PROCESSES OF PAKEHA CHANGE

IN RESPONSE TO

THE TREATY OF WAITANGI

A thesis submitted for the degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Waikato

by

Ingrid Huygens

2007

DEDICATION

To my father
the labourer-philosopher
who pondered these things
as he drove his tractor

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ABSTRACT

The sense of crisis that marks our times may be seen as a crisis for dominant groups whose once-secure hegemony is being challenged by marginalised others. It is in theorising the reply from the dominant group to the voices of the oppressed that existing Western conceptions of social change fall silent. The dominant Pakeha group in Aotearoa New Zealand has used discourses of benign colonisation and harmonious race relations to resist 165 years of communication from indigenous Maori about their oppression and a dishonoured treaty for settlement. My research documents the appearance of the Treaty of Waitangi into the Pakeha consciousness, and the now 30 year-long response by a Pakeha antiracism movement to educate their own cultural group about its agreements. Targeting government, community and social services organisations, activist educators used Freire's (1975) approach of conscientising dialogue to present a more critical view of colonisation, and to encourage participants to consider the complicity of their organisations in ongoing structural and cultural racism.

Based on my membership of local and national networks of activist educators, I was able to organise and facilitate data gathering from three sources to investigate processes of Pakeha change in: (i) unpublished material describing the antiracism and Treaty movement's historical theorising and strategies over 30 years, (ii) a country-wide process of co-theorising among contemporary Treaty educator groups about their work and perceived influence, and (iii) a collection of organisational accounts of Treaty-focused change. The collected records confirmed that a coherent anti-colonial discourse, which I have termed 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty', was in use to construct institutional and constitutional changes in non-government organisations. My interpretation of key elements in a local theory of transforming action included emotional responses to counter-cultural information, collective work for cultural and institutional change and practising a mutually agreed relationship with Maori. I concluded that these emotional, collective and relationship processes in dominant group change were crucial in helping to construct the new conceptual resources of 'affirming Maori authority' and 'striving towards a right relationship with Maori'. These counter-colonial constructions allowed Pakeha a non-resistant and facilitative response to Maori challenge, and enabled a dialogue with Maori about decolonisation.

By examining in one research programme the genealogy and interdependencies of a new discourse, my research contributes to theorising about the production of

new, counter-hegemonic discourses, and confirms the crucial part played by social movements in developing new, liberatory constructions of the social order.

My research calls for further theory-building on (i) emotional and spiritual aspects of transformational learning, (ii) processes involved in consciously-undertaken cultural change by dominant/coloniser groups, and (iii) practising of mutually agreed relationships with indigenous peoples by dominant/coloniser groups.

My research has implications for theorising how coloniser and dominant groups generally may participate in liberatory social change and decolonisation work, and the part played by the Western states in the global struggles by indigenous people for recognition of their world-views and aspirations.

It remains to be seen whether counter-colonial discourses and organisational changes aimed at 'honouring the Treaty' with indigenous peoples will be sufficiently widely adopted to help transform Western dominating cultures and colonial projects. In the meantime, acknowledging and documenting these counter-colonial discourses and their constructions opens up increasing possibilities for constructing, from a history of colonisation, a different future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PROCESSES OF PAKEHA CHANGE

IN RESPONSE TO

THE TREATY OF WAITANGI

A thesis submitted for the degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Waikato

by

Ingrid Huygens

2007

DEDICATION

To my father
the labourer-philosopher
who pondered these things
as he drove his tractor

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ABSTRACT

The sense of crisis that marks our times may be seen as a crisis for dominant groups whose once-secure hegemony is being challenged by marginalised others. It is in theorising the reply from the dominant group to the voices of the oppressed that existing Western conceptions of social change fall silent. The dominant Pakeha group in Aotearoa New Zealand has used discourses of benign colonisation and harmonious race relations to resist 165 years of communication from indigenous Maori about their oppression and a dishonoured treaty for settlement. My research documents the appearance of the Treaty of Waitangi into the Pakeha consciousness, and the now 30 year-long response by a Pakeha antiracism movement to educate their own cultural group about its agreements. Targeting government, community and social services organisations, activist educators used Freire's (1975) approach of conscientising dialogue to present a more critical view of colonisation, and to encourage participants to consider the complicity of their organisations in ongoing structural and cultural racism.

Based on my membership of local and national networks of activist educators, I was able to organise and facilitate data gathering from three sources to investigate processes of Pakeha change in: (i) unpublished material describing the antiracism and Treaty movement's historical theorising and strategies over 30 years, (ii) a country-wide process of co-theorising among contemporary Treaty educator groups about their work and perceived influence, and (iii) a collection of organisational accounts of Treaty-focused change. The collected records confirmed that a coherent anti-colonial discourse, which I have termed 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty', was in use to construct institutional and constitutional changes in non-government organisations. My interpretation of key elements in a local theory of transforming action included emotional responses to counter-cultural information, collective work for cultural and institutional change and practising a mutually agreed relationship with Maori. I concluded that these emotional, collective and relationship processes in dominant group change were crucial in helping to construct the new conceptual resources of 'affirming Maori authority' and 'striving towards a right relationship with Maori'. These counter-colonial constructions allowed Pakeha a non-resistant and facilitative response to Maori challenge, and enabled a dialogue with Maori about decolonisation.

By examining in one research programme the genealogy and interdependencies of a new discourse, my research contributes to theorising about the production of

new, counter-hegemonic discourses, and confirms the crucial part played by social movements in developing new, liberatory constructions of the social order.

My research calls for further theory-building on (i) emotional and spiritual aspects of transformational learning, (ii) processes involved in consciously-undertaken cultural change by dominant/coloniser groups, and (iii) practising of mutually agreed relationships with indigenous peoples by dominant/coloniser groups.

My research has implications for theorising how coloniser and dominant groups generally may participate in liberatory social change and decolonisation work, and the part played by the Western states in the global struggles by indigenous people for recognition of their world-views and aspirations.

It remains to be seen whether counter-colonial discourses and organisational changes aimed at 'honouring the Treaty' with indigenous peoples will be sufficiently widely adopted to help transform Western dominating cultures and colonial projects. In the meantime, acknowledging and documenting these counter-colonial discourses and their constructions opens up increasing possibilities for constructing, from a history of colonisation, a different future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1.0

INTRODUCTION

> I consider the fundamental theme of our epoch to be
> that of domination – which implies its opposite, the
> theme of liberation, as the objective to be
> achieved…
>
> Any given society within the broader epochal unit
> contains, in addition to the universal...its own
> particular themes…
>
> Freire, 1972, p. 84

1.1 Purpose of study

There are schools of thought and political opinion in which the privilege and wealth enjoyed by one human group at the expense of another is treated as 'natural', and justifiable. There are also scholarly and activist traditions in which social justice and equitable resource distribution between groups are considered essential components of the 'good society' (Prilleltensky & Fox, 1997). As global distribution of wealth, health and ability to exert control over one's destiny rapidly centres on privileged elites and dominant cultural groups, these latter schools of thought argue that the intensification of the dominance of particular groups is a significant contributor to the exacerbation of poverty and the risk of social unrest. These traditions express a growing concern about the justice of systems that perpetuate these social outcomes, and advocate change to the status quo of Westernised societies (Sloan, 2005). In countries like New Zealand, the ideas of a non-coercive, inclusive and democratic society are common to most political and scholarly traditions, and are assumed as a basis of policy and practice in our public institutions. And yet, speaking in the growing critical tradition, educator Donald Macedo has said that the relationship between privileged and "at risk" groups "has less to do with a democratic society than with a colonial society, even though we are not allowed to call it so" (in Freire, 1998, p. xxvii).

The ideals of European colonial capitalism were essentially partial and oriented to the interests of the coloniser, so that colonisation is built on a fundamentally inequitable discourse of superiority and exploitation. As expressed by critical

psychologists, "the underlying values and institutions of modern societies, (particularly, but not only capitalist societies) reinforce misguided efforts to obtain fulfilment while maintaining inequality and oppression" (Prilleltensky & Fox, 1997, p. 4). In this rising critical tradition within the human and environmental sciences, it is becoming pertinent to consider how wealthy, privileged or culturally dominant groups may be encouraged to recognise their disproportionate power and resources as undesirable and to undertake change in their societies. In the context of these concerns, my research aimed to contribute to theorising about how dominant groups may involve themselves in processes of change to their patterns of dominance. I was particularly interested in the "internal colonialism" (Feagin & Feagin, 1978, p. 9) pertaining in many modern democracies, including New Zealand.

In this opening chapter, I introduce my research aim and the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi, and orient the reader to my research approach.

1.1.1 Research aim

Colonisation of the Pacific by European nations created oppressive social relations between settlers and indigenous peoples in Aotearoa New Zealand, despite a treaty between indigenous Maori and the colonising Pakeha. My research investigates how we, as Pakeha, theorise our own change processes in response to learning about the agreements made in *Te Tiriti o Waitangi, 1840*. I aim thereby to contribute to an understanding of dominant group change in the fields of critical psychology and transformational learning, and to support a decolonisation agenda wherein a coloniser group actively participates in their own decolonisation.

New Zealand today is a place where the European colonial projects of the 18th and 19th centuries, and indigenous responses to them, are visible in everyday relationships. Many Pakeha contend that in the treaty signed at Waitangi in 1840 by the British Crown with the indigenous peoples, Maori signed over their country to culturally superior colonisers, and 'ought to be jolly grateful for the benefits of civilisation'[1]. Many Maori claim that their unqualified and self-

---

[1] From workshop commentary, Mitzi Nairn, past Director of Programme on Racism, New Zealand Council of Churches.

determined authority in this country was confirmed in the Maori text of the treaty, *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* and continues to this day. From their viewpoint, Pakeha ought to learn to work respectfully with Maori constitutional authority and Maori societal institutions (Awatere, 1984; Jackson, 1988; Walker, 1990). This thesis records my search for theorising on how Pakeha, as members of a coloniser group in New Zealand, become critically conscious of the local situation and begin to act to change it.

1.1.2 Local & international significance

A treaty between nations

Nga iwi Maori[2] are the indigenous peoples, literally, 'the ordinary people' (Williams, 1971) of Aotearoa New Zealand, descended from successive Polynesian migrations over a millennium. *Pakeha* (a reference to paleness) is the name they gave to the settlers arriving in some numbers in the 1800s, who were predominantly of English, Scottish and Irish descent. Both 'Maori' and 'Pakeha' as ethnic descriptors emerged through inter-cultural contact, since indigenous tribes call themselves *tangata whenua*, which may be translated as 'people who are the land'. Their key economic and political entity was the *hapu*, a collective related by kinship and able to trace descent from a common ancestor. A larger collective, the *iwi*, denotes a grouping of hapu. Treaties to govern access to resources were common between polities with sovereign authority such as hapu and iwi. Making, monitoring and keeping such political contracts was a primary feature of the Aotearoa political and economic landscape (Jackson, 2000). In the early 1800s, when Australian and American ships began calling at these shores, inter-hapu and international relations in Aotearoa New Zealand could be viewed as a complex diplomacy of 'united nations'[3]. As part of the British interest in Australia and New Zealand, a symbolic British Resident was sent to live at Waitangi in the Bay of Islands. He encouraged the northern leaders to sign a Declaration of Independence (Moon, 2002), *He Wakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tireni, 1835*, which used the term *te tino rangatiratanga* to capture the independence and absolute sovereignty of hapu over their country. Continued pressure on the British Colonial Office led in 1840 to Captain Hobson

---

[2] Words from *te reo*, the Maori language, are italicised the first time they are used, and also appear in the Glossary. Owing to limits in technology, I have not been able to include the required macron to indicate long vowels in Maori words.

[3] Treaty educator gatherings, mid 1990s.

being sent to sign a formal treaty with over 500 political leaders around the country. Translated by missionaries into the Maori language, this treaty text is known as *Te Tiriti o Waitangi, 1840,* named for the place at which it was first signed. The treaty text confirmed te tino rangatiratanga asserted in the Declaration, allowed for the settlers to set up a government (*kawanatanga*) and buy land, and gave the rights of British subjects to Maori as well as to the new settlers. Sometimes called 'the Maori text', there is no mention in te Tiriti o Waitangi of hapu ceding their political authority, and indeed many hapu and iwi did not sign since there was no need to confirm powers they already held. The main concession as seen by Maori was allowing the British Crown a monopoly on land buying (Simpson, 1979) and allowing them to set up an administrative government, initially to regulate trade and to bring the settlers to order (Yensen, Hague, & McCreanor, 1989). By emphasising the retention of existing Maori authority alongside a limited British power to set up administrative systems and buy land, te Tiriti o Waitangi was typical of treaties agreed between any two sovereign nations during peacetime. It confirmed existing political authorities and agreed to a new relationship between them (Jackson, 2000). However, a recovered English version of the treaty records that the British intended that Maori cede to them their sovereignty over Aotearoa New Zealand and retain a lesser, limited authority described as "undisturbed possession of their Lands and Estates, Forests and Fisheries and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess" (English text of Treaty of Waitangi, 1840). Gazetted by the Colonial Office as a translation, the English version is recognised by the Treaty of Waitangi Act, 1975, as having equal standing with the Maori text, since they both carried signatures[4].

The English and Maori texts of the Treaty of Waitangi could be said to express, respectively, a colonial view and an indigenous view of the intended relationship between the parties. In the difference between the two versions lies a key source of tension between Maori and Pakeha in New Zealand today. Te Tiriti o Waitangi is often described by Maori as a covenant, a social contract for how two independent nations could reside peacefully in a shared territory. In this sense it can be seen as a record of the social reality that Maori people expected to construct with the settlers. In contrast, from the time of the signing of the Treaty,

---

[4] Hobson's English wording was signed by 39 leaders but a convincing argument can be made that the effective oral media of the Maori world would have ensured that these signatories were in support of the Maori text signed at Waitangi (M.Nairn, personal communication).

most Pakeha had little knowledge of, or interest in, the Treaty. Understanding of the concepts of *mana* and te tino rangatiratanga was limited to a very few missionaries, and Pakeha were on the whole oblivious to the responsibilities agreed to on their behalf by the British Crown in either text (Moon, 2007). Instead, the settlers brought their 'commonsense' ideologies for responding to indigenous peoples from the European tradition of colonial cultural racism (McCreanor, 1997). They instituted their view of a 'peaceful' society, one in which indigenous law, trade, education, political practices and language were supplanted by those of the coloniser, so that the settlers were advantaged and Maori people suffered ongoing deprivation (Belich, 1986, 1996; Walker, 1990).

For most Pakeha the focus on the Treaty in the late 20th century came out of the blue. Many of us had never heard of it, some knew it as an old document signed a long time ago, and others had vague recollections of some copper-plate writing behind glass hanging in a school corridor. Da Silva (1994a) describes Treaty education as a policy issue that surfaced in the late 1970s and spread in the 1980s. She contrasts the comments of two Race Relations Conciliators a decade apart to demonstrate the shift in national policy. In 1982, Hiwi Tauroa described the major emphasis of his report *Race Against Time* as "social change… and the building of a true multi-cultural society…". He did not mention the Treaty at all during his commentary on Maori protest. However, by 1992 Chris Laidlaw, was moved to say: "It's one of the 20th century miracles that the Treaty has responded to resuscitation the way it has" (cited in da Silva, 1994a, p. 34). The intriguing question that arises in the New Zealand social context is how such a dramatic change occurred in Pakeha awareness.

In contrast to the 'miraculous resuscitation' of the Treaty in Pakeha awareness, Maori have maintained a steady focus on the agreement. Protest against its dishonour began almost immediately after te Tiriti was signed. Its first signatory, Hone Heke, cut down the flagpole and customs signal balls at Kororareka in protest that the new Governor had unilaterally taken down the flag of the United Tribes and imposed a customs duty driving away lucrative trade. Heke believed that the two flags should fly together to symbolise the co-existence of two powers in New Zealand. Another northern signatory who reversed his opinion was Nopera Panakareao. Signing the Treaty at Kaitaia, he spoke the famous words: "The shadow of the land has passed to the Queen, the substance remains with us" (Walker, 1990, p. 98). Within a year, Panakareao reversed that statement. In the early 1880s Ngapuhi iwi built a Treaty house at Waitangi as a reminder of the enduring nature of the treaty (Walker, 1990, p. 161). Their discussions had

concluded that it was colonisation, not the Treaty of Waitangi, which was at fault. In a petition to Queen Victoria, a Ngapuhi delegation pointed to the numerous instances of colonial actions since 1840 intended to "trample under the soles of their feet the Treaty of Waitangi" (Walker, 1990, p. 161). They requested a commission of inquiry to "draw forth from beneath the many unauthorised acts of the New Zealand Parliament the concealed treaty that it may now assert its own dignity" (Walker, 1990, p. 161). The *Kotahitanga* movement of the 1890s was a comprehensive effort to secure the autonomy and full participation in the functions of the state guaranteed in the Treaty. The later *Kauhanganui* movement (see Appendix 1) continued until the 1920s to call for recognition of Maori autonomy (*mana motuhake*) and treaty rights (Orange, 1987, p. 226). In 1920, as Wiremu Ratana began his mission of pursuing political objectives for Maori through a religious vehicle, he announced: "I will shake hands with King George and lay before him the Treaty of Waitangi and I will ask him: is this the Treaty you made, what do you think of it? He will not be able to deny it" (Simpson, 1979, p. 227). When the British Crown proved unheeding, Ratana went on to organise a mass petition seeking to have the Treaty embodied in statute, gaining over 30,000 signatures. The first Ratana member of Parliament, Eruera Tirikatene, presented the petition to the House in 1932 and began his maiden speech with: "My policy is to stand for the rights and privileges of the whole Maori race as embodied in the Treaty of Waitangi…" (Simpson, 1979, p. 229). Ratana's petition lay on the table of the House for 13 years before it was considered, even though the political party (Labour) to which Ratana brought his considerable constituency was in government throughout this period. The response, when it came, was a government edict to hang a copy of the Treaty in every school. It was at this time, as Ratana's submission lay unread by the New Zealand Parliament, that Pakeha speechmakers in 1940 blithely spoke of the "best race relations in the world" [5]. Within 100 years of its signing, Pakeha had so successfully forgotten the Treaty that we believed the relationship between Maori and Pakeha to be harmonious, and a matter for some pride internationally.

So how did Pakeha, complacent in our self-congratulatory worldview, begin to respond to the less favourable view of colonial history as experienced by Maori? The contention of my thesis is that the emergence of the Treaty into Pakeha consciousness did not happen 'out of the blue', nor because mysterious processes were at work, such as Pakeha New Zealanders suddenly having a 'sea-change' of heart towards Maori people. I explore a number of avenues to show that the

---

[5] from speech by Governor General at Treaty of Waitangi centennial celebrations, 1940.

resuscitation was not, in fact, a miracle. The present-day focus on the Treaty of Waitangi has traceable antecedents in a Maori critique of colonisation and in a recent, but significant, Pakeha response to the Maori experience.

Continuing colonisation

The tensions that arise in the relationship between indigenous and non-indigenous inhabitants of New Zealand are echoed throughout the world. The emergence of European capitalism from the 1500s onwards depended upon systematic exploitation of environmental and human resources in other lands. Backed up by institutional and military force, the process was termed colonisation or colonialism. Still continuing today, colonisation follows standard processes whereby the colonisers take control of indigenous spirituality, land, law, language and education, health and family structures, and finally culture itself (M. Nairn, 1990). The outcome for indigenous populations worldwide has been poor health, social disruption, low educational achievement, and suppression of culture, language and spirit. Approximately 300 million indigenous peoples live in 70 member states of United Nations. Continuing exploitation of the physical, intellectual and genetic property of indigenous peoples is sometimes termed 're-colonisation', 'neo-colonisation' or ongoing colonisation (Glover, Dudgeon, & Huygens, 2005). An example of an ongoing colonising practice is the reduction of indigenous culture to an exotic commodity to be sold to international and local tourists. Another example is the contemporary passage of confiscatory legislation (see, for example, Stavenhagen, 2006, on the Seabed and Foreshore Act 2004).

When European powers began withdrawing direct political control from their former colonies in the 1940s, the term 'decolonisation' was applied in the political arena, referring to the formal process of handing over the instruments of governance to the indigenous inhabitants of a colony. The meaning of the term decolonisation has gained,over time a more social and psychological orientation, and has more recently been described as a "long-term process involving the bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic and psychological divesting of colonial power" (Smith, 1999, p. 98).

Two related aspects of continuing colonisation are pertinent to this thesis – notions of political authority and human rights, and the dominant group's blindness to indigenous worldviews. Present day dialogues about human rights often progress in ignorance of their impact on indigenous struggles for collective and cultural rights (Glover et al, 2005). Western democracies reinforce the notion

that human rights are held by individuals and that one's political power is derived from individual citizenship granted by a nation state. Indigenous and tribal peoples struggle to retain a basis for their rights as cultural collectives, and to retain a basis for political authority that is not derived from Western political and constitutional structures. Generally, they pursue the notion that their political authority is determined, collectively, by them. Maori delegates were part of a Pacific Peoples workshop in 1996 which adopted the Resolution on Decolonisation for Indigenous Peoples of the Pacific The preamble refers to their "timeless history as free and independent Nations" existing in a "state of dynamic social, cultural and political evolution which has been obstructed by colonialism…". They go on to explain:

> The inherent right of self-determination of Indigenous Peoples as expressed in article 3 of the UN Draft Declaration is continually being denied by states. Indeed states continue to define the rights of Indigenous Peoples in colonial terms. (Pacific Peoples' workshop, 1996).

The struggle by tangata whenua for te tino rangatiratanga in New Zealand contributes to an international struggle by indigenous peoples for recognition of their political rights and status. The United Nations Declaration for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which has been under development by indigenous peoples worldwide since 1982, challenges colonial notions of justice and rights as residing in the individual rights upheld by the modern nation state. Instead, the Declaration asserts the right of indigenous peoples to self-determination as a people, including their right to determine their political status. It is this assertion upon which resistance to the Declaration by culturally dominant groups has turned, resulting in its glacial progress towards adoption among international human rights instruments. Despite the significant influence of Maori on the shaping of the declaration, our government was among those who failed to ratify the Declaration during the 1995 – 2004 Decade of the World's Indigenous Peoples. The Anglophone trio of New Zealand, Australia and the United States continued to strenuously resist its progress, proposing dilutions to its claims, and together with Canada, voted against its passage recently in weakened form at the United Nations (Peace Movement Aotearoa, 2007). Our New Zealand experience may thus be particularly pertinent to other countries colonised by the British, such as the United States, Canada and Australia. There are likely to be important parallels between the experience of Pakeha New Zealanders as we respond to assertions of indigenous self-determination and those of other coloniser groups led by governments unwilling to support the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Maori claims to their guaranteed political authority, and to their unique cultural status as indigenous peoples, continue in response to ongoing colonising processes and standard colonial discourse (McCreanor, 2005). Throughout the chronology of colonisation and the establishing of political dominance and cultural hegemony by Pakeha, there is woven an alternative story which takes the 1840 Treaty agreement between Maori and Pakeha as its root. 'Honouring the Treaty' has been a vital discourse in the Maori world since its signing (Walker, 1990). As Maori activists have explained over the years to Pakeha anti-racism workers: "We have been hearing about the Treaty all our lives on the marae" usually in Maori. However, it was not until the latter half of the 20th century that Pakeha in any numbers began to question the colonial status quo, and not until the 1970s that a significant number of Pakeha could be said to have 'changed' the way they conceptualised the Pakeha-Maori relationship. This thesis documents how, in 1986 as the country looked towards the sesquicentenary of the Treaty signing, Pakeha were formally invited to educate themselves in preparation for dialogue with Maori about the Treaty. Two decades have passed since the launching of the national campaign *Project Waitangi: Pakeha Debate the Treaty* to educate a dominant group for social change. The high profile of the Treaty in New Zealand today means that a study of Pakeha responses to learning about the Treaty since that campaign is relevant and timely.

1.2 Personal background

My background was a primary influence on my choice of research topic and approach. I am a New Zealand-born child of Dutch parents who believed they were coming to country where Maori and Europeans lived in harmony, and where all cultures were treated with tolerance. They arrived instead to find the Pakeha mono-culturalism of 1950s New Zealand. In the rural and strongly Maori setting of the Bay of Plenty, they optimistically bought records for us to learn *waiata* before we went to school, only to see our disappointed faces at the end of the day – we had sung only English nursery rhymes. As a child bilingual in Dutch and English, I learned how it felt to be treated in racist ways by a dominant cultural group, and saw that Maori were also so treated. Hearing our language, culture and food denigrated laid a youthful foundation of critique of self-serving dominant discourses. My father was sacked twice in his life from a non-unionised occupational group, not for his applauded work in bringing golf courses to national tournament standard, but for his stubborn insistence, certainly delivered

in a strong Dutch accent, on spending Sundays with his family. In those years, when white New Zealanders seldom described themselves as an ethnic group, I remember my father coming home one day from the golf course over which the local hapu often passed on their way to fishing grounds. He announced with excitement, "We are Pakeha! The old Maori men explained that all the white foreigners are Pakeha…". We were delighted to be given a name and a place in New Zealand society.

When we shifted to Nelson in the South Island, where Italians and Lebanese had already settled as non-Anglophone immigrants, our language, our school lunches and our family life were less visibly different. But local Maori were invisible here too, with no recognition of their position as tangata whenua of the area. In later years, I came to appreciate that a culturally blind or 'colour blind' community can be racist in more subtle ways than an overtly hostile one.

For Pakeha teenagers in the late 1960s, our primary expression of sentiments about social injustice was through interest in 'underdeveloped countries'. As a school leaver teacher with Volunteer Service Abroad in the Solomon Islands, I found that the so-called 'most underdeveloped' country in the Pacific was brimming with multilingual communities maintaining complex economic, political and spiritual systems. I left with a conviction that every society has profound ways of dealing with all facets of life, and that labels such as 'underdeveloped' and 'primitive' were but a mono-cultural defence by the Western world against the richness and sophistication of other cultures.

With many other young Pakeha, I joined the Maori Land March in 1975, and wondered how else we could support change in New Zealand society. A typical expression of support for Maori rights and culture for my young generation was to join a *kapa haka* performance group (e.g. Ritchie, 1992). As one of three Pakeha performing in the back row of the Auckland University Maori Club, I travelled to rural *marae* and heard our speakers diplomatically defending our presence in the Maori cultural renaissance. In this group, I witnessed the rise of activism that would soon burst upon the country in 1978 as the He Taua challenge to Auckland university engineering students for their mockery of the *haka*. Later, two decades in the Auckland lesbian feminist community involved me in acting politically and socially on behalf of our own marginalised group, and simultaneously how it felt to be challenged about our racism and privilege by Maori flatmates and friends (Huygens, 2000a). I was training as a community psychologist at the time, and came to understand that an oppressed group may be asking not for

'empowerment' by another, but that the dominant group undertake their own work to change themselves (Huygens, 1988).

The forming of activist Pakeha groups in the 1980s helped many of us move on from uncritical participation in Maori efforts at change. My conscious involvement in anti-racism work began in 1984 with the Auckland Lesbian AntiRacism Group. Small groups of us travelled to join the Maori-led *hikoi* to Waitangi each year, where we met other Pakeha activists. In 1989, I joined Project Waitangi, attracted to adult education as a tool for change. I found myself part of a nation-wide network of activists and educators, and felt that I had found a vehicle and community for a lifelong commitment. With them, I came to understand that although my first language and culture had been marginalised by the Anglophone majority, I was part of a larger settler group who were in our turn suppressing Maori language and culture.

The late John Kirton (1997) dedicates his book to those working for change with the words:

<div align="center">

to Paakeha/Tauiwi who dare -
to those who look deep and challenge their own
to construct *ways of being* that practise a shared justice -
and to the courage of Te Tiriti and Antiracism Networks.
Above all else
this small book greets the multitude, past and present, who
- accepting the pledges of our Paakeha ancestors to be honourable -
TODAY INSIST THAT HONOUR BE FOUND (p. iii)

</div>

Kirton's capital letters help to emphasise the personal significance of the Treaty to me as a Pakeha meaning to live honourably in the country in which my parents settled.

1.2.1 Professional involvements

Beyond the impact of personal background, my research choices were strongly influenced by the ethics and value base of my professional involvements as a community psychologist and as a Treaty educator. My professional identity as a registered psychologist committed me to values of social and cultural justice and to a commitment to affirm the Treaty of Waitangi in our professional practice, as expressed in the New Zealand Psychological Society's Code of Ethics (2002) and in the Objectives of the Institute of Community Psychology Aotearoa (2005).

Community psychology also insists that interventions, including research, should strengthen and resource the aspirations of participants and communities (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2005).

I worked as a community psychologist and as an independent Treaty educator from 1989 onwards with organisations in the health, social services and education sectors, which encouraged my interest in how Pakeha made changes in their workplaces (e.g. Huygens, 1999). Working as a senior manager in tertiary education in the mid-1990s helped me to appreciate how Pakeha staff may welcome or resist organisational changes. Being the manager supporting the Maori unit enhanced my appreciation of the struggles and successes of Maori staff trying to make overwhelmingly Pakeha institutions more welcoming for their people.

1.3 Research orientation

I had often pondered on how we could evaluate the impact in New Zealand society of Pakeha learning about the Treaty. I knew that people spoke strongly of the effects, both positive and negative, of education about the Treaty in their workplaces (e.g. Consedine & Consedine, 2001). My personal and professional experiences suggested a qualitative, rather than a quantitative, study of the cultural and social significance of Treaty-focused changes among the dominant Pakeha group. I wanted to explore the quality of changes made by Pakeha in response to the Treaty, rather than to assess, for instance, how many organisations had included the Treaty in their charters or made changes to professional practices, although the latter are significant evaluative questions in New Zealand today. My thoughts turned eventually to the meaning or symbolic role of Treaty education in our current socio-political and organisational contexts, and how Pakeha interpreted such learning about the Treaty.

1.3.1 Focusing on Pakeha process

The orientation I adopt in this thesis is thus a **social constructionist** one, lending itself to questions of how and why in socio-cultural matters. The Treaty itself may be viewed as the blend of social reality and symbolic interactionism that typifies the social constructionist paradigm (Berger & Luckmann, 1967). Contemporary

Pakeha responses to learning about the Treaty could be considered delayed appreciation of what Captain Hobson signed on behalf of the white settlers.

My research links a social constructionist research orientation to a **decolonisation agenda** (Smith, 1999), and is in this sense an interventionist approach in the tradition of participatory action research favoured by community psychologists. There is an increasing demand that qualitative and critical inquiry move "beyond rage to progressive political action, to theory and method that connect politics, pedagogy and ethics to action in the world" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. x). Since all knowledge of the world and theory about the world is tied to the social and political conditions surrounding its use, I wanted to follow the insistence by critical theorists on "tracing historically the conditions of possibility of knowledges" (Henriques, Hollway, Urwin, Venn, & Walkerdine, 1984, p. 92). I also wanted to help "announce" (Freire, 1975) and promote such new knowledge within our current social and political climate. To accomplish this, I moved beyond **critical theorising** as a means to undo ideological webs of dominance and selected an orientation that was emancipatory or **liberatory** as well as critical. I wanted to address directly the questions of how, where and with what effect does a liberatory ideology arise in a dominant group. I intended with this research to contribute to such emancipatory change in Aotearoa New Zealand, as well as contributing to theory-building in the areas of critical psychology and social change work.

In considering how a dominant colonial group may participate in decolonisation, a possible approach would have been to look to social movements around the world, such as the movement of men against patriarchal violence or white antiracism work in many countries. However, as I conducted preliminary searches of international databases, it became clear that reflections on practice in social change movements were seldom published in scholarly literature, and that such reflections would be extremely time consuming to source and gather from activist and educational centres overseas. Thus, rather than review sparse or unpublished work elsewhere, I decided to explore the theoretical basis of local decolonisation work by Pakeha, and its impact in workplaces.

I saw in the New Zealand campaign to educate Pakeha about the Treaty of Waitangi an explicit attempt to encourage change in a dominant group. Reflections on this campaign have prompted calls for "theoretical consideration of all the roles of education in social change processes and further development in the area of working with a dominant group" (Herzog, 1996), p. 76). I therefore

focused upon gathering and studying the reflective practice of our local Treaty movement for change. Thus this research looks to oral and written literatures within Pakeha antiracism and Treaty work and from Treaty-focused workplaces to explore how and why a dominant group may change.

There was another reason for focusing my research on Pakeha processes of change. There is in liberatory and feminist theory an understanding of the "epistemic privilege of the oppressed" (Narayan, 1988, p. 31), such that critically aware members of an oppressed group may be considered experts on how the social system functions to oppress them, and skilled at evaluating changes that will make a significant difference. In keeping with these considerations, I could have approached Maori commentators and sought their understandings about how Pakeha change, but did not for two reasons. The first was a question of respectful ethics – working in coalition with Maori activists had brought Pakeha Treaty workers to appreciate how much time and energy for Maori was bound up in the overwhelming agenda of working for their own people at political, cultural and survival levels. Given my ethical commitments, it did not feel appropriate to ask for time to help investigate processes within the coloniser group. The second was a question of epistemology and positioning – because I was researching the processes (rather than the outcomes) of how a dominant/coloniser group theorise their own changes, Maori might genuinely be unaware of 'how Pakeha change' from the inside. So, I undertook to proceed with "methodogical humility" and "methodological caution" (Narayan, 1988, p. 37), acknowledging that working as a dominant group member I might miss, or be dismissive of, crucial aspects of the relationship between Pakeha and Maori.

1.3.2 Ontological and cultural blindness

Contemplating the agenda of decolonisation put forward by indigenous people around the world, it is challenging for Western scholars to study ways in which linguistic and psychological power may be 'divested' by a dominant group in favour of indigenous peoples (Smith, 1999). The decision to focus on Pakeha participation in local decolonisation work involved me in a dilemma. Dominant groups in colonial settings typically maintain an ontological and epistemological hegemony to the detriment of indigenous peoples. We construct our worlds through dominant discourses, and are materially privileged by them (Hall, 2001). Most Pakeha appear 'blind' to their cultural dominance and its role in oppression of another. Most Pakeha do not perceive the lack of tino rangatiratanga for Maori as unjust. Sartre, following Memmi, would describe us as "self-accepting

colonisers" (in Memmi, 1965, p. xxii). Even where researchers have explicitly sought data in which Pakeha discuss challenges from Maori to their cultural dominance, little emerged in the way of self-reflection by Pakeha as a group. When Nairn and McCreanor (1990, 1991) analysed a large body of material relating to race relations between Maori and Pakeha they found that most Pakeha informants focused on Maori as the problem rather than on Pakeha processes. Any notion that the status quo might change was far from their minds. Other research has shown little or no self-reflective reference to culture in Pakeha accounts of girlhood memories (Hamerton, 2000) or in stories of recovery of mental health (Black, 1997). In another example of ontological blindness, a 2004 poll found that New Zealanders over-estimated their knowledge of the Treaty. Moewaka Barnes et al (2005) reported that the UMR Treaty of Waitangi Awareness Research found that over half of respondents believed they had a good knowledge of the Treaty and settlement processes, yet less than half could name the Waitangi Tribunal, only a third could give the date the Treaty was signed and less than a third could name Hobson as the Crown's chief negotiator of the time (p. 36).

John Kirton (1997) develops the same dilemma in his extended theoretical discussion entitled *Pakeha/Tauiwi: Seeing the Unseen*. He argues that our inability to perceive our society as racist is evidence of the fragile grip that Pakeha have on reality:

> In the face of a general belief that our systems are free of racism…when stories of consequences for Maaori are so available, the continuing presence of Paakeha/ Tauiwi racism itself demonstrates any control we exercise over 'reality' to be very limited. (Kirton, 1997, p. 39).

Part of the struggle for indigenous peoples lies in the difficulty the Western world has in accepting that indigenous peoples define themselves and their world-views according to self-determined criteria not derived from any Western system of religion, history, philosophy or politics. This could be seen as a struggle over whose social reality may claim to exist, and scholars must clarify where they stand in such a struggle. Since ontologies have socio-political underpinnings (Crotty, 1998), an important step towards resolving the issue of ontological blindness seemed to me to lie in the arena of politics and ethics – whose world view will be accepted as valid and worthy of respect? Kirton (1997) proposes a political resolution, based in praxis – that of making ourselves accountable to Maori, thereby deliberately structuring an alternative power relationship where the dominant group makes their work accountable to those holding the marginalised worldview. Humphries and Martin (2005) frame an ethical resolution to our Pakeha blindness to racism. Pointing out that *te Ao Maori*, the Maori world and

world-view, is constructed by its supporters as intending to continue into the future, they ask "What is the Pakeha response-ability in relation to a world which intends to continue?" As they put it: "We can talk assimilation into being, we can talk mutual respect into being, we can talk a creative relationship between two different worlds into being" (Humphries & Martin, 2005; Martin, Humphries with Te Rangiita, 2005).

I have followed the general ethical and political stance taken by Kirton (1997) and Humphries and Martin (2005) in accepting the self-determined legitimacy of the Maori worldview. I therefore accept the validity of the assertion by those Maori who have posited te tino rangatiratanga, or unqualified authority of those with *mana whenua* (Walker, 1990, and others), as their basis for a just society in this country. Thus, in exploring Pakeha responses to Maori notions of justice, this study accepts that:

> Indigenous Peoples have the full right to self determination that all other peoples of the world have under international law, including all rights to decolonisation and permanent sovereignty, as expressed in U.N. General Assembly Resolution 1514 (XV) of 1960. (Pacific Peoples' workshop, 1996).

In conclusion, I took as a foundation the 'epistemic privilege' of Maori in their claims that they are unable to express the self-determined authority guaranteed in te Tiriti o Waitangi and affirmed in the Declaration of Indigenous Peoples Rights. In this thesis, I proceeded to explore the Pakeha response to these claims.

1.3.3 Useful terminology

I have used the terms **Maori** and **Pakeha** throughout, following King's (1985) argument that these words have meaning, relevance and appropriateness in the context of New Zealand life and history. As he puts it: "Both offer a kind of shorthand to describe two broadly separate though not homogenous cultural traditions", which represent "actual cultural options, two different forces in New Zealand by which people can chose to organise their lives" (p. 13).

I found the term **dominant group** useful to denote a "culture defining group" as defined by Tyler (1992) to mean the group whose culture constitutes the implicit norm for the broader society. In present-day New Zealand the culture-defining group is **Pakeha**, white descendants of British settlers. This group enjoys and routinely maintains cultural dominance within all government institutions. I rely on this combined cultural/political definition of Pakeha throughout the thesis. Although in historical terms, 'Pakeha' was used in the Treaty to refer to all the

intended new settlers, it has since come to denote white settlers of British and North European ancestry. The phrase **Pakeha/tauiwi** is sometimes useful to emphasise the inclusion of Pakeha among *tauiwi*, denoting all non-indigenous people living here.

Treaty education typically introduces both versions of the treaty. Both versions confirm Maori as retaining powers – either retaining "te tino rangatiratanga" in the Maori text or retaining "undisturbed possession" of their estates in the English text. Both of these powers could be said not to pertain in New Zealand today. For this reason, I use the broad term **Treaty work** to denote all work towards a te Tiriti or Treaty-based future for Aotearoa New Zealand. Where participants specified the Maori text of te Tiriti, as is increasingly common today, and where their theorising was explicitly about the constitutional issue of rangatiratanga, I have used te Tiriti. I use **Treaty workers** as a general term to describe those who undertake protest, critique, change or education in support of te Tiriti/Treaty in their workplaces or community settings. I use the term **Treaty educators** specifically to refer to those who work as contracted educators with groups and organisations, usually, but not always, external to their own workplace.

1.4 Guide to the thesis

Chapter 1 Introduction presents my research aim and its relevance in a global context of continuing colonisation for indigenous peoples. The Treaty of Waitangi is introduced as a historical and contemporary focus for change in Aotearoa New Zealand. I share my personal background and commitments in the area of Treaty-based change, and orient the reader towards my choice of a qualitative approach to Pakeha change processes.

Chapter 2 Local colonisation and responses presents the New Zealand socio-political context using several critical devices. An account of the standard story of our colonial history is contrasted with a critical timeline of Maori and Pakeha actions and responses from 1840 to the present (Appendix 1). Using published local literature, I give a 'public eye' view of the impact of revisited histories and critiques of institutional racism, and establish the persistence of a self-serving dominant discourse for Pakeha.

Chapter 3 Concepts of social change looks to the international literature for theories of changing from the point of view of interested participants in a dominant group. I critique both empiricist and social constructionist traditions for a scarcity of emancipatory theory about dominant group change, and for the meta-theoretical constraints on developing such theory.

Chapter 4 Methodologies for transformative action argues for an epistemology and methodologies that highlight interactive consciousness-raising to create new constructions of reality and thus new theory for change. I develop a convergence of Freire's liberatory theory, Eyerman and Jamison's notion of the 'cognitive praxis' of social movements and aspects of critical inquiry to underpin my research. Used together, these approaches provide a research strategy for investigating Treaty work as a site of new discourses with which to theorise Pakeha change processes.

Chapter 5 Scholar in a social movement gives a rationale for my research positioning as an insider and co-theoriser with other Pakeha doing Treaty work and education. I describe the participatory processes I undertook to gather and record work towards change and decolonisation by Pakeha/tauiwi. My positioning led to a research design of three studies:

Study 1 (Chapter 6) Developing treaty theorising
 - constructing an intellectual history of theory and practice in Pakeha antiracism and Treaty work from previously unpublished literature.

Study 2 (Chapters 7 and 8) Contemporary theorising of Pakeha change
 - co-theorising with other Treaty educators about the processes of Pakeha change.

Study 3 (Chapter 9) Organisational discourses of Treaty-based change
 - analysing narratives of Treaty-focused changes in workplaces.

In the three studies I refer to data contained in publications arising from the research:
- *Treaty Conference Proceedings 2000* (Huygens, Maclachlan, Yensen, Huijbers & Reid, 2000) containing the accounts of organisational journeys to implement the Treaty.

- *How Pakeha Change in response to te Tiriti: collected focus group records* (Huygens, 2004) containing the full regional and national discussions and photos.
- *Carrying the Treaty in our Hearts: Treaty educators speak 2003* (Huygens, 2005a) a video of Treaty educators presenting their groups' visual theorising work

These publications can be found in the accompanying CD/DVD and at http//:www.ihuygens.org.nz

The thesis converges again in the final chapters:

Chapter 10 Integration: A local theory of transforming action integrates the findings of the three studies. I propose a series of key elements towards a theory of Pakeha change processes, and identify where my interpretations of local theory extend existing concepts of change.

Chapter 11 Conclusions evaluates the impact of Pakeha learning about the Treaty within a local agenda of decolonisation. Limits to the present research are discussed, and implications for theory and practice identified.

CHAPTER 2.0

LOCAL COLONISATION AND RESPONSES

> From the point of view of political education,
> common sense is not only its necessary starting
> point, but its most formidable obstacle.
>   Adamson, 1980, p. 151, on Gramsci

This chapter introduces various arenas of change, and resistance to change, in Maori Pakeha relations. To show how Pakeha dominance was established, a 'common sense' version of New Zealand's colonial history is contrasted with a more critical view, in which settler indifference and refusal to listen to the other party to the Treaty characterises the Maori Pakeha relationship. Contemporary Pakeha responses to the Maori experience of colonisation are outlined – in revisited histories, legal and institutional initiatives, and in public discourse and the media. These more publicly visible responses by Pakeha provide a historical and sociopolitical context for my research, in which I explore what may be gleaned from lesser known and unpublished accounts.

Aspects of this chapter may have an effect of simulating for readers the experience of Pakeha who are brought up on standard versions of our history, only to discover that Maori have experienced a different history. Such a journey of changing awareness about sociopolitical 'realities', and critical learning about who benefits from each version, is an enduring theme throughout the thesis.

2.1 Standard story of New Zealand history

A 'standard story' (Fish, 1980; Nairn & McCreanor, 1991) draws on dominant discourses to cast the history of present-day political, social and cultural arrangements in a positive and inevitable light. Resources from the dominant discourse function to 'naturalise' the status quo, as though the current social order is the best possible outcome of historical choices and processes. Stories, reports and so on told with these discursive resources both confirm the obvious legitimacy of the status quo and also reinforce the appropriateness of the resources for intelligible accounts. Earlier statements of New Zealand's standard story have

been fairly short, but I present here a relatively detailed form based on a publication by the Department of Internal Affairs titled *Making New Zealand: Pictorial Surveys of a Century* (1940). Produced for the centennial of the Treaty of Waitangi signing, the component booklets were widely used in schools in the 1940s and 50s. In my approach, I focus on how Maori and Pakeha are portrayed, and how the relationship between the two groups is presented.

In accounting for human discovery of these islands, Volume One of *Making New Zealand* acknowledges "the early brown-skinned navigators" (2, p.3)[1]. The Maori are said to have come to a land inhabited by the Moriori or Mo-uriuri, "the people in occupation before most of the Maori canoes made landfall" (4, p.3). Kupe, the famous Polynesian navigator is presented as discovering these islands in 950AD, and reporting back to Hawaiki a rich land, with signs of habitation. In 1350AD, a fleet of canoes is said to have set forth bringing the ancestors of the modern tribes. The hardy souls who survived the long, perilous sea journey overcame the earlier inhabitants, covered the land with their place names, and established a lifestyle built around fishing, hunting and cultivating kumara.

Maori are depicted as "a warring race still in the stone age when the first white immigrants came" (5, p.2), with tribes and sub-tribes, chiefs and priests, warfare and superstition. The account suggests that fortified *pa* were necessary to protect the tribe during times of war, and as quarrels broke out, sub-tribes would break away, and settle in new territory, creating the myriad of tribes known today. The ethos of Maori life is described as collective, controlled by regulations of *tapu* (supernatural forces), and the mana of chiefs. Maori childhood is said to have been happy and effortless, with the necessary skills for survival learned through a child's games and "his grandfather, resting comfortably in the sun, would amuse the child with tales of tribal history, and recite once again the genealogy of famous names that traced the tribe back to the beginning of the world." (2, p.12). Life is described as "pleasant, vigorous and happy" (2, p.30), and death marked by "wailed and chanted farewells from the land of the living." (2, p.13). The account asserts that Maori lifeways were playful: "for him, fighting was the chief pastime, just as, perhaps, football is for us" (2, p.24). However, "the old-time Maori was not lazy and shiftless. He liked to carve his snaring perch or his fighting spear…" (2, p.18). Indeed, Maori constructions could be favourably compared to those of advanced civilisations: "stockades, ramparts… enfilading platforms and fighting

---

[1] In this section, an issue number followed by a page number refer to *Making New Zealand* (1940) Volume 1.

stages were model defence works that many times defied armies both civilised and native" (2, p.25).

Trade is said to be "a new thing to the Maori" (5, p.8), and part of the "civilising adventure" (5, p.14) brought by British and French missionaries who "convince the Maoris that the material civilisation of the white man was worthy of being copied" (11, p.2). The missionaries are lauded as forerunners of white settlement that cultivated the land and improved the country (5, p.16). Soon the industry of the missionaries, traders and settlers began to bear fruit: "a church, a school, gardens, meadows and smiling fields have taken the place of an old dilapidated Maori Pah" (von Hochstetter, cited in Issue 5, p.16).

Maori political and territorial authorities are portrayed as impediments to civilised endeavour: "Mana Island had been stocked with sheep by Bell early in the 1830s, but the habit of the powerful chief, Te Rangihaeata, of slaughtering sheep whenever he held a feast made the venture unprofitable" (11, p.2). In another example, Te Rauparaha's authority over Kapiti Island is found irritating: "cattle ran wild on Kapiti Island, which white sailors shot to amuse themselves. But when they took off the carcasses to their ships, they had to pay the local Maoris a musket for each beast killed" (11, p.2). The Treaty of Waitangi is presented as the means "by which more than 500 Maori chiefs ceded their territories to Queen Victoria in exchange for her protection…." The account emphasises the Treaty guarantee that "no Maori should have to part with his land unless he wished." (7, p.6). The New Zealand Company is presented as instrumental in much white settlement, and their setting aside of tenths (shares of lands as reserves for Maori) is presented as generous: "beyond doubt Wakefield and his friends had the welfare of the natives very much at heart." (6, p.4).

Once the Treaty was signed, Maori resistance to the gift of European civilisation is portrayed as unreasonable: "In spite of the care of the Government to protect the Maoris, they were very dissatisfied with the white settlement, and there was friction amounting to war…" (7, p.6). The British immigrants are presented as optimistic that they were coming to a country much like England, with abundant flat, cleared land, but facing instead the perils of the bush and hostile natives with "a bad reputation for fierceness and treachery." (6, p.4). The settlers are praised as being of good quality stock, resourceful and uniformly courageous in facing hardships, such as heroically defending their settlements against Maori attack: "In the North Island, many settlers were ruined by the Maori Wars" (7, p.8). The hint of military force appears reasonable: "A sense of insecurity after wars with native

tribes was the origin of grants of land to soldier-settlers in frontier localities, their holders being liable for military service" (5, p.26).

From the 1870s onwards, the volume recounts the settlement of New Zealand as a white man's triumph. The early settler assemblies were "packed with men of education closely concerned with the ownership and working of land." (7, p.8). Surveys of Maori lands prior to purchase are told as tales of intrepid exploration of rugged, unoccupied terrain by educated men. White scientists providing reports of botanical and geological features of the country are individually hailed for their discoveries and credited with advancing international scholarship. Maori disappear from the record at this point, mentioned only in passing as a labour force, e.g. "The Maoris have played an important part in the development of many New Zealand industries and today provide much of the labour needed for sheep farming in the North Island" (7, p.15. The remainder of the volume is an account of the triumphal progress of white civilisation in New Zealand.

2.1.1 Critical commentary

A standard story as delivered in the version above is extremely plausible. None of the statements are entirely false, but the story relies on silences, partial truths and the use of particular verbs and adjectives to achieve very specific portrayals of indigenous and settler peoples, and the relationship between them.

The colonial view that indigenous people had difficulty adapting to capitalist economics is achieved by presenting Maori tribes as primitive and child-like, their customs as quaint, and their way of life as clearly in the past. Typically, this version presents Maori as awe-struck, passive and capricious recipients of advanced civilisation. Maori initiatives and support for Pakeha in trade and agriculture are mentioned so seldom that they appear as exceptions to a rule. The account mentions Ruatara's highly successful introduction of wheat crops to Northland, and allows his claim that: "I have now introduced the cultivation of wheat into New Zealand" (14, p.7), but gives the credit for the introduction of agriculture to Samuel Marsden's mission: "which did most to make the Bay of Islands a cradle of civilisation" (5, p.4). The dominance of Maori commercial enterprise during this period, in boat-building, coastal trade, Trans-Tasman and Trans-Pacific commerce, is absent from the account, boat-building and timber milling being presented as uniquely white settler activities. European technology appears as the mature option, as in "before the use of the white man's gun turned sport to slaughter" (2, p.25). Here, the account depends on the careful insertion of

"use of" to imply that Maori were thoughtless in their handling of the accoutrements of civilisation. At other points, Maori appear unpredictably hostile. Where Maori reacted defensively to European transgressions or treachery, the sensational labels, "Boyd Massacre", "Wairau Massacre", and "Volkner murders" are used. In contrast, European violence towards Maori is omitted altogether or treated as an unfortunate exception. The account makes no mention at all of British Army invasions, confiscations or forced land sales.

The political and territorial authority of Maori is rendered vague or arbitrary as in the plaintive account of sheep rearing on Mana Island, in which there is no mention of Rangihaeata's ownership of the island or the reciprocal gift relationships entered into with settlers. The Treaty of Waitangi and assertion of British sovereignty over New Zealand appears as a unilateral and uncontested act that was "executed" upon natives who ceded control over their territories. By foregrounding the protection afforded Maori in the Treaty against unwilling sales, the account apparently need not discuss the following 160 years of land and resource alienations breaching this Treaty clause.

The relationship between Maori and settlers is also carefully portrayed and justified to appear unproblematic. The supposed supplanting of the Moriori by Maori is explicitly used to justify the settler treatment of Maori as in: "Thus and thus did, in turn, the white settlers coming late upon their heels" (5, p.3). As in the standard stories of most European colonies, the wars over land are presented as wars of indigenous aggression against well-meaning settlers, rather than wars in defence of indigenous mana, *tikanga* or landholdings. The impression of the New Zealand Company's altruism in setting aside reserves for Maori depends on omitting to mention that the reserves were leased to white settlers (Burns, 1980). The settler government's role in ruthlessly acquiring Maori land is equally obscured: "Though later it bought a great deal of land from the Maoris, at first the Government was greatly concerned to keep them from being cheated by white speculators" (7, p.6). Here, the British Crown and the Governors it appointed are conflated with the "responsible Settler Government" set up in 1852. The settler assembly, unlike the Governor of the Crown Colony, had no duty or political pressure to care for the welfare of the indigenous population. Rising Maori resistance to land sales is presented as unreasonable. The part played by politician-speculators in pressuring for the invasions of the Waikato, Bay of Plenty and Taranaki is laundered through a careful triangulation of forces: "The Government took such good care to protect the Maoris that it was quite difficult to

buy land in early New Zealand. On the other hand, the speculator was frustrated. In the long run, the genuine settlers found farms" (7, p.8).

In such an account of the standard story of New Zealand history, these partial truths and silences about the Treaty, Maori capitalist enterprise, and Maori resistance to land loss obliterate from the public record the reality of Maori political and territorial sovereignty as well as their viable commercial interest in British colonisation.

Lest the reader become optimistic that such a version of the standard story was soon supplanted by a more even-handed or critical account of New Zealand history, the school journals and history classes of the latter half of the 20th century followed used much the same approach. Even where more careful attention was paid to historical detail, the standard story's function persisted – to present contemporary social relations as the best possible outcome of history. An interesting comparison may be made with a recent government publication, *the Treaty of Waitangi* (Treaty of Waitangi Information Programme, 2005) produced by the State Services Commission. In a series of booklets about "New Zealand's founding document" (back cover), settler and Maori experiences are presented with faithful attention to historical detail. However, as with the 1940 account, the Maori experience is subordinated to the British view in the critical matter of interpretation of the Treaty, e.g. "the promises that were exchanged in 1840 were the basis on which the British Crown *acquired* New Zealand" (emphasis added, back cover). There is acknowledgment that "the Crown deliberately used armed force to drive through land purchases, crush Maori autonomy movements, and confiscate land in the Waikato, Taranaki and other areas" (Part 1, p.20). There is also acknowledgment that the century up to the 1970s saw increasing demand by Maori for "'ratification' of the Treaty to give it real effect in support of Maori rights, and to form the basis of redress for injuries done in breach of its terms or its principles" (1, p.20). But the government's actions in recent decades are presented as a comforting conclusion: "This deep and longstanding movement eventually found expression in the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 and its subsequent amendments, which set up the Waitangi Tribunal to inquire into Treaty claims" (1, p.20). In this way, the standard story of benign race relations is reasserted. Pakeha breaches of the original agreement for colonisation are presented as occurring in the past, needing only redress through official means for the Treaty to be fully settled. Left unarticulated is the ongoing struggle by Maori to give expression to their mana and te tino rangatiratanga as guaranteed in te Tiriti. Reviewing samples of Pakeha discourse from 1979 – 2002, McCreanor

(2005) concluded that "there exists a firmly entrenched, widely endorsed standard story of race relations in Aotearoa" in which "racial problems are seen as a disjuncture with an idealised past in which we enjoyed the best race relations in the world" (p. 65).

Through the persistence of the standard story of New Zealand history, mainstream Pakeha opinion on the Treaty has tended to be symbolic and non-legalistic, viewing the Treaty as "a record and pledge of a good will which should continue to inform future generations" (Sharp, 1990, p. 99). It was during the Centennial speeches in 1940 for which *Making New Zealand* was produced that the Governor General uttered the oft-quoted phrase claiming for New Zealand the "best race relations in the world". Race relations have been considered benign and the treatment of the indigenous inhabitants better than that suffered in other British colonies such as Canada, the United States and Australia (Sinclair, 1971). A general Pakeha opinion was (and is) that Maori have "had a good deal" (Consedine & Consedine, 2001, p. 101,).

Since the mid-1980s, a puzzle has arisen for the standard story of New Zealand's colonial past. The (re-) emergence of the Treaty into Pakeha consciousness in the mid-1980s is a contradiction for its function of naturalising Pakeha dominance. To tease out whether such shifts of awareness for a dominant group are just inexplicable quirks of history, the reader is now invited to consider a timeline of Maori and settler actions from the early 1800s to 2000, to be found in Appendix 1. The entries were selected to emphasise the political authority assumed by Maori, and the institutional structures assumed and enacted by Pakeha society. Such timelines were, and are, frequently used in critical education about the Treaty and colonisation, functioning as a 'discovery tool' for readers. They provide a simple, compact reading of events in context and in historical sequence. While complexity is lost, a timeline encourages a holistic response to new information, particularly at an emotional level. In this particular timeline, Maori and settler actions are placed alongside each other in the same time period, so that the reader may, by scanning back and forth, consider each entry as a response to the actions of the other party. I aim thereby to illustrate how a 'dialogue' between the two parties to the Treaty might appear if some of the omissions in the standard story were inserted.

2.2 Revisiting history

As with a standard story, a timeline may be read for how it portrays Maori and Pakeha, and how it portrays the relationship between them. The timeline included in Appendix 1 challenges the standard story's portrayals of Maori as the child-like savage and Pakeha as the benign civiliser. Even more importantly, it challenges the treasured belief that the relationship between Maori and Pakeha is, and has been, untroubled.

Where the standard story portrays the relationship after the armed struggle as serene, and assimilation as a benign process, the timeline presents the intense struggle to which Maori committed themselves from 1860 onwards. Their actions were consistently intended to resist white settler encroachment on land not offered for sale, and to take charge of their own destiny. By glossing over the Maori struggle, the standard story has rendered invisible, to use Walker's (1990) title, their "struggle without end" to maintain their mana. The colonial standard story functions to create amnesia. In the absence of historical evidence to the contrary, it portrays the relationship between coloniser and indigenous peoples as unproblematic, thereby undermining any challenges to the settlers' assumption of legitimate land ownership and masking their dominance of society's institutions. This reminds us of the function of dominant discourses and the standard stories they sustain, and introduces an issue woven throughout the thesis – the issue of what is achieved by different discourses of race relations in New Zealand.

If the actions and responses by Maori and Pakeha shown in the timeline were treated as a 'dialogue' between parties to an agreement, what impression might we form of that dialogue? I use below three extracts from the timeline to illustrate key stages in such a 'dialogue' between Pakeha and Maori.

Initially, a broad pattern can be seen of Pakeha engaging with Maori, albeit with Pakeha determined to disrupt the sovereignty of a numerically dominant indigenous population.

Extract (i) from Appendix 1

Maori actions & responses	Pakeha actions & responses
Maori Population 100,000 – 200,000 or substantially more. **1835** *He Wakaputanga o Te Rangatiratanga* **- Declaration of Independence** - signed at Waitangi on October 28 and later to clarify that: • All sovereign power and authority - "tino rangatiratanga" - rested with Maori. • Maori would meet each year to make laws for "justice, peace, order and trade". • No "legislative authority" other than this would be recognised. Both the flag and the Declaration of Independence were formally recognised by the British Crown.	**1833 James Busby** arrived as kaiwhakarite (intermediary) or British Resident - facilitated choice of a national flag and encouraged the Declaration of Independence. **1839 British Colonial Office** dispatched Captain Hobson with instructions to annex New Zealand, i.e. to have Maori cede their sovereignty to the British. Resident missionaries translated Hobson's English draft into *Te Tiriti o Waitangi*, retaining key concepts such as 'tino rangatiratanga' from the Declaration of Independence because they knew Maori would never cede sovereignty. **Pakeha population** 2,000
February 1840 *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* **-** Maori text of Treaty of Waitangi - signed on Feb 6 at Waitangi. and later by over 500 leaders: • Gave British a lesser right of government - "kawanatanga". • Guaranteed Maori retention of "Tino Rangatiratanga" over all aspects of property and culture. They could sell land they wished to sell. • Guaranteed Maori equal rights with the British. • Spoken guarantee of spiritual freedom for all, including Maori custom Many iwi and hapu did not sign, e.g. Te Wherowhero, who later became the first Maori leader of Te Kingitanga, as he had already signed the Declaration of Independence and felt that it said what he wanted to say. **1842-44 Hone Heke**, first signatory to the Treaty, cut down British flagpole in Kororareka (Russell) in protest at unilateral decisions made by British governor. At the fourth protest, the town was evacuated, and he and Kawiti sacked and burned it.	**March, 1840** a Treaty copy written in English was signed by 39 Maori. Maori were described as having "ceded to her Majesty the Queen of England, absolutely and without reservation, all the rights and powers of Sovereignty" but retained "full, exclusive and undisturbed possession of their Lands and Estates, Forests, Fisheries and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess…" **November 1840 Proclamation of Sovereignty** Hobson proclaimed British sovereignty over the whole of the country, and established a Legislative Council of Pakeha land-owning men. **1845 British troops** called from Sydney to quell Heke. British army no match for Maori strategy and fortifications, but Governor Grey announced victory and made peace.

However, the quality of engagement shifted from settler dependence on Maori up to the mid-1800s to hostility as land sales dried up in 1860 and the settlers launched the Land Wars. Once the population levels became even and the armed struggle had ceased, Pakeha could use the devices of majoritarian democracy and legislation to assert their view of a 'civilised' society. The following century of unilateral force by the settlers may be described as a brutal indifference on the part of Pakeha towards the co-signatories to the Treaty

Extract (ii) from Appendix 1

Maori became less willing to sell land. **1852 – 58 Rise of the Kingitanga** Meetings of the principal North Island iwi established a *rohe tapu* inside which no more land would be sold, under the protection of King Potatau Te Wherowhero, elected in 1858. **1858 Wiremu Kingi** told Governor he opposed the sale of Waitara land by his nephew. **1860 Kohimarama Hui** The 200 Maori leaders attending viewed the Queen's representatives as having only a nominal sovereignty. Gathering produced *Te Whakakotahitanga o Te Tiriti o Waitangi* or the Kohimarama Covenant affirming te Tiriti o Waitangi. **1860 - 80s Parihaka** Te Whiti o Rongomai and Tohu Kakahi aimed to regain confiscated land and assert Maori control of Maori affairs in Taranaki. Their people began ploughing confiscated land and constructed fences across roads built through their cultivations. Hundreds imprisoned without trial.	**1858 First population census** Maori 56, 049 – Pakeha 59,413 **Governor Gore Brown waived** Kingi's right of chieftanship. His nephew sold 600 acres, resulting in Taranaki land wars. **Governor Gore Brown invited Maori leaders** to Kohimarama, promising to respect mana Maori to avoid other iwi joining the Taranaki war. The Government saw this conference as a Maori ratification of the Treaty and of the Crown's sovereignty. **1862 – 64 Invasion of Waikato** fomented by Auckland business men and bankers who stood to gain enormous profits from land sales. British army and local militia killed villagers and destroying cultivations in the Waikato, Bay of Plenty and Taranaki. Defenders were declared rebels, and their land confiscated. Customary title to the lands of loyal tribes in the same areas was equally extinguished. **1862/65 Native Land Courts Acts** established the Native Land Court, designed to extinguish customary title on land remaining in Maori hands by substituting individual ownership for the rangatiratanga of hapu control. Fragmentation of succession meant that the land remaining in Maori hands became unmanageable.

In the early 1850s, in a move considered by some scholars to be the primary breach of te Tiriti, the British colonial power established a "Responsible settler government" though the New Zealand Constitution Act, 1852 (McLintock, 1958). Maori were not explicitly excluded but there was no provision for Maori political and territorial authority, leaving most Maori disqualified from participation in government. Following methods for successful British colonisation of Ireland, Canada and Australia, the settler government used force and legislation, such as the Suppression of Rebellion Act (1863) and the various Native Lands Acts (1862 and beyond) to alienate native lands. The settlers took for granted their right to land for their agricultural systems and profit, and drew on diverse arguments to support social policy aimed at assimilating the native population into the settlers' way of life, language and institutions. They brought their notion of a Darwinian hierarchy of relative racial superiority, which positioned them as 'civilised' and Maori as 'noble savages' who might be assimilated into settler society (Nicolson, 1988) Governor Grey called this policy focus 'amalgamation' (Simpson, 1979), later termed 'assimilation', and eventually 'integration'. Assimilationist practices were most clearly seen in suppression of the Maori language, health practices, and spiritual values. Pakeha consistently perceived the negative effects of aggressive colonisation, such as increasing landlessness, poverty, and ill-health among Maori, as confirmation of the 'natural' superiority of Pakeha (see Appendix 1).

The white settlers in New Zealand were by no means unique in their relentless attack on indigenous landholdings and culture – equivalent routes to settler dominance by coercion and legislation were taken in Australia, Canada, and the United States of America. A timeline for the coloniser and indigenous actions and responses in their territories would look remarkably similar to ours.

Once the settlers gained territorial and institutional dominance, there appears an increasingly evident pattern of Maori 'speaking', for instance in the Kingitanga, the Kohimarama covenant and at Parihaka, and Pakeha 'not listening'. For instance, at the time when the Maori population census was at its lowest, Hone Heke, grand-nephew of his namesake, presented his Native Rights Bill in 1894, giving a Maori Parliament power to govern Maori. Pakeha Members of Parliament left the Debating Chamber to prevent its discussion.

The posture of Pakeha indifference to Maori was assisted by geographical separation, with 90% of Maori living in rural communities up to 1926. The limited points of contact as Maori sold their labour as bush-fellers, road-makers, farm and freezing workers and shearing gangs (Walker, 1990, p. 186) encouraged a capitalist view of Maori as a 'class'. When Maori began migrating to the cities in the 1950s, they became, in Pakeha eyes, an urban working class (Walker, 1990).

2.2.1 Maori and Pakeha activism

As the timeline in Appendix 1 implies, Maori protest about dishonouring of the Treaty of Waitangi has been continuous since 1840. The injustice of the settler society's control of land, economy and societal institutions has been a topic of heated discussion on marae since the settlers arrived and continues to be so. Hapu throughout the country have offered armed resistance, unarmed resistance, pursued court cases, delivered petitions and submissions, and occupied land to assert their sovereignty and communicate their views of the injustices of colonisation over the past 170 years. Walker (1990) describes the underlying dynamic of Maori activism as the assertion of *mana motuhake* (indepentent or autonomous power), characterised by a restless search to recover and reassert their lost sovereignty.

The timeline also illustrates contexts for change. Walker (1990) points out that the urban migration, through which 75% of the Maori population moved to urban areas after the Second World War, allowed a pan-Maori activism. Greenland (1984) suggests that a (re-) development of Maori rhetoric and activism on Treaty issues can be seen in various organisations, media and events. In the 1970s, a new generation of Maori began to use protest methods readily broadcast by modern media, such as marches and occupations. The 'new' activism was reported by the media, and some of the background for protest became known to a Pakeha audience. In the mid-1970s, the mainstream media carried accounts of Bastion Point with its history of Ngati Whatua homes burnt down by the Auckland City Council in 1953, with Ngati Whatua called "willing sellers" when they had taken 16 actions in the courts and made 15 Parliamentary Petitions (Walker, 1990, p. 217), and of Raglan Golf Course with its history of land seizure for defence purposes (Walker, 1990), returned to the local council rather than the Maori land owners, then leased to a golf club. It was through these protests and occupations that the Maori critique of the injustice of colonisation first became visible to the Pakeha

world, and for the first time in colonial history received an organised response from some Pakeha. A scattering of antiracism groups formed in the 1960s and 70s; some churches took stands against racism and in support of Maori; and a programme was launched in the 1980s to educate Pakeha about the Treaty. These organised responses from Pakeha are highlighted in the timeline, and are examined in the research studies that follow.

Extract (iii) from Appendix 1

1962 Maori Council formed by government to act as an advisory body on Maori policy. Regional Maori councils followed**.** Maori Councils developed considerable skill in monitoring Parliament, scrutinising legislation and making submissions to ministers and select committees.	**1959/60 Protests began against racist selection of sports teams for international competition**, including *No Maoris No Tour* protest in 1972
	1960 Hunn report gave thorough statistical report of Maori trailing behind Pakeha in most areas. Recommended stepping up assimilation.
The 1967 Maori Affairs Amendment Act seen by Maori as the 'last land grab' by Pakeha. It triggered the Maori land rights movement in the next decade.	**1960 World Council of Churches** established Programme to Combat Racism. Locally, Young Christian Workers (Catholic), Student Christian Movement and church groups became more aware of injustice globally and locally.
1967 Revival of Kotahitanga Movement Meeting at Otiria Marae, Kawakawa, to revive the Kotahitanga movement. Discussions included Maori self-determination, ratification of the Treaty of Waitangi and a symbolic unity under the Maori Queen.	**Early 1960s Citizens for Racial Equality (CARE) founded** with Maori and Pakeha members, focused on racism at home. In response to Hunn report, set up homework centres to support Maori school children.
1968 Te Hokioi newsletter published by a radical Maori group in Wellington as a "*taiaha* of truth" about the role of the Maori trustee in disposing of Maori resources.	**1967 Maori Affairs Amendment Act** opened up membership of Maori land corporations to non-owners (i.e. Pakeha) and forced land owned by fewer than four people under one title into conversion from Maori lo European land.
1968 Maori Organisation on Human Rights (MOOHR) formed in Wellington. They opposed discrimination in housing, employment, sport and politics. Advocated recovering control of Maori reserved lands under perpetual leases to Pakeha.	**1967 Rating Act** subjected land to rates even though not producing income with Maori away in cities. Local bodies able to lease or sell Maori land to recover rates.
1970 Young Maori Leaders Conference convened by the Maori Council at Auckland University established **Nga Tamatoa** 'the young warriors'. They initiated legal aid, an employment office and a nation-wide programme for full recognition of the Maori language in education. Began protests at Waitangi to challenge Pakeha and their own elders about lost rights, e.g. to sell kaimoana under 1866 Oyster Fisheries	**1970 Halt All Racist Tours (HART) founded** Focused on racism abroad, particularly apartheid in South Africa.
	1973 Nelson Action Group published *Justice and Race: A Monocultural System in a Multicultural Society* examining structural racism in court decisions.

Act. They raised the cry of "How much longer must we wait?"

1975 Maori Land March Te Matakite o Aotearoa welded localised grievances over land loss into a cohesive Maori land rights movement. Whina Cooper elected as president and Titewhai Harawira secretary. Led 30,000 people to Parliament under banner of *Not one more acre of land* (to be alienated). Joined by some Pakeha.

1977 Occupation of Bastion Point began by Orakei Action Committee to expose the dealings of past governments over the 700 acres of Maori land at Orakei declared "inalienable" by the Native Land Court in 1873. Supported by some Pakeha.

1977 Occupation of Raglan Golf Course taken under the Public Works/Defence Act, Eva Rickard led.

1979 Waitangi Action Committee formed to continue the protests at Waitangi.

1984 Hikoi ki Waitangi organised by Waitangi Action Committee and People Opposed to Waitangi (non-Maori) to highlight the dis-honouring of the Treaty.

1984 Ngaruawahia Conference called by Maori Anglican Church and the NZ Maori Council considered constitutional questions relating to the Treaty. Followed by conferences around the country and at Waitangi, these conferences asked that Pakeha educate themselves about the Treaty of Waitangi in preparation for dialogue in 1990.

1970s Race Relations Office established

1973 Auckland Committee on Racial Discrimination (ACORD) established with past members of Nelson Action Group to draw attention to structural racism. Met with Nga Tamatoa and Polynesian Panthers to develop an educational approach.

1975 Treaty of Waitangi Act established the Waitangi Tribunal and Waitangi Day.

1981 Springbok tour protests supported by Pakeha who were then challenged by Maori to address homegrown racism and their responsibilities under the Treaty of Waitangi. A separation between Maori and Pakeha activism from here on.

1982 Programme on Racism established by the Conference of Churches Aotearoa New Zealalnd. Initially used confrontational methods, later adult education philosophy.

1984 Anglican General Synod established a Bicultural Commission.

1984 First National gathering of Pakeha anti-racism workers held in Katikati called by Tauranga Men's Action Collective and Women's Reflection Action Group.

1986 Project Waitangi - Pakeha Debate the Treaty campaign formed by Bob Scott of Programme on Racism, YWCA and trade unions. Taken up by local groups.

Thus it is only in the past 30 years that there has been a re-engagement with Maori by Pakeha, in response to 170 years of continuous communication from them about the Treaty and the impact of colonisation. Seeing Pakeha awareness of, and support for (by some), the Treaty agreement with Maori in such a historical timeframe underlines its recency, its impact and its fragility.

The timeline helps to highlight that just as the 'new' Maori activism about the Treaty did not emerge miraculously, neither did the Pakeha response, but that the lifespan of an organised Pakeha movement has been much shorter. The antecedents to Pakeha activism during the 1960s, and its growth as an organised movement in the 1970s and 80s occurred away from the public gaze. A facilitative Pakeha reply to the Maori critique of colonisation is recorded primarily in unpublished, ephemeral and organisational material, and will be examined in the research studies to follow. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to published sources more widely available to a reading public which document assertions and responses to the Maori critique of colonisation.

2.2.2 Published alternatives to 'standard' colonial history

For Pakeha, the process of revisiting the standard story of New Zealand's history has been late in coming and is still underway. There were always Pakeha individuals who put forward alternative views (e.g. Sutherland, 1940) but these made no impression on the complacency of the historical account. It was not until the latter half of the 20th century that slowly, book by book, alternative histories which 'listened' to the Maori experience began to appear. These revisited histories can be seen as a publicly visible expression of a belated Pakeha response to the Maori view of a shared colonial history.

In 1954 a Pakeha journalist, Dick Scott, published a small book, *The Parihaka Story*, described by the author as an effort to address a "hitherto overwhelmingly one-sided record; it was an impatient and angry attempt, but a beginning" (Scott, 1975, p. 7). Published in a limited edition, the Pakeha who read it were taken aback by his revelations. Maori elders at Parihaka, encouraged by his viewpoint, provided further oral history so that 20 years later he was able to publish a much fuller account, *Ask That Mountain: The story of Parihaka* (1975). Expecting that Pakeha attitudes may have undergone significant change in the intervening years, he lamented the removal of Parihaka from maps in the glossy government publication *A Descriptive Atlas of New Zealand* produced in the same year.

A few years later, another Pakeha, critical of our 'historical single vision' went into print with *Te Riri Pakeha: The white man's anger – the destruction of Maori identity* (Simpson, 1979). In consternation at the resentful attitudes to Pakeha that he

encountered among Maori while working on a documentary about Rua Kenana, Tony Simpson began a journey to find out why:

> I determined to begin with 'the Maori wars', which I had heard of (as which New Zealander has not?) as a rather shadowy period of fighting, of indeterminate date, in which a brave but gallant British soldiery came up against an equally brave but chivalrous foe, each side fighting the other with respect until there came the inevitable but honourable laying down of arms in mutual regard by yet another native people in the face of the might of the British empire. The facts, however, swiftly disabused me of this quaint picture. (Simpson, 1979, p. 3)

What Simpson found shocked him, and he wanted to share with other Pakeha his discoveries about our history. Presenting Maori as an aggressed-against and aggrieved population as Scott had done, he aimed his readable, photograph-packed book specifically at Pakeha "to admit to ourselves what is recounted here" (p. 5). Simpson concluded that: "the treasured belief that New Zealand is the most successful multiracial society in the world is a delusion." (p. 240).

An influential account aimed at a wide readership was released by Donna Awatere, Maori psychologist and member of activist group Nga Tamatoa. Beginning in 1982, she published a series of articles in the national feminist magazine, *Broadsheet*, entitled 'The Death Machine' 'Alliances' and 'Beyond the Noble Savage'. With a final article, 'Exodus' these were later published by the Broadsheet Collective as the book *Maori Sovereignty* (Awatere, 1984). Historical photographs throughout were accompanied by a commentary of blunt captions that left the reader in no doubt about the violence of the colonisation process. Thus, Pakeha readers were exposed to a Maori analysis of colonisation, and to an unequivocal Maori assertion of sovereignty over New Zealand, unmediated by government officials or the mainstream media. Awatere's analysis challenged Pakeha New Zealanders:

> All white people share in the benefits of the alienation of Maori land, in the imposition of European cultural values of individualism, materialism, in the imposition of their concepts of spirituality and in the imposition of the English language. (Awatere, 1984, p. 35)

Awatere marked the boundary between the Pakeha and the Maori experience of colonisation so clearly that there was no longer room for complacent illusion, nor was there a place for sympathetic Pakeha to merely 'join with Maori' as allies in protest. New strategies were required if Pakeha felt moved to support the Maori cause. As Bishop Bennett commented: "It challenges the rest of New Zealand to either put its house in order or to vacate" (Awatere, 1984, back cover).

Further accounts and analysis from a Maori viewpoint slowly became available. In 1986, when the Waitangi Tribunal was given retrospective powers, it began hearing

and publishing the oral histories that had been carried by hapu for a century and a half. Histories of tribal dispossession through confiscation, legislation, and the workings of the Native Land Court appeared in the Tribunal's published reports, and became, for Maori and Pakeha alike, a source of the Maori experience of colonial history. In most cases, after extensive research, the Tribunal upheld the claims. The public began to be exposed to the extent of the land loss and cultural grief affecting hapu. As required by its founding Act, the Tribunal set the English text of the Treaty alongside the Maori text and considered claims in the light of both versions. By 1987, reporting on the State Owned Enterprises case to the Court of Appeal, a *Listener* journalist could say: "Whatever version is definitive, it is clear the treaty was abused" (Ansley, 1987). Later in the 1980s two more Pakeha historians published significant re-visitings of our colonial history. James Belich's *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict* (1986) showed that Maori had out-engineered the British army with their earth fortifications and that in terms of military strategy, they had won most of the battles of the Land Wars. That should have shattered a lingering myth that Pakeha dominance was secured by military conquest. The following year, Claudia Orange's study *The Treaty of Waitangi* (1987) detailed the complex political influences bearing on the preparation and signing of the Treaty. She showed for the first time in a form accessible to a wide Pakeha readership, the differences between the Maori and English texts. She discussed why the missionary translators, to ease the Maori fear that the mana of the land might pass from them, carefully inserted into the Maori text a guaranteed retention of tino rangatiratanga (unqualified authority), alongside cession of the ambiguous kawanatanga (governorship) to the British Crown. Speaking of the emphasis placed by the missionaries on the unique moral pledge of protection made by the British Crown to the tribes of New Zealand, she sums up:

> …when the ambiguities of the agreement became apparent and doubts about its legal status arose, it would be this 'spirit' of the treaty that would sustain a sense of Maori expectation and Pakeha obligation that treaty promises be kept. (Orange, 1987, p. 59).

Her study was widely read and confirmed the critical re-visiting of the country's history demanded by Scott (1975), Simpson (1979) and Awatere's (1984) work. Orange acknowledged another Pakeha historian, Alan Ward, as the first to break into the details of New Zealand's history accumulated in the British museum. His study, *A Show of Justice* (Ward, 1974), of Parliamentary debates, reports and correspondence, confirmed that assimilation was used as a coherent policy directed at Maori.

The first publication by self-identified Pakeha activists was significant during these years, in that it constituted a direct response to Awatere's strategic challenges. In *Honouring the Treaty: An introduction for Pakeha to the Treaty of Waitangi* (1989),

Helen Yensen, Kevin Hague and Tim McCreanor, together with Jane Kelsey, Mitzi Nairn and David Williams, put into plain language the implications for Pakeha:

> At school we were taught a one-sided view of history; the true history of our nation is only now being written. Neither the media nor the Government give us full information about current Treaty claims. The role of this book is to present a Pakeha view of events surrounding the Treaty and also of the redress of grievances which we feel must take place…to challenge Pakeha and to promote discussion. (Yensen et al, 1989, p. 8 - 9)

Edited by a group determined to "honour the Treaty", the book stated clearly its call to action for Pakeha:

> it is a collective Pakeha responsibility to honour the Treaty; it is our side of the agreement which has been dishonoured, and it is we who must put it right. For 150 years Maori have been telling us what is wrong. It is time we listened, acted for change and took responsibility for our own actions. (Yensen et al, 1989, p. 8)

Significantly, following Awatere's demarcation of strategy, they do not rely on Maori authors and give some explanation of a Pakeha effort to work with their own group. (Nairn, 1989).

In time for the 150th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty, Ranginui Walker published a new history of New Zealand entitled *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle without end* (1990) told from the Maori standpoint. Speaking from his long involvement with urban Maori leadership, Walker linked the historical resistance to contemporary efforts, creating an account of continuous Maori activism in response to the colonial project. Here the reader could find in one volume a scholarly history of this country showing the constant striving by Maori leadership and hapu to maintain their mana, and to achieve a mutually agreeable future with Pakeha:

> the endless struggle of the Maori for social justice, equality and self-determination, whereby two people can live as coequals in the post-colonial era of the new nation state in the twenty first century. (Walker, 1990, p. 10).

Although there were further significant publications in the 1990s and beyond, such as Sharp (1990), Durie (1998), Williams (1999), Moon (2002) and one further volume by activist Treaty educators titled *Healing our History: The challenge of the Treaty of Waitangi* (Consedine & Consedine, 2001), the groundwork of revisited history had been laid.

Even in a country famed for its voracious readers and numerous bookshops, six or seven books providing an alternative to the standard story of our history cannot be credited with creating an organised Pakeha movement towards change. While the published works may have seemed to many Pakeha the only voices of dissent, these

authors were influenced by and contributing to a new synthesis of critical thought occurring in New Zealand. The critical synthesis developed by Pakeha activist educators from the 1970s onwards, taken up in Chapter 6, relied heavily on the historical detail provided by these writers, and on the critical and strategic positions encouraged by Awatere and Walker's work.

2.2.3 Critique of legal and institutionalised racism

In the late 1970s and early 1980s the comfortable arrangement of monocultural Pakeha institutions and marginalised Maori began to stir and shift, in both the legal arena and the world of government institutions. The Maori analysis and protest had consistently focused on constitutional, legal and institutional injustices arising from setting aside the Treaty. While the majority of governments holding power since The Constitution Act of 1852 have ignored or undermined the Treaty, the 1984 Labour government took the new step of declaring the Treaty to be "the beginning of constitutional government in New Zealand" (Hague, 1989, p. 124, citing the Royal Commission on the Electoral System, 1986). In 1985, the government extended the powers of the Waitangi Tribunal, established a decade earlier, to hear Maori claims of grievous treatment by the Crown dating back to 1840. The cases taken to the Waitangi Tribunal protested the effects of colonisation and the Tribunal's findings advanced a jurisprudence that relied on the English and Maori texts of the Treaty and moved away from colonial assumptions (Project Waitangi Otautahi, 1991). As an example, the Tribunal's recognition of te reo, the Maori language, as a *taonga* and that the "guarantee in the treaty requires affirmative action to protect and sustain the language" (Waikerepuru & Nga Kaiwhakapumau i te Reo Incorporated Society (The Wellington Board of Maori Language), 1986) persuaded the government to establish a Maori Language Commission.

In the early 1970s, a Pakeha activist group had published a critical research analysis of the court system (Nelson Action Group, 1973). However, the first public institution to come under formal scrutiny was the Department of Social Welfare a decade later. Pakeha and Maori staff of the department identified institutional racism in staffing selection policies, training, and departmental culture and a mismatch between staff and clients (Women's AntiRacism Group, 1984; Maori Advisory Unit, 1985). Their reviews prompted the government to set up a Ministerial Advisory Committee on a

Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare. The committee, led by the widely respected *kaumatua*[2] John Rangihau, described the effect of settler dominance:

> The development of pakeha institutions in the 1850s, especially those of 'Responsible' Government, transformed our own transformation. The Maori experience, since those institutions became dominant, has been one of recurring cycles of conflict and tension against a backdrop of ongoing deprivation. This has drained the Maori spiritually and physically. It finds expression today in atrocious levels of social dependency (*Puao-te-Atatu (Daybreak)*, 1988, p. 57).

Their report described institutional racism as "the basic weapon that has driven the Maori into the role of outsiders and strangers in their own land" (p. 78), and explained:

> Pakeha institutions blend a number of elements in the Pakeha ethos which have combined to serve Pakeha culture well but which, although sometimes well meaning, have been destructive of the cultural fabric of the Maori. (*Puao-te-Atatu (Daybreak)*, 1988, p. 57).

The *Puao-te-Atatu* report became a landmark for organisational responses, particularly in the social services and non-government sector, and helped to establish that it was institutional rather than personal racism that had been most destructive to Maori.

The 1984 Labour government also recommended that government services undertake staff education about the Treaty. Responding to an initiative by a coalition of churches, trade unions and women's organisations in 1986, they funded a public campaign for Pakeha to debate the Treaty in preparation for the 1990 sesquicentennial celebrations of the Treaty signing (Hoult, 2000). The educational opportunities offered were taken up by the government and the not-for-profit sector generally, including the health sector. In contrast, the commercial or profit-making sector was notable for its indifference to this Treaty-focused training activity. Chapter 8 explores the responses by Pakeha to learning about the Treaty since the 1980s.

Where the government sector relied on legalistic interpretations of the Treaty for an appropriate institutional response, non-government and community organisations took the spirit of the critique expressed in *Puao- te-Atatu* and, to varying degrees, made changes to the processes and structures associated with institutional racism. Their work was intra-organisational (e.g. Vanderpyl, 1998) and has seldom appeared in the public eye, except as occasional negative stories about disgruntled employees or students. Like pro-Treaty activism by Pakeha, the non-government organisational

---

[2] A kaumatua, often translated as 'elder' is a repository of history, genealogy, and leadership in hapu or iwi who routinely place current issues within the broader sweep of social, historical and spiritual concerns

response has not been visible beyond their sector. Chapter 9 takes up the impact of pro-Treaty work within non-government organisations.

A Royal Commission on Social Policy convened during this period invited critical attention to the guarantees of the Treaty in its preliminary briefing publication, *The Treaty of Waitangi and Social Policy* Discussion Booklet No.1 (1987). In their final report *Towards A Fair and Just Society* (1988) the Commission selected three interpretive 'principles of the Treaty' from the Waitangi Tribunal's work, aligned to each of the three articles of the Treaty. In contrast to a number of later interpretations developed by successive governments, the Royal Commission on Social Policy's three Treaty principles of partnership, protection and participation are still widely used, for instance in tertiary education settings (Nairn, 2007).

In the same period, in early 1987, Moana Jackson of the Maori Legal Service released Part 1 of *He Whaipaanga Hou - The Maori and the Criminal Justice System: A new perspective* (1988) providing a comprehensive analysis of the institutional racism in the courts and criminal justice system. Some innovative changes were made, particularly in youth justice, to adopt Maori values and processes. Processes such as the family conference and bicultural therapy (e.g. McFarlane-Nathan, 1994) are considered world leaders in their fields.

Very soon, however, influenced by a neo-liberal response to global economic trends, the New Zealand government began to resist the growing Treaty jurisprudence and the challenges to Pakeha institutional dominance (Kelsey, 1989). In 1988, the Maori Fisheries Bill was introduced to limit Maori commercial use of the country's fish stocks, and to extinguish forever their Treaty or common law claims to fishing rights. The 2004 Seabed and Foreshore Act similarly extinguished Maori claims to ownership of the coast and seafloor, at a time when interest by foreign investment was increasing, and the government wanted an unimpeded negotiation process. Under a neo-liberal economic regime, the differences between Maori and Pakeha wellbeing shown in health, housing, employment and infant mortality statistics began to widen (Ministry of Health, 2006). In terms of institutional outcomes two decades on from the 1984 Labour government's initiatives, Rod Oram of Statistics New Zealand reported that education was the only area in which there had been improvement in the worsening relative statistics for Maori well-being during the 1990s (Treaty lecture series, Trinity Cathedral, Auckland, 2004). In 1991, 39% of Maori and Pacific Island students gained higher secondary qualifications, rising to 60% by 2002. These few examples endorse the critical view that New Zealand's use of institutional means to strip the Maori

population of their economic and cultural assets continues in concert with global economic pressures on the country.

2.2.4 Maintenance of the standard story/dominant discourse

As the timeline implies, up to the 1970s very few Pakeha were aware of the guarantees of the Treaty of Waitangi, or exposed to any version of history other than the colonial story of a beneficent colonisation achieving harmonious race relations. The image at the 1940s centennial Treaty celebrations of British pomp and Maori pageantry made the Treaty signing a splendid starting point for a new nationhood, free of any context except the cession of sovereignty in the English text. When news of protests and land occupations by Maori first intruded upon the awareness of Pakeha in the late 1970s, the Race Relations Office invited submissions about the Haka Party incident (see Appendix 1). Nairn and McCreanor (1990, 1991) studied these submissions and concluded that patterns in the discourse used by Pakeha about Maori serve to maintain oppressive social relations by operating as a 'commonsense' about the New Zealand context, which they equated to a 'standard story'. McCreanor summarised the pattern of discourse used by Pakeha in 1979 thus:

> New Zealand has harmonious race relations – in fact, the best in the world. Although they were noble among other savages, Maori have benefited from civilisation because their culture was inferior. There are good Maori and bad Maori. Good Maori are naturally dignified and courteous. If stirrers (who are bad Maori) didn't agitate, Maori people would return to their natural dignified state, and harmonious race relations would be resumed. Pakeha do not intend to offend Maori, who have become over-sensitive about their culture, and this has led to racial tension. (McCreanor, 1995)

Nairn and McCreanor's (1990, 1991) analysis illustrates how Pakeha 'common sense' adapted the standard story to deflect the messages of highly visible protest by Maori. The pattern which splits Maori people into what termed 'good Maori' and 'bad Maori' functions to absolve Pakeha-dominated society from any kind of blame for the disenchantment of some Maori ('bad Maori') with the current social order. Another pattern they termed 'stirrers' functions to marginalise radical leaders and activists and so to declare their claims to be unworthy of consideration. This pattern also allocates blame for the deteriorating state of race relations to stirrers and effectively discounts structural problems in Maori/Pakeha relations (Nairn & McCreanor, 1991, p. 254). Searching for how such discursive resources are constructed historically, McCreanor (1997) found antecedents to the good Maori/bad Maori pattern in a New Zealand Company handbook produced to educate colonists about the native people already resident in New Zealand. In the early colonists' handbook, the 'good Maori/bad Maori' pattern functioned to divide the Maori population into those who would fit in with Pakeha goals for colonisation and those who would not.

Recently, as the work of the Waitangi Tribunal began to lead to some compensation for Maori claims, Pakeha 'commonsense' has shifted to allow limited concessions to a Maori position (McCreanor, 1993b). Since it was up to the government of the day to negotiate compensation for claims upheld by the Tribunal, each claim and its settlement has been the topic of ongoing debate in the political process, the media and the public arena. Through the workings of this process, a Pakeha public became more aware of Maori land and cultural losses under colonisation. A new discourse arose, used by Doug Graham, Minister of Treaty Settlements: "New Zealanders are very fair-minded. They realise that some of the events of the last century show a lack of good faith – so they want to fix it, but it mustn't drag on" (McCreanor, 1993b).

The present-day discourse of limited concessions has a number of elements. McCreanor (2005; 2006), using data from 2002 and 2004, concluded that the earlier patterns in the Pakeha standard story have persisted, and been joined by new 'commonsense' notions which I have expanded here as: 'The Treaty is a flawed historical document', 'Maori receive unfair privileges', 'Maori culture is inadequate in modern society', 'Maori are hypersensitive about their culture' coupled with 'Pakeha ignorance is well-intentioned' and finally a notion of 'Everyone's rights should be equal – biculturalism is divisive – we should be One People, with a multicultural approach to add spice and flavour'. A combination of these commonsense notions allows a Pakeha in New Zealand today to applaud the Maori cultural renaissance, but to resist claims that *te reo* should be fully resourced as an official language. When a small group of Pakeha students were asked about their support for policies to redistribute resources in favour of Maori, a majority supported biculturalism in principle (53%), but opposed resource-specific biculturalism (76%) when they perceived their material interests to be threatened (Sibley & Liu, 2004). Reliant on the long-standing, self-serving and adaptable standard version of New Zealand history, such 'commonsense' has allowed us, as Pakeha New Zealanders, to continue to live comfortably with the outcomes of British colonisation (Nairn & McCreanor, 1990, 1991; McCreanor, 1993a; 1993b; Wetherell & Potter, 1992).

2.3.5 Current attitudes

There is some evidence that there may now be a trend towards polarisation of views between those who support Maori claims and those who do not. Perry and Webster (1999) report on three large-scale surveys undertaken in 1985, 1989 and 1998, on values and attitudes. Support for dealing with the Treaty through the Waitangi

Tribunal "as at present" was supported by a third of respondents in the late 1980s, and by a quarter in the late 1990s (described as mainly Maori, Pacific Islanders, and lower class). Another quarter (described as Europeans and New Zealanders) agreed that there was need for "greater limits on Maori claims under the Treaty". Similar proportions believed that "the Treaty should be abolished" – a quarter of respondents in the late 1980s and a third a decade later (described as Pakeha, Europeans, lower-middle class and working class). Two thirds of respondents in 1998 were strongly or moderately against "support for giving Maori Special Land and Fishing Rights to make up for past injustices". The authors concluded that although the proportion choosing the various positions shows little change in the decade the figures suggest a trend towards increased polarisation.

The way that public polls are formulated, however, influences their findings in significant ways. At least one study has suggested that research using statements from the dominant discourse may produce misleading results. A survey by Nikora and Thomas (1989) challenged bias in statements in a public opinion survey resulting in a majority of Pakeha respondents appearing hostile to Maori claims under the Treaty of Waitangi. Adjusting key words in the statements used led to Pakeha respondents being evenly divided over the issue.

2.3.6 Critique of public discourse and the media

A relatively new critique has focused on the media as a Pakeha institution which shapes the impressions available to a Pakeha public about Maori people. Led by critical Maori and Pakeha researchers, the critique has focused on the role of the media as a racist institution maintaining the standard story by systematically avoiding presentation of the Maori viewpoint (e.g. Abel, 1997).

A number of recent critical studies assessed the impact of bias in media practices, showing that issues affecting Maori were systematically under-reported, including Treaty issues. Very few of the many news items mentioning the Treaty included its content, systematic breaches by the government, or tangata whenua rights to redress (Moewaka Barnes et al, 2005). The Kupu Taea research programme identified "silences" in the public discourse, particularly around the Treaty and Pakeha colonisation of Aotearoa, which were reinforced by the media: "analyses or acknowledgment of colonisation as a process that disrupted Maori culture, health, education, legislation and social fabric are virtually absent" (Moewaka-Barnes et al, 2005, p. 36). Interviewing Pakeha supporters of the Paikaitore land occupation in

Whanganui, Tuffin, Praat and Frewin (2004) also identified as "often silent" a discourse by Pakeha about sovereignty and the Treaty that is supportive of Maori interests (p. 107). As an example of such a silent discourse deployed to counter the dominant view that Maori are on a 'beneficiary train' from Treaty settlements, government statistician Rod Oram (2004) recently commented: "We are all Treaty beneficiaries".

The overall picture appears to be that the colonial status quo is maintained by a continual reproduction of the colonial standard story and institutional control. In these conditions, how does a new discourse take hold among a dominant coloniser group? A group who have little to gain from changing their complacent view of indigenous-coloniser relations? How, indeed, does a so-called 'silent' discourse about the Treaty by supportive Pakeha form in the first place? Where might evidence of its development be found, and what might be its impact in institutional settings? How was Rod Oram (2004) able to say "We are all Treaty beneficiaries", a view in direct denial of the standard story of New Zealand history? Given that the relationship between Maori and Pakeha became one of indifference and dominance on the Pakeha side, and one of deprivation and struggle on the Maori side, the question remains – by what routes have some Pakeha come to a different view of colonisation and the significance of te Tiriti o Waitangi?

The following chapters record my search for theory on processes of change for a dominant group, and build my argument for studying how Pakeha supportive of the Treaty theorise such change. The antecedents to Pakeha activism during the 1960s, and its growth as an organised movement in the 1970s and 80s occurred away from the public gaze. The pro-Treaty response to the Maori critique of colonisation is recorded in an oral tradition, in newsletters, records of meetings, unpublished papers and conference presentations. The research studies which follow examine the genesis, content and organisational impact of pro-Treaty discourse by Pakeha which challenges the standard story and 'commonsense' views of the Maori-Pakeha relationship.

To understand the rise of a critical view of colonial race relations among a culturally dominant group such as Pakeha, and why some Pakeha began to attempt change in New Zealand institutions, I turned next to consider theories of social change, and their relevance to our situation.

CHAPTER 3.0

CONCEPTS OF SOCIAL CHANGE

> …theories of change have been of more utility to
> observers of change than to creators of change; that
> is we have developed theories of change but not
> theories of changing.
>
> Lauer, 1982, p. 139

This chapter sets out to establish the scarcity of concepts of change with which to theorise change processes in dominant groups. As I am interested in theorising processes of Pakeha change in which I am participating as they occur, my review highlights theories of change that specifically address interested social actors. This led me to theories of *changing*, in Lauer's terms above. As a way of accumulating desiderata for a theory of changing for dominant groups, I took a particular interest in the proposed site of change, the suggested processes of change, and the implied direction and destination of change. Because of the wide sweep of review, my introductions are necessarily 'bare bones' outlines of theoretical frameworks, focused upon a key theorist, or key reviewer, in each area. Like Schwandt (2000) in his Cook's tour of philosophies that "demand more detailed attention", I apologise in advance for leaving the critically-minded "aghast at the incompleteness of the treatment" (p. 190).

If we accept, as does sociologist Lauer, that "the whole of social life is continually changing" (1982), p. 4), then it follows that our perception of social change depends on our timespan. Thus for the purposes of my review, maintenance of the status quo is of equal interest as processes of change, since maintaining social stasis implies suppression of, or resistance to, change. Therefore, I reviewed both theories of changing and theories of oppression, selecting those theorists whose work seemed most relevant for groups in colonial situations such as Pakeha in Aotearoa. My review led me to the same theorists that informed the decades of Pakeha activism introduced in Chapter 2. On this count, my review broadly reconstructs the evaluative path taken by local activists searching for theory relevant to processes of changing for Pakeha.

3.1 Concepts of changing for dominant groups

Classical sociology

A review of empiricist theories of change in the fields of sociology and social psychology clarified that the stance of a purportedly objective observer assumed to be recording the natural processes of social change led to theories that were after-the-fact (Lauer 1982). These theories depended heavily upon the time-frame chosen for their research. Some were macro-level, socio-historical theories of cyclical epochs of history, while others were micro-level explanations of how individuals adapted to available social roles in any one phase of a society. These broad ranging social theorists generated their theories at a time when the Europeanisation or Westernization of the world was understood as the necessary path of evolution or the mandate for its imposition. Many such theories were thus uni-directional, based on a Eurocentric assumption that European-style metropolitan culture was the ultimate destination of social change.

Classical theories of social change derived from, and were used to endorse European colonial projects at a time when colonisers displaced indigenous cultures and political systems with their own (Lauer, 1982; Smith, 1999). Such displacement was not readily deemed oppressive since many theorists focused on dynamics of social cohesion rather than issues of disruption and exploitation. Durkheim, for example, emphasised class and occupational groupings as a source of solidarity, rather than kinship relations or religions because he believed that culturally based groupings could no longer serve as forces of integration in the modern era (Lauer, 1982). Lauer (1982) describes classical sociology as supporting an adaptive approach to a supposedly given future rather than drawing attention to the human influence on its creation.

Not all social theory generated during the period of European colonisation of the Pacific was uncritical of the emerging dominant powers. The growing critiques of dominant power relations were in part driven by a desire to explain and change the oppressive experience of capitalism for the workers of Western Europe.

Marxist theory of class struggle

Marxist theory, with its foundations in Hegelian philosophy, established a critical tradition found useful by contemporary social movements. A key contribution of Marxist theorising about social change is its emphasis on the role of human action in making the future (Lauer, 1982). Marx and Engels argued that while "the Philosophers have only *interpreted* the world, in various ways, the point however, is to *change* it" (cited in (Gutierrez, 1974), p. 18). Marx saw change resulting from conflict within society – from the struggle and involvement of the masses in their particular historical circumstances to create their desired future (Lauer, 1982). He bequeathed us the notion of consciousness not as a form of intellectual exercise, but as the close ally of practical critical activity or praxis (Rude, 1980), p. 21). Although Marx suggested that participation in the class struggle developed the consciousness of the proletariat, he did not theorise further about the actual process, since he saw the direction of change as inevitable (Adamson, 1980): "We become free when we become conscious of the course of history and act so as to facilitate it" (cited in Lauer, 1982, p. 114).

In my reading, Marx's theory of change offers little material for how a dominant group may participate in change, except passively by waiting for the oppressed class to claim their freedom. Nevertheless, by focusing on the ordinary person in social change, by insisting on a group consciousness critical of its circumstances, and encouraging activist praxis, Marxist theory of change provides a significant theoretical point of reference for contemporary struggles. His emphasis on an awareness of positions in economic systems encouraged a critical approach to the self-serving directives of a society's dominant ideology, and provided a basis for critical structural analysis by Pakeha activists. However, although economic dynamics of settlement of Pakeha in New Zealand demonstrably affected the alienation of Maori from control over their own destiny, Maori and Pakeha change activists seeking a decolonising approach to their work were acutely aware of the cultural dimensions of Pakeha dominance and Maori oppression. Such cultural dynamics are better articulated through the work of Antonio Gramsci and those who later built on his work.

Gramsci's cultural hegemony

Gramsci, an Italian Marxist who theorised change during the rise of fascism in Europe, enriched the Marxist approach with a comprehensive theory of socio-political and cultural change. Gramsci believed that a society's power structure

was based not merely on the economic power of a ruling class, but on the consent of ordinary people to the systems of ideas promulgated by the current intellectual and moral leadership, even when these worked to their disadvantage (Sassoon, 1993). Giving the term hegemony to this apparent ideological consensus, he saw change as the result of a new group building a counter-ideology to destroy the ruling class's hegemony, and thereby influencing the concrete relations of civil and political society.

Gramsci placed education at the centre of the process of change. According to Adamson (1980), Gramsci understood that the Marxist concept of "spontaneous" development of a class consciousness through a "school of labour" lacked an analysis of the contemporary Western state and the possibility of "posing an activist and essentially educational politics against it" (p. 4). Following his emphasis on the importance of ideas to the social order, Gramsci suggested that all of society could be understood as a vast "school'" with a "scholastic" relationship pertaining between all people at all times, and concluded that "Every relationship of 'hegemony' is necessarily an educational relationship" (p. 142). Gramsci acknowledged the role of intellectuals in political and cultural education. He suggested that all classes could be educated for hegemonic compliance *or* for emancipatory change by their own intellectuals, whom he termed "organic intellectuals" (p. 143).

Gramsci's theorising of the process of change clearly has applicability to a dominant group, privileged by apparent hegemonic compliance – they may be educated for the current ideological hegemony or for a different one, and such education may occur in any relationship. Conceiving of all societies as schools points to the "multiple contexts in which legitimation processes occur, and conversely, in which alternative political outlooks can be prepared" (Adamson, 1980, p. 142). Such theorising about multiple contexts of legitimation may provide an explanation for the seemingly contradictory commitment of a dominant group to notions of democracy, freedom and justice in the face of demonstrable injustices and inequalities.

Gramsci's complex notion of commonsense also has relevance to the contemporary colonial situation. He saw commonsense in both a critical and idealistic way:

> It contains Stone Age elements and principles of a more advanced science, prejudices from all phases of history at the local level and intuitions of a future philosophy which will be that of a human race united the world over. (Gramsci, cited in Adamson, 1980, p. 150).

As Adamson (1980) explains, "Common sense is a complex and disjointed amalgam influenced by all previous philosophical currents" (p. 150). Using Gramsci's approach, the standard story of New Zealand history outlined in Chapter 2 can now be seen as a sedimented amalgam (Wetherell & Potter, 1992) of the imperialism, racism and humanitarianism of past generations, as well as serving to maintain and educate newcomers about the current hegemony in New Zealand. Gramsci's notion of the relationship between an individual and the common sense they inherit may be explained thus:

> …his [sic] personality develops amid concrete social, cultural and political circumstances which he not only does not choose but which embody assumptions about the world which he cannot initially even identify. (Gramsci, cited in Adamson, 1980, p. 149).

Gramsci also significantly enriched theoretical conceptions of consciousness and praxis. Rather than the notion of "a socialist consciousness brought to the working class from outside" associated with Marxist ideas (Bottomore, 1993), p. 366), he considered that political education and action encouraged the critical differentiation of commonsense and helped people come to know their world more clearly. Since commonsense in Gramsci's view was a repository of previous hegemonic education, to supersede commonsense the ordinary person must be "led to a 'series of negations' which expose and repudiate the prevailing commonsense" (Adamson, 1980, p. 151). Gramsci saw this process as a cathartic experience: "Political struggle differentiates the world and furnishes the actor with a collective identity and an 'instinctual feeling of independence' "(p. 153).

Gramsci offers a social psychological theory to examine the means by which cultural influences and social myths are carried in fragments by all social classes and inherited by individuals as "common sense". The extent to which the oppressed appear to concur in their oppression is the extent of the conditions of hegemony. But as hegemonic control is never total, the opportunities for awakening and challenge always exist. For Gramsci this meant that social change was essentially cultural, very complex, and unpredictable in its direction. Gramsci's work provides fertile elements for theorising dominant group change, including the possibility of counter-hegemonic education with which to critique the world of common sense, and political education towards a collective identity.

Colonisation and decolonisation

Personal experiences of European colonialism in North Africa and the West
Indies led writers such as Memmi (1965), Fanon (1967) and Cesaire (1972) to
scathing analysis of how European colonialism was held in place by more than
economic power. Of the theorists of decolonisation, Memmi, a Tunisian Jew
writing in 1957, devoted the most attention to the social position and the
psychology of the coloniser. In his view, the essential feature of the colonial
situation is "the relationship between one group of people and another" (p. 38).
He theorised that the colonial situation "manufactures colonialists just as it
manufactures the colonized" (p. 56). The impersonal nature of the colonial
relationship originates in the objective situation rather than in the colonialist:

> Colonial relations do not stem from individual good will or actions; they exist
> before his arrival or his birth, and whether he accepts or rejects them matters
> little. It is they, on the contrary which, like any institution, determine *a priori* his
> place and that of the colonised and, in the final analysis, their true relationship.
> (p. 38).

Memmi argued however, that "colonial privilege" had been achieved through
social and psychological means, as well as economic and military (1965, p. xii).
He described the "small colonizer" as supporting the grander colonialists and
obstinately defending colonial privileges, even though his "gullible complicity"
(p. 11) lies in the fact that "to protect his very limited interests, he protects other
infinitely more important ones…though, dupe or victim, he gets his share". He
concluded that to different degrees every coloniser is privileged, at least
comparatively so, "ultimately to the detriment of the colonized" (Memmi, 1965,
p. 11).

Memmi (1965) posited three positions in the colonial system – the coloniser who
accepts colonialism, the coloniser who rejects it, and the colonised. He considered
that the coloniser maintains the status quo through usurpation, falsification and
conceit. The psychology of the coloniser who accepts the part of colonialist is that
of a "usurper" who:

> to possess victory needs to absolve himself of it and the conditions under which it
> was attained…He endeavours to falsify history, he rewrites laws, he would
> extinguish memories - anything to succeed in transforming his usurpation into
> legitimacy. (p. 52).

As a final act of distortion to justify and reassure himself, the coloniser achieves a
double reconstruction of the colonised and himself, by seeing himself as custodian
of the values of civilisation and history, one who brings light to the colonised
darkness. The colonialist can now "relax, live benevolently" (p. 76), since the

colonised could only be grateful to him. Memmi called this "astonishing mental attitude" paternalistic and a form of "charitable racism" (p. 6). The timeline of Pakeha legal and institutional actions in Appendix 1 may be seen as an example of such usurpations, conceits and charitable racisms to achieve legitimacy for the settlers. In these ways, Memmi implicated the psychology of the coloniser in the outcomes of colonisation.

All these theorists of colonisation emphasised the racism inherent in colonial systems "not as an incidental detail, but as a consubstantial part of colonialism" (Memmi, 1965, p. 74). Contemporary indigenous theorists such as Smith (1999) allow that decolonisation is a "long-term process involving the bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic and psychological divesting of colonial power" (p. 98), and that the part to be played by the coloniser is to cease perpetuating the colonising of indigenous peoples by these means.

The early theorists of colonisation were sceptical of the coloniser's ability to achieve change. In Fanon's view, colonialists did not attempt to undo processes which underpinned their privilege, implying that the means of change rested with the oppressed undertaking to become critically aware of the concrete situation of their oppression (Fanon, 1967). Consistent with his views on the impersonal nature of structural relations between coloniser and colonised, Memmi allowed that some colonisers may "vow not to accept colonisation" (p. 19) but was pessimistic about the political impotence of such self-rejecting colonialists, considering them to be in an "impossible historical situation" (p. 39). Viewing as he did a French minority colonial regime in North Africa, Memmi suggested that the coloniser who refuses colonialism must decide that the fight for a social order in which he understands there is no place for him is not his own. Nevertheless, in his social psychological analysis of the distortion and charitable racism he perceives as practised by the colonists, Memmi offers us possible sites of intervention for those awakening from a colonial consciousness and seeking to transform such oppressive dynamics. Despite the scepticism by these early theorists of decolonisation about coloniser participation in changes to colonialism, their analysis of colonial dominance as an impersonal system receiving personal and psychological legitimation by the colonists suggests helpful possibilities for sites of change.

Peacemaking and non-violent conflict

Curle (1971), reflecting on his work in international conflict resolution, has theorised the conditions under which powerful groups are willing to negotiate change with less powerful groups, drawing in particular on decolonising contexts. Curle considered the worldwide shift of awareness in poor and colonised countries about "colonialism… as monstrous" to have been "one of the most dramatic revolutions of history" (p. 39), leading to struggles for political and cultural independence. Writing just prior to the publication of Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, he described as "unpeaceful relationships" those which "do damage to one or more of the parties concerned, through physical violence, or in economic, social, or psychological ways" (Curle, 1971, p. 2).

His theory of change rests on notions of the relative power and information available to strong and weak groups. A typical scenario is a dominant group whose power is high, but whose information about the material situation, including the experience of the groups they are oppressing, is low. Conversely, the oppressed group may be high in information and low in power. Curle's proposal was that a change on either dimension in either group will promote change in the behaviour of the dominant group. Often the oppressed group changes the power balance through military initiatives, but equally effective may be education and symbolic protest to increase the awareness of the dominant group about conflict in the relationship, and the associated risks of not attending to that conflict. In their focus on symbolic and informative non-violent confrontation, Ghandhi's use of *satyagraha* (Lauer, 1982, p. 354) methods in India during the 1920s-40s, and M. L. King's non-violent protest in 1960s' America both provide examples of increasing the information available to a dominant group about how an oppressed group experience an objective situation. Maori leaders such as Te Whiti o Rongomai at Parihaka in the 1880s (Scott, 1975) made highly innovative and successful use of these techniques well before the 20th century campaigns.

Curle's approach is helpful for understanding our local situation. The seemingly serene relationship between Pakeha and Maori from the end of the Land Wars until the 1970s would constitute an unpeaceful relationship, with low awareness by Pakeha of the imbalance of power that served their privileged position, and of the discontent of Maori with this situation. From the 1970s onwards, an intensifying of critical analysis among Maori expressed through protest, land

occupations and institutional critiques led to much higher awareness among Pakeha of the structural and cultural conflict created by Pakeha dominance.

Curle saw the direction and destination of change as the developing of human potential based on a particular quality of relationship between groups – one in which "each recognizes and respects the autonomy of the other, its right to organize itself according to its cultural and political preference; and at the same time each admits its dependence on the other for such matters as trade, communications, the sharing of scarce resources…" (p. 261). He termed the principle underlying such a developed relationship "autonomous interdependence" (p. 261).

Curle considered peacemakers (among whom he included both mediators and activists) to be key agents of change. When awareness of the imbalance in power is low, he saw education and moral confrontation as crucial steps to be taken by the weaker party. Moral confrontation, according to Curle, was a strategy to "change the perceptions of the ruling group, to raise its level of awareness until it understands what it has done and accepts responsibility for the damage it has inflicted" (p. 201). In his experience, a full acceptance of responsibility led to a re-apportionment of power and a restructuring of the relationship. For Curle, the weaker party, rather than just defeating their dominators, "must change them to a point where they reject their own past and are prepared to take an equal part in the future" (p. 23). He observed that the area of race relations was particularly intransigent, noting that some sources of unpeacefulness in this sphere could be eliminated only through changes in the structure of the relations between races. He acknowledged that education for awareness in the conditions of ruthless interest in maintaining the superiority typical of racial dominance is a "hard, dangerous, and largely unrewarding effort by people who have dedicated their lives to this task" (p. 194).

My critique here is that Curle, like the decolonisation theorists, assumed that the weaker party will undertake the task of changing the unpeaceful relationship – that the dominated will educate the dominant – and he does not clearly specify an active role for dominant group members. However, his views about education and moral confrontation to increase the information available to the dominant group allow for a theory that supports dominant group involvement in change, as was indeed the case in the American civil rights movement, the breaking down of apartheid in South Africa, and the Pakeha contributions to change that are the subject of this research. Curle's theorising thus provides a significant extension to

decolonisation theory for coloniser groups, and allows for the possibility of social psychological change for a dominant group.

European critical theory

Critical theory emerged from an intellectual project within Western Marxism to develop social theory "wedded to practice in the service of a more just organisation of life in society" (Horkheimer, cited in Crotty, 1998, p. 130). It has become a heterogeneous tradition of inquiry predicated on a critical view of the status quo (Honneth, 1993), p. 234). The critical project focusing on human processes in the construction of taken-for-granted social reality or truth is most associated with Foucault. Foucault and those who follow his line of reasoning highlight the relationship between power and knowledge, particularly how language is used in ways that have profound material effects in the construction and negotiation of social reality (van Dijk, 1987). As accounts and discourses become available and widely shared, they become social realities to be reckoned with, and they become efficacious in future events.

Critical theorists have made a particular point of theorising how dominant discourses (or equally 'commonsense') may be employed, consciously or unconsciously, to endorse or embed hegemonic regimes. Considering the oppressive social relations between Maori and Pakeha, McCreanor (1995) suggests that everyday Pakeha discourse about Maori Pakeha relations serves "important hegemonic functions in diverse fields of expression and communication by constructing, reflecting and reproducing the status quo (p. 170). He considers such everyday talk to be a crucial path by which Pakeha construct, interpret and so enact social relations between Maori and Pakeha.

Critical psychologists Wetherell and Potter (1992), conceiving of racism as a "collective discursive practice" (p. 217), conducted an extended study of the discourse of white middle-class New Zealanders. Following Foucault, they saw discourse as "thoroughly constitutive" (p. 62) of social reality, with no unmediated reality available to humans, and follow Stuart Hall's conception that it is only within the discursive that conditions of existence and real effects can be given meaning (p. 63). In an extended case study of the flexible discourses used by white middle class New Zealanders to constitute "modern racism" they argued for their interest in ideological practices and outcomes (rather than ideology per se), thereby helping focus local critical work on Pakeha commonsense and the standard story. They concluded that Pakeha New Zealanders "articulate in their

discourse a collectively shared set of resources for legitimating their social position" (p. 219), much as suggested by Memmi's analysis of the psychology of the coloniser. They concluded that "Racist discourse...justifies, sustains and legitimates those practices which maintain the power and dominance of Pakeha New Zealanders" (p. 70).

In most critical writing, the concept of changing, from the point of view of interested participants, is alluded to rather than explicitly theorised. Transformation of oppressive situations is implied through treating speakers who use a pattern outside the dominant discourse as showing 'resistance', or by exhorting the critical reader to exploit contradictions in dominant discourses. Resistance is treated variously as a characteristic of discourses or speakers. The concluding remarks of much critical writing contain calls to "resist", "undermine" or "transform" prevailing discourses. Like other critical theorists in the discursive tradition, Wetherell and Potter (1992) consider that it is in the spaces and contradictions of discourse that new discourses may emerge, but give little attention to this feature. For instance, while they do not consider it the only site of active change, their suggestion for intervention in racist discourse is "charting the fragmented and dilemmatic nature of everyday discourse, because it is at those points of fracture and contradiction that there is scope for change and the redirection of argument" (p. 219). As with much critical theory, the social actors addressed for this task remain unspecified. However, they follow Hall in noting that Gramsci's concepts of hegemony and overthrow of hegemony depend on "wars of position" or "wars of manoeuvre" using ideological or discursive resources. They acknowledge that such battles require the active construction of alliances and the definition of groups and forms of solidarity through discursive and other practices.

Henriques, Hollway, Urwin, Venn and Walkerdine (1984) have been among very few critical theorists to consider specifically *how* new discourses are produced. They drew the conclusion that: "although one may speak of localized sites of resistances, the possibility of their co-ordination remains a theoretical problem" (p. 116). Gergen (1994) concurs, suggesting that the critical focus on dominant intellectual, scientific and cultural practices exists in a "critical but parasitic relationship" (p. xvii) with dominant discourses, and makes the point that "Far less attention has been devoted to possible successor projects, of developing viable alternatives to existing procedures" (Gergen, 1994, p. xviii).

To expand a little on the theoretical problem identified by Henriques et al (1984), it may certainly be important for creators of change to analyse discursive patterns that construct oppressive relations such as colonialism and racism. However, notwithstanding the insistence by critical theorists that it is in spaces and contradictions that new discourses 'emerge', I am not yet convinced that these patterns in themselves suggest techniques for their demise. Although a discourse may contain contradictions, its conceptual resources are also strongly mutually reinforcing, so that merely negating one pattern may have the effect of reinforcing another. Indeed many critical scholars understand these contradictions to be precisely the basis for the longevity of dominant discourses.

A further question is precisely how, at the social psychological level, innovative or resistant constructions 'become' a new discourse. While critical theory maintains that alternatives to colonial racism can occur in every conversation, I would contend that they disappear unless they can create a definite pattern in the social milieu. As Jackson and Cram (2003) found, although some young women in group discussions on (hetero)sexuality were able to disrupt the meanings and power of dominant heterosexual discourses, those practising such resistance often held a lonely position, without the collective support of the other young women in the group or, at times, the interviewer. They concluded that although individual young women positioned themselves and their sexuality in alternative discourses, their voices were "muted and individual rather than collective". Jackson and Cram (2003) conclude that the young women who speak outside the dominant discourse are "individual whispers". Certainly critical theorists often express the need, as does Burman, to go beyond the "individual and spontaneous" forms of resistance, to develop resistance that is both "collective and organised" (Burman, 1996, p. 10). Despite such exhortations in critical writing, I was unable to find further theorising to this effect. As far as I could ascertain, Henrique et al's (1984) earlier conclusion about the lack of theory concerning coordination of sites of resistance still holds.

In my view, while the methods of critical inquiry are potent tools for analysing constructed realities, the critical project within social constructionism does not appear to have devoted particular attention to processes for *changing* the discourses which construct and legitimate an oppressive status quo, i.e. a theory of how language may be changed. The critical project therefore does not at present offer theorising about the 'possibility of coordination' of Henrique et al's 'localised sites of resistance'. In my terms, critical theory does not itself offer a *theory of changing*.

Returning to a foundational critical theorist who does explicitly theorise a process of changing, Habermas's views rest on the possibility of 'emancipatory learning'. Learners become aware of the forces that have brought them to their current situation and take action to change some aspect of situations they now deem unacceptable to them. Apps (1985) explained that "emancipatory learning is that which frees people from personal, institutional, or environmental forces that prevent them seeing new direction, from gaining control over their lives, their society and their world" (p. 151). In its focus on liberating humans from the constraints which inhibit communication, thereby allowing a "rationality of communicative action" (Honneth, 1993, p. 235), there is in emancipatory learning an air of freeing oneself from all ideology and becoming more rational. I take up the issue of rationality as a destination for social change in my closing critique, but turn now to Freire's theorising of psychological and social processes of changing.

Freire's theory of conscientisation

Based on a lifetime as a literacy educator in Brazil, Freire's liberatory theorising provides a crucial link between Marxist, decolonisation and critical theory, and political action. Sharing Hegelian and Marxist roots with critical theory, liberatory theory developed in the South American colonial context into a unique body of theory, including a philosophy of liberation, a theology of liberation (Gutierrez, 1974), and a psychology of liberation (Martin-Baro, 1994). As Freire worked with illiterate farmers to help them name their world in ways that negated the oppressive status quo, he developed a pedagogy of liberation (Freire, 1972, 1975, 1996). Freire, like Gramsci, ascribed a crucial role to ideas, language and culture in maintaining a social order:

> The relationship between the dominator and the dominated reflect the greater social context, even when formally personal. Such relationships imply the introjection by the dominated of the cultural myths of the dominator. (Freire, 1975, p. 33)

Freire's theory of change turns upon the concept of conscientisation, often defined as the process whereby humans "achieve a deepening awareness both of the socio-cultural reality which shapes their lives and of their capacity to transform that reality" (Editor's footnote, Freire, 1975, p. 27). But Freire's own words spell out more strongly the social as well as the psychological nature of change resulting from critical praxis, proposing that conscientisation is achieved through critical

reflection and joint action *with others*:

> Conscientisation is a joint project in that it takes place in a man among other men, men united by their action and by their reflection upon that action and upon the world. Thus men together achieve the state of perceptive clarity which Goldman calls "the maximum of potential consciousness"… (Freire, 1975, p. 46).

Freire (1975) links conscientisation to a process of collective cultural action by suggesting that conscientisation "implies further the critical insertion of the conscientised person into a demythologized reality" (p. 46). To the extent that the interiorisation of the dominator's values is not only an individual phenomenon, but a social and cultural one, ejecting it "must be achieved by a type of cultural action which negates culture" (p. 16). Freire thereby extends Gramsci's work by spelling out that cultural action is required to change collectively-held, or common-sense values in a society.

Freire (1975) also provides a more open-ended and hopeful account of the direction and destination of change than do Marx and Gramsci. Unlike Marx, he maintains that we should not seek to "domesticate" history in our theories of change. On the contrary, he sees a utopian vision in the desire for independence by the Third World, and includes emotions of hope and courage in the pursuit of change, since: "Utopian hope…is engagement full of risk" (p. 21). He explains that "to be utopian… is to engage in denunciation and annunciation...." which he describes as "teachers and learners together, in the act of analyzing a dehumanizing reality, denounce it while announcing its transformation in the name of the liberation of man" (p. 20). In this manner, conscientisation is a means to liberatory cultural action with no preordained destination, involving social actors in a "permanent cultural revolution" (p. 48). His key concepts of (i) conscientisation, dependent on (ii) dialogue between social actors, who achieve social change through (iii) cultural action provide a comprehensive theory for social change. To Freire, the site of change is personal, interactional **and** cultural.

Freire (1975) followed the emphasis given by decolonisation theorists to the mutual dependency in colonialism between coloniser and colonised. Like these theorists, he considered that when the oppressed end their tolerance of that dependency, both groups are liberated (p. 20). While his theory allowed for conscientisation as a "joint project" (p. 46) dependent on dialogue between people, he did not elaborate in his earlier writing on the possibility that members of the dominating group might undertake such a process in a complementary way alongside the colonised. However, in addressing New Zealand antiracism groups in the early 1970s, Freire spoke of "co-intentional" work by dominant groups

alongside oppressed groups, with each group undertaking their own tasks towards a common agenda. Freire's concepts and methods of conscientisation and cultural action proved very useful to Pakeha attempting education for change. The social and psychological processes experienced by Pakeha in such co-intentional conscientisation work are explored in the research studies.

Feminist theory and praxis

Feminist theory, like liberatory theory, was a major advance that brought together a critical analysis of structural oppression and an everywoman's practice of consciousness-raising as the major site of intervention. Building on selected Western theoretical debates around Marxism and class oppression, feminist theorists drew upon Frantz Fanon's work on the internalisation of colonialism, and Mao Zse Dong's approach to continually renewed political consciousness (Barrett, 1993), p. 226). Feminist theorists made explicit that for women's liberation the social structures needed to be changed *and* the interior of each woman needed to change. While feminist theory concerned itself primarily with women as an oppressed group, some theorists explored the complex intersections of gender and race, particularly at the personal level, which denied the possibility of an 'essential womanhood' or a 'universal sisterhood'. Black American theorists such as bell hooks (1994) elaborated the learning that one could be an oppressor and oppressed at same time. Such understanding allowed, for instance, for the situation in which white women involved in antiracism work found ourselves. Some of us developed the critical awareness that we can at any one time be involved in a liberating conscientisation process about one hegemonic ideology in our lives (such as colonial racism) while uncritically reproducing numerous other hegemonic practices (such as modern waste-making or capitalist forms of trade and exchange).

The development of a feminist praxis of consciousness raising and collective organising was particularly helpful to other social movements. Henriques et al (1984) affirm the key role played by women's liberation and feminism in developing a new form of politics which privileged the awakening of personal consciousness, often described as 'the personal is political':

> …feminism produced a form of politics and analysis which has perhaps more than any other modern movement asserted and demonstrated the necessity of personal change. This is crucial because, unlike traditional forms of resistance, it was insisted that subjective transformation was a major site of political change. Indeed it was implied that significant political change cannot be achieved without it. (p. 7)

Marshall (1993) offers her interpretation of 'the personal is political':

> The process of change through one-by-one personal transformation may seem
> slow, but it is sure, soundly grounded, authentic and above all continually
> adaptive. The critical factors for significant impact to be achieved are that
> numbers should grow, and that the individuals concerned should each act as if
> they make a difference, thus influencing the sphere in which they operate.
> (p. 162)

Marshall points out that the impacts of such one-by-one transformation "challenge
our stale notions that social change must be large-scale and standardized to be
meaningful" (p. 162). In contrast to the focus on language and discourse in post-
modernist and critical theory, feminist theory kept a focus on personal
consciousness and the person as agent, leading to theorising how consciousness is
formed through relationship: "to discover a collective concept of subjectivity
which foregrounds the construction of identity in *relationship*" (Waugh, 1993),
p. 467, original emphasis).

Feminist organising to promote consciousness-raising and incorporate traditions
of radical participatory democracy led to practices such as consensus decision
making and attempts to build community. While leading to numerous tensions in
practice (Riger, 1984); (Vanderpyl, 1998); (Pringle & Henry, 1994) the personal
and collective praxis developed in the women's liberation movement provided a
model very useful to other social movements, including the pro-Treaty movement
by Pakeha.

Having reviewed concepts of change drawn from theory largely focused on
oppressed groups, I turned to theorising with a more explicit focus on dominant
groups. Here I am critically reviewing theories underpinning antiracism
interventions for contributions to a theory of changing for dominant groups.

U.S. and U.K. anti-racism interventions

Theories of racial discrimination in the United States of America traditionally
focused on personal prejudice. Social scientists tended to view prejudice as an
"archaic survival of an irrational past" which would disappear as society became
more industrialised, rational and progressive. Feagin and Feagin (1978) call this a
"prejudice-causes-discrimination model" (p. 2) leading to an optimistic outlook
that social change involves a progressive, gradual process of inclusion into the
dominant society for non-white groups. However, their preoccupation with
personal prejudice meant that theorists found themselves unable to explain the

ghetto riots of the 1960s and the growth of the Black Power Movement and black cultural nationalism (Wilson, 1973), p. 4). The Kerner Commission's (1968) finding that structural and institutionalised racism against African Americans was the primary cause of the riots encouraged more systemic and historically aware approaches. The (then) new theorising developed analyses of internal colonialism and institutionalised racism in the United States (Feagin & Feagin, 1978).

Theorists of internal colonialism placed less emphasis on prejudiced individuals and more on historical processes. They proposed that in newly colonised societies non-white workers were brought in as cheap labour, or their land was stolen, so that an unequal racial distribution of political and economic resources, initially established by force, was soon institutionalised by laws and informal means As Feagin and Feagin (1978) explain:

> …once a colonial system is established historically, those in the superior position seek to monopolize basic resources. In this process, privilege becomes institutionalized, that is, it becomes imbedded in the norms (regulations and informal rules) and roles (social positions and their attendant duties and rights) in a variety of social, economic, and political organizations. (p. 12)

The racial divisions in such a system of internal colonialism require few prejudiced people because "the processes that maintain domination – control of whites over non-whites – are built into the major social institutions" (Feagin & Feagin, 1978, p. 10) so that racism is structured into social processes.

Charles Hamilton and Stokely Carmichael, writing in the mid-1960s, were among the first to link institutional racism, seen as discriminatory mechanisms and effects, to the concept of internal colonialism: "Black people in the United States have a colonial relationship to the larger society, a relationship characterized by institutional racism" (Feagin & Feagin, 1978, p. 13). Since they focused more on the mechanisms of systemic racism than its historical origins, their major emphasis was on racial differentials in the *effects* of societal operations. Their pioneering analysis of racism in food, housing, and medicine showed a cumulative impact on the higher death rate of black children in the South. These interlocking patterns of discrimination in the political, economic and social spheres gained the terms "systemic discrimination" or a "web of racism" (p. 35).

In response to the 1960s crisis in U.S. race relations and drawing upon the concepts of institutionalised racism rather than internal colonialism, large-scale affirmative action programmes were devised, such as desegregation of schools. Small-group approaches were also used, for instance in the education system by

Sedlacek and Brooks (1976).   However, as with affirmative action programmes their change philosophy was outcome oriented. Feagin and Feagin (1978) argue that without a clear analysis of the impersonal nature of historical and cultural colonialism, change efforts became focused on individual staff. The site of intervention became, by default, the personal racism of teachers and administrators. Feagin and Feagin (1978) suggest that the U.S. theorising about how to change the dominant group's racism had essentially returned to a 'prejudice-causes-discrimination model'.

Notwithstanding the shifts in U.S. theorising, combining analyses of colonialism and institutionalised racism led to a useful range of concepts of racism:

- Personal racism, where an individual's negative stereotypes and attitudes towards other racial groups cause him or her to discriminate against those groups.
- Institutionalised racism or structural racism, where the policies and practices of organisations deny members from an oppressed group access to resources and power; and
- Ethnocentrism or cultural racism, where the values, beliefs and ideas that are embedded in social representations endorse the superiority of one group over the other.

These forms of racism were often acknowledged elsewhere as underpinning colonisation (Jones, 1997).

In contrast to the Kerner Commission's findings of institutionalised racism as a cause of race riots in the U.S., Lord Scarman found in his report on *The Brixton Disorders* about the 1981 uprisings in British cities that a few isolated police officers acted as racially prejudiced. In Henriques' (1984) view, the Scarman report used the 'rotten apple theory' of racism, viewing society as basically unproblematic, and thereby resisting the challenge to understand racism as a fundamentally social phenomenon. Prejudice was conceptualised as an individualised, exceptional phenomenon – an irrational response originating in ignorance. Using the same intervention hypothesis as in the U.S. that familiarity would correct racial prejudice helped in the United Kingdom to legitimate a laissez-faire policy of letting time and contact take their course in improving race relations (Henriques, 1984). A small-group educational approach was developed, called Racism Awareness Training, aimed at white people's racism. Not surprisingly given its theoretical and socio-political understandings, it was based on rational learning theory to "correct prejudice" (Henriques, 1984, p. 84). The Racism Awareness Training model has been critiqued for its focus on the

individual, and its neglect of issues of structural racism, for instance in Gurnah's (1984) insistence that "racism is a relationship" (p. 13).

Overall, these U.S. and U.K. approaches to institutional racism and discrimination theorised injustice in the present, without attributing a history to current structures. Focusing on personal prejudice, antiracism theory from the U.S. and U.K. contexts obscured the collective, cultural 'common sense' nature of racism and dominance as a result of colonial history. The view that change occurs passively and uni-directionally towards the dominant white way of life is one of the traditional positions taken by Western social scientists. Hence in both countries, with a social psychology more or less in common, and despite different intervention policies, the enduring focus of racism and antiracism theory settled on correcting individual prejudice as an aberration within a rational society (Henriques, 1984, p. 82).

Henriques (1984) concluded from his comparison of the U.S. and U.K. situations that "theory and politics, knowledge and power are locked in a mutually conditioning system of effects so that the analysis of one must directly engage with the analysis of the other" (p. 64). His view helped me to appreciate the theoretical impact of the New Zealand series of institutional reviews - *Puao te Ata Tu* (1988), the Royal Commission on Social Policy (1988) and Jackson's (1988) review of Maori and the criminal justice system. Their authors consistently used a critique of historical colonisation and its contemporary outcomes in institutionalised and cultural racism. These reports avoided focusing on the prejudice of individuals, in spite of a local theory base in social psychology, shared with the U.S. and U.K, about prejudice as the cause of racism.

Social and community psychology

Mainstream psychology, portrayed as a science, has tended to subscribe to an uncritical view of the status quo of Western societies (Prilleltensky & Fox, 1997), p. 4). Notwithstanding some early critical work on the operation of power in society (Harris, 1997), social psychological theorists have generally maintained a conflict-free model of power, seeing society in terms of groups bound together by unchallenged attitudes and values:

> Power derives more from the routine application of effectively unchallenged assumptions than from manifest dominance of one group over others in open conflict. A major source of power for dominant groups is simply the routine operation of social institutions. (Ng cited in Thomas & Veno, 1994, p. 89)

In contrast, community psychologists, who often identify their discipline as an applied social psychology, have made social change a central perspective with their emphasis on "creating or changing social systems to generate more positive societies which promote wellbeing" (Thomas & Veno, 1994), p. 13). The field has promoted interventions at the micro, meso and macrolevels of societal systems, although it is acknowledged that macro-level change has seldom been attempted by community psychologists (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 1997), p. 175). A founding theoretical position is the field theory of Lewin and colleagues, proposing that human nature is influenced by the immediate social environment. Discussion and decision-making in small groups have been considered effective settings for change work (Lauer, 1982, p. 338). In this theoretical context, the concept of "empowerment" has developed as a favoured approach to social change, defined as enhancing the possibility that people can more actively control their own lives (Rappaport, 1981, 1987). Interventions have focused on increasing the power of individuals and small groups to control their own lives, based on developing a more critical understanding of socio-political environments and developing skills and resources to achieve social and political action (Kieffer, 1984). However, empowerment as a strategy has been critiqued by other community psychologists as over-emphasising individual power (Riger, 1993) and setting up a competitive relationship between disempowered groups. In its focus on self-determination and the acquisition of power, it risks advancing the agenda of one group at the expense of another (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 1997).

Proponents of the radical psychology position within community psychology have been concerned to link the personal to the political, the micro-levels to the macro-levels of change (Fox & Prillelltensky, 1997; (Serrano-Garcia & Lopez-Sanchez, 1992); (Watts & Abdul-Adil, 1994). Radical psychologists have focused particularly on how critical awareness may be encouraged, and on useful actions for change. For instance, acknowledging their debt to Freire and his theory of conscientisation, Watts and Abdul-Adil (1994) proposed a developmental model of socio-political awareness for young African American men, where an individual's growing critical consciousness brings oppression into clearer focus and ultimately to an impulse for action. They posited the following five stages of change: (i) the acritical stage, where the asymmetrical distribution of resources and privilege is outside the person's awareness; (ii) the adaptive stage, where the asymmetry is acknowledged, but seen as immutable and must be accommodated; (iii) the pre-critical stage, where complacency gives way to awareness of, and concerns about inequality (iv) the critical stage, where more learning about asymmetry occurs through social and historical analysis, and finally (v) the

liberation stage, where the awareness of oppression stimulates the person to social action.

Rather than theorising comparable processes of social and psychological change for dominant group members, radical psychologists have most often suggested that privileged individuals may act as catalysts or resources to oppressed groups. For instance, Prilleltensky and Nelson (1997) suggest that "professionals who identify with the emancipatory goals of oppressed groups can define new roles in collaboration with such groups and assist them in realising their goals" (p. 180). In this position, there appears to be an implicit assumption that the helpful individual is not 'part of the problem' of oppression by a dominant group. The site of change within the dominant group becomes the enlightened professional practising 'empowerment' with groups of the oppressed.

There have been exceptions to this theoretical trend, however. In an effort to put psychology at the service of social change, Prilleltensky (1990) posed the question of the psychological phenomena involved in creating and countering hegemony. He used Freire's concepts of "denunciation" and "annunciation" to suggest ways to counter-act hegemony available equally to those in dominant or oppressed groups. He suggested that an individual or group proceeds through particular stages: Denunciation of practices sustaining hegemonic mechanisms, exchange of information, triggering action, and then annunciation of new social actions and long-term visions. He also posited "reactance", a negative emotional state which may impel the person to action in a parallel route between denunciation and annunciation. The present research takes up the same issue by exploring in more depth the means by which a dominant group may participate in counter-acting a colonial hegemony.

Overall, my major criticism of the social and community psychology approaches to change is the apparent mismatch in treating social problems as arising from "the routine operation of social institutions", and yet focusing interventions on the individuals and small groups affected by institutions. Even when social justice and freedom from oppression are explicit aims, for instance in the work of radical psychologists, with some notable exceptions the focus is on how individual professionals can create relationships with oppressed groups in order to help the oppressed group achieve its goal. In common with most psychological theorising, social, community and radical psychologists have not developed an explicit theory of change involving the dominant group.

Transformational adult education

Although theorists of adult education for social change overwhelmingly focus on oppressed groups (Herzog, 1996), the work of Mezirow and his colleagues provides some potential for theorising dominant group change. They theorised that adults may, through critical reflection on their unintentional cultural frames of reference, undergo transformative and emancipatory learning ((Mezirow & Associates, 1990). In their view, adults may transform their meaning perspectives through "rational dialogue" (p. xiii) to encourage validity testing of the cultural codes that distribute privilege and power. Mezirow's (1991) concept of "meaning perspectives" incorporates a uniquely adult ability to evaluate paradigms:

> In addition to providing a framework for classifying experience, they [meaning perspectives] are informed by a horizon of possibility that is being anticipated and that represents value assumptions regarding ends, norms, and criteria of judgement. (p. 62)

Critical examination of the paradigms through which we are taught by our culture to understand our experience may lead to "self-realisation and social action in adulthood" (p. xiv). Transformation in meaning perspectives is stimulated by dilemmas in life which adults find disorienting, and which cannot be resolved by simply acquiring more information within the same perspective (Mezirow, 1978). However, these disorienting dilemmas are uncomfortable, and a person's response to the emotional component in meaning-making may explain resistance to change:

> We trade off awareness for avoidance of anxiety when new experiences are inconsistent with our habits of expectation, which can result in meaninglessness. To provide meaning, we may resort to the psychological mechanism of self-deception.(Mezirow, 1991, p. 63)

Following this line of reasoning, Mezirow (1991) argues that "dialogic communities" (p. 63) are necessary to validate commonly held meanings, and that cultures vary greatly in the opportunities they provide for critical and transformative perspective taking (Mezirow, 1978), p. 109). In this, the transformational learning theorists make a parallel attempt to Freire's to combine theorising about language and meaning with socio-political change. The notions in transformational learning of 'disorienting dilemmas' and 'emotional discomfort' help to extend Freire's theory of conscientisation and cultural action towards greater relevance for dominant groups.

My criticism of transformational learning theory follows my critique of Habermas's emancipatory learning – the direction posited for mature critical thinking is towards increasingly rational perspectives, with an implied freedom

from cultural restraint. There appears an underlying view of a rational person, who once they have entertained a more critical view, will by unspecified means manage to cease supporting the status quo. Furthermore, transformational learning keeps the focus on the individual as the site of intervention. These approaches thereby imply that the site of change in the dominant group sits with the enlightened individual who has learned a more critical approach. While political action is mentioned, there seemed little explicit theorising about how critically educated individuals form dialogic communities. In my view, transformation learning theory by default leaves the enlightened learner to struggle alone. By neglecting collective transformation, both the emancipatory and transformational learning approaches seem to suggest that somehow an individual can be more emancipated, more rational, than the cultural discourses (or dialogic communities) available to them.

3.2 Critique of available theory

In summary, each theory I reviewed offered useful concepts with which to theorise change but neglected one or more aspects significant to changing for dominant groups. Much of the sociological and psychological theory was weakened by lack of concern with historical and structural oppression and social conflict. Theories that acknowledged structural oppression, such as decolonisation and feminism, discounted the dominant group as a site of change. Antiracism interventions did target the dominant group, but by focusing on personal prejudice, 'de-ethnicised' the culturally dominant group, and overlooked their cultural assumptions legitimating the status quo. Of the other approaches that did theorise involvement in change by members of the dominant group, such as radical psychology, adult education and peace theory, there was a lack of attention to collective transformation for the dominant group. In critical theory, there was no theorising about motivated action to change the discourses with which dominance is constructed.

Indeed, reviewing theories of changing for their implications for dominant groups, one is rather left with the impression that as constructed within theory, the average member of a dominant group (including the theorist) is 'blind' (does not consider the possibility of alternative social orders), 'deaf' (does not hear or is resistant to voices of change in society) and 'passive' (considers change the burden of the oppressed). Should a member of the dominant group feel moved to consider an

alternative social order, and step outside the blind, deaf and passive position allowed them in theory, they become rather a 'lonely' ally to the oppressed in their task of transforming the social order. These gaps and blindspots could all be considered outcomes of meta-theoretical constraints (Gergen, 1994) or what I would describe as 'meta-theoretical blindness'.

3.2.1 Meta-theoretical constraints on generating new theory

Three forms of meta-theoretical blindness appeared to me to constrain Western theorising about dominant group change most severely – the naturalising of dominance in social systems, the assumption of the social actor as a rational individual, and a tendency to treat dominant groups as homogeneous.

Naturalising dominance

Theorists and researchers in the positivist traditions have overlooked participation in maintaining dominance as unimportant, and not requiring investigation. The position of being an uncritical supporter of the status quo is treated as 'natural'. Reviewers such as Lauer (1982) state baldly that: "The tendency for the powerful to retain and even increase their power and to resist any efforts to alter the power distribution, is a characteristic of all societies" (p. 350). This assumption, made throughout Western theorising, naturalises the dominant - subordinate social structure. Gramsci and critical theorists theorise that dominance is actively maintained. Gramsci might describe it as actively maintaining hegemony, while critical theorists might describe it as constructing discourses that maintain their own group's structural position, but all these theorists appear to assume that ruling classes desire to retain their dominant position.

Indeed, the 'naturalness' of maintaining dominance presents itself as self-evident from history as constructed in most Western scholarship. However, history may equally be read for evidence that the powerful do indeed acquiesce, cooperate and actively support changes to a power balance. Some socio-historical critics, e.g. Eisler (1987) have amassed archaeological evidence for the relative recency (in millennial terms) of dominance-based societal forms, and argue that other societal forms have persisted for much greater lengths of time.

Rational individuals

Many theoretical positions assume a 'rational' individual, capable of being free from ideological influence. Indeed, the long tradition in Western thought of the rational, "self-certain and singular subject" (Luke & Gore, 1992), p. 7) can be used equally to underpin a 'blind' individualism of uncritical support for the status quo, as well as an 'enlightened' individualism for critical members of the dominant group. In the theories reviewed, such a rational individual resides either in an ideology-free dominant group, or, when critically awakened to the ideologies maintaining the social structure, becomes a critically enlightened, singular supporter of the oppressed. In my reading, theorists of emancipatory and transformational learning appeared to embark on a quest for critical consciousness as an individual competence for a dominant group member (Ellsworth, 1992).

Homogeneous dominant group and lonely defectors

The assumptions of a 'rational" individual and the 'natural' Western status quo are joined by the tendency in many theories to treat the dominant group as monolithic, linked presumably by privilege into a comfortable, homogeneous mainstream. Most theories did not distinguish between resistant and facilitative responses by the dominant group, or sub-groups within the dominant group, to challenges of the status quo. And yet, as Henriques (1984) puts it: "if knowledges were all consistent with the dominant power relations, it would be impossible to understand how they could have radical or reactionary effects".

To reflect back upon Jackson and Cram (2003)'s description of the voices of young women using alternative discourses of sexuality as 'individual whispers', might their discouraging conclusion arise partly from research methods that gather informants rather randomly, as though discourses were dispersed evenly throughout a social group? Critical researchers seem at times to make the same mistake as their empiricist colleagues in choosing focus groups (or texts) as though speakers may be randomly selected from a monolithic dominant group. In the study of discourses about young women's sexuality, had the researchers recorded the discourse of the local queer youth movement, the seemingly individual whispers of resistance may well have sounded a confident and well-rehearsed choir. Equally, we may ask of the local material presented in Chapter 2, were Tony Simpson and Donna Awatere individual whispers of resistance to colonial discourse? Or were they conversing with an audience among whom a 'coordination of localised resistance' to colonial discourse was already underway?

Again, while critical theory provides theory that does not treat a dominant group as homogeneous, we are left with individuals who choose between competing discourses. There is a theoretical gap concerning the conditions under which alternative discourses arise, and who creates them in the first place. My impression from reading critical theory is a ghostly sense of discourses arising in a disembodied way, and fading away from view, thereby naturalising a focus on a 'centre stage' and leaving unexamined the activity in the so-called wings. Although critical theory relies on a constructed subject in place of a rational individual, there is still no position from which to theorise motivated changes in a group's constructions of reality. The theoretical blind spot becomes – why would dominant group members construct discourses that serve to disestablish their own cultural group's hegemony? Why would they support change to societal institutions that lessen their control?

Because of the self-reinforcing tendency of meta-theoretical constraints, Henriques (1984) concludes that new knowledges need to come from outside the terms of the debate, and that "the task is therefore as political as it is theoretical" (p. 86). He gives a specific example of how meta-theoretical blindness may be woven into the theorising of antiracism work, leading to reinforcement of the dominant ideology and power structure. Since the U.K. antiracism education approach came to see "the provision of objective facts" (p. 84) about the other's culture as the way to change attitudes and reduce prejudice, white remained the vantage point and the norm from which black differences were measured and evaluated. With the shift from looking at prejudiced individuals to looking at the object of prejudice, the notion of prejudice "recommends that the problem of ignorance lies with black people as the unknown object rather than with the prejudiced individual as the unknowing subject" (p. 85). Since they rely on both scientific and common-sense notions of individualism and rationality, even theories of white prejudice or ignorance suggest the idea that blacks are themselves the problem, making it impossible to use the concept to argue against its own racist effects. He concluded that a theory that is progressive in one set of social conditions may become reinforcing of the status quo in the next, and that trying to theorise social change from within dominant paradigms and discourses was impossible.

Social scientific blindness as a result of theoretical approaches is also described by Gergen (1994). He argues that the assumption in the social sciences of "enduring fundamentals" in human behaviour has implied that there is no need for

social scientists to study the past or construct alternative futures. By contrast, if the theoretician considers current patterns of action as "fragile, temporary and capable of alteration", then she may:

> …usefully direct attention to differences between past and present. What forms of conduct have been abandoned? What has developed anew, and with what functional consequences? Most important, the theorist may be invited to consider alternatives to the present and to explore the advantages and disadvantages of patterns as yet unseen. (Gergen, 1994, p. 137)

The meta-theoretical assumptions identified here support and reinforce each other – a rational member of a dominant group does not attempt to change patterns of dominance in their culture which advantage them. With dominant groups considered to 'naturally' resist change, the scenario for change becomes adversarial by theoretical default – impetus for change is assumed to rest with the disadvantaged and oppressed, who may be joined by critically enlightened individuals, who might then be viewed as 'defectors' from the dominant group.

Taken together, then, in all their diversity, these meta-theoretical constraints on existing theories leave us with an under-theorised approach to processes of changing for dominant groups. Overall, my critical examination of existing concepts for dominant group change has identified a lack of available theory concerning change processes in the dominant group. While each theory of change had some merit and application, none of them in my view accounted adequately for the processes by which dominant groups change. Indeed, I concluded that there is no 'theory of changing' for dominant groups – basically there exist no arguments for or against self-conscious change by dominant groups. However, there are shards that are suggestive, and I turn now to the task of considering how we might construct an adequate research strategy from the most promising theoretical positions.

3.2.2 Alternative directions

My resolution to the theoretical issues identified above lies in rejecting the assumed homogeneity of the dominant group, and establishing a theoretical rationale for a search for alternative discourses in use by the dominant group. This requires me to deal explicitly with the issue of dominant group members who step outside the passive and individualised positions offered them in most theories of change, and who work actively and collectively to become less 'blind' and 'deaf', even where this lessens their privilege. The methodological question becomes –

how may I approach with a research intent those Pakeha who feel impelled to act for change, and who speak together using new discourses about the Treaty?

In attempting to construct theory, and a research strategy, about processes of Pakeha change it will be important to deny at least three meta-theoretical assumptions in social scientific theory – the naturalising of dominance, the ideological homogeneity of a dominant group, and the rational individual. It will also be important to argue for a more motivated subjectivity than can be found within the critical project in social constructionism.

In place of these common meta-theoretical constraints, I will opt for the following meta-theoretical assumptions that:
- alternatives to dominance are possible in inter-group relationships,
- within a dominant group there may be both facilitative and resistant responses to challenges to the status quo,
- another subjectivity may be conceptualised which avoids the limits of both rational individualism and passively constructed subjectivity.

In summary, across a range of literatures there is little focus on social or psychological processes of a dominant group in either consciously maintaining privileged positions or in changing the social order. To my mind, the most promising platforms for theorising social change within a dominant group were to be found in theories and practices of change as collective conscientisation, namely (i) liberatory theory of conscientisation and cultural action for change, (ii) non-violent peace-making work to raise the awareness of a dominant group through moral confrontation and education, and (iii) feminist praxis of consciousness-raising, using cycles of collective reflection and action for change. Theorists of decolonisation such as Memmi and Fanon also suggested helpful links between the personal psychology of the coloniser and the impersonal nature of colonialism as a system, between personal racism and the impersonal operation of structural and cultural racism.

These bodies of theory were indeed what Pakeha theorists and activists found most useful during in the 1970s, as documented in Study 1. Although most of these bodies of theory focused strongly on the oppressed as the change agent, they offered the best link at the present time between structured oppression, increased critical consciousness and collective action. Their helpful concepts will be used in the next chapter to create an acceptable methodological platform for investigating Pakeha change processes.

CHAPTER 4.0

METHODOLOGIES FOR TRANSFORMING ACTION

> Denunciation of a dehumanising situation today
> increasingly demands precise scientific
> understanding of that situation.
> Likewise, the annunciation of its transformation
> increasingly requires a theory of transforming action.
> Freire, 1975, p. 20.

The lack of adequate theory about how a dominant group may change its patterns of dominance means that particular care is required in structuring a suitable research approach to the area. A research strategy must be built upon a consistent approach to how human beings – both researcher and participants – may 'know' their world. My guiding questions in building a research strategy and choosing methods of inquiry were:

- How may an epistemology allow for *change* in our constructions, when a dominant group such as Pakeha in New Zealand construct our world to maintain the linguistic and material status quo?
- How may a research strategy allow for investigating new, counter-hegemonic discourses and social practices developed by Pakeha in response to challenges from Maori?
- Where might we look in the New Zealand setting for sites of such alternative, facilitative practices as data sources?

I explore the most promising theoretical pathways within social constructionist epistemology identified in the previous chapter. A careful combination of approaches helps to resolve the gaps and defaults in existing theories of change, which I argued left us with 'passive' and 'deaf' dominant groups and 'lonely' change agents. As a way of drawing upon the best in both critical and liberatory theory, I bring together a discursive and a praxis-based approach to change.

4.1 A critical, liberatory and praxis-based approach

Liberatory theory affirms conscious processes of dialogue for change, where we attempt to speak a new world into being, thereby 'announcing' a new world, in Freire's terms above. I argue that critical methods, while often dedicated to

Freire's 'denunciation' of oppressive discourses, can equally be used to analyse discourses formed to construct liberatory change. I also argue that participatory action methods, where we "attempt to name a life world together" (Park, 1993, p. 6) allows me to investigate the intentional collective praxis of the Pakeha Treaty movement, seen as a site of 'annunciation' for transforming the local social order.

Liberatory theory and critical theory/inquiry have sufficient consistencies and common roots to be used in combination. Liberatory theory has been considered a branch of critical inquiry (Crotty, 1998). Both theoretical frameworks rely on the epistemology of social constructionism, which argues that meaning is constructed by human beings through engagement with a material and social world "always already there" (Crotty, 1998). Creation of meaning depends on a social consensus, and is always in the process of being produced, reproduced, or renegotiated, by individuals in inter-personal and inter-group interactions (Foucault, 1972, 1980). The active and interactive process of constructing meaning among social beings leads to a constant production and reproduction of knowledges. I argue in this chapter that my research required a particular emphasis on these active and interactive aspects of knowledge. My research intent pointed me to sites where the social consensus is oriented towards creating new social constructions, as in the intellectual praxis of a social movement.

As critical theory emphasises, language is crucially involved in the production and reproduction of social orders, and thus may be seen as both "a site of defence for and a cutting edge of change in the ideological fabric of societies" (McCreanor, 1995, p. 45). However, my critique in Chapter 3 showed that critical theory explains change after the fact as reliant on language, and does not itself offer a 'theory of changing'. It does not explain the impetus of social actors to change their social constructions. Choosing between discourses, rather than constructing new discourses, has been the theoretical focus (Kress, 2001). I argue that in order to theorise social change, we need to consider the conscientisation of which liberatory theory speaks, in which the social actor is motivated towards change by dialogue with the lifeworld of another. Beyond that again, for an adequate theoretical approach to social change, we need to consider how conscientisation may become collective cultural action, at which point liberatory theory falls silent. At this point, I turned to a critical sociological theory that regards the intellectual praxis of social movements as crucibles of new knowledge and social constructions. Used in concert with a socially conscious subjectivity described below, these several approaches allowed me to fashion a critical, meaning-making and change-oriented research strategy.

4.2 Seeking theory for transformative action

4.2.1 Producing new discourses

The concept of discourse as integral to constructing meaning was developed by Foucault to argue that "nothing has any meaning outside of discourse" and thus it is discourse which produces knowledge for human beings (Foucault, 1972, cited in Hall, 2001, p. 73). Foucault used the term 'discourse' to mean "a group of statements which provide a language for talking about – a way of representing the knowledge about – a particular topic at a particular historical moment…." (Hall, 2001, p. 72). Discourses rely for their 'validity', their obvious truth, on assumptions and propositions in contiguous discourses and in wider, culturally shared beliefs or "deeply entrenched convictions and explanatory schemas fundamental to the dominant form of making sense of the world at any particular period in a culture" (Henriques et al, 1984, p. 108). Thus a discourse may be defined as a regulated set of statements with rules, which do not imply a closure:

> … discourses delimit what can be said, whilst providing the spaces - the concepts, metaphors, models, analogies - for making new statements within any specific discourse (Henriques et al., 1984, p. 106).

Following Foucault, discourses may be examined for the rules and practices which produce meaning in different historical periods (Hall, 2001), thus allowing theoretically for the emergence of new discourses. Critical psychologists acknowledge that to theorise that discourse is critical in reproducing the social order at once acknowledges its potential role in social change (McCreanor, 1997). However, Henriques et al. (1984) have argued that because of the delimiting nature of discourse, change is not contained inside a discourse – change is an effect of the struggles that criss-cross the indeterminate relationship between power and knowledge in each historical period. They point out that the production of a new discourse can be described by reference to two sets of activities - its development and transformation from an existing discourse or set of closely connected discourses, and the range of activities that are at once discursive and material in relation to which that development occurs:

> There exists a system of mutual effects between the two sets of activities, effects that do not refer to some pure stage of reality but to the previously established effects between them, thus to historically grounded and specific practices and phenomena. The reality we apprehend is always-already classified and distributed according to a system of discursive differences which are locked into differences in material effects. (p. 113).

In Henriques et al's (1984) view, new discourses both arise from and help to shape new social relations. I take from this that new, or alternative, discourses are needed to enact new, or alternative, realities, and equally that the enacting of alternative realities may give rise to new discourses. Applying this more specifically to theories and interventions in racism, Henriques et al. maintain that new discourses (or new theories) are always produced in interaction with sites of intervention and action. They explain that when *inside* a discourse, it is impossible to explain why social practices and their attendant knowledges "collapse or are forced to innovate" since change is "not a product of discourse alone but of powerful social forces which the dominant knowledges failed to anticipate" (p. 109). An example of dominant knowledges failing to anticipate a new discourse has been the inability of the standard story of New Zealand history to explain the (seemingly) sudden emergence of discourse about the Treaty of Waitangi by Pakeha in the 1980s.

Notwithstanding the theoretical possibility of new discourse in critical theorising, the question remains as to precisely why and how, at the social psychological level, a person from a culturally dominant group would choose to use or create a counter-hegemonic discourse. Before proceeding to Freire's resolution of this issue, it is important to clarify the form of human subjectivity that I assumed in my approach.

4.2.2 Choosing a conscious, active subject

Since I drew upon both liberatory and critical theory, I was incorporating two different traditions of subjectivity in my research, and needed to allow for this in discussing my interpretations. Waugh (1993) describes the philosophical transition from a Hegelian or Marxist understanding of the subject in history to a structuralist or post-structuralist one as "a shift fundamentally from consciousness to language" in which "the epistemic subject, characterised in terms of historic experience, interiority and consciousness has given way to the 'decentred' subject identified through the public, impersonal signifying practices of other, similarly 'decentred' subjects" (Waugh, 1993, p. 465). Where liberatory theory relies on a self-conscious historic subject, critical theory has developed a decentred subject.

However, the post-modern tradition, upon which critical theory rests, of a decentred, deferred subject constructed by the discourses in which the speaker positions themselves (Luke & Gore, 1992), rendered it problematic in my research

to focus on the social and psychological processes of a subject who is choosing between discourses. The tension between consciousness and language in the decentred subject is a tension dealt with by all who are involved in social/political research.

My particular solution was to move aside from the historically determined subject towards an indeterminate subject positioned in the discourses they use, and yet retaining the notion of social consciousness implied in intentional reflection about historical change. Critical psychologists Henriques et al (1984), in their foundational critical work on subjectivity in psychological theory, point out that Foucault's deconstruction of the monolithic unitary character of power and the social domain helped "make links between a diverse and contradictory social domain and the multiple and contradictory subject" (p. 92). They insist that such a "contradictory subjectivity" must be understood as arising in a three-fold relationship with power and knowledge:

> It is not a concept that fits into psychology's notion of the individual...It cannot be usefully worked on outside an approach which starts not from the unitary subject, or even a power-knowledge couple, but from a triad: power-knowledge-subject. (p. 118)

Henriques et al. (1984) use the relationship between these three elements to argue that "the politics of theory, personal politics and the politics of social change are inextricably intertwined" (p. 118). Encouraged by their lead, I chose to avoid the wholly decentred, discursively-constructed subject of the critical position. Instead, in approaching intentional critical action by Pakeha, I have relied on a 'conscious' subject who can make decisions about power and knowledge – one who is both *constructed by* and a conscious *constructor of* discourses. In this I followed the feminist politics of standpoint - "standing firm on a politics of location and identity" (Luke & Gore, 1992, p. 7) which is grounded in awareness of socially constructed difference. I also relied on Freire's epistemological argument below that a conscious subjectivity is underpinned by our human faculty for critical reflection on our past and future constructions of the world, which "is a process in which the people assume the role of subject in the precarious adventure of transforming and recreating the world" (Freire, 1975, p. 43). Both feminist and liberatory theorising allow a socially conscious yet indeterminate subject, located in knowledges that are "always provisional, open-ended and relational" (Luke & Gore, 1992, p. 7).

A 'conscious subject' and more explicitly a 'socially and historically conscious yet indeterminate subject' is particularly useful for my research because it allows

for intentional aspects of change, such as political actions within the shifting complexity of social relationships. Combining the epistemic traditions in critical psychology, feminism and liberatory theorising situates the social actor among other social actors undertaking "acts of knowing" (Freire, 1975) in concert with political projects. I am able thereby to foreground a form of collective subject, consciously undertaking with others reflection about their place in history and society, while acknowledging that the group is not biologically constituted by race. This provides a subjectivity for those Pakeha constructed within discourses in which they position themselves as intending to change the colonial relationship between Maori and Pakeha cultural groups.

4.2.3 Action and interaction to make new knowledge

In my view, the liberatory approach offered an important epistemological extension to much contemporary critical theory. The liberatory approach posits that critical reflection on the world, motivated by our becoming more fully and consciously human and undertaken in interaction with others (Crotty, 1998), leads to action for change. In its emphasis on action in the world undertaken interactively in dialogue with others, liberatory theorising provides a more explicit epistemology for the affirmative impetus towards *changing* our constructions of the world. In its turn, the critical approach helps clarify that action for change *depends* on generating new discourses interactively with others.

Conscious action to make new knowledge

Freire (1975) extends a social constructionist epistemology to argue for our ability to be conscious of our world in a critical way: "If it is true that consciousness is impossible without the world which constitutes it, it is equally true that this world is impossible if the world itself in constituting consciousness does not become an object of its critical reflection" (p. 29). He begins by highlighting the importance of a reflective, critical faculty to human consciousness:

> …the dominant ideology 'lives' inside us and also controls society outside. If this domination inside and outside was complete, definitive, we could never think of social transformation. But, transformation is possible because consciousness is not a mirror of reality, not a mere reflection, but is *reflexive and reflective* of reality. As conscious human beings we can discover *how* we are conditioned by the dominant ideology. (Freire in Freire & Shor, 1987, p. 13, original emphasis).

He goes on to link the critical faculty of conscious subjects with our actions in the world:

> The 'critical' dimension of consciousness *accounts for the goals men assign their transforming acts upon the world.* Because they are able to have goals, men alone are capable of entertaining the result of their action even before initiating the proposed action. They are beings who pro-ject. (Freire, 1975, p. 30).

Freire's epistemological argument links together the introjecting of social constructions, the conscious projecting of intended actions, and the faculty of critical reflecting on the impact of these projections. I take from his approach that our actions may be aimed at reproducing our knowledge of the world and avoiding changes, or equally may be aimed at adjusting our knowledge of the world and making changes to it. Such an active knowing process is how Freire understands "praxis" – as "reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it" (Freire, 1972, p. 28). By giving a primary place to action, goals and motivation in his epistemology, Freire (1975) provides a convincing argument for the necessity of action in the world in order for human beings to create new constructions.

There is affirmation in many disciplinary areas for the role of experience and action in producing knowledge. Action researcher Park (1993, p. 6) considers that critical knowledge acquired as a result of attempting to challenge the status quo contributes to questions of justice: "there is a kind of knowledge that comes from reflection and action, which makes it possible to deliberate questions of what is right and just…reality is revealed to us in full clarity when we try to change it" (Bronfenbrenner, 1972, cited in Park, 1993, p. 8). Lichtenstein (1997) investigated the relationship between theory and practice by interviewing organisational experts who had comprehensive theories and practical experiences concerning transformation in organisations. All their informants cited an interdependence between theory and practice as necessary for transformative change in groups and organisations: "When a new cultural structure emerges…a new cognitive map [is produced] containing new values, that more efficiently match environmental realities" (Lichtenstein, 1997, p. 407).

There is also general acknowledgment in the field of qualitative inquiry that "acting and thinking, practice and theory are linked in a continuous process of critical reflection and transformation" (Schwandt, 2000, p. 191). In the field of critical psychology, Henriques (1984) argues for the "mutually productive" relationship between knowledge and theory and the practices and powers associated with them (p. 65). In his view, the emergence of the concept of racial prejudice as an object of scientific inquiry and as a political issue exemplifies the

relationship between internal theoretical development and external political events:

> …theory and politics, knowledge and power are locked in a mutually conditioned system of effects so that the analysis of one must directly engage with the analysis of the other. (p. 64)

Conscious interaction to make new knowledge

In the social constructionist paradigm, knowledge exists within shared systems of intelligibility and as "an expression of relationships among persons" (Gergen & Gergen, 1991, cited in Schwandt, 1994, p. 240). Closely related to the emphasis on action in liberatory theory for producing and reproducing social constructions is the place of others around us in co-constructing the world. As we saw in Chapter 3, psychological approaches, and to some extent critical theory, leave under-theorised the question of how lone individuals engaging in critical thinking embark upon transforming the social constructions of their society. Ladson-Billings (2000) considers a theoretical focus on the group rather than the individual to be crucial in theorising social change. She contrasts Descartes saying "I think therefore I am" with the African saying "Ubuntu (I am because we are)" (p. 257) to underline what she calls a deliberate choice for scholars between epistemologies supporting hegemony or those supporting liberation. It is this long reach of individualism and the systematic neglect of collectivity in theories of changing that my research seeks to address – the *interactive* part of creating counter-hegemonic social constructions.

Freire (1972) insists that while conscientisation is a process that takes place within each individual, it must take place among other social beings:

> We cannot say that in the process of revolution someone liberates someone else; nor yet that someone liberates himself; but rather that men in communion liberate each other. (p. 103)

Freire's (1975) emphasis is on the importance of conscientising dialogue *among* social actors considering a material situation. It is in social interaction that change to constructions of reality becomes manifest. Freire conceived critical conscientisation not as an attribute of an individual, as so often implied in the Anglophone scholarship with which I am familiar, but rather as a process of finding modes of shared language through dialogue with which to construct a specific material situation. His insistence that conscientisation requires the "critical insertion" of conscientised individuals into a "demythologized reality" (p. 46) underlines the collective nature of both the process of conscientisation and the task of 'demythologising' dominant constructions such as Pakeha conceptions of

colonial history. Indeed, the urgent tone adopted by Pakeha and Maori authors of the revisited histories described in Chapter 2 exhorting their readers to join them in a project of demythologising the standard story of New Zealand history relies on such a dialogic, interactive aspect of constructing new views of reality. In the liberatory view, change to social constructions is ultimately an interactive, collective process. Taking this view, social change becomes a mutual interpretive process among those striving to change an objective reality (Freire, 1972, 1975).

In fairness, Foucault's interactional view of power and knowledge, whereby structural power and representational meaning are re-negotiated in every interaction using the available discourses, provides the theoretical space for new discourses to arise. However, for my research the crucial question remained as to how the innovative interactions that do occur actually become a new discourse. I would suggest that innovative discursive interactions are likely to disappear without trace unless such innovations can create a definite pattern in the social milieu. To my mind, a series of spontaneous re-arrangements of meaning in one-to-one interactions does not create an alternative discourse unless the challengers can create and sustain a speech community (Fitch, 2001), or the dialogic community of which Mezirow (1991) speaks.

These explicitly interactive approaches to how humans construct knowledge helped to enrich my theoretical approach to the production of new discourses. In summary, using the affirmative emphasis of liberatory theory on action in the world and dialogue supports both an active and interactive component in generating new discourses.

4.2.4 Linking discourse and praxis

Adopting Freire's particular epistemology of critical conscientisation occurring simultaneously with transforming action implies an integral relationship between discourse and praxis, a relationship left rather under-articulated in critical theory. The concept of praxis has remained "elastic in its application" in Western scholarship (Kilminster, 1993, p. 507), but most often denotes a general epistemological approach of coming to know reality (reflecting) through action, making praxis the cycle of reflection and action. Using the broad view of praxis, it could be said of a dominant group that 'most of the people enact the praxis of maintaining dominant discourses and social constructions most of the time'. However, the definition of revolutionary or intentional praxis that underpins Marxist and liberatory theory is a cycle of reflection and action consciously

undertaken to build new knowledge and new practices. In the way used by Marx, "revolutionary praxis" has the element of producing knowledge through practice but also of an idealistic ethics – of "realising philosophy in practice", and "the project of bringing reality up to what it ought to be in practice" (Kilminster, 1993, p. 507). Using this more restricted definition, it might then be said of a dominant group that 'some of the people enact a consciously idealistic praxis of producing alternative discourses and social constructions some of the time'. Putting these two definitions together, the general praxis of 'most people' in using dominant discourses may be rather unconscious and habitual, in the manner of the "everyday racism" described by Essed (1990) or "banal nationalism" posited by Billig (1995). In contrast, the critical praxis of people seeking change may be more conscious and intentional. For the purposes of my research aim, I understood praxis as a form of *consciously* theorising ones' (constructed) world, and how to change it.

Community psychologist Elias (1994), in developing a theory of praxis, proposes that conscious praxis is "willed action by which a theory or philosophy becomes social action" (p. 301). He points out that praxis is more than reflective practice in which practitioners consider the processes they used, and more than generative practice in which products are generated to share. He considers praxis the generation of knowledge outside of the individual (p. 301). Combining his proposal with my distinction between two types of praxis above, if dominant, hegemonic discourse is largely held in place by habitual action and an uncritical praxis, then new discourse requires willed action or conscious praxis. Conscious praxis, incorporating action in the world and dialogue with others to produce new discourses and social practices, may thus be seen as a fulsome and integrated attempt to transform social reality. Undertaken collectively, a conscious praxis of intentional reflection and action becomes a way of deliberately sustaining a challenge to dominant discourse and social practices, enacting what Lauer (1982) has called "willed history" (p. 348). Freire makes the point that critical consciousness and transformative action must occur together:

> We must avoid being interpreted as if we were thinking that *first* we should educate the people for being free, and *after* we could transform reality. No. We have to do the two simultaneously, as much as possible. Because of that, we must be engaged in political action…. (Freire, in Freire & Shor, 1987, p. 167)

To review my argument so far, liberatory theory articulates, in the active praxis of conscientisation, a process by which critique of the current social order impels the social being into action to create a new world. Liberatory and critical theorists such as Freire (1975), Henrique et al. (1984) and Gergen (1994) concur that new

discourses or knowledges grow in concert with action to change social practices –
new discourses and active praxis to change the social order arise together. In my
view, it is through the gateway of conscious praxis and by relying on an
intentionally conscious, indeterminate subject that the factors involved in social
change are opened up beyond those theorised in critical theory. Ascribing a
central role to willed action in changing discourse allows us to bring in factors
such as motivation, emotion and political action. This theoretical convergence
makes changes in discourse dependent on explicit, willed commitment to dialogue
together, incorporating an intention, or project for change. Freire's use of the
word "pro-ject" to describe the intentionality motivating our consciousness of the
world reminds us that our constructions of the world are indeed projects – of
maintaining, or changing, a social order.

The link I have made between conscious praxis and new discourse moves my
argument for a suitable methodology to its final stage - a rationale to direct my
research to likely sites of conscious praxis and collective annunciation, where
members of a dominant group are motivated to transform both their knowledge-
making and social practices.

4.2.5 Cognitive praxis of social movements

In addressing the question of where in a dominant group would a researcher look
for sites of conscious praxis and new, counter-hegemonic knowledges, I have
used the work of sociologists and environmental activists Eyerman and Jamison
(1991). They argue that social change movements should be seen as a means of
creating new knowledge as well as new socio-political relationships. As they put
it:

> The forms of consciousness that are articulated in social movements provide
> something crucial in the constitution of modern societies: public spaces for
> thinking new thoughts, activating new actors, generating new ideas; in short,
> constructing new intellectual 'projects'. The cognitive praxis of social
> movements is an important, and all too neglected, source of social innovation.
> (p. 161)

In their view, every social movement has a "cognitive praxis", shaped by its
context in local intellectual history and political culture, which in turn shapes the
movement's "project". A social movement's collective cognitive praxis develops
over time, as a "process in formation" (Eyerman & Jamison, 1991, p.121) so that
the project of the movement does not emerge ready-formed at the first protests
obvious to the public. An example of development and change in cognitive praxis

would be the manner in which antiracism theorising by Pakeha in New Zealand began in opposition to racist selection of visiting sports teams in the 1960s. It was a decade before Pakeha developed a critical focus on domestic racism, and another decade before a conscious effort was made to learn about the Treaty of Waitangi.

To substantiate their argument, Eyerman and Jamison (1991) examined rich or "thick" narrative descriptions of social movements as political process and proceed to both generalise and theorise from these. By theorising the mechanisms with which social movements create new knowledge and historical identities, they claim to provide a missing link in chains of determination and conditioning that have long bewildered philosophers and sociologists of knowledge – and I would add, have long been neglected by theorists of social change:

> In seeing social movements as cognitive praxis, we have tried to show that 'society' is continuously being recreated through complex processes of interaction and innovation in particular contexts...Like other actor-oriented social theorists, we see social change in terms of historical process, but we want to claim for that process of history-making a 'deeper' philosophical significance... how the social context affects the development of human knowledge. (Eyerman & Jamison, 1991, p. 162)

Other theorists provide support for a focus on social movements. Gergen (1994) proposes that a primary avenue for new, generative theorising is "articulating minority interpretation":

> Frequently those who believed themselves to be oppressed by majority views share interpretive conventions that have neither been fully articulated nor understood by members of the majority. (p. 140)

He considers the process of articulating minority views as a "form of organised audacity [that] has sparked the rise of most major social movements in recent American history" (p. 140). Also in support of social action as a ground for theory building, Elias (1994) points to the "mutuality of theory building and social action" (p. 301). Freire's epistemology also fits comfortably with Eyerman and Jamison's (1991) concepts of cognitive praxis and intentional projects in social movements. For instance, their concept of a social movement as a process in formation may be considered a visible form of Freire's continuous cultural action.

To summarise, Eyerman and Jamison's (1991) contention is that social movements are a primary source of new ideological knowledge in a society. In particular, I see them as providing a significant response to Henriques et al's (1984) critique raised about the reliance in critical theory on an untheorised process about how localised sites of resistance to dominant discourses become

coordinated into new discourses. To my mind, Eyerman and Jamison's theory that the cognitive praxis of social movements creates innovation in social constructions directly addresses the question of how localised sites of resistance may become coordinated into powerful intellectual projects. The crucial missing link missing between discourse and praxis approaches to social change may be found in a social movement's cognitive praxis towards its intellectual project.

4.2.6 Remaining tensions

Most of the metatheoretical constraints identified in Chapter 3 are addressed by my methodological argument. In order to deny the homogeneity of a dominant group, the naturalising of dominance, and a rational, individualist subjectivity, I have contrasted habitual, everyday praxis maintaining the status quo with a more critically conscious praxis for change. Both types of praxis are available to dominant group members. An intentional conscious praxis towards new constructions of the social order needs to be undertaken in dialogue with others, and may be found in the intellectual innovations of a social movement.

The key remaining tension is whether the intention to create social change is always accompanied by new social constructions. Having argued for the theoretical possibility of new knowledges and discourses arising through conscious praxis and action for change, we may consider whether this has been occurring in New Zealand. As action researcher Park (1993) puts it "new meanings and new knowledge *may* be created through action to change a social situation" (my emphasis). Freire (1975) warns against idealism, where new beliefs are not grounded in action, and equally against mechanistic action, where activism is not accompanied by conscientisation. Searching for those 'moments in history' when new constructions and new social practices arise together is the challenge for this research, for it is not necessarily the case that different social actions are accompanied by different discourse. An interesting example to consider comes from a study of the discourses used by white Australians who supported the campaign of Reconciliation with Aboriginal peoples. Green and Sonn (2005) concluded that many reconcilers used the dominant discourses of whiteness in which indigenous peoples continued to be positioned as the 'other'. In speaking of their commitment to reconciliation, white reconcilers certainly used 'righting wrongs' as a primary discourse, but they also relied on colonising discourses such as focusing on the indigenous other as the problem, looking to indigenous culture for practices of use and interest to white culture, and speaking as experts on indigenous culture. Green and Sonn's (2005) conclusion left me with a key

research question – if we can identify sites of conscious praxis or willed action by Pakeha towards changing the colonial relationship with Maori, can we also establish that new constructions of the relationship between Maori and Pakeha were indeed in use by these Pakeha? If not, we will have identified a source of idealism or of mechanistic activism (Freire, 1975). If so, we will have identified an authentic source of theorising social change.

Having argued for the theoretical possibility of identifying a site of transformative action in a social movement, and having introduced the critical tension of whether such a site proves upon investigation to be indeed a source of new discourse, we may turn to the strategic issues of selecting suitable informants, data and inquiry methods.

4.3 Selecting sites of transformative action by Pakeha

I considered Pakeha who overtly identified themselves as supporting the Treaty to be the group most likely to be able to articulate a conscious praxis of change to the colonial relationship between Maori and Pakeha, in the form of their conceptions of how Pakeha change. As activist educators in a social movement, and as active supporters of Treaty-focused change in workplaces, we focused on change for ourselves and for our whole cultural group. The view that the antiraicsm/Treaty movement's cognitive praxis may be a crucial source of theorising for change is endorsed by John Kirton, one of the few activist educators to have published an extended personal reflection on the movement's work. He described how his theoretical thinking:

> emerges from a personal synthesis of the wide-ranging, sometimes conflicting, experience-based thinking of friends and co-workers with some of whom, over twenty years of antiracism and Te Tiriti work, I have been privileged to share confusion, determination and a growing body of knowledge…as we glimpsed change in dominant attitudes in Aotearoa (Kirton, 1997, p. vii)

In Kirton's assessment, the "experience-based thinking" (or, in my terms, the cognitive praxis) of antiracism and Treaty workers was a significant site of theorising Pakeha change processes.

For guidance in identifying specific informants, I used an approach consistent with Marxist structural analysis that specifies the social positions necessary in

effective social change. Drucker's (2003) model for spread of innovation in a society may be applied to the broad movement for decolonisation which took shape in the late 1970s and early 1980s, and helps to distinguish a range of sites of pro-Treaty praxis for change.

In a social change process, according to Drucker, 'radicals' present an innovation that is incomprehensible or threatening to the mass, whose main characteristic is inertia. 'Translators' explain the message of the radicals in a form more comprehensible to the mass. 'Early adopters' are those motivated and courageous enough to try something new. Those in the "mass" become willing to consider the innovation when they see it taken up by trusted early adopters. In Drucker's approach, translators and early adopters each occupy crucial positions in ensuring the adoption of an innovation by the mass.

If change to the existing colonial relationships of Pakeha dominance, or more generally decolonisation, is considered the social innovation in question, radicals would be those Maori challenging the status quo by claiming and assuming their rangatiratanga, expressed through symbolic actions, occupations, protests, writing and so on. Translators would include those Pakeha who support Maori claims, and who attempt to explain the radicals' position to other Pakeha, for instance through community and workplace education, by writing and supporting Maori actions. Early adopters would include those Pakeha who have adopted some of the new ways encouraged by the translators through initiating Treaty-based changes in their organisations and communities. The mass would be the large group, including most Pakeha, who resist changes and maintain the status quo.

Considering the range of sites of conscious pro-Treaty praxis, activist educators in an organised Treaty movement could be viewed as a site of sustained articulated theorising to facilitate Pakeha change, whereas workplaces might provide a more situated theorising of change specific to the organisational context. If both translators and early adopters were approached, it would be possible to examine whether there were links between the praxis used by Treaty educators and the discourses used by organisational workers, or whether, as Green and Sonn (2005) found with the reconciliation discourses, dominant discourses of race relations prevailed.

4.3.1 Selecting participants

I selected as participants in my research Pakeha and other non-Maori in the 'translator' and 'early adopter' roles suggested by Drucker's model of social innovation. I considered Pakeha Treaty educators, who express a facilitative response to Maori challenge, to be potential constructors of a new relationship with Maori, and to be potential articulators of theorising on how our dominant cultural group changes. These Pakeha in the 'translator' position typically identify as both activists and educators. Many would consider themselves to be part of a social movement supporting the Treaty. Most were experienced educators about the Treaty in the community and in organisations. Pakeha in the 'early adopter' position would consider themselves to be working towards cultural and practical changes in support of the Treaty in their workplaces or communities. They would typically have experienced Treaty education at some time in their work lives delivered by those in the translator role.

There is some overlap in the two groups, since a number of activists and educators have spent time as staff involved in Treaty-focused changes in workplaces. While people in both groupings would be aware that they were taking up positions contrary to the current social order, their opportunities for explicit reflection with similarly-minded others might differ. The antiracism/Treaty movement is sufficiently organised at a local and national level that many of these Pakeha would meet regularly to discuss their activist and educational work. The Pakeha supporting the Treaty in their workplaces would use opportunities for dialogue with Pakeha and Maori staff in their immediate work environment and possibly in their wider organisational sector.

Following this line of strategising, I came up with three sites of conscious praxis by Pakeha:
- The historical praxis of the antiracism/Treaty movement
- The current thinking of Pakeha Treaty educators on stimulating and facilitating Pakeha change in their interventions with organisations and Pakeha in general
- Experiences in workplaces involved in Treaty-based change processes

Next, I looked for suitable methods of inquiry in keeping with my epistemological arguments for a meaning-making approach by social actors capable of critiquing their social reality.

4.4 Critical and constructivist inquiry

The unit of analysis implied by social constructionism is the shared, meaningful experience of social actors, allowing both critical and constructivist methods of inquiry. Following my argument for a convergence of critical and liberatory theoretical frameworks to investigate processes of social change, I opted for a combination of critical deconstructive and participatory action inquiry methods. I needed inquiry methods in which the researcher is involved as one among many actively constructing change. Both critical and constructivist inquiry support the legitimacy of interactive knowledge, co-constructed between the researcher and their community of participants, based on "sharing a life-world together – speaking with one another and exchanging actions against the background of common experience, tradition, history and culture" (Park, 1993, p. 6).

Prilleltensky and Nelson (1997, p. 233) point out that constructivist inquiry must be informed by critical theory when approaching a value-laden area such as social change. They cite feminist standpoint, anti-racist, participatory and action-oriented approaches as examples of a critical approach to issues of power and dominance in which agendas for change to the social order are explicit.

Constructivists focus particularly on the "social, dialogic nature of inquiry" (Schwandt, 1994, p.128) and affirm that qualitative inquiry requires attending both to the inquirer's own self-reflective awareness of her own constructions and to the *social* constructions used by individuals, including the inquirer. For instance, Gergen and Gergen (1991) take an interactive approach to inquiry in which the researcher and participants open a socio-psychological phenomenon to inspection and through dialogue generate a process of continuous reflexivity, thereby "enabling new forms of linguistic reality to emerge" (p. 108). The overall aim of this approach is "to expand and enrich the vocabulary of understanding". Similarly, Guba and Lincoln (1989) consider the goal of constructivist inquiry to be a consensus, or failing that, an agenda for negotiation on issues and concerns that define the nature of the inquiry.

Critical participatory action research

Participatory methods lend themselves particularly well to investigating collective knowledge generation such as the cognitive praxis of social movements in a manner which makes explicit the researcher's participation. Participatory research

has been described as an alternative philosophy and epistemology of social research. It has roots in liberation theology and neo-Marxist approaches to community development, as well as in human rights activism (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005). It emphasises shared ownership of research projects, community-based analysis of social issues, and an orientation towards community action. Among the many forms of action research, "fourth generation" action research developed from critical and emancipatory forms of action research, and emphasises an actionist approach to research and the importance of links to social change work (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005).

These forms of participatory and action research became connected as "participatory action research" in the context of social movements in the developing world, and were championed by people such as Paulo Freire and Fals Borda. Their work had extended the concept of action research to include adult education and socio-political actions (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005). Community psychologists affirm the explicit aim of participatory action research to bring about a more just society (Comstock & Fox, 1993, p. 7) and agree that participatory, action-oriented approaches are best suited to the goals of a social justice agenda (Prilleltensky & Nelson, 1997, p. 181). Participatory action research has been considered both a critique of mainstream social science and an affirmation of the potential for social research to be a progressive force (Comstock & Fox, 1993).

In summary, participatory action inquiry supported a dialogue between the researcher and activist educators in which we could co-theorise about processes of Pakeha change in settings of adult education and socio-political action.

Critical deconstructive inquiry

Social constructionist epistemology and critical inquiry allow us to ask simply 'What social realities do people construct?' but also encourage us to examine precisely how people construct these realities in association with their practices. With the mediating role of language taken as a given, a widely used method to investigate how people construct social realities is 'deconstruction' of social constructions through critical investigation of the history of particular constructions and the ways in which they are used in practice. Since I was investigating the rise of a new discourse among Pakeha, I was interested in both the antecedents and intellectual history of new constructions among Pakeha. Critical deconstructive inquiry supported examining historical and current

dependencies of a pro-Treaty discourse, as well as its achievements in organisational settings.

4.5 Research objectives

Having reviewed relevant theory, argued for a unique theoretical and strategic approach and selected appropriate informants, I was able to commit to specific research objectives. To meet the research aim to explore social and psychological processes of change among Pakeha in response to the Treaty of Waitangi, I specified the following objectives:

1) To explore the implicit theorising of Pakeha change developed by the Pakeha antiracism/Treaty movement over the past 30 years as recorded in the history of the movement.

2) To examine the explicit theorising expressed by contemporary Treaty educators about Pakeha changing in response to learning about the Treaty.

3) To analyse the discourses about Treaty-focused change in use in organisations.

4) To explore facilitatory and inhibitory factors for Pakeha change processes.

5) To record useful tools and strategies in processes of Pakeha change.

These five objectives together guided in-depth examination of the history, theorising and implementation of the Treaty movement's praxis for change.

To conclude, the critical and liberatory theoretical frameworks supported examining the cognitive praxis of the local antiracism/Treaty movement, and accounts of Treaty-focused change in organisational sites. I have argued that these sites are potential sources of new discourse with which to theorise or construct Pakeha change. For this research strategy, critical deconstruction methods and participatory action methods were the most compatible methods of inquiry.

Seen in a liberatory frame, my research *constructs* a theory for transforming action by facilitating and examining the reflective aspect of the praxis cycle, asking practitioners of change how they theorised their own processes of change, and those of other Pakeha. Seen in a critical frame, my research *deconstructs* the history and current dependencies of a discourse running counter to the hegemonic standard story of colonial race relations in New Zealand.

CHAPTER 5.0

SCHOLAR IN A SOCIAL MOVEMENT

> An understanding of those [social movement] projects, in their own terms, as dimensions of cognitive praxis, can thus be an important, even crucial task for social theory.
>
> Eyerman & Jamison, 1991, p. 166.

Having established potential sites of new constructions of Maori-Pakeha relations among Treaty educators and organisational workers, I attended to my researcher positioning and compatible methods. With my history as a Treaty educator and activist, I was both a contributor to, and a theoriser of, changes in the way Pakeha constructed their relationship with Maori. By adopting the position of a 'praxis explicator' I was able to resource as well as research the cognitive praxis of Treaty workers. I became, for the duration of the research, 'a scholar within the Treaty movement'.

There is a growing convention in qualitative research towards articulating issues of process and reflexivity for researchers, such as issues of roles, voice, and ethical and moral aspects of researcher-participant partnerships (Orland-Barak, 2002). Since research by an insider involves unique challenges, I have argued with particular care for my positioning and methods, and have included a critical evaluation drawn from my own and participants' reflections during the research. The interplay between my commitments as an insider and as a researcher allowed the research design and data sources to evolve as my study progressed. Three separate studies became possible, each study examining a different aspect of how new social constructions and new Maori-Pakeha relationships developed using different methods.

5.1 Researcher positioning and ethics

The methodological framework created in Chapter 4 supported investigation of a theory of *changing*, from the viewpoint of those intending change, in which the researcher is involved as one among many actively constructing change. Both

critical and action research methodologies explicitly welcome the position of 'interested participant' for a researcher. The ethics and culture of the movement for Pakeha Treaty workers had a profound influence on my positioning and commitments as a researcher. From the outset, I was determined to remain an active Treaty worker, a member of the organised movement for Treaty-based change, and to commit myself to outcomes useful to our collective practice.

5.1.1 Acknowledging insider status

In qualitative inquiry, the position of an interested insider is considered an advantage, so long as critical attention is paid to the implications of being a user of the discursive practices being examined. Aguilar (1981) maintains that shared frames of reference and consensual meanings make interaction more natural and rapport more thorough in insider research. In discussing positioning issues for her as a bicultural insider in Turkey, Bolak (1996) concluded that she was "probably more cognisant of complexity and variation than an outsider would have been" (p. 123). She argued that while indigenous status can be both empowering and restricting, the insider/outsider position can be employed as a useful vantage point for "rethinking the familiar". Acknowledging her debt to feminist theorising of standpoint and power dynamics in research, she contends that "being a semi-distanced insider with baseline cultural understanding facilitated my work. I was able to both 'notice' and 'problematise' the familiar and the obvious" (Bolak, 1996, p. 122). Collins (1986) suggests that the researcher may also become an "outsider within". She cites Martin's (1978) anguish over the "obviousness" of what the women in her study were saying: "that women's responses in our interviews were obvious to me is a way of saying that I felt as much at home hearing them as a fish in water. As an anthropologist, my problem was to find a vantage point from which to see the water I had lived in all my life" (p. 11). As Bolak (1996) put it: "while a foreign researcher runs the risk of being culture blind, an indigenous researcher runs the risk of being blinded by the familiar" (p. 109). Aguilar (1981) proposed a realistic model that views a local ethnographer as relatively insider (or outside) with respect to a heterogeneous system. Moreover, an indigenous researcher can enjoy both insider and outsider status in a strategic way, such as being ascribed a "marginal native" in unfamiliar communities.

In Aguilar's terms, I found that I was able to occupy more-and-less insider positioning. In each of the research studies, my positioning varied slightly, depending on my specific relationship to the participants. Among the organisational narrators (the 'early adopters') I was an interested stranger, albeit

an empathetic one familiar with their pro-Treaty efforts. I would describe myself as a 'marginal native' in relation to these participants, since I had worked in organisations undergoing Treaty focused change, but was not known to most of the organisational narrators personally.

Among the Treaty educators (the 'translators'), I was a familiar and locally identifiable member - a 'teenager' (my term) in the community in relation to 'older' longstanding members and 'younger' recent members. I would describe myself as an insider in the national network of activist educators, having worked in the host organising group for three national gatherings (1991, 1998 and 2000). I was certainly an insider in my own local group of Tamaki Treaty Workers, the regional network of tauiwi Treaty workers in Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland region.

In Bolak's terms, I had attempted on previous occasions to 'problematise the familiar' by describing the theorising involved in Pakeha Treaty work at international community psychology conferences and in submissions to overseas journals (e.g. Huygens, 1997, 2000b). While some were well-received, a journal reviewer's feedback, well warranted, was that my account was "under-theorised". The experience had sensitised me to those aspects of our praxis which I took most for granted, the "water" with which we were so familiar, and which I found difficult to articulate to outsiders. The present research project thus challenged me to become a more articulate 'outsider within'. As Fals Borda (1980, cited in Comstock & Fox, 1993) has described the challenge for the intellectual committed to popular struggles, I needed to speak in two languages at once – that of the people and that of the scientist of social change. The thesis became an attempt to bring those languages together.

Autobiographical nature of 'interested' research

In considering how research is influenced by our own lives and experiences, Orlando-Barak (2002)) suggest that research is autobiographical in that some aspect of yourself is mirrored in the work you choose to pursue as a researcher. Bolak (1996) emphasises the close connection between the personal and the representational, so that how we represent and account for others' experiences is intimately related to who we are. She cites Collins (1986) who argues that intellectuals can enrich and strengthen their disciplines by learning to trust their own personal and cultural biographies as significant sources of knowledge.

My choice of topic, my positioning as a researcher and my ethical commitments were all inextricably bound to my personal and cultural biography, as introduced in Chapter 1. To expand this a little, I approached the present research as a Treaty educator since 1989, and as a supporter and leader of Treaty implementation work within organisational settings since 1982. Beyond this, I drew on a lengthy professional history of community organising, counselling, group facilitation, health promotion, adult education and quantitative and qualitative research, as well as intermittent training in Moreno's ideas in sociometry, socio/psycho-drama and family therapy. I had developed my research skills in a researcher position familiar to community psychologists – the researcher as facilitator of action and empowerment research, producing accessible resources consistent with participants' aspirations. Beyond this, the support of a partner who ran a home-based desktop publishing business provided vital inspiration (and services) for publishing collections of written and graphic material throughout the research project.

Commitment to Treaty worker ethics

Positioned therefore as an insider among Treaty workers with my particular life history, skills and supports, I made the crucial decision that the most ethical way to proceed with my research was to remain an active Treaty worker, keeping my work accountable to the ethics developed within Treaty work. I saw myself as a member-researcher, retaining my identity as a Pakeha Treaty worker with its attendant obligations to the culture, ethics and protocols of the Treaty movement, and offering the research effort towards ongoing strategic goals of the movement. I needed to act in trustworthy ways in relationships with people who would continue to be my peers and mentors throughout my life. I wanted to maintain these relationships as ones of mutual respect while I temporarily moved into the position of researcher.

To express these ethical commitments, I followed a convergence of the Treaty movement's own culture and ethics and the principles of "praxis explication" (Elias, 1994) from community psychology, described below. At the heart of both these positions is an ethic of accountability to one's co-participants, supported by values of collectivity and transparency. The ethics and values of Pakeha Treaty movement praxis drew upon traditions of church and civic participation, feminist praxis and organising and philosophies of adult education, as I attest in Study 1.

Key ethics and traditions included:

- an ethic of Pakeha taking responsibility for our institutions and culture and their outcomes (the kawanatanga article of the Treaty)
- an ethic of respecting the Maori world as a self-determined and self-legitimated entity (the tino rangatiratanga article of the Treaty)
- responsiveness and accountability in our work with the Treaty to Maori collectives and their aspirations
- processes for accountability to and support for each other as non-Maori working with the Treaty
- respecting our own local experience and local dynamics with Maori collectives as a source of knowledge
- a tradition of recording our group brainstorms as collective knowledge
- an ethic that researchers show respect for and acknowledge collective authorship in presenting knowledge generated through Treaty work
- attending to our holistic needs such as food, rest and emotional support in our gatherings.

I maintained an attitude of trust in these ethics of practice developed by the Treaty movement – after all, these guiding principles had been formed on a 20 - 30 year journey by Pakeha activist-educators in their work to deal with racism and to honour the Treaty. I reasoned that the movement's culture and ethics were likely to be an adequate, if not better, guide to helpful investigation of new and alternative knowledge about Pakeha-Maori relations than conventions formed by academic institutions. The Western academy has traditionally denied the validity of indigenous worldviews and aspirations, as well as resisting the alternative views held by social change movements.

This is not to say that ethics such as those of the Treaty movement are unsupported in scholarly writing. In his discussion of the narrow focus on inter-individual ethics of Western psychology, Prilleltensky (1990) suggested a broadening of ethics to encompass communitarianism, which I read as an ethic of collective work and accountability similar to the Treaty worker ethics. Local scholars and Treaty activists such as Kirton (1997) recommend a Pakeha practice of action and reflection accountable to Maori aspirations. Humphries and Martin (2005) suggest a posture of "response-ability" towards te Ao Maori. These each depend on an ethic of active responsiveness by Pakeha towards the strategic aspirations and the worldview of Maori, again endorsing the ethics held by Treaty workers.

I set in place several sites of support and accountability to allow me to express my primary ethical commitments. First, I moved to form a peer supervisory/mentor group of experienced antiracism/Treaty workers who were also engaged in academic pursuits. Secondly, I selected an inquiry position and research methods that flowed from the movement's ethics regarding knowledge and accountability. Thirdly, I proposed an action plan at the next gathering of Treaty workers about increasing academic access to unpublished and oral sources of knowledge about Pakeha Treaty work under which my research could fall as part of a jointly agreed strategy (Margaret, 2002b, p. 236).

Collective reflexivity

For mentoring and accountability that would follow both the ethics of antiracism/Treaty work and those of the Western academy, I joined with other academics experienced in anti-racism/Treaty activism work to form a small peer advisory group. My peer mentors were also undertaking, or had already completed, theoretical and research writing using their Treaty activism as a foundation. They included founding members of Auckland Committee on Racism and Discrimination (ACORD), a founding member of Pakeha Treaty Action, and a founding member of Tauranga Women's Action Reflection Group. One member was the now-retired Director of the New Zealand Conference of Churches Programme on Racism. The group has met each month since 1998 to share and comment on current academic work, eat together and offer each other emotional and practical support.

Following the ethic of accountability and transparency within our community of Treaty workers, we introduced the group in the national newsletter and committed ourselves as follows:

- that we intended our PhD studies and academic writing to support social justice efforts in Aotearoa with respect to Maori;
- that we would report back regularly to our colleagues in Treaty/anti-racism work;
- that we would support each other; and,
- that we would seek ways, within academic regulations, to link our areas of study to collective work supporting the Treaty of Waitangi.

We invited feedback to the group at any time (*Network Waitangi Newsletter, July, 1999*).

Critical theory and critical psychology insist that researchers maintain a self-reflexive, critical stance. However, I argued in Chapter 4 that emphasising a more *interactive* and *collective* reflexivity may be crucial in the arena of developing and practising new social constructions, thereby giving a greater emphasis to reflexivity within relationships. In our monthly consultations, I presented my work in detail and sought the group's responses on my sense of appropriate ways to proceed within the shared ethics of the movement. The open invitation for other Treaty workers to give feedback to the group was intended to ensure that critical feedback could be diplomatically passed on via other group members. In this manner, I was able to participate in a collective reflective process that was accessible to my peers' feedback. I could remain an active Treaty worker, close to the guidance of knowledgeable, respected members of the movement.

In addition, I was fortunate to secure a chief supervisor who herself had a herstory as a Treaty educator during the 1970s and 1980s, and who was a member of her local Treaty workers' network. She participated in her group's research sessions, and attended the national gatherings at which my research was presented and discussed. Through these levels of participation, she was able to validate whether my interpretations seemed authentic in her experience of the movement and of the research process.

I also sought feedback at an early stage from Maori academics on my research proposal and received brief feedback familiar to many Pakeha activists, amounting to 'sounds good, looking forward to reading it, how about you make it more directly relevant to Maori?' In consultation with my peer mentor group, I made the choice to continue with my project of studying the theorising of change carried in the Pakeha Treaty movement. My decision was based on acknowledging that while there may be no immediate benefit for Maori, a process for reflecting upon and resourcing Pakeha activity for change was in keeping with a longer term agenda for local decolonisation.

5.1.2 Researching as a praxis-explicator

My professional background as a community psychologist strongly influenced the inquirer positioning and methods in which I felt at home and competent. Revisiting the 1966 Swampscott conference, where the ideas of community psychology as a discipline began, Elias cites Bennet et al (1966):

> The role of community psychologists may therefore be seen as that of a 'participant-conceptualiser'. As such, he or she is clearly involved in, and may be

a mover of, community processes, but he or she is also a professional attempting to conceptualise those processes within the framework of psychological-sociological knowledge. (in Elias, 1994, p. 297)

In similar vein, Prilleltensky and Nelson (1997) describe community psychologists as collaborators rather than experts in their approach to research. The ethics and intent of these broad positions matched the Treaty worker ethics I had determined to follow. I saw myself as both drawing upon, and contributing to the ongoing cycles of action and reflection of my peer Pakeha Treaty workers. This train of thought led me to search for a position that captured the notion of being a collaborative participant conceptualiser who was of service to her peers in the cycles of action and reflection in Treaty work. When researchers consider themselves participants and collaborators in a social change movements that intend to 'make a difference', I considered that we were also obliged to act productively in such a role, as suggested by the Treaty worker ethics. I was therefore obliged to design research that would resource our praxis with further generation of theory (Elias, 1994, p. 297).

I found in the community psychology literature a position that captured this posture of service. Reaching beyond participant conceptualisation, Elias (1994) proposed the position of "praxis explicator" in the action-reflection cycle of praxis – practitioners reflecting on their practice with the researcher as explicator of praxis:

> …not only working in settings to understand and help conceptualise change processes but also of reflecting on action processes that are a part of the setting, of reflecting on theory, and of generating products that share relevant learnings. (Elias, 1994, p. 302)

The researcher 'gives back' to practitioners their own best work, in the interests of forging a continuous link from theory to action. The intention is to develop theoretical principles derived from extensively capturing excellent, context-sensitive practice and linking it to theory. In this manner, Elias (1994) considers that a researcher working from the praxis explicator position is able "to create maps of patterns of change, markers for shifts in terrain, realistic guideposts" (p. 306) for merging theory, research and practice in particular contexts of inquiry.

There were a number of implications of choosing the praxis explicator position. Revisiting the concept of a participant-conceptualiser, all those undertaking active Treaty work could be seen as participant-conceptualisers – moving beyond the position of participant social actors to explicitly conceptualising and planning for Pakeha change. Since all Treaty workers could be described as participant

conceptualisers in processes of Pakeha change, I was in fact a praxis explicator among participant conceptualisers. Since my focus was specifically on the task of theorising change, I considered myself a co-theoriser alongside the research participants in our mutual quest for understanding and facilitating Pakeha change processes. To put it another way, I did not consider myself the only theorist at work. I was joining with my peers in our customary cycles of reflection on our work, using my scholarly resources of time and grant money to stimulate one particular cycle of reflection and publishing the results. I approached each group of participants as key social actors in our local socio-political setting, deserving of being serviced by my research work, just as they were servicing my academic work, thereby acknowledging the importance of reciprocity in field relations (Gurney, 1985).

In summary, I positioned myself as an insider to Pakeha Treaty work, a participant-conceptualiser among my peers, and a praxis-explicator of our praxis, all consistent with the inquiry position of a critical constructivist researcher. Such positioning committed me to preparatory projects that significantly influenced the ensuing design of the research, and significantly enriched the data I was able to draw upon. Since researcher positioning, design, methods and voice are all intertwined, ideally forming a coherent system, I return throughout this chapter to the links between my primary positioning and all other aspects of my inquiry methods.

5.2 Acting as a scholar in the Treaty movement

Implications and outcomes of my positioning as an insider praxis explicator among Pakeha Treaty workers became obvious immediately. For each of my research objectives, I faced the problem of lack of written material. There were only two published volumes containing the expressed views of Pakeha Treaty workers (Yensen et al, 1989; Consedine & Consedine, 2001). As far as I knew, most of the theorising by Treaty workers remained in an oral tradition and in the records of meetings. I worried about how I was to 'review' local literature without becoming an oral historian. I needed an accessible, published local literature to which I could make formal reference. In the face of these concerns, my dual commitment to remaining involved in our collective work as well as undertaking scholarly research created a productive tension which helped me to approach the problem creatively, and with a view to fulfilling aspirations wider than my research agenda.

As reactionary discourse about the 'Treaty grievance' industry had mounted in the late 1990s, I had often heard calls from beleaguered staff for positive case stories of organisational experiences with the Treaty. There were also calls for more theoretical consideration of Treaty education work (Herzog, 1996). As I developed my research design, I made myself available to progress these agendas with my scholarly resources of time on a university scholarship and some small research expenses grants. As a result, the first three years of my PhD time were spent in organising, gathering and publishing collections of previously unpublished work by Pakeha Treaty educators and workers in organisations.

- *Organising a national conference for tauiwi*

In 1998, Maori academic Cheryl Smith called for affirmation of the Treaty by Pakeha at a professional level, preferably in a formal conference setting. In response, Pakeha and Pasifika Treaty workers in my region resolved to hold a national Treaty conference in July 2000, for tauiwi to affirm the Treaty. I was invited to facilitate planning meetings over an 18-month period, and also acted as coordinator of the workshop programme with presenters from around the country. I made a point of encouraging them to share their experiences of working with the Treaty in their local settings and workplaces. In response to requests from conference participants, I volunteered at the end of the conference to coordinate production of the full proceedings, relying on the connections I had built up with each presenter. Our small publishing group produced the *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (Huygens, Maclachlan, Yensen, Huijbers & Reid, 2000) in December. At the time, I considered the two-year conference involvement to have been a diversion from my research project, part of my Treaty work commitments rather than my PhD study. However, the proceedings proved to be the first published collection of such organisational Treaty stories. As a record of diverse organisational praxis in support of the Treaty, it provided a rich ground for examining the work of early adopters of Treaty-focused change.

- *Publishing collections of Treaty work by Pakeha*

I next offered my time to Treaty worker colleagues who were establishing a Treaty resource centre. Working as an assistant to the project coordinator, I summarised material for an annotated bibliography on Treaty work by Pakeha (Margaret, 2002a). By contacting the networks of Treaty workers around the country, we received a volume of unpublished material, as well as building up

complete series of key circulars and newsletters of the past two decades. The unpublished material, much of it prepared by individual activists and educators for university courses in which they were enrolled, proved to be precisely the reflections on practice that I had been so pessimistic of finding in written form. Clearly there had been many scholars in the Treaty movement before me! I worked with the project coordinator to publish a 250-page companion volume to the bibliography entitled *Pakeha Treaty Work: Unpublished material* (Margaret, 2002b).

The longest continuous newsletter documenting Treaty activism, aimed at interested church communities, had been put out by the Conference of Churches of Aotearoa New Zealand (CCANZ) Programme on Racism for 17 years. Heartened by the previous publishing ventures, and in consultation with the original editor, who was a member of my peer study group, I led our proceedings publication group to publish a complete bound volume of *Programme on Racism: Collected Newsletters 1985 – 2002* (Nairn, 2002). Again, I was able to contribute my time as a researcher towards an annotated index to the collection.

- *Archiving national records of Treaty movement*

Finally, when a longstanding office holder in Network Waitangi, the national organisation for Treaty workers, announced her retirement, the annual general meeting resolved to deposit her records with the National Library's archives. As before, I volunteered my research time to help sort the material in her house. I was delighted to find minutes of annual general meetings and records of national gatherings of antiracism and Treaty workers produced over 20 years of activist and educational work. There were also complete series of the network's circulars *Project/Network Waitangi Newsletter, The Net Working* and the *News Sheet.* I read details of how concepts developed, how theorising shifted, how controversial strategies were discussed, and how praxis was debated. The materials were not intended for the general public, but were certain to be of interest to Treaty workers and researchers as primary sources, as well as being invaluable to my research. I made sufficient copies for deposits into several archives and resource centres, including the National Library. To facilitate access to these archives, I created an annotated listing of national gatherings since 1984 and circulated relevant indexes to Treaty workers around the country. A fuller account of these years of preparatory 'service' research can be found in Huygens (2005b).

These unpredictable years of contributing my voluntary scholarly time to local and national Treaty work projects led to a wealth of data sources for my research. Accounts of change in workplaces were now available in the conference proceedings. The archives and public collections of newsletters and previously unpublished material contained a history of the Treaty movement's praxis. All that now remained was to gather accounts of contemporary theorising by Treaty educators, which would be possible through face-to-face meetings around the country. The records of these meetings were also published in a 100-page compendium *How Pakeha Change in response to te Tiriti: Treaty educators speak - collected focus group records* (Huygens, 2004).

5.3 Research design

In total, three data sources were gathered and published:
- Publicly accessible archives of Pakeha anti-racism and Treaty work between 1984 – 2000.
- Contemporary theorising about the processes of Pakeha change by Treaty educator groups during 2003.
- Narrative accounts by organisational leaders about Treaty- based change in their organisation between 1984 and 2000.

Prilleltensky and Nelson (1997) point out that research which follows action driven by the participants in the setting and their needs, and which examines processes and outcomes at multiple levels of analysis, will not fit neatly into experimental or quasi-experimental designs. They advocate a naturalistic case-study approach (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Case studies provide a flexible way to use several methods to describe and analyse change in a particular social setting. The three data streams now available made feasible a research design consisting of three case studies.

In each of the three case studies I relied on the praxis-explicator positioning, and developed variations on critical and participatory action methods of inquiry that fitted with my insider positioning.

In Study 1 – *Developing Treaty theorising* I examined the collections of archival and previously unpublished work for antecedents and influences on the theory and praxis used by anti-racism and Treaty workers from 1984-2000.

In Study 2 – *Contemporary theorising of Pakeha change***,** I co-theorised about Pakeha change with my peers in 10 Treaty educators groups around the country during 2002-3, and interpreted our meeting records and visual imagery.

In Study 3 – *Organisational Treaty discourse*, I analysed the discourses used by organisational narrators in 16 accounts of Treaty-focused change undertaken in workplaces between 1984 and 2000.

The following questions were asked of the data sources:

5.3.1 Research questions

1) How did the antiracism/Treaty movement theorise and practise Pakeha change?
- What were key theoretical influences in the early theorising of the antiracism/Treaty movement?

2) How do contemporary Treaty educators theorise the processes of Pakeha change in response to learning about the Treaty, based on their education work with Pakeha in organisations?
- Which tools of practice do Treaty educators consider most useful?
- What appear to be facilitatory and inhibitory factors in promoting a critical Pakeha response to the Treaty?

3) What evidence is there of alternative discourses in use by Pakeha in organisations working to 'honour the Treaty'?
- What are the key discursive resources used by narrators in accounts of their organisational journeys?

4) In what ways do the theorising of Pakeha change by Treaty educators and the organisational discourses contribute to an agenda of decolonisation?

5) What are the current challenges and emerging directions for processes of dominant group change arising from this research?

In *Developing Treaty theorising* (Study 1) and *Organisational Treaty discourses* (Study 3), I used deconstructive and critical discursive methods to examine the

history of the pro-Treaty discourse by Pakeha and its achievements in organisations. In *Contemporary Pakeha theorising* (Study 2), I used the participatory action approach to support a dialogue between the researcher and activist educators in which we co-theorised Pakeha change.

5.4 Validating interpretations

Consistent with their common epistemology in social constructionism, critical and constructivist methods of inquiry have similar ways of validating the researcher's interpretations. Four principles of validation are often cited (Schwandt, 1998):
(i) interest - the interests and commitments of investigators and informants need to be acknowledged and allowed for within the analysis and interpretation. An account of research is an interested representation, and the agency of the researcher in selecting methods and interpretations needs to be reflected.
(ii) trust (worthiness) - the analysis and interpretation must be shown to be consistent with people's experience and research in other, similar situations. Adequate samples of situated talk about the relevant topic are required.
(iii) credibility - the analysis and interpretation must make sense both to participants (or others familiar with the setting and behaviour) and interested readers.
(iv) generality - the findings need to have more than local import.

Because of my insider positioning and commitment to praxis explication, I elected to use particularly strong forms of validations for the interest, trustworthiness and credibility criteria. For instance, in relation to the credibility criterion, Taylor (2001a, 2001b) suggests that credibility depends on the intended audience. She maintains that in methods analysing discourse-independent-of-individual-speakers a researcher should not feel obliged to check their reading back with informants. However, positioned as an insider praxis explicator using a participatory action approach, I prioritised the participants and other Treaty workers as the primary audience for my interpretations. My rationale for prioritising them as an audience was that these were the people with whom I was co-researching a new discourse, a discourse we shared but which was as yet not widely recognised by other audiences.

In both *Contemporary Pakeha theorising* (Study 2) and *Organisational Treaty discourse* (Study 3), I checked with the Treaty educator groups and organisational

narrators personally (face to face or by phone) to see whether my reading of their theorising made sense to them. As required in constructivist research, I sought a consensus, or failing that, a negotiated agreement about differences. It was this group with whom I aimed to achieve a consensus, and with whom I needed to check that my academic interests were not creating distortions. Checking an interpretive analysis with informants fulfilled an ethic of accountability left implicit in critical discourse analysis – that of treating the speech community who generates a discourse as a significant collective in their socio-political environment. It allows participants from a vulnerable group to monitor the discourse being used by the researcher and to check that at best it affirms and validates their discourse and at least that it does not publicise a reading of their discourse that is potentially dangerous to their socio-political interests.

As I undertook each study, my critical reflections matured and crystallised about my positioning as a scholar in a social movement. For continuity and ease of reference, I have included these reflections here, although the reader is most welcome to turn to the studies at this point, and return to my reflections later.

5.5 Critical reflections on positioning

The researcher as a 'praxis explicator' proved to be an apt inquiry posture for the lengthy processes of gathering, recording, publishing and examining the cognitive praxis of the Pakeha Treaty movement. I found that my position as an insider scholar embedded in a social movement created a number of clear advantages as well as some drawbacks, and tensions.

5.5.1 Working as an insider praxis explicator

In the initial stages of Study 2 *Contemporary Pakeha theorising*, in which I negotiated the co-theorising study with Treaty educators, I was aware of relying on my familiar and comfortable status as insider. I was able to introduce my research intentions, and advertise the accountabilities I would adhere to long before approaching each group to request their specific participation. Such a 'one-of-the-family' status continued during the stage of arranging focus meetings with each educator group. But as I completed two pilot meetings, I became acutely aware of the subtle but definite shift from 'insider practitioner to 'insider researcher' with my peer educators. From a comfortable position as a practitioner

in a team with familiar consensual processes, I had now moved to a new, authoritative position in which I invited my colleagues to trust me in a new collective venture, one which relied on new processes of decision making. The feeling was suddenly that of a negotiation between strangers. I was aware of having to sharpen up and clarify for myself and the participants exactly what I was offering and what I was requesting, what assurances I could give and what consents I needed. There was clearly the potential for betrayal of trust – I had become the "outsider within".

My peer study group, some of whom participated in the research and mingled at the national gatherings of Treaty workers which took place during the research period, gave me feedback at a meeting we recorded to evaluate my research project[1]. They reflected that my positioning had embodied integrity in enacting the spirit of the ethics and values of the Treaty movement and of community psychology. In their view, a researcher without that integrity may have brought the same skills and experience to the project, and yet not achieved the level of trust and participation reached in the present studies, particularly in an anti-academic climate. They strongly challenged my conception of myself as working in a "blind" or "groping" way (as I had described myself while facilitating a national discussion with participants (Huygens, 2004, p. 82)). They countered that my approach had been more akin to feeling my way at each step to ensure that I was expressing the spirit and intent of our Treaty worker ethics and my community psychology values. In their view, I had "lived it all along" (meeting audiotape, 2006). They reminded me, moreover, that over the years of peer supervision I had communicated a very clear picture of what needed to happen, so that my approach could be described as a form of intuition crafted from my previous academic and experiential learning. They concluded that I had achieved a "brilliant researcher response to the anti-academic values and ethics of accountability, collectivity and transparency in the Treaty movement" (meeting audiotape, 2006). Another Treaty worker who was concurrently involved in academic pursuits suggested, after participating in Study 2, that my position had been as a "peer witness" to new constructions by Pakeha in our present socio-historical situation (personal communication, Susan Healy, 2004).

Reflecting upon my insider status and the autobiographical nature of interested research, I would conclude that my particular identity and skills were indeed key

---

[1] Audiotape of peer study group meeting on 22 May, 2006, at 94 Garnet Rd, Westmere, Auckland.

factors in shaping the action processes and research outcomes in the studies that follow.

Usefulness of publications

The publications and resources arising as a result of my positioning as a praxis explicator were:

- *Pakeha Treaty Work: Unpublished material* (Margaret, 2002b)
- *Programme on Racism collected newsletters 1984-2000* (Nairn, 2002)
- *Treaty Conference Proceedings 2000* (Huygens et al, 2000)
- *How Pakeha Change in response to te Tiriti: Collected focus group records* (Huygens, 2004)
- *Carrying the Treaty in our Hearts: Treaty educators speak 2003* (video) (Huygens, 2005a)

Working as a praxis explicator among change practitioners had committed me to resource the participants with useable repositories of their work/research contributions. I expected that participants would use the archived, newly published and circulated material for their own purposes in their sectors and communities, as indeed occurred. All the resources generated through the research process have continued to circulate and sell quietly. Orders from public and academic libraries as well as from organisations and community groups have been steady, and each publication has reached a second printing. I have received consistent feedback that Treaty workers have found it useful as well as affirming to have the early praxis of the movement between covers. Younger and incoming Treaty workers have used the publications as an orientation resource. There has also been some feedback that they have been used as reference material in public debate. For instance, while mature spokespeople for Maori activism may refer to Pakeha Treaty work from personal knowledge, a younger Maori politician who was relying on hearsay was recently delighted to access our records for alternative Pakeha views to the mainstream. A Maori team making a documentary for national television also found in the video an accessible source of Pakeha pro-Treaty discourse and imagery.

5.5.2 Tensions created by research strategy

Mutual influences of data streams

As recounted in Section 5.2, I took opportunities to act as a praxis explicator as they arose. As it happened, the decision to host a Treaty conference sharing organisational journeys came first, the opportunity to gather and archive written material came next, and lastly I undertook to travel around the country to record the educator group's contemporary theorising. As a result, the chronological order in which I gathered and analysed the data was:

(i)   a discourse analytic reading of accounts of Treaty change in organisations (Huygens, 2001b, 2002b);

(ii)   an examination of themes in Pakeha conscientisation journeys in local unpublished literature (Huygens, 2002a);

(iii)   co-theorising of Pakeha change with Treaty educators (Huygens, 2004).

Thus, in real time/chronological sequence I moved from analysing the discursive resources used by organisational narrators, to examining past Pakeha Treaty work, to co-theorising with my peer Treaty educators. While I brought my lengthy history as a Treaty worker to all three studies, my understanding of our work increased markedly as I moved through each phase of the research.

Another mutual influence arose through a number of the Treaty educator participants in Study 2 validating the credibility of my reading of the organisational themes in Study 3. These validation sessions occurred in late 2002, prior to their theorising process. It is certainly possible that hearing my interpretation of the organisational discourse influenced their later theorising in their local focus groups. However, since their feedback was that there were no surprises in the organisational themes, I concluded that my input did not provide any new information – rather it served to affirm and reinforce their existing theorising about Pakeha change.

In any case, the data streams were intertwined in the discursive and material world independently of my research. In order to match my thesis of how a pro-Treaty discourse arose among Pakeha, I have presented my study reports in the sequence of early theorising in the Pakeha Treaty movement (Study 1), contemporary theorising by Treaty educators (Study 2) and finally narrative theorising by organisational workers (Study 3).

Researcher voices

As the methods varied in each case study, so did the researcher's 'voice' with which I spoke. I found two voices conducive at different points in the research, both considered by Guba and Lincoln (1994) appropriate to research directed at change. When speaking among Treaty educators about the constructions of reality we have developed, I used the voice taken by constructivism of the "passionate participant" (Lincoln, 1991, cited in Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 115). I set out in the study of contemporary Pakeha theorising to passionately articulate our praxis in collaboration with my colleagues. I speak as a committed participant, a facilitator of "multi-voice" reconstruction of participant's constructions as well as my own (in Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 115), creating what may be termed an 'internalist' account. In contrast, I was aware of taking up a more distanced position in the other two studies. The construction of a genealogy, as Henriques et al (1984) point out, is definitely not an "internalist" account (p. 108). Tracing the antecedents and formation of a pro-Treaty discourse, and analysing its current use in contemporary organisations required the voice taken in critical theory of the "transformative intellectual" who speaks as "an advocate and activist towards expanding consciousness and transforming hegemony" (Giroux, 1988, in Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 115).

Through the voices adopted, both the critical and liberatory approaches 'spoke' throughout the research process. My entire research could be seen as a project to construct a genealogy for a Pakeha pro-Treaty discourse, in which I speak as an activist, transformative intellectual to other Pakeha New Zealanders as a group. Equally, my entire research project could be seen as a liberatory participatory action project, in which I speak throughout "for the work of many others" (Elias, 1994). As I integrated my interpretations from all three studies at the end of the thesis, I worked towards a harmony of the insider voice of the passionate participant and the more distanced voice of the transformative intellectual. Tensions from using these two voices are discussed there.

Limits on reflection

There has been one significant consequence of my positioning as a scholar in a social movement. Retaining a commitment to collective ethics and aspirations had both enabling and limiting aspects. My choice of epistemology, positioning and methods led to the expansion of my research project into three studies. My tasks as an insider praxis explicator in this particular research setting became those of

an archivist, cataloguer, publisher, and curator of present and past Pakeha Treaty work. Because I spent large amounts of my research time facilitating group processes (in person, on the telephone and by email) and producing resources useful to participants and to Pakeha generally (compilations, publications, a video and a DVD), I was able to spend proportionately less time on other directions useful to my research aim. I had made a choice at the outset to pursue the wealth of local theorising rather than to review, for instance, the work of other social movements or to engage in any number of current international debates around colonisation, hegemony and democracy. As a consequence of my positioning, those important areas of engagement with the present work have had to be left for later attention.

CHAPTER 6.0 STUDY 1

DEVELOPING TREATY THEORISING:

PAKEHA WORK FOR CHANGE

> What I found out about New Zealand's colonial history shocked me profoundly…at every level of the political and economic system Maori had been marginalised…..it challenged and transformed the way I viewed my country. I became part of a large network of Pakeha people who went on to create a process that would challenge the social conditioning many Pakeha (including myself) had received ….the message was clear: start by educating yourselves and your own people. If Maori were going to receive justice, Pakeha had to change.
>
> Consedine & Consedine, 2001, p. 20

The study described in this chapter expands on my indication in Chapter 2 that during the 1970s some Pakeha began to respond to the Maori view of colonisation. The trajectory of the Pakeha response is discernible in the ephemeral and unpublished literature of the antiracism/Treaty movement. Eyerman and Jamieson (1991) argue that the "cognitive praxis" of a social movement is shaped by its context in local intellectual history and political culture, which in turn shapes the movement's "project". This chapter draws on their assumption and examines how just such a project arose of Pakeha learning about, and responding to, the Treaty of Waitangi.

The specific research questions addressed in this study are:

How did the antiracism/Treaty movement theorise and practice Pakeha change?
-   What were key theoretical influences in the early theorising of the antiracism/Treaty movement?

Based on the critical view that all knowledge of the world is tied to the social and political conditions surrounding its use, to investigate how new discourse is produced entails "tracing historically the conditions of possibility of knowledges" (Henriques et al, 1984, p. 92). Foucault called such investigation of the history of

a discourse "constructing a genealogy" for a discourse. The point of constructing a genealogy is to retrace the mutual dependencies between a discourse and its use in concrete situations, and to provide an account of the specific conditions of the emergence and production of the discourse (Henriques et al, 1984).

In Chapter 4, I argued that new ways of constructing the world do not just serendipitously appear, fully formed and functional as a new and useable discourse. Developing new discourses depends on efforts over time by speech communities engaged in dialogue to reconstruct their world. Accounts of development of new discourse need to emphasise transformative intentions, actions and interactions (Ellsworth, 1992) weaving back and forth between the discursive and theoretical and the situated. In this case, the 'situated' is that which Pakeha/tauiwi involved in antiracism and Treaty work experienced as their reality. My interpretation reconstructs the implicit and explicit theorising by antiracism/Treaty workers about New Zealand society and their efforts for change.

Following Eyerman and Jamison's (1991) approach to cognitive praxis as theorised from rich descriptions of social movements, I used the genealogical approach suggested by Carabine (2001) to records of Pakeha antiracism and Treaty work. The primary sources used in this study reflect a shared oral tradition in a social movement developed through casual conversations, planning sessions in local groups, and national gatherings over a quarter of a century. That oral tradition was the basis for ephemera such as pamphlets, action alerts, minutes of meetings, educational resource kits, parliamentary submissions, and the regular newsletters of the Programme on Racism (NCC and CCANZ) and Project/Network Waitangi. Reflective papers written by antiracism/Treaty workers for academic courses and conferences are also included. I relied in particular on the following sources:

- *Pakeha Treaty Work: Unpublished Material* (Margaret, 2002b);
- *Programme on Racism Collected Newsletters, 1985 – 2002* (Nairn, 2002);
- Project/Network Waitangi's *Newsletter/The Networking* 1986 – 2002 (Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives);
- Project Waitangi records of meetings and correspondence (Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives);
- Minutes and publicity of national gatherings of antiracism and Treaty workers, 1984 – 2000 (Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives).

This collection of documents records the work of Pakeha activists, and illustrates how they drew together several major streams of theorising to create what became

the cognitive praxis of antiracism and Treaty work. While antiracism/Treaty workers shared ideas and experiences the movement was never centralised. Individuals and local groups drew on their own resources and struggled with different conceptualisations of oppression that might sharpen their analyses or benefit their work as activists and educators. A full history of the Pakeha antiracism and Treaty movement over the past 30 years has yet to be written. Da Silva (1994a, 1994b), Hoult (2000) and McNamara (2001) give valuable perspectives in short papers, Herzog (2000) gives an outline of tauiwi Treaty work, and Nairn (1989) has described her view of the transitions in Pakeha thinking which occurred during the 1970s and early 1980s.

Rather than seek to impose a single chronology on the diversity of the antiracism/Treaty movement, I have organised the chapter around five dated events that invited conceptual innovations and new constructions of social reality: the release of the Hunn Report (1961); the growth of an institutional racism analysis (1968 onwards); protests and hui concerning the Treaty of Waitangi (1970s); preparation for the sesquicentenary of the Treaty (up to 1990), and Treaty education for Pakeha in organisations and institutions (1990s). By providing a series of snapshots of how anti-racist and pro-Treaty theorising developed among Pakeha from the 1970s to the present, I begin to create such a genealogy for a counter-hegemonic discourse. I have also included a brief account of how Pakeha activists and educators worked with Maori consultants over the years. In other words, rather than attempt a 'full length movie', I have opted for a small gallery of 'snapshots' of significant scenes, and a small sample of an ongoing 'soundtrack'. Each scene includes analyses, actions, and innovative ideas drawn on to contribute to the cognitive praxis of the movement. To share in particular the active and interactive aspects of creating a new discourse among Pakeha, I have foregrounded particular social actors and political actions among the many contributing to these events.

Since I sought validation of my interpretation of developments in the intellectual history of antiracism/Treaty work from Mitzi and Ray Nairn, members of my peer advisory group, my account will necessarily reflect our shared Tamaki region perspective. There is certainly further material in private collections that would provide accounts of similar and unique developments in other parts of the country.

6.1 Snapshots of cognitive praxis development

Pakeha responses to Maori protests and distress were initially informed by the same constructions as the hegemonic discourse presented in Chapter 2, and it took some time for more critical constructions to develop. The consensus of earlier writers is that the critical period of exploration and synthesis of ideas from various intellectual and experiential streams occurred in the 1970s and early 1980s (da Silva, 1994a, 1994b; Hoult, 2000; MacNamara, 2001; Nairn, 1989, 2000). Among the intellectual and experiential streams were:

(i)   Maori critiques of white racism and subsequently colonisation,

(ii)   Christian approaches to social justice,

(iii)   opposition to apartheid,

(iv)   feminist and Marxist praxis in analysing oppression, and

(v)   liberation theology.

These streams were interwoven into a cognitive praxis that has continued to develop since those times.

6.1.1 The Hunn report

The *Report on Department of Maori Affairs, with Statistical Supplement* (Hunn, 1961), produced at the direction of the Secretary of the Department, J. R. Hunn, showed that Maori were not achieving in education, employment, housing and health. Policies of assimilation needed Maori success and the report recommended further efforts, which were taken up as integration, for example by the Department of Education, (Currie Report, cited in da Silva, 1994a). For some Pakeha, the Hunn report was startling news that New Zealand had policies of assimilation in place, and that enormous coercive force had been applied to Maori to assimilate. Mitzi Nairn, former Director of the Conference of Churches Programme on Racism, recalls that Hunn's report was the first time information had been published by the official system that showed that "All is not as rosy as our myths suggest" (in Paul, 1991).

Prior to 1960 there had been widespread protests over the NZRFU decision to select a 'white' All Blacks team to tour South Africa in 1960. The protest slogan *No Maoris No Tour* brought together churches, unions, Maori committees and organisations, public servants, students and staff of several universities and teachers' colleges favouring a properly representative New Zealand team

(Thompson, 1975). Many of those protestors became members of the Citizens Association for Racial Equality (CARE), a body with Maori and Pakeha, secular and religious membership which provided early continuity to New Zealand opposition to apartheid sport. CARE also responded to the Hunn Report by helping to set up homework centres for Maori children and providing support in court. While these activists in the 1960s responded affirmatively to indications of Maori distress, their response was based on an assimilationist approach. As Nairn summarises it:

> We wasted a lot of time in the 1960s trying to make an old analysis work…'we will all try harder and be more sincere and it will come good, the Maori people will catch up'…. there was no racism analysis available until the 1970s – we just didn't have the vocabulary for it. (in Paul, 1991, p. 26).

Actions such as CARE's response were typical of what are now seen as well-meaning attempts to make the old analysis work because a new analysis needed a new vocabulary, as yet undeveloped (Nairn, 1989). Both the Hunn Report and the available analytic tools emphasised individual behaviour and aggregated consequences of individual actions, which fitted the dominant discourse of blaming Maori for their misfortune. Pakeha responses, glossed as 'helping Maori to catch up', were shaped by those tools and associated vocabulary much as the actions of white Australians involved in the Reconciliation campaigns drew upon, and were constrained by, dominant discourses that positioned the indigenous people as the problem (Green & Sonn, 2005).

At this time, *Te Hokioi* and the Maori Organisation on Human Rights (see Appendix 1) began broadcasting their critiques of colonial oppression and cultural loss, bringing into focus the issue that programmes such as homework centres needed to be run in ways that maintained (and re-introduced) cultural forms. 'Helping' and 'meaning well' were not enough, since Pakeha people used Pakeha cultural forms, thereby furthering the erosion of Maori language and culture. Work against apartheid in South Africa also helped in understanding colonial racism in New Zealand – the institution of apartheid was a crystal clear picture of colonial domination (personal communication, Mitzi Nairn, 2005). For concerned Pakeha during the 1960s, the interplay between available theory, dialogue with other social actors, and reflections upon their intentions and interventions made their current way of constructing the position of Maori increasingly uncomfortable. By attending to these alternative, and far more critical ways of theorising the local situation, these Pakeha were about to take a crucial first step beyond their familiar constructions of the Pakeha-Maori relationship.

6.1.2 Seeing institutional racism

With hindsight it is clear that a new analysis needed to direct attention onto the dominant social systems and practices which created such distress for Maori. The early sources of such analyses were overseas but there were diverse early adopters who applied them here and shared what they found. The publication of the Kerner Commission report about racial unrest in the U.S. (1968) helped identify institutional racism as the basis of white power and its maintenance. While the Commission was impeccably mainstream, the same analysis was being offered by Black Power leaders in the U.S. For some an institutional racism analysis was interwoven with critiques of colonisation. Mitzi Nairn recalls her time in the Student Christian Movement when many Third World member countries challenged Western colonial paternalism: "We are not mission fields!" (Paul, 1991). Through a growing local awareness of black consciousness in America and South Africa, writings by Freire and Fanon about colonial oppression, and the U.S. analysis of institutional racism, she and her peers began asking themselves: "Is *oppression* happening in our country?" (Nairn, 1989, 2000; Paul, 1991).

The first analysis of local institutional racism in action was offered by the Nelson Race Relations Action Group and the Nelson Maori Committee in a joint project to ensure legal representation for every Maori or other Polynesian appearing in the Nelson Magistrates Court in 1972. Their report, *Justice and Race: a Monocultural System in a Multicultural Society* (Nelson Action Group, 1973), compared the outcomes for those who were represented with the outcomes for those who were not, and pointed clearly to institutionalised racism against Maori and Polynesian people in the courts.

Following such a new way of considering the New Zealand situation, a party of New Zealanders visited centres of antiracism action and analysis in the United States in 1972, and the following year a team of antiracism trainers from Detroit Industrial Mission and elsewhere were brought to New Zealand. They ran antiracism courses in Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch and a national gathering demonstrating white-on-white antiracism work. Key members of the Nelson Race Relations Action Group were transferred to Auckland in mid-1973, and with a mix of church, student and some SCM members formed the Auckland Committee On Racial Discrimination (ACORD). The all-Pakeha group worked to expose institutional racism in New Zealand and to work for change. ACORD referred to and consulted with Maori members of Nga Tamatoa and other Polynesians, including the Polynesian Panther Party, and others like Betty Wark

and Agnes TuiSamoa who were active on behalf of Polynesian people (da Silva, 1994a; Nairn, 1989).

These Maori, Pakeha and Pasifika groups eventually collaborated to form a joint educational arm they called New Perspectives on Race (NPR): "NPR was intended to do the public education that activist groups found difficult because of the public's perception of them" (da Silva, 1994a, p. 36). As an analysis of institutional racism came into view, discussions between Maori and Pakeha within the antiracism groups included issues of Pakeha working with Maori acting as consultants or monitors (da Silva, 1994a, p. 36). Activists and educators increasingly strategised that they needed to work in Pakeha-only groups with Maori and Pasifika activists as 'consultants':

> It became obvious that [mixed groups] blurred responsibilities. The primary dominant group responsibility is to unlearn and dismantle its dominating institutions and social constructions, such as institutional and cultural racism. We kept hearing this quite clearly from the consultants. (Ray Nairn, personal communication, 2005).

By the late 1970s, NPR was running small-group antiracism workshops with Pakeha while Maori energy was gradually withdrawn. Pacific activists also withdrew to begin the journey of theorising their unique relationship with tangata whenua and their specific experience of colonisation. Over time, comparable groups like the Urban Training Centre, part of the Inner City Ministry in Wellington, were formed in other parts of the country, later followed by numerous Pakeha antiracism groups such as Whakatane Association for Racial Understanding, pakeha AntiRacism Coalition (pARC), Lesbian Antiracism Group, and Association for Racial Unity among many others.

For the Pakeha antiracism groups of the late 1970s, the theorising of an ahistorical institutional racism as the key element in oppression became uncomfortable in its turn as it too failed to fit the local situation and the issues as presented by the Maori analysis. The NPR education group focused on general antiracism work, because, as Mitzi Nairn explained of the mid-1970s: "Simpson's *Te Riri Pakeha* had not yet been released, nor had Scott's *Ask That Mountain*. We did not yet have the material with which to re-examine New Zealand's history. We hadn't indigenised our approach to the New Zealand situation" (personal communication, 2005). The need for education of the activists themselves about the local situation grew urgent.

Several chroniclers recall the extended "crucible" effect among the various streams of theorising, which now included Pakeha reflections on their 1970s work with antiracism/institutional racism interventions (Da Silva 1994a; McNamara, 2001; Nairn, 1989, 2000). As Mitzi Nairn explained (Paul, 1991), most antiracism workers were working against apartheid, and had made a commitment to domestic racism before the Springbok Tour, but in 1981 the scale of the opposition to racist sports team selection changed. The tour of an 'apartheid' South African sports team that excluded indigenous Africans now brought racism into focus for large numbers of Pakeha. The anti-apartheid movement achieved a mass mobilisation of New Zealanders against the 1981 Springbok Tour, and many Pakeha felt that racism had been dealt a significant blow. But the counter-challenge from Maori activists was swift – what about domestic racism? Pakeha were challenged to "look to their own history for evidence of the racism they had so fiercely opposed on the anti-apartheid barricades" (McNamara, 2001, p.189), and to "learn your own history, cultural identity and cultural values" (Consedine & Consedine, 2001, p. 19). Robert Consedine, jailed after the 1981 tour protests, met so many Maori in prison that he experienced an intense turning point in perspective:

> While my work for Corso in the 1970s had kept my focus overseas, that experience, combined with the emotional impact of being in jail in 1981, brought into question all that I had assumed about poverty and racism. Why did I know so little about colonisation in New Zealand and what had happened to Maori? (p. 143)

However, the journey of discovery "took a slow path" (Consedine & Consedine, 2001) as antiracist Pakeha discovered that the apparent white-wash of New Zealand history by the education system had led to a form of historical amnesia (Paul, 1991; Consedine & Consedine, 2001). One of the tasks undertaken by the antiracism activists was "to educate themselves about New Zealand history and to begin to dispel the myth that New Zealand had the best race relations in the world" (McNamara, 2001).

6.1.3 Looking towards Waitangi

In 1960 Maori Member of Parliament Matiu Rata had introduced an annual "Waitangi Day" to commemorate the signing of the Treaty. When the government moved to change the name to "New Zealand Day", the Maori Organisation on Human Rights (MOOHR), declared in 1970 that "we think …that Waitangi Day should be observed by and for all New Zealanders as a Day of Reckoning…" (da Silva 1994a, p. 35). The protests at Waitangi initiated by Nga Tamatoa during the 1970s were continued by Waitangi Action Committee, and Pakeha began joining

this protest. From 1983, a *hikoi* (march) arrived at Waitangi on Waitangi Day. In 1984, the hikoi was led by a revival of the Kotahitanga (Hoult, 2001; Waitangi Action Committee, 1985) under banners including *The Treaty is a fraud*. Church leaders supported the hikoi and the Maori Council of Churches declared: "…we question the celebrations which are held at the Treaty House which claim to speak of nationhood and unity but from our perspective speak of dominance and oppression" (Church and Society Commission, 1983 in da Silva, 1999a).

Referring to the learning undertaken by Pakeha about liberation theory, structural analysis and white-on-white antiracism work during the 1970s, da Silva (1994a) considers that: "These pieces of learning, and the 1981 challenge to address home-grown racism exploded into action and education around the Treaty of Waitangi in the 1980s" (p. 36). Pakeha and Maori activists were now responding to each other's analyses and educational material, and sharing new constructions of the situation. Drawing upon work by the Auckland Maori Council and others (Walker, 1990), the Waitangi Action Committee's circulars disseminated widely material that was critical of colonisation, such as timelines of legislation breaching the Treaty (Waitangi Action Committee, 1984, 1985). The focus became firmer around the Treaty as a dishonoured agreement between indigenous and coloniser peoples, and Pakeha groups formed coalitions for action with Maori groups. One such coalition was People Opposed to Waitangi (POW), a network of Pakeha in Auckland working alongside the Waitangi Action Committee, with aims to:

> 1) stop the celebrations
> 2) encourage dialogue between all peoples within Aotearoa as to the effects the Treaty of Waitangi has on us
> 3) ensure education of people abut the Treaty of Waitangi happens year round (People Opposed to Waitangi, 1986, in da Silva 1994a, p. 37).

Their list of member groups shows how widely supported these aims were: Halt All Racist Tours (HART), National Council of Churches, pakeha AntiRacism Coalition (pARC), Auckland Committee on Racism and Discrimination (ACORD), Health Workers against Racism, CARE, Women's AntiRacism Action Group (DSW based), New Zealand Association of Social Workers Standing Committee on Racism, Auckand Rape Crisis, Jewish Feminists, CORSO, Lesbian Group, and the Auckland Unemployed Workers Rights Centre among them (da Silva, 1994a, p. 37). The call from such coalitions for reflection and education about the Treaty all year round created a climate of mutual support in which it became possible to lobby for a government-funded national education programme about the Treaty of Waitangi, aimed at Pakeha New Zealanders.

Dialogue in Maori circles, particularly a dialogue between elders and younger activists, led to a consensus about the place of the Treaty of Waitangi in the present foment. In respect of the ancestors who signed the agreement in good faith, and in growing acknowledgement of the signed Maori text, te Tiriti o Waitangi, the enduring banner became *Honour the Treaty*.

During 1984, a conversation of call and response between Maori and Pakeha activists about events at Waitangi is evident. A major hui was called at Ngaruawahia in September, 1984, by Te Runanga Whakawhanaunga i nga Hahi o Aotearoa (Maori Council of Churches) to discuss the "legal, moral, political and historical ramifications of the signing of the Treaty" (Waitangi Action Committee, 1985) p. 1). The hui was the first of a series of gatherings originally proposed as a more conservative alternative to the Great Hikoi Ki Waitangi in 1984 (Te Kawariki, 2000). The hui was monitored by the Waitangi Action Committee, who recorded in their notes the Ngati Raukawa submission delivered on the first evening, beginning with "the Treaty implied two sovereign peoples" and including "teach the history of the treaty from a Maori perspective". Te Runanga Whakawhanaunga i nga Hahi o Aotearoa also included in their formal submission at this hui: "Develop bicultural New Zealanders" (Waitangi Action Committee, 1985, p. 6-7)

Later that same year Pakeha activists called a major gathering of the antiracism groups now numerous enough to be described as a 'movement'. Lesbian feminist women had led the way in 1983 with a national white women's gathering in Tokomaru Hall, Palmerston North. In December, 1984, the Tauranga Men's Action Collective and the Women's Reflection Action Group hosted the first open national gathering of antiracism workers at Aongatete Lodge near Katikati. Their publicity stated that: "on the Hikoi Ki Waitangi (and elsewhere) the need has been recognised for Pakeha antiracist groups and individuals to meet and discuss white racism in Aotearoa" (Antiracism & Treaty worker national gatherings, 1984 – 2000). They proposed as starting points for discussion: "Pakeha responsibility under the Treaty of Waitangi; Pakeha responses to Kotahitanga; Waitangi 1985 and responses to the Hui at Turangawaewae, and communication, structure and networking in the movement" (Antiracism & Treaty worker national gatherings, 1984- 2000). In response to the hikoi and events at Turangawaewae and Waitangi, these antiracism activists were exploring new conceptions of the Treaty of Waitangi and planning practical and symbolic contributions to the next Waitangi Day. As Nairn (2000) suggests, Pakeha groups could be said to have accepted the

strategy, originally proposed by Maori, of 'honouring the Treaty' as a remedy for white racism.

6.1.4 The Treaty in focus

During these same years, in the early 1980s, the tangata whenua, the government and non-government organisations and activists began to look towards the sesquicentenary (150th anniversary) of the signing of the Treaty in 1990. The series of hui led by the Maori Council of Churches during 1984 – 85 confirmed the Maori call for dialogue, healing and reconciliation between Pakeha and Maori regarding the Treaty of Waitangi. On the Pakeha side, the National Council of Churches declared its commitment in 1984 to "working with Pakeha so that one day the two peoples could discuss the nature of the society they wanted to achieve" (Bob Scott, cited in Hoult, 2000, p. 105).

However, a major problem was that Pakeha knew virtually nothing about the Treaty: "Even the casual observer must admit that, in contrast to the energy and time spent by Maori people, very little attention has been spent by pakeha people" (Wellington Working Group, 1985a, p. 1). Pakeha antiracism groups understood that: "Before Maori and Pakeha develop dialogue, we Pakeha need to debate our actions and responsibilities as co-signatories to the Treaty of Waitangi" (Project Waitangi Resource Kits, p. 1). Bob Scott, then Director of the National Council of Churches' Programme on Racism, said in a letter to the Pakeha Caucus of the Waitangi Coalition:

> for some time now I have been exploring a project to encourage pakeha discussion on the Treaty of Waitangi. It seems clear to me and others within the anti-racism network that a vital step in promoting a bi-cultural society is that pakeha spend some time and energy learning about and considering the obligations laid on pakeha people by the Treaty of Waitangi and responsibilities since then….it is a massive project and could play a crucial role in the development of pakeha awareness on race issues. (Scott, 1985, original emphasis)

The National Council of Churches called together church organisations, union representatives, community and antiracism groups into a Core Group which met during 1985 to develop a *Proposal for a Nationwide Debate on the Treaty of Waitangi: Project Waitangi – Pakeha Debate the Treaty* (Wellington Working Group, 1985a). The project's intent was to inform Pakeha debate about our "having a clear place in Aotearoa, a place determined by and conditional upon the honouring of the Treaty of Waitangi" (Haggie, 1990a, p. 70). The focus on the

Treaty required Pakeha to contemplate their past and future identity in relationship to Maori:

> Maori are not just another minority group. They are the people of this land – and this identifies us as manuhiri. In this sense the Treaty gives us the right to be here. The tangata whenua have their spiritual roots here. They are the people who make this place unique and they make us unique. This is the positive thrust of the proposal – people can be part of a new bi-cultural society. (Wellington Working Group minutes, 1985b).

Now the theorising about intervening in institutional racism in the present gained a visionary, future-oriented thrust which depended on understanding the historical agreement. The aims of Project Waitangi were for Pakeha to "study and debate the Treaty of Waitangi in order to understand Pakeha commitments under the Treaty; and, by studying and coming face to face with the history of New Zealand since 1840, and through recognising Maori as the *tangata whenua,* to move towards a genuine bi-cultural and eventually multi-cultural society" (Project Waitangi, 1986-7).

To allow comparison with the discourses I researched two decades later in Study 2 and Study 3, the Aims of Project Waitangi are here included in full:

> **That Pakeha will study and debate the Treaty of Waitangi in order to understand Pakeha commitments under the Treaty**: by getting to know the texts and historical context, and examining misconceptions, fears and confusions about these commitments.
> **That Pakeha will recognise Maori as tangata whenua**: by learning about the meaning of tangata whenua in the Maori sense; by beginning to look at the basis of this country in terms of a tangata whenua/Pakeha contract for a shared nation; by understanding that contract, to examine Pakeha status when the Treaty is honoured and what that will mean for all the institutions and structures in New Zealand society; beginning to look at Pakeha culture, tracing Pakeha history and ancestors, why they came here, where they came from, and what visions and hopes they had for a new life in this country.
> **That Pakeha will study the history of New Zealand since 1840, and by coming face to face with our history, will begin to move towards a genuine bi-cultural and eventually multi-cultural society:** by studying the Treaty and the subsequent land dealings and legislation that go against the whole meaning and essence of the Treaty, becoming aware of the true history of this country; by becoming aware of racism, to recognise the history of racism personal and institutional; by becoming aware of Pakeha culture and feeling confident within it; by expressing feelings of threat or confusion about racism, going beyond guilt in coming to terms with racism; and by deciding to act, make goals, challenge racist structures and practices. (Project Waitangi, 1986-7)

The aims of Project Waitangi can be seen to reflect the various strands of theorising that had contributed to Pakeha antiracist work up till then. Theoretical positions on historical, constitutional, institutional, cultural and emotional issues can be discerned. Also visible in Project Waitangi's aims is the liberatory

approach to critical consciousness raising, allowing people to respond to new information and its implications, and make up their own minds.

Seen by the government as a "middle ground approach" (Barron & Giddings, 1989, p. 8) to avoid the radical demands of groups like WAC and POW, the national campaign received funding for a small national office and a coordinator who would produce educational and media resources, train educators and advertise educational workshops for Pakeha (Haggie, 1990a). The processes adopted by the project resourced the existing antiracism groups and encouraged further groups of activist educators to offer education for Pakeha (Scott, 1986a). By 1988, there were 22 groups offering Treaty education for Pakeha around the country (Project Waitangi Inc records, 1985-1990).

Having accepted the Maori challenge to honour the Treaty as a strategic remedy for New Zealand racism, theorising began to flourish among Pakeha antiracism/Treaty workers about the relationships between Pakeha, Maori and the Treaty. The series of resource kits produced by the project during 1987 confirmed the emphasis on Pakeha responsibility for institutional racism , and prepared the ground for examining Pakeha culture in general as well as New Zealand institutional cultures.

6.1.5 Treaty education for Pakeha institutions

Initially, education about the Treaty by Project Waitangi and church-based educators was provided as a weekend activity for interested members of the public and for motivated community groups. Soon, the increasing number of government organisations requesting Treaty education required a more specialised focus on the resources and methods needed for working with organisations. The Waitangi Consultancy was formed in 1987: "to enable clients to identify the barriers to bi-cultural partnership that exist within their organisations, to equip them with the skills to find their own solutions, and to offer ongoing positive strategy and support" (Waitangi Consultancy Group, 1987). In a widely circulated submission developed by Project Waitangi, L'Estrange and Richardson (1987) presented their analysis of Pakeha in control of institutions, reluctant to relinquish power and offering token gestures while maintaining mono-cultural organisations. They critiqued the tendency of organisations to undertake "biculturalism training" in which "Maori are being handed the responsibility to change" (p. 179). They also pointed to lack of skill for genuine organisational change and declared the need for Pakeha in organisations to develop "new ways of working" (p. 180).

The analysis of historical, institutional and cultural racism used in the major institutional reviews undertaken in those years both drew upon and contributed to the work of antiracism and Treaty educators (Gerzon, 1988). In order to intervene in institutional racism, groups like NPR had initially experimented with the U.K. and U.S. models of Racism Awareness Training, using devices such as emotive role plays and a Maori Otis (MOTIS) to have Pakeha experience the humiliation of failing a mono-cultural intelligence test. These methods were rejected as confrontational and coercive, evoking personal guilt (da Silva, 1994b; James, 1996). As James (1996) explained, Treaty education ideally left such feelings of individual guilt aside to focus instead on "telling the truth" about Maori-Pakeha relationships and to examine collective belief systems and values. Methods used by colleagues were critiqued where these appeared to create immobilisation rather than empowering Pakeha to action for change (James, 1992). Local groups thus rejected the focus in the U.S. and U.K on personal racism, encouraging instead a collective responsibility for racism by Pakeha as a 'people'. This was a further significant coalescence of theorising and action relevant to the local situation – the strategic intervention of 'honouring the Treaty' came to be focused on Pakeha institutional culture as the site of change.

Although there were variations in emphasis, most groups of activist educators during these years used essentially the same approaches of facilitating a critical revisiting of New Zealand's colonial history, and encouraging a sense of collective responsibility among Pakeha for the structures and procedures of their institutions. The primary educational methods used were Freire's critical consciousness raising, including naming the current situation, a modified version of white-on-white institutional racism work, and the accountability methods developing with Maori activists.

A common format for Treaty workshops became the twin focus on a critical history of the Treaty and subsequent colonisation and an institutional racism analysis of organisational structures, policies and practices. Some organisations, began making policy, structural and procedural changes to implement the Treaty, particularly in the non-government sector. Herzog (2000) cites as early adopters of Treaty-based policy and practice among women's and community organisations – Playcentre, Rape Crisis, Women's Refuge and Literacy Aotearoa; the Anglican, Methodist and Catholic churches; Kindergarten and Te Kaiawhina Ahumahi Social Work Industry Training Organisation; among the professions – nurses, early childhood educators, social workers, librarians, planners and

lawyers; among government organisations – Health and Justice Departments; and a number of City Councils. Eventually, Treaty education became a topic in the training curricula for many professions such as social work, teaching, nursing, law and in the environmental and social sciences. Tensions in delivery within assessed professional training courses are discussed by Greenwood (2000), Herzog and Margaret (2000) and Richardson (2000) among others.

A minimum two-day workshop format was developed (ideally a multi-session course over an extended period). The first day usually dealt in depth with the participants' knowledge of the Treaty and colonisation. Coverage included the political context in which the Treaty was signed, discussion of the texts, and subsequent events in New Zealand history. Groups were invited to pool their knowledge of settler and indigenous history towards a timeline similar to that shown in Appendix 1. Typically, groups placed events valorised in the standard story on the timeline while often leaving the Maori side blank. They were then encouraged, by using resources and reading at hand, to add events on both sides, as well as including events on the settler side which are usually 'forgotten' in the standard story. Participants responses as described below attest to the significant emotional impact of making visible and assessing such a revisited mutual history. The learning from this section of the workshop was then applied to issues relevant to the contracting body, its policies and practices and their effects. At this point, the focus shifted from revisiting history to the institution and its culture (Way, 1988). On the second day (or in later sessions), participants were facilitated to analyse their own organisation's culture, structure, staffing and services in light of the guarantees of the Treaty. Where the Treaty was not used as the focus, an analysis of historical and institutional racism, as shown below, served the same purpose. The delivery of such a two-day workshop is described in Barron and Giddings (1989) as part of post-basic professional development for early childhood educators:

> Timeline of Aotearoa's/New Zealand's history compiled by course participants…*five sheets of paper …rotated between five small groups formed for this exercise.*
> Discussion of the colonisation process evident in the history of Aotearoa/New Zealand and how this process becomes engrained (sic) in a country's institutions – *in the large group.*
> Discussion of the invisibility of Maori history and the fact that it was not represented in the school history books that course participants had read…*in the big group.*
> Definition of racism and institutional racism by the facilitator… *discussed in one large group.*
> The facilitator outlines the institutional racism inherent in the education system….*participants discussed this in small groups.*

These small groups then discussed the implications …for the early childhood sector of the education system.
The larger group then discussed their collective and individual commitments to working in an antiracism way. (Kindergarten Senior Teachers Workshop Content and Process, in Barron & Giddings, 1989, p. 12)

To illustrate how the responses of participants in workshops became part of the theorising by antiracism/Treaty workers about how Pakeha change, I have selected from evaluations conducted by Barron and Giddings (1989) and Consedine (2001). Several months after they had attended the workshop described above in their respective sectors, three nurses and three early childhood teachers reported feeling "apprehensive" before the workshop, as they feared that their values and beliefs would probably be challenged: "I didn't know what to expect so I blocked off till the workshop started" and "I felt threatened and on guard" (Barron & Giddings, p. 15). The emotional level remained high as attendees noted their responses to here-to-fore unknown information about their world. An attendee noted that the historical information presented and their ignorance of it "stirred up a lot of feelings" (p. 22) while another explained: "The historical events gave credence to the emotional response that I feel now, about the injustices of the system that has kept the Maori race at a low ebb" (p. 18). Indeed, all the women in Barron and Giddings' group commented that they knew very little of Maori and Pakeha early history, and many linked this realisation with strong emotional responses: "I discovered how little I know and I was angry about this" while another said she was appalled at her "ignorance, in fact ashamed of it really" (p. 18).

The workshop also brought Pakeha culture into critical focus for many participants: "We are a dominating culture all the time, and repressing the other cultures, not just Maori. I would like to see more understanding" (p. 22). Barron and Giddings (1989) considered that "the affirming and claiming of cultural identity [at the beginning of the workshop] appeared to be a critical part of the process of the workshop for the six women we interviewed" and report one participant's comment: "I would have been shattered …but with my own culture strengthened I felt I could cope…better" (p. 16).

Participants in Barron and Giddings' (1989) study agreed that the workshop "had a profound effect" with one commenting that: "It was more than just evangelising, it was not that at all…I found it spine tingling in that it was so revealing" (p. 29). Several came to a critical understanding of the impact of a colonial standard story: "It was useful to have a reminder that we don't always look at the other's history;

that we always have British history thrust in front of us" (p. 18). As a result, attendees commonly felt emotionally drained: "We all went home quite exhausted, because it is an emotional thing, because you are all the time inwardly digesting stuff" (p. 21). Over time, attendees were able to consider the impact of this new information:

> There just seemed to be an overall suppression of Maoridom right
> from the Treaty, as though we had signed it with the Maoris and
> that would keep them quiet and get on with our way…It was
> Pakehas that made the decision…It was things like that that I found
> hurtful. (Barron & Giddings, 1989, p. 19)

Twelve years later Consedine and Consedine (2001) published a selection of responses to Treaty workshops held with a variety of organisations. Validating the liberatory consciousness raising method used by the Treaty educators, a staff developer reported: "What I had vaguely felt to be unjust I now knew to be real. Although shocked, I felt a sense of relief at knowing the truth and a real challenge to do more in future" (p. 192). A Director General of a government ministry commented on his staff learning about:

> …the injustices inflicted upon Maori by the government of New Zealand…The
> realisation that their knowledge of the true situation has been so sketchy tends to
> make people suddenly more open to viewing things in a different way, and
> receptive to the idea that their presumptions of the equality of the treatment of
> Maori and non-Maori have been all wrong. (Consedine & Consedine, 2001, p.
> 190).

Again, the emotional responses to conscientising learning were linked by both participants and educators. The retention of a racism and oppression analysis allowed educators to make links between participants' emotional responses to workshops and Pakeha structural dominance in a way that would not have been possible had 'learning about the Treaty' been considered a form of 'neutral' historical, constitutional or civic education. Bob Scott, then Director of the Programme on Racism, explained in an editorial how educators theorised the emotional responses:

> Any workshop on racism with Pakeha people is bound to bring participants slap
> up against the realities of New Zealand society - realities we have often ignored
> or which have been hidden from us. That is what people find painful and want to
> reject. We are not used to seeing the issue drawn in its stark, dramatic lines,
> without escape from the realities, and we seldom have to, because we are the
> dominant group in this society. (Scott, 1986b, p. 1).

As interpreted locally, liberatory theory of conscientisation also insisted that an oppressor group needed to begin by "naming and revealing the situation" through taking "an honest look as the present situation, the gaps, the statistics and what Bob Scott called 'hearing the cries of pain'" (Nairn, 2001, p. 204).

Although initial theorising about Treaty education for Pakeha was focused on feelings and emotional responses, issues of strategy, tactics, actions and implications became more salient as Treaty education was more widely undertaken. As institutional workshops gathered momentum, there was a greater focus on making organisational changes. A ministerial director considered that the closing exercise on 'where to from here', "encourages people to think about their own organisation and how they would want it to react….helps build a sense of involvement at a time when many of the participants are already excited by their sense of discovery and their desire to be proactive in new ways" (Bruce Ross, Director General, Ministry of Agriculture, in Consedine & Consedine, 2001, p. 191). A general manager described the impact of Treaty education on a health organisation's managers: "… the confidence gained and comfort with new experiences created its own momentum. This was exemplified by our visit to a marae to engage in dialogue with Maori to begin to better understand their health needs. The Treaty workshop process has sent Southern Cross on a voyage of discovery" (Consedine & Consedine, 2001, p. 190).

As an example of the extended interventions encouraged by Treaty/antiracism educators and trainers in institutional settings, Way (1988) recommends "power sharing" and "self-determination" for Maori within the institution, and "Maori participation in all decision-making" (p. 242). The site of such changes ranged from institution-wide planning and restructuring by senior management, resource allocations, job descriptions and professional development objectives directed by middle management to the professional skill levels and daily decisions about service delivery of practitioners.

6.1.6. Co-intentional relationships with Maori

To augment the five snapshots of theory development above, I now consider the ongoing 'soundtrack' of how Pakeha activists related to each other and to Maori undertaking change. Both collectivity among Pakeha and co-intentionality with Maori became significant strategies in building praxis for Treaty activists and educators, but such ongoing strategic understandings are seldom articulated in written records.

For instance, in early challenges from Maori activists, Pakeha were told how difficult and destructive their individualism was when working in coalition. The message conveyed by Maori activists was that Pakeha needed to become

conscious of the ways in which they operated as a cultural collective, so as not to exhaust, manipulate, or sabotage Maori energies. In response, ACORD members reported that they made collectivity a conscious project (personal communication, M. and R. Nairn, 2005). Developing uniquely in other parts of the country in response to local dialogues, this resolve helped to develop an ethic for Pakeha activists of working collectively to develop analysis and actions, and then 'speaking with one voice' when dealing with Maori. The Pakeha women and small numbers of men in the antiracism/Treaty movement were guided by feminist praxis for organising collective action, informed by values of accountability and emotionality (Nairn, 1989). The Pakeha in New Perspectives on Race, for instance, resolved on a "principle of acting collectively for support, to keep each other honest, to guard against 'stars', and individual lack of accountability, and in recognition that the end of the process was empowerment [of Pakeha]… to make changes" (Da Silva, 1994b, p. 49).

Another seldom-recorded area of cognitive praxis among activist educators was the relationship between Maori and Pakeha activists. Activists and educators followed the liberation theory notion of "co-intentional processes of education and action" (Nairn, 1990, p. 202) within the decolonisation agenda shaped by the Maori, Pakeha and Pacific dialogue up to that point. Following an ethic that "action by members of the oppressor group should be consultative" (p. 202) meant that activists and educators adopted various processes of consultation with, and accountability to, Maori. For instance, Project Waitangi Otepoti disseminated in their region a rationale for the principle of accountability in Treaty work practice:

> ACCOUNTABILITY: Because our actions against racism have consequences for Maori people, we must be accountable to them.
> We seek to work in consultations with Te Whanau A Matariki [local Maori group].
> Sometimes we may need to consult with other Maori groups affected by our action. This will be arranged through our consultants.
> We take responsibility for initiating action and their consequences, but undertake to inform our consultants well before the time we take any action. Decisions will be made through discussion. (Project Waitangi *Newsletter*, 1987, August).

As Mitzi. Nairn noted in reflection, once a Pakeha activist group began working closely in a consultative relationship with a Maori group, they tended to take account of the consultants' advice and to appreciate their visions for the future (personal communication, 2005). Similarly, educators felt committed to ensure that workshop participants were presented with a view of the Treaty and

colonisation that enabled rather than undermined Maori aspirations. Such commitment and accountability was often practised in the following ways:

1) *Consulting with Maori within a sector or organisation prior to undertaking educational work there.* Maori staff often gave guidance about issues of concern for them, helped the educators strategise about desirable outcomes, and sometimes chose to act as monitors and caucus leaders within a workshop.

2) *Building relationships with an independent Maori group or individuals who acted as funded monitors to the delivery of antiracism and Treaty education.* These were usually groups who were themselves involved in activism and education. The Maori monitoring group were invited to attend antiracism/Treaty education aimed at Pakeha, and to co-facilitate where they deemed fit. They ensured that a Maori perspective on the Treaty and colonisation was observed, and led separate caucuses for Maori participants when they deemed necessary. For instance, the differing emotional responses for Maori and non-Maori participants evoked by a timeline of colonial legislation often required work in separate caucuses, as did the early phases of strategic planning for change in an organisation.

6.2 Growing edges in Pakeha theorising

In the 1990s many aspects of the cognitive praxis of antiracism and Treaty work were elaborated. I have made a brief selection of those areas relevant to the present research studies. Today, these same areas might well be described as distinct discourses deserving of further study, such as that undertaken by Tuffin et al (2004) about Pakeha discourses of sovereignty and tino rangatiratanga. Of interest in a genealogical sense is how the counter-hegemonic constructions of the 1970s and 1980s have been reinforced, challenged or extended in subsequent decades.

These growing edges of theorising Pakeha change overlapped and reinforced each other, as well as interacting with related counter-hegemonic discourses, such as cultural safety in nursing, mana Maori and constitutional change. The new theorising also reacted to hegemonic discourses. For instance, Hoult (2000) observed that "Project Waitangi's rhetoric was characterised by [a] focus on Pakeha, and Pakeha commitments and responsibilities, as opposed to those of the

Crown" (p. 108). She follows Mitzi Nairn (cited in Sharp, 1990, p. 102) in suggesting that the emphasis seemed to be on thinking of Pakeha as 'a people' who were represented in the signing of the Treaty by Captain Hobson, thereby countering both public opinion and government discourse, that positioned the Treaty as having little to do with Pakeha individuals.

- *Cultural racism and personal prejudice*

Issues of cultural racism had been dealt with in several ways within antiracism/Treaty education. For instance, workshop exercises and resources were developed to encourage awareness of Pakeha culture and critique its impact on other cultures (L'Estrange & Richardson, 1987). As described in the words of Treaty educators in a formal report made at Waitangi in 1997:

> A related aspect of our education work is the journey to find and create a genuine Pakeha cultural identity…Hone Kaa was on the line when he said that it is good for Pakeha to know who we are, but it is also good that we know HOW we are what we are, and HOW POWERFULLY we are what we are. (Network Waitangi, 1997, p. 14).

The difficulty of making changes to (mono-) cultural institutions became clearer as efforts to restructure organisations got underway. Even with significant organisational change in some sectors, cultural and personal racism were tenacious, and required further theorising. McNamara (2001) explained: "There was a slow realisation that to view Pakeha culture as neutral was to deny the power of any negative effects this dominant culture might have on Maori and other cultural groups" (p. 191). In 1992, members of Network Waitangi Taranaki challenged the emphasis on institutional racism in Pakeha Treaty education. They suggested that the strategic focus on "faceless institutions" had denied people the opportunity to challenge personal prejudices "as an essential part of how colonisation works and maintains itself" (Network Waitangi Taranaki, 1992, p. 2). They challenged the Treaty education movement for "looking at this the wrong way round" (p. 2) and went on to theorise the link between prejudice and longstanding cultural racism, describing how dominant group members can draw on cultural resources such as prejudices to maintain the status quo. They argued for putting prejudices into a political framework so that Pakeha could see that the power of individually-held prejudices "comes from the way they reinforce personally the political and economic oppression of a group" (p. 2). They proposed that such a strategy would allow people to move past the guilt and defensiveness that usually went with looking at personal prejudice. They thereby challenged Treaty educators' earlier rejection of personal prejudice as a useful

construction of local racial oppression, and demonstrated how within the cognitive praxis of a social movement, earlier constructions may be revisited and critiqued as new reflections are made.

L'Estrange came to a deeper understanding of how cultural racism may create conditions for what I would term a form of 'constitutional racism'. Arguing against a Pakeha-centred multicultural future for Aotearoa, she saw biculturalism as allowing a more negotiated vision of the future. However, she was acutely aware of how her cultural assumptions influenced her vision:

> To talk about biculturalism is to suggest a future…but I do not want to write a blueprint. The Pakeha part of me that requires documentation, a pattern, a marked out strategy before I will move perpetuates the superior assumption that I should have everything my own way…I will take it step by cautious step. (L'Estrange, 1987, p. 25)

Her reluctance to create "a blueprint" for the future seemed to me an attempt to avoid 'constitutional racism', since models of the future could themselves be manipulated, and could serve to reinforce Pakeha control.

- *Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its terms - tino rangatiratanga and kawanatanga*

Along with Maori groups such as Waitangi Action Committee, Project Waitangi had initially accepted as unequivocal the cession of sovereignty by Maori declared in the English text (e.g. L'Estrange & Richardson, 1987) and had argued for Pakeha action to honour the protections afforded in the second article. However, as Pakeha activists and educators became more familiar with Maori views on the Treaty, and as they drew upon contemporary scholarship, Treaty jurisprudence and debates, they developed their understanding of both texts, and were able to theorise their preference for te Tiriti, as shown in later protocols and ethics statements (Network Waitangi, 2001). As they came to appreciate the issues of historical interpretation involved, they began to use various devices in workshops to legitimate the Maori text, such as arguing for its pre-eminence as the document under discussion by Maori during 1840, the number of signatures, the contra proferentum (against the proffering party) principle in international law, and the link with terminology from the earlier Declaration of Independence.

In publicising a "baseline" commitment for all their subgroups, the regional network Otepoti Project Waitangi were explicit in their focus on te Tiriti and the translations of its terminology:

> We recognise honouring of Te Tiriti O Waitangi by Pakeha as essential for a just relationship between Maori and Pakeha.
> Provisions of Te Tiriti, for example the guarantee of the fullness of control by Maori over their lands, their villages and all the things they value highly, have not been honoured by Pakeha.
> We believe that Pakeha must take responsibility today for ensuring that the consequences of past injustices are corrected and Te Tiriti is honoured.
> This includes Pakeha acceptance of Maori self-determination as guaranteed in Clause 2. (Project Waitangi *Newsletter*, August, 1987)

By focusing on te Tiriti and its guarantee of Maori retaining te tino rangatiratanga, activists and educators were following the commitment that the history of the treaty be taught "from a Maori perspective" (Waitangi Action Committee, 1984). They were also developing a stronger theoretical basis for the stated aim of Project Waitangi to "recognise Maori as tangata whenua …in the Maori sense" (Project Waitangi Resource Kits, 1986-7).

Increasing familiarity with terms used in the Maori text, such as 'Pakeha', 'kawanatanga' and 'tino rangatiratanga', and the history of these terms also helped turn attention upon the Treaty as an agreement about immigration between two sovereign nations. Te Tiriti legitimated Pakeha settlement and subsequent migration by other non-indigenous settlers, and could thus be considered our 'first immigration document'. Following this theorising, some Pakeha and other tauiwi have described themselves as 'tangata tiriti' (following Justice Durie), settled here under the agreements of te Tiriti.

- *Constitutional relationship*

Eventually, the focus on Maori political sovereignty in te Tiriti encouraged a departure from another stated aim of Project Waitangi – away from biculturalism and multiculturalism towards the relationship between kawanatanga and tino rangatiratanga. Having an adequately grounded basis for this shift proved important as discourse in government institutions began to erode terms around biculturalism and partnership, using 'bicultural relationship' and 'Treaty partnership' to justify further denial of Maori interests. Such co-options of their discourse as rhetoric stimulated Pakeha antiracism/Treaty workers to begin emphasising the bilateral and power-sharing (as opposed to bicultural) nature of the Treaty agreement. They also settled on using the term 'relationship' between two parties or 'Treaty-based relationship' to avoid further co-option of terms. Familiarity with the Treaty texts has allowed more theorising of the future constitutional relationship envisaged by the rangatira who signed, and has led to explicit consideration of constitutional change to the current state arrangements.

During the 1990s, the notion of Pakeha committing themselves to 'honourable kawanatanga' in relationship to tino rangatiratanga as a constitutional option was developed in a range of actions. A Kawanatanga Register was established for Pakeha who declined to vote in the 1993 elections to sign (Kenrick, 1991; Network Waitangi, 1993). The Kawanatanga Network based in the Waikato/Bay of Plenty region called a number of national gatherings to develop a Pakeha discussion on a te Tiriti-based constitution (Kawanatanga Network, 1996). Their work suggested that a Tiriti-based relationship with tangata whenua would require Pakeha/Tauiwi to find ways of being which will essentially transform the Pakeha/Tauiwi system and sense of self. Their key theorist, Kirton (1997) suggested that Pakeha prepare themselves for negotiating a bi-lateral constitution, and re-constructed national paradigms by working towards cultural change in their deepest values, and making changes to their "collective way of being". He saw, as did the members of Network Waitangi Taranaki, that changing our institutional outcomes was not enough, and that another step awaited:

> We face making changes to our institutions and to our collective ways of being in that order. This is not about us being personally less monocultural, or more 'culturally sensitive'… it is about ourselves constructing and using collective discourse of relationships and 'ways of being' that generally are unlike Pakeha/Tauiwi today use in public arenas. At the same time, we will develop new kinds of interaction with – but not dependency upon – tangata whenua.(Kirton, 1997, p. 81).

I interpreted this stage of theorising, which continues into the present, as addressing the connections between cultural and constitutional racism.

By 1997, Network Waitangi had spent two years at national gatherings agreeing on resolutions for a report to the UN Treaty Rapporteur, and presented these at Waitangi. In making their report, they effectively summarise the strategic focus of the Treaty movement as it had developed by the late 1990s. A press release summarises their position:

> A commitment to Treaty of Waitangi-based constitutional change was endorsed at the weekend by a national conference in Wellington of Pakeha involved in treaty education and related issues…such a constitution would fully recognise the position of Maori as Tangata Whenua, and non-Maori as Tangata Tiriti. The practical effect of such a move could mean that national decisions were made on an equitable, or consensus, basis between the Treaty partners…Many community organisations, including churches, had already made the structural change toward Treaty-based decision-making and were benefiting from the change in perspective. (Non-Maori Anti-Racism and Treaty Workers 8th Gathering. (1996 July).

It is notable in their theorising in the late 1990s that the bicultural relationship between Maori and Pakeha has been replaced with a focus on bilateral, or bi-polity constitutional relationships.

- *Corporate globalisation as continuing colonisation*

Finally, early connections between activists working on local colonial racism and the organisation for a Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific had helped theorise the links between colonisation, racism and the military and commercial interests in the Pacific (Waitangi Action Committee, 1985). In 1997, Network Waitangi described the second wave of colonisation by international capital as a continuation of the processes of colonisation. They observed that in response, "alliances being forged between various sectors of the broader progressive movement, and between Pakeha and Maori activists on the basis of a Tiriti analysis" were particularly germane to a critical approach to corporate globalisation: "we are aware of some Tauiwi reflecting and acting against the impact of global capitalism, who see implementing the Tiriti as the only hope for our future…" (Network Waitangi, 1997, p. 14). They were encouraged that some Pakeha were "actively linking our destinies to the self-determination of you who are most firmly rooted in this land" (p. 16).

Young Pakeha/tauiwi people active in Peace Pacific formed the basis for a new network of activists theorising antiracism and Treaty work. Calling themselves *arc* (antiracism crew, also known as Aotearoa reality check), they have maintained the strategy of co-intentional work in relationship with Maori groups. Peace Pacific has worked in relationship with Tu Wai, and organised, for instance, a decolonisation hui at Waitangi in 2002 with Maori and Pakeha/tauiwi caucuses (Peace Pacific, 2001, 2002).

6.3 Treaty education praxis as counter-hegemonic discourse

This chapter has examined the development of theorising among Pakeha Treaty workers critical of the colonial relationship between Pakeha and Maori. Published accounts primarily acknowledge the leadership of the churches (e.g Sharp, 1990; Spoonley, 1988) and leave unrecorded the Project Waitangi educational campaign. My examination of previously unpublished literature has highlighted

the secularisation of the churches' analysis of injustice, and the localising of overseas theories of racism and colonisation.

The snapshots showed how theorising about the local situation developed in concert with strategising about how to change it. As Freire (1975) puts it: "Critical consciousness is brought about not through an intellectual effort alone, but through praxis – through the authentic union of action and reflection" (p. 48). In my interpretation, the significant theoretical and active steps undertaken by Pakeha could be summarised as follows:

1. Perceiving the injustice of the Maori position and attempting to help.
2. Listening to Maori challenges about racism, and searching for new theory to fit the local situation.
3. Beginning to use an institutional racism analysis to develop theory and strategy about Pakeha responsibility for the racism of New Zealand's institutions, and acting on this with antiracism education for Pakeha.
4. Listening to and beginning to appreciate the Maori utopian vision of the Treaty honoured.
5. Adopting the Maori vision of the Treaty honoured as a strategic goal to remedy institutional and cultural racism.
6. Undertaking nationwide education for Pakeha to revisit colonial history and their understanding of the Treaty.
7. Deepening theorising and practice as educators worked with communities and organisations to implement the guarantees of the Treaty agreement.
8. Committing eventually to the project of new constitutional relationships between tangata whenua and tangata tiriti, based on the implications of the kawanatanga and tino rangatiratanga clauses in the Maori text of te Tiriti o Waitangi.

Interaction with other social actors, and acting to change the local situation can be seen as key influences in theoretical development – the primary interventions of (i) undertaking critical education among Pakeha about colonisation and (ii) encouraging organisational change to express a Treaty/Tiriti relationship between Maori and Pakeha set the scene for further new constructions of the Pakeha-Maori relationship, such as the focus on constitutional issues. The new critical constructions, for instance of settler legislation as breaching the Treaty, functioned to cast Maori anger and activism in a rational light, and emphasised the continuity between past and present protest by Maori. The new view of historical racism provoked a crisis for Pakeha activists, and invited a re-examination of the

Treaty, particularly of the Maori text. Indeed, using a conscientisation approach to Pakeha education helped Pakeha see themselves in a less rational light, as influenced by specific cultural views, and thereby introducing the hitherto unthinkable possibility that cultural views might undergo a willed change in a conscious way.

In light of the epistemology developed in Chapter 4, the Pakeha activist educator groups can be seen as sites for a developing 'cognitive praxis' of Treaty education, in Eyerman and Jamison's (1991) terms. Through attending to the Maori view that honouring the Treaty of Waitangi was a viable vision, Pakeha activists adopted the strategy of honouring the Treaty of Waitangi as a strategic remedy for colonial racism. The banner for the intellectual project of the Pakeha antiracism/Treaty movement could be 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty – a decolonisation strategy'.

My proposed steps for the development of Pakeha theorising about the Treaty can now be considered in the light of theory reviewed in Chapter 3, and in relation to the observations of other Pakeha Treaty workers. Nairn (1992) considers that the most significant influence on local theorising was "the thinking and methodology of Paulo Freire" (p. 1). She sees Freire's influence demonstrated by the following stages in local theory-building: a) revealing and naming the local situation, b) using proper theory, processes of education and leadership, c) agreeing on a strategy of co-intentional work between Maori and Pakeha, because different of needs in both education and action, d) establishing foundations for indigenising liberation theory – analysis and practice coalescing around the Treaty of Waitangi, but remaining distinguishably an analysis of institutional racism in a liberation paradigm, and finally, e) indigenising of overseas theory on liberation. In my view, her observation that we were "indigenising overseas theory on liberation" (M.Nairn, personal communication, 2005) is an apt description for the way in which Maori, Pakeha and Pacific activists and theorists searched for constructions that provided them with an adequate response to the local situation.

The actions and interactions undertaken by Pakeha activist-educators can be seen as examples of Freire's 'dialogue' to 'conscientise' a situation, and eventually to construct a 'project' for Pakeha to honour the Treaty. The Pakeha project of 'honouring the Treaty' developed within a context of continuous Maori effort to assert te tino rangatiratanga, and in dialogue with Maori and Pacific theorists, and through consultation and reflections on local efforts at change. In their accounts of developing Pakeha theorising, Da Silva (1994a), Hoult (2000) and McNamara

(2001) all point to distinct streams of local theorising and action influencing each other over the past 30 years. In my view, there were three streams of counter-hegemonic theorising about the colonial Maori-Pakeha relationship which 'spoke' to each other, each stream produced in its own site of social actors actively constructing a new social reality:

(i)   Maori theorising and assertions of tino rangatiratanga,

(ii)   Pakeha/tauiwi education about racism, colonisation and the Treaty, and

(iii)   organisations making changes to implement the Treaty.

There was nothing inevitable about any of the new constructions developed. There were substantial influences and pressures from overseas and domestically to use a 'prejudice-causes-racism' analysis, and to adopt either a human rights or multiculturalism approach to inform strategy. Organisations like the Race Relations Office and Human Rights Commission have followed other Western democracies in using a human rights discourse, although they have undertaken to develop a human rights approach compatible with the Treaty (Human Rights Commission, 2004-5). But the early approach of theorising that Pakeha needed to help Maori to 'catch up' proved not to be an alternative acceptable to the Maori side. Indeed, it was constructed through an assimilationist discourse that persists in many forms of social policy in contemporary New Zealand, such as the *Closing the Gaps* policy. In contrast, the U.S. approach to institutional racism helped Pakeha to see themselves as responsible for the racist outcomes of their institutions, thereby denying the victim-blaming achieved by dominant colonial discourses. However, unlike the interventions in the U.S and U.K, which reverted to a theoretical basis of prejudice-causes-racism, the local theorising maintained a consistency between the way that racism is theorised and the sites of intervention. This can be attributed to the dialogue with Maori and Pacific theorists and their analysis of colonisation, so that Pakeha came to view racism as having its most devastating impact on indigenous peoples in its cultural and institutional forms rather than through personal prejudice.

Thus the target for change became the impersonal racism enacted by institutional policies and practices, and the shared cultural racism underpinning these constructions. In this, the local theorising endorsed more critical positions on racism – such as Gurnah's (1984) approach to "racism as a relationship" and Essed's (1990) "everyday racism" in the operation of routine institutions. The U.S. and U.K. format of small-group workshops for staff in organisations was found to be useful to encourage a collective response by Pakeha staff. The small-group format also allowed facilitators and participants to provide support for the

psychological and emotional responses experienced by members of a culturally dominant group to challenging or unwelcome information.

The local theorising endorsed and extended Curle's (1971) strategies for peace-making in unpeaceful relationships. Maori actions can be seen as the moral confrontation and symbolic protest required to stimulate awareness for a dominating group of conflict in the relationship. Curle's thesis that the oppressed group "must change them to a point where they reject their own past and are prepared to take an equal part in the future" (p. 23) was here demonstrated by some Pakeha adopting a critical view of colonial history and a commitment to a Treaty-based future. While Maori groups provided the moral confrontation, the education which Curle considered necessary to increase the information available to a dominating group was here undertaken by Pakeha educating each other.

In contrast to the pessimism expressed by the early theorists of decolonisation about the motivations and abilities of the colonialist, the local antiracism and Treaty activists were highly motivated to seek change. Their theorising was focused towards creating self-critical colonisers, and there was no sense of Memmi's (1965) impasse about being in "an impossible historical situation" and looking for a passage 'home'. The groups who delivered antiracism and Treaty education workshops can be seen as sites of an idealistic ethic of "willed action", in Park's (1993) terms, towards a Treaty- based relationship with Maori. Unlike early decolonisation theory, the local theorising placed the dominant group firmly on the stage as actors consciously involved in their own change processes, and as potent agents for change to the oppressive colonial relationship. In line with Linda Smith's (1999) later conception of decolonisation as the "bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic, and psychological divesting of colonial power", these Pakeha were theorising precisely such a process – of dismantling the colonial relationship in situ. Furthermore, they placed responsibility for divesting colonial power squarely on their own coloniser group. By focusing on change to the culture and institutions of the colonial group, the Treaty education project searched for other ways to be Pakeha than as Memmi's colonialists.

The types of praxis developed within Marxism and feminism were validated in the local antiracism/Treaty movement praxis. Feminist and Marxist critical analyses of a society's power structures, the tradition of praxis as consciously idealistic and the Marxist thesis of social actors as active in creating history, were all used here by the antiracism/Treaty movement. The co-operative work between Maori and Pakeha groups in analysing the current social order had attuned Pakeha antiracism

workers to the macro, structural level of how New Zealand society is organised. Treaty education work with Pakeha in organisations could certainly be deemed an ethical revolutionary praxis. The local praxis, carried largely by feminist women, followed the familiar (for us) methods of undertaking critical analysis of structural oppression, and relying on an everywoman's consciousness raising approach. The local theorising and praxis used the notion of 'the personal is political' in its original sense, without dropping into the tendency to reduce the political to the personal, or individualised level (hooks, 1994). The Treaty movement accepted, as did the women's liberation movement, that one-by-one transformation was slow, but continually adaptive and allowed each person to influence the sphere in which they operated.

The local theorising of change processes did not proceed in the directions suggested by social and community psychologists, whereby individual Pakeha might work to empower Maori groups (although individual Pakeha were welcomed as resource people within Maori projects of decolonisation). Maori discouragement of an assimilationist approach helped to turn concerned Pakeha toward counter-hegemonic constructions of the situation, such as focusing on "depowerment" (Huygens, 1997) of the Pakeha institutional controls on Maori. The reduction in Pakeha power was intended in Linda Smith's (1999) sense of divesting colonial linguistic, bureaucratic and psychological powers, particularly in institutional settings. The present growing edge of theorising about constitutional change in the relationship between Maori and Pakeha polities is a logical long-term outcome of the focus on depowering Pakeha institutional power.

The enterprise of Treaty work adopted a critical perspective by identifying and challenging the assumptions that underlie the standard story of New Zealand society. The link in the Treaty between coloniser and indigenous people and the notion of indigenous people consenting to sharing their land for settlement, on terms negotiated with them, was a profound alternative to a dominant Eurocentric view of the paternalistic and exploitative relationship between coloniser and indigenous peoples. From the outset, Treaty education was intended to encourage a critical view of the impact of colonisation and racism, and was designed to lead into action to implement the Treaty's agreements in institutional settings.

These insights about how the 'project' developed for Pakeha to 'honour the Treaty' set the scene for the following two studies – examining both contemporary theorising about Pakeha change and contemporary organisational discourse about honouring the Treaty.

CHAPTER 7.0 STUDY 2
AN INNOVATIVE METHOD

> We are on an emerging journey together and
> welcome whoever comes.
>
> <div align="right">Catriona Budge in Huygens, 2004, p. 91</div>

In Study 1 *Developing Treaty theorising*, I reviewed how early theorising and practice by antiracism/Treaty workers created new social constructions of the Maori Pakeha relationship. Their strategic work also created a connected network of activist Treaty and decolonisation educators who have continued to theorise a new relationship between Maori and Pakeha. In Study 2 *Contemporary Pakeha theorising*, these educators used an innovative process to share with me and each other their observations and reflections about how Pakeha change in response to the Treaty. In this chapter, I describe and reflect on the methods we used in Study 2. In the next chapter, I summarise and interpret our theorising together.

In Chapter 4 *Methodologies for Transformative Action*, I argued for the legitimacy of interactive knowledge, co-constructed among researcher and participants, "enabling new forms of linguistic reality to emerge" (Gergen & Gergen, 1991, p. 108). I also explained how participatory action inquiry methods support a dialogue between the researcher and activist educators to co-theorise processes of Pakeha change. I was unavoidably and happily an 'insider' among Pakeha Treaty educators, accountable to my colleagues and the shared ethics and traditions of the Treaty movement described in Chapter 5 *Scholar in a Social Movement*. As I moved into a position as researcher of our ongoing praxis, I became an "outsider within" (Collins, 1986) in my community of peers. This pre-existing familiarity allowed us to design an innovative collaborative method for co-constructing theory, or 'co-theorising'.

7.1 Planning for appropriate methods

I approached the co-theorising of Pakeha change with my peer Treaty educators with the plan of facilitating and recording conventional focus groups. However, in keeping with my 'praxis explicator' intent, I sought a method that would:

- rely upon the ethics and culture of the Treaty movement
- contribute to the cycle of action-reflection or praxis of Treaty educators and activists
- prompt Treaty educators to articulate their praxis to a peer researcher
- create records that could be disseminated among participants and the wider Treaty movement

These intentions led me toward a number of choices:

To work with existing groups – I decided to meet with Treaty educators in their local groupings. The existing groups were the natural sites of collective praxis for Treaty workers. These groups had formed to theorise and carry out actions together over many decades, with unique local dynamics in their theorising, including each group's relationship with tangata whenua in their area. I saw myself as joining them in one reflective cycle among many in the lifetime of each group, and decided to visit each group in their locality.

The researcher to act as both guest and host – Visiting each group meant that I would be their guest. However, the research meetings were my initiative and at my request, so I carried out some 'host' functions, such as serving a hot meal before meetings, and donating a gift.

To be a flexible and responsive facilitator – I resolved to follow our tradition of flexible meeting process in which a range of goals could be negotiated and met during a gathering. This meant that I needed to be open to changing the process midway to make it more inclusive or responsive to participants' requests.

To use a familiar recording method - Rather than arriving with a tape recorder, and later asking people to check written transcripts, I resolved to use our familiar method for recording collective knowledge – taking written notes of brainstorming sessions and circulating the record, including sketches created on a white board or sheets of paper.

To use meeting minutes as data - My data-gathering process would be to create meeting minutes, and then to circulate these for checking, so that each meeting's record was an open, approved record by the group concerned. I recorded as much direct speech as possible, but edited to remove repetition and circularity. Because I was not taping or transcribing verbatim speech, the authenticity of my data was reliant on careful checking by each group, and needed to be easy to read for participants.

To use visual imagery – A powerful communication tool used by Treaty educators in meetings and workshops were simple sketches of circles and houses to depict cultural groups and processes. Seeing visual imagery as a discursive resource important to our speech community, I wanted to encourage participants to use this familiar medium. Beyond this, I wanted participants to have available a medium for constructing new meanings, particularly those falling outside hegemonic discourses. I looked for means of expression that would encourage us beyond consciously held metaphors, and in fact beyond language. Most critical approaches rely upon spoken and written language as the primary mediator of social constructions, and as the primary means for their investigation. However, some notable contemporary philosophers have argued against the primacy of the word in Western scholarship (Irigaray, 2002). I was concerned not to discount emotion and action as types of data about social change, since it is not clear whether social change is a conceptual process, an emotional process, a change in behaviour, or a combination of all three (Campbell, 2000; Gergen, 1994). I needed media that would encourage communication of implicit as well as explicit theorising. Orland Barak (2002) cites Gudmundsdottir's metaphor of the iceberg to suggest that as researchers we tend to resort to readily available narrative structures, leading us to make explicit interpretations (the tip of the iceberg) and to cast out implicit interpretations (the biggest part of the iceberg that remains untold). In short, I needed a medium for the emotional, the creative and the seldom-expressed about processes of change. I saw in visual (and action) imagery the potential for expressing such implicit theorising.

Graphic images contain a large amount of information, and may bring to the awareness of the speaker allusions, dualisms and continua (such as higher/lower, lighter/darker, opening up/narrowing down) in a way that speech might not. To my mind, visual imagery had the potential for expressing alternative constructions of social reality, normally limited by dominant linguistic discourse patterns. Gergen (1994) maintains that visual metaphors allow the theorist to create "a novel visualisation that may unify a range of diverse concepts" (p. 143). He sees

much to be gained by a compelling metaphor since it lends itself to creative elaboration on the part of the recipient. He makes the point that the metaphor does not rely so much on concept manipulation as on "*visual substitution*" (his emphasis, p. 144).

Thus I saw potential in visual media to create novel metaphors for theorising changing by a dominant group. In his work with illiterate farmers, Freire (1996) used sketches and photographs to stimulate his participants to "decode" (p. 86), or to theorise, the complexities of their concrete reality. Similarly, Pakeha often commented many years later on the sketches used in Treaty education workshops, recalling them, in their apparent simplicity and emotional force, as life-changing. Gergen (1994) points to the use of visual metaphors in "unsettling common ways of thinking within the society, that is, to their generative capacity" (p. 4). Thus an important feature of visual media for theorising novel concepts was likely to be their utility in unsettling hegemony.

In summary, co-theorising with my peers required recording methods that would encourage explicit and implicit theorising, would allow approval of shared theorising by a whole group and would encourage interaction about ideas within and between groups. The combined use of meeting minutes and visual imagery coalesced eventually, by following participant feedback, into an innovative and highly effective method for our co-theorising.

7.1.1 Consents and acknowledgements of authorship

In considering whether there are advantages to theorising as an insider in socially innovative areas, Ritchie and Rigano (2001) cite Guba and Lincoln's (1999) contention that the interactivity in constructivist research "makes it possible for the human instrument to achieve maximum responsiveness, adaptability and insight" (p. 142). Thus, retaining my 'insider' accountability to the participants' and my ethics and values in our shared social world was in keeping with a constructivist framework, in which the participant's values are included. However, Guba and Lincoln (1994) make the point that the close personal interactions required by this methodology may produce special and "sticky" (p. 115) problems of confidentiality and anonymity. A pertinent example is the Western academic convention, often followed in critical inquiry, of ensuring anonymity to participants and confidentiality about their contributions. On both counts, the ethics of Treaty work and participatory action research pointed in a different direction. As the co-theorising among Treaty educator groups

progressed, it became clear that a group's authorship was a key piece of information about the history and genesis of that particular theorising about Pakeha change.

Ritchie and Rigano (2001) acknowledge that shifting interests can shift the approvals needed from participants and conclude that post-modern researchers should engage in ongoing dialogue and plan for periodic re-affirmations of consent with their participants. The co-theorising method reported here shows how as I responded to developments in the research process, particularly to requests to make each group's material available to other groups, I adjusted the process and renegotiated consents several times. Indeed, I perceived that it was the responsiveness demonstrated through these re-negotiations that allowed my acceptance as an 'outsider within' to grow in trustworthiness as the research progressed.

As reported below, I renegotiated consents about identifying authorship several times with participants, so that their identified work could be made available to other participants. Eventually, the enthusiasm of non-research participants about accessing our theorising required asking for further permissions to publish the written and video records for a much wider audience of people supportive of the Treaty.

7.2 Participants and process

7.2.1 Treaty educator groups and networks

Participants were 10 groups of activist educators who were members or associates of the national organisation for tauiwi Treaty workers, Network Waitangi Inc (see Appendix 2). All the groups involved were regular or occasional attendees at the annual anti-racism/Treaty workers gatherings for Pakeha/tauiwi. Most worked as invited educators with organisations and communities on Treaty, anti-racism and colonisation issues, as well as doing political work in support of tangata whenua, either within workplaces or in the broader public realm. Most identified as Pakeha and a small number named Maori, Samoan, Tongan, Antiguan and other cultural heritages. While most participants considered themselves antiracism/
Treaty educators, one group described themselves as decolonisation educators. Identifying as black tauiwi women, they had shifted their focus from educating

about the Treaty to working on decolonisation with settlers for whom New Zealand was not ancestral land.

All groups worked towards change among Pakeha as the dominant cultural group in this country, and many considered their target group to be Pakeha specifically. The decolonisation educators took this as a necessary component but worked with all non-indigenous New Zealanders to help them understand their history in global processes of migration and colonisation.

Among the groups participating in this study were two business partnerships, four community groups and three regional networks and, in one region, a number of individuals who occasionally worked together as Treaty educators, but who did not meet formally. Many of the groups had enjoyed lengthy histories of working together in their locality, often since the early 1980s, and had shared intensive periods of consensual development in theorising their activist and education work. The looser regional networks, on the other hand, comprised individuals and member groups who cooperated on projects and shared resources, but who had not necessarily attempted to gain group consensus on their various approaches to Treaty work in the past. About half of the groups had younger members who had joined in the past few years, and who were developing their antiracism and Treaty work. Most of these younger members were linked nationally by their involvement in *arc* (antiracism crew), a network with its own unique history of praxis. Several of the groups and networks had much larger email nets than the number of people who would typically attend a meeting. Two of the networks had not met face to face in over a year.

The meetings that were arranged for my research endeavour could be best described as special meetings of existing groups, or 'focus meetings'. These were attended by every current member of the smaller groups and the majority of members in the larger networks. Fifty educators participated in total, a similar number to a well-attended national gathering of antiracism and Treaty workers.

I had published in the *Network Waitangi Newsletter* (July 1999) the details of my peer mentoring group and our intended accountabilities to the wider movement of Treaty workers. A year before the field work was due to begin, I sought permission at the annual general meeting of Network Waitangi (November, 2001) to initiate research with groups in the network. There was general positive interest, and no conditions were set. In a research strategy developed at the *Walking the Talk Treaty Conference 2001*, a wider network of Treaty workers

were also made aware of my intention to research Pakeha Treaty work (Margaret, 2002, p. 236). When I contacted each local group in to request their participation, all groups agreed to proceed. The introductory packages sent out by post and electronic mail included formal consent forms (Appendix 3). At their initial meeting, each group appointed a representative member to sign on their behalf. Once the pilot process was complete, all groups agreed to:

a. Being identified as a group in research archives.
b. Being identified in meetings with other participants.
c. Being identified in published research reports.

Personal stories told during local meetings were kept anonymous in all records, and sensitive material of a personal nature was deleted from the national focus group record. As the interest of non-participant Treaty workers in the researched material became clear, I sought a further verbal consent from representatives of each group attending the 2004 Treaty conference that:

d. The national focus group record could be added to the published collection of records with individual speakers named.
e. The expanded edition of *How Pakeha Change in response to te Tiriti: collected focus group records, 2004* and the video *Carrying the Treaty in our Hearts* could be made available to the wider Treaty movement, and to interested educators, researchers and academics. This consent covers the appending of these publications to the thesis.

7.2.2 Piloting a process

The research process began in 2002 with two pilot meetings, in which I facilitated using my research questions (Appendix 4). Afterwards I asked for feedback from the groups about the process. In response to this and later feedback, the co-theorising process developed through two stages of evolution towards an innovative method that I came to call "cumulative theorising".

Providing a simple hot meal from food available at the local supermarket helped us all feel nurtured and generated the sense of a gathering of peers who had been building community together over many decades. As we put the meal together and later tidied it away we were able to revitalise our connections, update on absent friends, and hear about current issues. The focus meeting opened with welcomes and expressions of appreciation at being gathered for this purpose. As part of

personal introductions, I asked participants to share their considerations of themselves as reflective practitioners. This helped warm everyone up to a reflective focus, rather than to our more common interventionist or strategic focus.

I negotiated which of the focus questions (Appendix 4) the group wanted to focus on (some groups substantially rephrased them) and who would take handwritten notes (usually me). The group either initiated a round of individual responses to the selected questions, or proceeded with an open discussion.

After the first two pilot meetings with groups in Wellington and Whangarei, I reflected that the meeting minutes recording style seemed to be working as planned, and the attempts at making pictorial sketches were promising. However, when I met with the second group, they expressed strong interest in the work of their colleagues: "What did they say? How did they draw it?" I realised that there were a number of problems associated with my plan of moving around the country treating each focus meeting as an isolated event. I would be the bottleneck, the sole conduit and processor of information in such an interlinked and mutually interested system. I came to feel very uneasy at the privileging of the researcher's interpretations in this scenario. Being an insider does not automatically avoid the issues of imposing or importing strong and unshared assumptions. Lather (1991) warns against imposition and reification on the part of the researcher in praxis-oriented research: "in the name of emancipation, researchers impose meanings on situations rather than constructing meaning through negotiation with research participants" (p. 57, cited in Gatenby & Humphries, 2000). Furthermore, to occupy such a pivotal role as an individual, and to deny participants free access to each other's work, would not be in keeping with the culture of the movement. It was too anonymous – these participants had multiple historical and collegial links with each other, as well as being aware of unique local developments in their colleagues' approaches, which they were curious to hear more about. The conventional focus group format was neither transparent enough nor layered enough in time or place for these participants.

As I reflected in this way on the two pilot meetings, my supervisor and I were awarded a grant for research expenses, including travel, catering and accommodation. The increased resourcing meant that I could now have two meetings with each group – I could remain in each locality while I typed up the meeting record, and could return to the group for a second meeting. The extra meeting would allow the group to approve their written records, and, most

importantly, would allow me to pass on highlights of previous groups' work, and perhaps give each group the opportunity to integrate their work with that of others. So I now needed a medium that was portable, easy to display to successive groups in a variety of physical settings, and which could be changed or added to easily by a group. Giving practical expression to my desire to use visual media, my peer study group now contributed the idea of the 'felt board', a background of coloured wool felt to which other felt pieces stick easily. Shapes could be cut out, attached to the background, photographed, then shifted around or new shapes added in later sessions. Felt material would encourage flexibility during the creative period, was more durable than paper and could be carried around the country by air or car. I envisaged that a group would create a layered coloured image, and then the following group would debate, adjust, and shift the pieces to suit their views. At this stage, I bought large soft sheets of coloured felt, numerous pairs of scissors, velcro to assist with adhesion, and packed these into a suitcase. I also adjusted the consent form and renegotiated consents with the two pilot groups, now seeking permission to identify and display each group's work to subsequent groups. My letter to the pilot groups (Appendix 5) shows how my interpretation of the process was developing in response to their contributions. I suggested the term "cumulative theorising" for the new development.

7.2.3 Cumulative theorising in local meetings

Incorporating these innovations, our cumulative theorising settled into a pattern of two focus meetings with each group following the format shown in Appendix 4. The first meeting allowed groups to generate their own theorising independent of the other groups. This independence served to corroborate the trustworthiness of the common themes identified among the groups, and meant that participants were able to express their theorising in the area in which their group had particular experience and strength. In the second meeting, groups reflected on their first session, checked my edited record, then considered the visual imagery produced by previous groups and worked on their own imagery. With the coloured felt to hand, the visual theorising of other groups hanging on the wall and the freedom to create any imagery they might choose, some groups made large pathways, maps and dreamworlds, others acted out a sequence of stages or created a mobile, while yet another arranged the children's blocks around them in the living room into a graphic display. I had imagined that groups might make adjustments to each other's visual imagery, but in the short time available for explanations, and in respect of each other's authorship of the images, they generally chose to create new works. Only one group used the imagery of another group in the same city as

a basis for further elaboration, and two groups in another city met together in their second session to create a joint image. As with the initial sessions, I recorded any further discussion in note form, photographed the imagery and sent the written and visual record back to the group for approval. When I returned to the two pilot groups, a year had passed since their initial sessions. Rather than create further visual imagery, they chose, independently of each other, to reflect on the values and risks of theorising in the ways depicted by the other groups.

Evaluating the visual medium

The visual medium had many advantages. Firstly, the colourful, spatial nature of the visual and action imagery seemed to allow participants to express the full range and depth of what they wanted to say. The manner in which visual imagery communicates metaphors, and its quality of allowing fluid visual substitution seemed to give participants a particularly responsive vehicle for theorising the complex issues of Pakeha change. Since visual imagery invites multiple interpretations of a perceived metaphor, they felt stimulated to challenge, extend or innovate on the basis of previous group's work. In particular, the educators seemed not to focus on 'getting the (verbal) discourse right' – a legitimate enough concern when we were reflecting on praxis and strategy in national gatherings. Furthermore, the visual medium seemed to encourage those who otherwise may have spoken less in a verbal discussion to 'speak' with their imagery. In one group, a highly articulate male educator said very little in the second session, and his female colleague used the opportunity to create an abundance of visual imagery and to speak at length about her imagery. Such 'visual storytelling' power in those who may have remained silent in an exclusively verbal process enriched the theorising in unforseen ways.

Secondly, the visual nature of the imagery allowed me to present the accumulating theorising to each successive group in a much more energising way than had I handed out written records to read. The visual images seemed to stimulate a kind of cognition and recognition that was highly generative for theorising. Because visual imagery carries a lot of information, educators were able to 'recognise' the metaphors used by previous groups quickly. In the local meetings, hanging up the visual images in our meeting room served to jog my memory as continuity narrator to each new group. I felt that the colourful and continuous promptings of the visual images kept me closer to a group's interpretation than if I had merely re-read their account as a cue before the next meeting.

Finally, the encouragement to create a consensual visual record within each focus meeting enabled a form of collective storytelling. Since the visual imagery was a group product, without individual authors, it served as a particularly apt medium for collective theorising.

Movement praxis vs my research project

Several further tensions now arose to push the process to its second development. It quickly became evident that in the second focus meeting there was at most 15 minutes to spare for me to describe the work of previous focus groups. I found myself telling 'the story' by pointing to particular features in the accumulating visual imagery, passing on pithy quotes and briefly identifying areas where groups differed in their theorising of Pakeha change. Despite the new arrangements and portable visual records, I was still in a bottleneck position, with my interpretations still the sole verbal conduit between groups.

Secondly, a tension was growing between my commitment to resourcing a cycle of praxis in the Treaty movement and my research project. I began to make a distinction between the value of the accumulated theorising to our ongoing praxis, and the value of my interpretations of our work for my (time-limited) PhD study. As also voiced by participants, there are risks when individuals conduct academic projects reporting on collective work. I reflected very deeply about the interface between what was mine, as an individual scholar among peers, and what was ours collectively as a social movement. I took very seriously Elias's suggestion that when the praxis explicator communicates about action and practice, she writes "for the work of many others" (Elias, 1994, p. 304).

Conceiving of two pathways of theorising, a collective pathway and my individual pathway, helped me to clarify that the participating groups deserved access to each other's work independent of my process of interpretation. I concluded that the material generated by the Treaty educator groups had a similar status to any other 'explications of praxis' that we brainstormed during our gatherings with a facilitator and recorder. I felt that their own reflective work needed to be available to them regardless of whether they were interested in my interpretations and conclusions as a researcher. I wanted to weave my interpretive pathway into theirs, but also to be able to withdraw and write up my study, knowing that my colleagues had direct access to the body of work they had generated.

I resolved therefore to hold a national event to allow the participants to view and discuss each other's work for their own purposes, and to allow me to dialogue with them about my interpretations. In preparation for the national session, I bound together the written records and colour photos from all the local meetings into *How Pakeha change in response to te Tiriti: Focus group records (2003)* and sent copies to each group. This furnished groups throughout the country with a rich shared archive of their theorising and a resource for their educational practice. Attendees at the national meeting reported that they had read other groups' theorising with great interest. The decision to publish the focus group records was also very helpful for me as a researcher. The ability to reference publicly the work of each group has proved invaluable throughout this thesis.

7.2.4 Co-theorising at a national meeting

The cumulative theorising process culminated after 20 focus meetings over 18 months in a national display and discussion of the entire body of work held at Nga Kete Wananga marae at Manukau Institute of Technology, Manukau. A planned national conference for antiracism and Treaty workers allowed me to arrange two dedicated research sessions, and I was able to offer travel reimbursement to a representative of each group to attend. All groups thus sent at least one, and sometimes several members, to the final national meeting. Although formally covered by the general consent to allow their work to be shared with other participants, I sought explicit approval to display each group's visual imagery at the conference, and during the conference gained consent that non-participants attending the conference were welcome as observers at the display and discussion sessions, and that these sessions could be recorded on video.

I arranged each group's imagery in the marae dining room to form a colourful exhibition under the banner *Pakeha /Tauiwi respond to te Tiriti*. Representatives came forward to speak about their group's display, bringing to life their local group members, their locality and its issues, and their group's particular areas of elaboration in Treaty work. When group members stood in front of their imagery to "speak to it", they used the visual images to cue their explanations. Even where they had forgotten their earlier discussions, when presented with their own imagery again, they were able to provide a coherent and lively interpretation in a manner unlikely had we been using written records. We were spellbound as layer upon layer of our history, our connections with each other, our understandings about our practice and our dreams for the future unfolded.

The following day, I facilitated a national focus meeting which began with sharing heartfelt responses to the presentations. The second hour was dedicated to discussing my accumulated impressions of common features of Pakeha change in the local groups' work. I made it clear that my impressions were discussion starters for participants to respond to and revise to their satisfaction. I used the left-over shapes of coloured felt to illustrate each point, stimulating a lively discussion. With the help of video and audio footage and notes taken by a colleague, I later made a tidy written record and circulated it for approval. At the completion of the theorising process, I stored the felt images for display at subsequent conferences, and the blocks were returned to their youthful owners. Finally, I edited the video to a 55 minute resource video showcasing each group's presentation titled *Carrying the Treaty in our Hearts: Treaty educators speak 2003* (Huygens, 2005a). I included the national discussion and the professional photographs taken at the conference in an expanded edition of the focus group collection *How Pakeha change in response to te Tiriti: Treaty and decolonisation educators speak* (Huygens, 2004). Both resources can be found in the accompanying DVD and at http//: www.ihuygens.org.nz. At a subsequent conference each group was presented with their own copies of these resources and an accompanying letter confirming their free access to all original footage for their own purposes.

7.3 Reflecting on each other's work

Local meetings

As I travelled around the country collecting the visual and written work, some groups volunteered their appreciation of a "great process", "a great way to work with ideas and chronology" and "using visual imagery and movement allows us to connect with the ideas/our work/history in different ways and on a range of levels, and helps us think about our stories and our journey" (Huygens, 2004, p. 49). The recognition aspect of visual metaphor was useful both to participants and myself at different stages of the cumulative theorising process. While I was the facilitator and collecting point, like a curator, I was never seen as the sole storyteller, because the images patently told their own stories. Each distinctive image served to remind participants in the local and national meetings that here was a record of a particular (known) group's efforts, independent of my interpretations. The

distinct recognisability of the visual images (like a face) served to affirm the independent authorship of each depicted theory.

In relation to my notetaking, one group stated their disappointment that my notes, while recording the meeting, did not express how the group works and thinks. Another reluctant participant, however, upon reading the notes of her group's first session, felt reassured:

> I really appreciated the note-taking!…I have been reassured about the approach being that of exploratory research – you are managing really well keeping it balanced between letting groups go where they want to go, and keeping it focused on ensuring that something comes out of the discussion and reflection. I hated the idea of coloured felt, but the unusual process attracted me and I didn't want to miss out on the wealth of ideas! (Research participant in Huygens, 2004, p. 49)

National meeting

Viewing and hearing the entire body of theorising during the national meeting drew intense and excited responses from participants. Their quotes in the text below are drawn from the record of the national focus meeting (Huygens, 2004, pp. 79 – 93).

Participants expressed great appreciation for the "powerful, and really useful and positive" experience of witnessing "the huge amount of integration and the many years", and "the story telling, the wonderful playfulness of the metaphors, and the creativity". Many voiced a sense of awe at the commonalities visible in the work of ten diverse groups from around the country. As one participant put it:

> I was struck by how the Treaty is the common denominator for such diversity within our groups. It is amazing that we have atheists, ex-Catholic priests, Anglicans, sexuality educators, anarcho-feminists, anarcho-syndicalists, Marxist feminists all managing somehow to meld into structural analysis around the Treaty. (Research participant in Huygens, 2004, p. 80)

Reflecting on the synergy with Treaty worker ethics, several pointed to the theorising as a strong form of accountability: "that story telling, that reaching within ourselves to see 'what is it that I bring?' is the ultimate accountability that we owe to the work we do". There was agreement that through the theorising process "a good part of [our ethic of] accountability was addressed".

Participants were deeply touched by the similarities among personal and group journeys: "It was a way of seeing each other, and seeing ourselves mirrored".

Others observed "the value of knowing ourselves and knowing the people we work with really well". One participant reflected on how "grounded" the work was in the lives and situations of each Treaty worker:

> We all do carry it [the Treaty] in our hearts, wherever we are. Even though we may give up, even though there are times when we have the feeling that nothing much is really going to change, even though it has seemed hopeless, even when we are not consciously doing it, it is coming through, this strength emanates from us about the Treaty. (Research participant in Huygens, 2005a)

For many, the experience of hearing Treaty education work presented so passionately affirmed the impact of the work on our lives. A participant suggested that because the Treaty was incorporated "inside ourselves...it is not only the people we meet in workshops, it is the people we meet in our everyday lives… the conversations … wherein what we say reflects the importance of the Treaty, the importance of acknowledging Maori values". A non-participant Treaty educator, hearing and seeing the theorising for the first time, commented on the sense of integration over a long timespan as he heard "theory, and relationships, and learning from experience and re-assessing" all being described.

Soon after the national meeting, an evaluation form was sent round by email asking participants to comment on the value of conceptualising Pakeha change in the ways used in the research process. Overall, the cumulative theorising process was evaluated as "extremely valuable work" that provided "space for reflection, discussion and learning from each other" and that such "critical self-evaluation" had been "a valuable part of continuing professional development". Several participants commented that such an opportunity was rare because "we're so busy doing the work" and that it was "confirming, affirming in a type of work where results are largely unknown".

Many commented on the value of confirming a shared pool of concepts, tools and ethics, and of reassuring them about a common direction: "It was great to realise we all had such a common base". One participant commented on how the cumulative process had helped to build theory: "[It is] collective, iterative, creative, allows for diversity of expression, builds a collective theory". There was general endorsement of the view that the cumulative theorising process had strengthened the movement theoretically and socially: "I totally enjoyed the whole process. The value I see as ongoing through connections made and re-made" and "The process has enriched us all, I think".

Finally, there were comments on how the process inspired participants with hope and confidence about working with the Treaty and with each other: "I am awed by the passion that links us all. Still!"

Participants were also asked to evaluate the risks they saw in theorising their work in this way, . There were fears expressed that creating a written record of current theorising would "freeze" praxis in some way (Participant feedback form, 2003), so that their written words and mine would be treated as facts, rather than as a "snapshot in time". A risk was that one "right" way would develop and that "creativity may be discouraged or there may be internal criticism on the basis of one 'right' way" (Participant feedback form, 2003). Some participants in the national meeting had also expressed wariness about the process of abstraction: "The process of conceptualising at all could cause Treaty work to become static". They also suggested that published material, particularly arriving in a vacuum as with Pakeha Treaty work, might be treated as a fixed "truth" about a group's ongoing theorising and praxis. Others expressed concerns that the theorising might be "too vague, and the imagery not in a form others can readily access" and "educators being labelled (e.g. bleeding hearts)" (Participant feedback form, 2003). However, the general feeling was that the benefit of articulating the movement's theorising about Pakeha change outweighed the risks. In my view, all these were valid concerns, and will need to be taken into account as the records of Treaty educator theorising are more widely disseminated.

Evaluating the researcher's efforts

In evaluating my efforts, one participant expressed a typical view: "I think it's been really good. You have been great in giving us feedback, accountability, updates, etc.". Participants acknowledged the innovative nature of the process: "It was good (and energising) to explore things in a different way – visually, spatially and through metaphor".

When I formally gifted the focus group records and video resources to each group, participants composed a letter of appreciation to record the general consensus (Letter of Appreciation, Appendix 6). Of my work with the movement's unpublished literature, participants said that they "very much appreciate … outstanding bibliographic and archiving work…" and that my "disciplined and systematic approach has brought order and structure to a field" and "established a framework that enables different work to be properly reviewed". Particularly welcome given my ethical commitments was their attestation to my working

"within the movement's own conventions and practices with sensitivity and skill" using "our proven processes".

Receiving participants' endorsement of their trust in my efforts as a member-researcher was all the more valuable in light of the Treaty movement's history of extreme care about public access to their ideas. In the Letter of Appreciation, Treaty educators acknowledge themselves as "a group that is generally very suspicious of research". Along with many other marginalised groups, they have experienced researchers and writers as 'raiding' their ideas, and then publishing the resulting work with little or no acknowledgment of sources: "We got burned in the 1970s and stopped writing things down. It is brilliant to be in charge of our own process, and to keep control of our own work" (Huygens, 2004, p. 49).

Revitalising & therapeutic effect

One participant neatly summarised the contributions she felt the process had made to the Treaty movement:

- Allowing members in their areas to share with one another in depth about their experience and theorising of Pakeha/Tauiwi change in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi;
- Helping draw back workers into contact with their local groups and the national movement;
- Contributing to a reconciliation of differences between some groups within the movement. (Participant feedback form, 2003).

Encouraging groups to choose the process that best suited them led to the larger networks inviting each individual to tell their own story of conscientisation about the Treaty and Maori-Pakeha relations in New Zealand. The telling of these personal stories was considered a critical feature by one of the younger participants:

> It seemed a common thread for all the groups that even just the process of getting together and answering your questions was a really important group building exercise. It was just amazing that this many people who have been working together for so long could not know each other's stories [of how they became Treaty workers] although of course some groups have different dynamics than others. There were also common threads in how individuals changed, but it was more about a *group* process, an important process of finding out each other's stories. (Research participant in Huygens, 2004, p. 81)

One younger member of a loose regional network noted that "this exercise brought them together again…to theorise and think critically and analyse their stories and their part". In one region, the process of gathering for the focus meetings helped to establish a new network, and in a second region, helped to revitalise a network that had become quiescent after a number of bereavements. In a third region, members in email contact appreciated the focus meetings since they had not met face to face as a network in some years. As a member of my peer study group commented: "now we do have a greater sense of a coherent movement". Commenting on the process overall, a longstanding Treaty worker said:

> It has enabled us to tell our own stories and try to put all that has happened into context. It has helped us to know and understand more about ourselves and each other. It is a great way of recording some of the history of a movement. (Participant feedback form, 2003)

For participants, revitalising activist networks and affirming a shared counter-hegemonic discourse could both be said to have had a "therapeutic effect" (Prilleltensky, personal communication, 2004). Several participants specifically identified the therapeutic value of the cumulative theorising process:

> I believe [this work] has already assisted and strengthened the work of Treaty educators throughout New Zealand and will continue to do so. The session in October also appeared to have a 'healing' aspect for some of the people, which I was not conscious was necessary, but obviously was in fact. (Participant feedback form, 2003)

In confirmation of the revitalising and therapeutic effect of the cumulative theorising process, a longstanding Treaty worker closed the national discussion with these gentle words:

> I realised how much hara [harm] had been settled by the talking that everyone has been able to do, knowing that they have been heard and that their work has been valued and that healing has happened – in a really unconscious way, but it has made us able to be here, and it has been great. (Huygens, 2004, p. 93)

CHAPTER 8.0   STUDY 2

CONTEMPORARY THEORISING OF

PAKEHA CHANGE

A research participant commented on our theorising of how Pakeha change:

> The central visual symbol seemed to be a flow, like a
> river. I was struck by the starting points, the cultural
> conserve, the mist on the land, the mystery of going
> into a group and encountering what lies there.
> > David James, in Huygens, 2004 p. 80

In Chapter 7 *An Innovative Method,* I recounted how the research process for Study 2 was crafted in interaction with my peer Treaty and decolonisation educators. In this chapter I present my summaries and interpretations of our work together, addressing the research question:

How do contemporary Treaty educators theorise the processes of Pakeha change in response to learning about the Treaty, based on their education work with Pakeha in organisations?
- Which tools of practice do Treaty educators consider most useful?
- What appear to be facilitatory and inhibitory factors in promoting a critical Pakeha response to the Treaty?

8.1 Co-theorising Pakeha change

In co-theorising with groups of Treaty educators, my insider understanding provided an important threshold for shared meaning. The shared frames of reference and consensual meanings posited by Aguilar (1981) meant that I was more sensitised to the complexity of our commonalities and differences than an outsider would have

been. In particular, I knew of the shared history of dialogue over several decades in national gatherings, as well as appreciating the unique histories of local theorising in each region.

As I travelled around the country, I was impressed by how each of the ten groups of Treaty/decolonisation educators operated with a complete theory of Pakeha change. Each group's theorising could stand alone, serving as a coherent basis for their practice as facilitators of Pakeha change in workshops and workplaces. Below I present a brief synopsis of my records of each group's theorising as published in *How Pakeha Change in response to te Tiriti: Treaty and decolonisation educators speak – collected focus group records* (Huygens, 2004). All page numbers below refer to this collection. I also give a description of each group's imagery, which can be viewed in the attached DVD and at http//: www.ihuygens.org.nz .

Since the cumulative theorising process encouraged reflection and response, both the participants and I responded to the accumulating body of theory about Pakeha change as the process built towards the final national discussion. As the local meetings progressed, I began to draw out common themes and important variations. Two progress reports (Appendix 7) circulated to participants and supervisors show how my interpretations developed, and were eventually discussed with the national meeting of participants.

The focus questions we used were:
1. What processes do we believe/experience Pakeha in organisations go through as they respond to learning about the Treaty of Waitangi?
2. What keeps Pakeha moving through these processes?
3. What seem to be facilitative factors? Inhibiting factors?
4. What particular approaches or tools do we, as Treaty workers, think are working?

The flexible and responsive nature of the cumulative theorising process led to rich coverage of these questions by the first six groups, so that I was sufficiently confident in later sessions to address further questions:

5. How do we relate to Maori as we change?
6. How do we relate to other Pakeha as we change?

8.1.1 Themes & images of Pakeha change – local meetings

All quotes are drawn from Huygens (2004), pp. 5-78.

1. From ignorance to action

Network Waitangi Whanganui-a-Tara initiated the theorising process by suggesting a series of stages for Pakeha change: (i) ignorance, (ii) awareness as a result of an event or a workshop, (iii) learning about the Treaty and colonisation accompanied by responses such as denial, anger, guilt and blame. They proposed that these emotional responses operated in cycles, and that Pakeha could become stuck, for instance alternating for a lifetime between guilt and denial about the relationship between Pakeha and Maori. Alternative responses such as passion and activism allowed the person to move on to a further stage of (iv) 'What do I do about it?' which could be termed an action stage.

Imagery of stages in change

I depicted their theorising as a simple sequence of stages from Ignorance to Awareness to Learning to Action, with cycles of emotional responses in the Learning stage rather like whirlpools in a river.

2. Awakenings through information, de-centring, and empathy

Network Waitangi Whangarei elaborated the awareness stage as awakenings that start Pakeha moving and wanting to change. Awakenings were triggered through realising that Pakeha ways are "not …the Norm!", and "not …the centre of the universe!" (p. 9), through empathy and "standing in the shoes of the other", and through the shock value of statistics showing the differences in Maori and Pakeha circumstances in New Zealand today. They considered the process of change to flow towards destinations such as "exploring honourable kawanatanga", "finding common ground with Maori", and "becoming spiritually aware" (p. 9). They contributed the idea of tino rangatiratanga as an 'It' in the future that Pakeha are nervous about, as in "what will IT be like?" in sex education.

Imagery of sunrise awakenings, seesaws and cycles of cultural default towards "It"

Network Waitangi Whangarei sketched a number of processes on paper. How change happens was drawn as a rising and falling egg-shaped cycle of feeling and thinking in context as Pakeha briefly see themselves as part of a collective, then fall back into the "cultural default" (p. 9) of being an individual.

3. From individualised ignorance to a sense of connected destiny

Network Waitangi Otautahi theorised that a crucial part of the change process is Pakeha moving from a (blind) individualised state to one in which we think and act more consciously as a collective. In the individualised state, Pakeha were seen as misinformed or uninformed, lacking a positive cultural identity and feeling fearful and angry about Maori issues. Sometimes with reluctance, sometimes with a spark of passion, the Pakeha person enters a process of learning and change, increasingly gaining "a sense of collectivity as Pakeha and connectedness to Maori" (p. 12). The Pakeha person often slips back into individualised processes such as feeling guilty or victimised, in which case they need to refresh their collective awareness. The collective state was characterised by "trusting mana whenua", relaxing "about not being in individual control" and "knowing how to continue" the journey (p. 10).

Imagery of broad yellow pathway from individualisation to conscious collectivity

Network Waitangi Otautahi depicted Pakeha individualisation as a large white area of ignorance, resistance and lack of identity. A red flame of feeling – passion, empathy or hope – sparks the Pakeha person through the narrow neck of a broadening pathway from individualisation to collectivity, and allows for a constructive tension between "the individual motivation and the collective path" (p. 15). The path itself narrows and widens to indicate that there may be more or fewer people on it at different times. Fears and hopelessness that cause people to slip back were depicted as loops back down the pathway. The destination of collectivity was elaborated as having "no blueprint" and where there are "agreed values and processes" with mana whenua (p. 10).

4. Becoming part of a group that is changing

Waitangi Associates linked individual and collective processes in a different way by emphasising the importance of the "cultural conserve" (p. 17). They described this as the totality of familiar worldviews and cultural knowledge drawn upon by individuals: "a safe known place, like the shed in the back garden", learned in early life and held unconsciously. They considered that it is not easy to change the cultural conserve. Although individuals experienced "Oh I see!" shifts in their worldviews, their new awareness would not address many "sticking points, old worries" (p. 17), necessitating a return to their cultural repository of beliefs and knowledge. They visualised the process of change as a zigzag route for individuals underlaid by a slowly changing Pakeha cultural conserve until eventually the Treaty relationship was integrated into daily life as normal.

Imagery of step by step, back and forth, from cultural conserve to Treaty as normal

Waitangi Associates augmented the previous group's broad pathway image by adding footsteps treading backwards through numerous backwaters. They also added to the negative emotions suggested in the early stages of the pathway positive feelings of hope and excitement experienced later in the journey. The Pakeha cultural conserve was placed at the heart of the white state of individualisation. They also added white triangles holding up the individualised state to represent the active production of misinformation and fear by institutions such as the media and government policies. Starbursts represented the moments of integration of a new worldview. Organisations were represented as standing apart from the pathway of change, but as containing one or more flames to denote a person with passion. When "three or four individuals of passion" became "a group that is changing" (p. 18) they were shown in a white life-belt shape, which linked them to the pathway of change. *(shown facing page 168)*

5. Searching for a different relationship with Maori, a different way of being Pakeha

The Pakeha members of *Network Waitangi Otepoti* met to share their personal journeys of change, and search for themes. While each person's story was unique, a common first step involved the Pakeha person responding to Maori – hearing stories of Maori pain and dispossession, being critically challenged by Maori people or being

immersed in supportive Maori environments. Most went on to make connections between the situation for Maori and other oppressions, as well as coming to appreciate that Pakeha equally have a complex history. Prompted by personal experience in struggles for justice and liberation, most went in search of others like themselves who were taking a role as activists and educators about Maori-Pakeha relations.

6. Preparing ourselves emotionally to understand our place in colonisation

In their decolonisation work as black tauiwi women, *Freedom Roadworks* /*Beams and Specks* explained that they help tauiwi look critically at the cultural values underpinning colonisation. They suggested that when tauiwi are facilitated to appreciate the pain and vulnerability their ancestors felt at being displaced, and the subsequent processes of denial and distancing, they are able to explore their present feelings towards Maori in this country. Then, with relief and hope, tauiwi are able to explore new frameworks and visions for their communities and society.

The two Otepoti groups initially visualised change in different ways: *Beams & Specks/Freedom Roadworks* saw Pakeha change as akin to a river journey of emotional healing from histories of colonisation and migration, in preparation for decolonisation; the Pakeha members of *Network Waitangi Otepoti* saw Pakeha change as a cyclic or spiralling journey, both inwards and outwards, where the same issues are revisited in more depth in new social or political contexts.

7. Spiralling journeys of individual knowing and collective inspiration

Network Waitangi Otepoti and *Freedom Roadworks* combined to consider the theorising and imagery created by the previous groups. They agreed that each of us are born "with a sense of connection" (p. 31) to each other and to places, and that these internal flames of connection are present in us as children before the state of individualised ignorance is created through schooling. Since Pakeha change involves individual and collective processes working in concert over long time spans, a combination of individual learning journeys may lead to moments of sudden integration for an entire group, as though there has been a shift in the collective consciousness.

Processes
of
Conscientisation

Imagery of spiralling weave of individual, unconscious and collective journeys

The combined Otepoti groups decided that the "state of original knowing" (p. 31) involved feeling connected to the land and the sea of Aotearoa, but with a white mist of society's colonising messages covering the land, and dousing the flames of connection. A broad spiral shape showed the collective journey reaching from the land into the sky with visions, hopes and an enduring belief in human connection. All over the collective spiral, yellow and green dots represented individual life journeys. The yellow starbursts of understanding were borrowed from the previous group to denote moments of "collective enlightenment" (p. 32). Red spirals flowing upwards depicted individual unconscious journeys, weaving in and out of other people's journeys and spiralling around, above and below the collective journey. The collective change process drew upon the inspirations, revelations and awakenings of individuals, and was described as "the journey of our collective dreams and visions, our hope for our society and our children" (p. 32). (*shown on facing page*)

8. Relationships between Maori and Pakeha activists

As a network, *Tamaki Treaty Workers* began by telling their personal stories of conscientisation, focusing on their relationship with Maori during their journeys of change. While some Pakeha individuals began their journeys through close connection with Maori in educational or activist contexts, others began simply by learning about the Treaty. Whatever the nature of the initial introduction to the Pakeha-Maori relationship, the individual became aware that in order to be effective change agents, they needed to be in contact with other Pakeha on a similar journey. By many different routes, people found their way to Pakeha activist groups, through which a strategic working relationship with Maori radical groups was possible. However, the style of these relationships had changed over time. Older Treaty workers had often participated in building the relationship between Maori and Pakeha activists, and many maintained personal connections. Younger Treaty workers found themselves joining formal relationships between Pakeha and Maori groups which they had not personally developed, but within which they were accepted. The group concluded that "contact with like-minded Pakeha is a crucial component of an action stage in Pakeha change processes towards supporting tino rangatiratanga." (p. 42) and that working in Treaty-based relationships was "stimulating, liberating and rewarding" (p. 43)

Imagery of moving ever closer to Pakeha activist groupings

The Tamaki network acted out a series of three action scenes. In the first scene they placed themselves as Pakeha unaware of Maori activist groups, who were depicted by bags and kete lying down in the room. In the second scene, Maori activist groups became visible to the Pakeha, shown by the now upright bags and kete. Participants turned towards these groups, but the Pakeha who drew closer found that there was no role for them in Maori activism. To be usefully involved in work for change in race relations, they needed to work collectively "as Pakeha". The third scene showed Pakeha reaching out to each other by gravitating towards a few long-time Pakeha activists who held aloft a previous group's white rings marked as "Pakeha groups that are changing". Maori and other Pakeha would refer newcomers to these well-known Treaty workers, who linked Pakeha into groups, and inspired lone Pakeha activists working in organisations: "I knew of these groups and individuals, and they helped to inspire me and keep me going" (p. 46).

9. Working with each other as educators

The *Hawke's Bay Treaty educators* knew each other as colleagues, but had not worked together as a group. They decided to describe how they came to be Treaty educators, and to share their understandings of how Pakeha learn and work together. They reflected that initially they were quite harsh with other Pakeha, believing: "I changed, why can't you?" but now they work in more thoughtful ways with processes of empathy, guilt, and fear.

Imagery of the connected web of those carrying the Treaty in their hearts

In the second *Hawkes Bay* session, a Maori educator colleague joined the meeting, and the group created a large mobile depicting the myriad, tangled connections shared among those "carrying the Treaty in our hearts". The Treaty agreement was represented by sturdy bamboo cross bars for the Maori and Pakeha partners, and hanging from these were numerous symbols for Scottish heritage and Pacific peoples, the feminist, environmental and union movements, kapa haka groups and educational sparks lit by teachers, all linked in complex ways. Activism was depicted by a *More Maori Teachers Now* button, and a ragged red singlet saying *There can be no Peace*

without Justice. Deeper forces like fears and hopes were represented by a hanging spider, which had the potential to connect people by spinning together these myriad elements into an understanding about the Treaty in Aotearoa today.

10. Relating to assertions of tino rangatiratanga

The *Rowan Partnership*, of two Pakeha and one Maori educator all sharing a Quaker heritage, were clear that the contribution made by Treaty educators was a very small part of change. Citing Jack Mezirow, they theorised that the catalyst stimulating change usually comes from assertions of tino rangatiratanga by Maori, which become 'disorienting events' for the dominant Pakeha group. They saw the role of Treaty educators as Peter Drucker's 'translators' to the Pakeha community, helping to explain these challenges. Furthermore, they theorised from Adam Curle's work that confrontation by Maori results in a stalemate when Pakeha are high in power but low in information. In their experience, as Pakeha increase their information about Maori, themselves and the historical relationship, their discomfort increases to a point where they may became sufficiently uncomfortable to be willing to negotiate rather than resist.

Imagery of Pakeha as translators to their own community

Rowan Partnership decided to illustrate all these processes at work with an example of Pakeha acting as allies to local tangata whenua during the 1995 occupation of Pakaitore in the city of Wanganui. They showed hapu from the length of the Whanganui River linked to a meeting house built on the contested land. Yellow arrows represented Pakeha supporters surrounding the occupied meeting house facing outwards to the watching community, police and the District Council, who had ordered an eviction: "being allies to Maori and facing our own side with both challenge and compassion" (p. 65). The Crown was shown as hiding in their picture, but eventually the translating and educating work undertaken by these activists helped to bring the hidden power of the government to the negotiating table and thence to a satisfactory agreement over the disputed land.

As a large network that had not met since the deaths of two founding members, and with new younger members present, the *Waikato AntiRacism Coalition (WARC)* decided to tell personal stories of how they came to be in the network, and their experiences in organisations. They reflected that listening to Maori stories of injustice had been a catalyst for action as members took on numerous challenges in the region. It had often been difficult to stay connected to each other and supported by the network, particularly when an individual was the only activist Pakeha in an institution. The group agreed that courage, inspiration, hope and rolling with the flow were important factors in Pakeha journeys. They emphasised the role of supportive Maori in institutions willing to educate, challenge and sustain individual Pakeha in attempts to work with the Treaty.

Imagery of journeying through institutions 'not quite touching' other Pakeha activists

WARC used children's wooden blocks to depict real and abstract structures that provide a context for Pakeha lives, such as the edifices of the local university and polytechnic, early childhood education and education in general. They showed their network as a ragged group of blocks attempting to maintain links between members working in diverse institutional sites, who were "stretching towards each other, not quite touching" (p. 77), yet linking through the yellow pathway of the group's longevity. At the beginning of the group's journey through these edifices they placed the red heart of the anti-apartheid badge *Halt All Racist Tours* to show the inspiration of the New Zealand antiracism movement as well as aroha from Maori. A pair of red shoes represented the courage required for the Treaty journey.

8.1.2 Treaty educators as facilitators of change

In their local meetings, the Treaty educators also considered factors that, in their experience, facilitated or inhibited change for Pakeha. These factors were recorded in each focus meeting and formed part of the background material for the national discussion. All quotes are drawn from Huygens (2004).

Facilitating & inhibiting factors for Pakeha change

A number of factors were noted as facilitating change for Pakeha people. A person's feeling for justice as well as empathy learned through personal experiences of injustice could facilitate their willingness to undertake change. Receiving support, challenge or education from Maori colleagues, friends and political figures was seen as a significant factor in stimulating change. However, a challenge from Maori had to be intelligible to the Pakeha person, so receiving timely and relevant educational input was critical. Education input needed to be relevant to current decisions and actions. For instance, when Pakeha were in an escalating confrontation with Maori, new information about the historical basis of the confrontation might prompt change. Leadership from outside the immediate environment also facilitated change for individuals and helped in responding to Maori challenges, such as an organisation undertaking a new strategic plan to implement the Treaty.

A Pakeha person also needed the opportunity to put changed views into practice, such as enacting a new work procedure, taking a stand in support of Maori or having the opportunity to join in specific action: "it is vital for people to experience changing themselves and changing something outside themselves, so that they experience both internal and external change at work" (p. 54). Finally, change was more likely when a Pakeha person experienced a shift in their self-interest towards a greater investment in the well-being of Maori people into the future, described as "recognising links between what we want and what Maori want" (p. 11). Developing a sense of connected destiny could come from many sources – for instance, the advent of Maori grandchildren in the family. Finally, a lone individual keen to put new learning into practice was not enough to stimulate movement in an organisation or community. Individuals needed to join with others to form groups that both modelled changes themselves and encouraged change in others. Support from like-minded others during change was important. When people feel they are part of a "liberation community" and have "a sense of being part of something bigger than themselves, being accountable" (p. 28) they were more likely to undertake sustained change.

A series of inhibitory factors were proposed clustered around fear, rigidity and complacency. Just as "being part of a group that is changing" (p. 18) was seen to facilitate change for Pakeha, being out of step with family, friends and colleagues could hold them back: "what this [change] will do to my relationships, to my social

milieu, and family and friends" (p. 61). A Pakeha person's concern about whether they can live with a strong mismatch in values between themselves and their families, or between their home and their workplace may present an extremely uncomfortable choice. As one workshop participant in a Treaty workshop was reported to have said: "I understand what you are telling us, but my family are so racist that I cannot take it on board" (p. 61). As well as fearing the loss of valued relationships, Pakeha could fear what they will lose, materially and culturally, if they change towards supporting the Treaty, including the fear that they will lose "known worldviews" (p. 17).

Personal rigidities against adopting new views could also inhibit change. For instance when "very racist or unhealed themselves" (p. 29), a Pakeha person might remain unwilling to open up sufficiently for new learning. Others theorised that a small minority of individuals appear to be so entrenched in their own world view and personality structure that they do not accept the possibility of a vision beyond the one they currently hold, and actively avoid new learning. Another personal rigidity inhibiting change for Pakeha was when someone who had achieved a position in society at the summit of their personal ambition was determined never to share power, with Maori or anyone else.

Complacency could equally inhibit change. When a cohort of Pakeha occupied powerful positions (theorised by one group as typically male, elderly, from longstanding settler families and part of small business groups who went to school together) they often resisted changes to their comfortable positions. When such a peer group could not empathise with anyone's position outside their own cohort, and had enough social support to remain very comfortable, change was further inhibited. However, it was suggested that even these intractable people would sometimes make significant shifts in response to facilitatory factors such as a growing empathy as they heard stories of Maori dispossession, receiving support and challenge from Maori, and being part of a work team that began to change. If not, the best that could be expected was that such people witnessed the changes among their colleagues, and came to see themselves as a minority.

Strategies & tactics for Treaty education

Although prompted to include "tools for change" in their discussion, most groups did not mention specific tools, apart from the timeline of colonisation and legislation breaching the Treaty, and one or two exercises to increase empathy and awareness of racism. Instead they drew on a wide range of strategies and tactics to create optimum conditions for change. Details given by each group are presented in Appendix 8, and highlights discussed below.

Head and heart involvement
The educators were agreed that both the head and the heart needed to be involved when undertaking critical learning. Material and exercises were required to support both types of process. *Network Waitangi Whangarei* visualised the process of facilitating awareness for Pakeha participants as a seesaw: "a balancing act" for participants and facilitators of "feelings and knowledge, engaging and storytelling, process and content" (p. 9). They suggested that educators achieved this "By enchanting them, reassuring them, and fascinating them – then challenging them" (p. 8). It was clear that a delicate balance of conditions was critical in facilitating change during Treaty educational workshops, since the inhibitory factors for Pakeha at an individual level included both extreme fear and extreme comfort. Thus, participants needed to be neither too fearful, nor too comfortable. For instance, educators took care to build a safe, respectful process with participants and to engender trust, so that Pakeha/tauiwi were more open to emotional connections with tangata whenua and with each other. To allay fear and prejudice, and to contradict stereotypes, they typically presented Maori society as complex and respectable, and Maori as rational, predictable human beings. To facilitate links among those ready for an action step, they enabled participants to identify a like-minded group, cluster together and begin to plan actions within their institutions. I concluded that these experienced educators considered their participants carefully, and worked to increase the facilitatory factors for change, and to decrease the inhibitory factors.

Critique of education strategy and practice
Throughout, arising spontaneously and in response to my requests to consider values and risks, participants critiqued their Treaty education practices. There was a clear strand of self-critique about past use of strategies based on simplistic theorising that

Pakeha were triggered to change by the same conditions under which the educator themselves had experienced a shift in perspective.

Some longstanding Treaty educators reflected on the difficulties in the early years of working together in positive ways, and the ongoing challenge of treating each other well in such demanding work: "We have not always been kind to each other, accepted or working willingly with the hard challenges, and we have pushed people out and at times caused quite a lot of pain in our circles. I have a really heartening sense that we are growing up, and able to expand… to a place where we can be more accepting. But it still can be violent and tough" (p. 86).

Longer time frame for change
In a form of critique of the early hopes for the five-year Project Waitangi campaign, the educators' theorising acknowledged the long time-frame for change in a dominant group. One group reflected: "We've done really well on institutional change, but we haven't shifted cultural racism" (p. 51). The most explicit view was that change would take seven generations. While newer educators may have expressed frustration at the slow pace of Pakeha change, groups with longstanding members reflected more philosophically on the slow pace of change: "We've had to wait 10 years for the outcomes [of Treaty work] and there has to be an emotional catch-up" (p. 51). Such philosophical theorising affirmed the importance of emotional processes in change, and also reinforced the focus on the collective nature of change.

Enabling a cultural make-over
The imagery of the Pakeha "cultural/default position" and the Pakeha "cultural conserve" as an old-fashioned shed out the back full of nostalgic items met with an enthusiastic response from other groups, and led to strategic considerations about Treaty education. For instance, a warning was sounded about Treaty educators "not dynamiting the shed too soon, which can leave people with nowhere to go – like an awful garden makeover!" It was agreed that the most strategic approach was a gentler "cultural enabling of a cultural make-over" (p. 48).

Pakeha change as the 'slippery eel'
At several points, queries were raised about the extent to which Pakeha actions progress the cause of tino rangatiratanga for Maori: "How much of what we do truly brings about change?…It feels like a long, slow movement into which we drop little

bits, and the education that Treaty workers do is only one small part" (p. 63). One group suggested that Pakeha change was like a slippery eel, from the metaphor used by a rangatira in the nineteenth century who described dealing with the Crown or government as akin to catching eels barehanded – all you were left with was slime.

8.1.3 Features of Pakeha change - national meeting

At the national focus meeting, I presented as discussion starters some of my preliminary interpretations of how we had co-theorised Pakeha change (Huygens, 2004, p. 77). Lively discussion on each point helped to extend our theorising to either a consensus or to a deeper appreciation of diversity in opinion. Since attendees spoke as individuals, the national discussion could best be described as an open dialogue between experienced Treaty educators and the researcher in response to the entire body of theorising. All quotes are drawn from the meeting record in Huygens (2004), pp. 79-93.

The meeting endorsed that Pakeha change seemed to depend on both Maori and Pakeha input. Most institutional change and many of our personal change journeys were triggered by contact with the Maori world or Maori individuals, which seemed to push us in a new direction from our predictable or standard cultural journey. Others underlined the connection between Pakeha change and Maori change: "The fact that Maori are moving is a challenge", and the Maori-Pakeha relationship as a motivator of change: "You're saying that change is because of relationship. Without the relationship, without wanting to care, we wouldn't be changing".

However, the impact of contact and challenge from Maori was not enough to sustain Pakeha change and the meeting agreed that: "our change builds on change that has already happened among Pakeha and leads onto further change – it doesn't depend on Maori any more at that point. It takes on a life of its own". Participants recalled the image of Pakeha Treaty groups as "lifesavers" during the long journey of change. However, the Pakeha journey continues in interaction with Maori change process: "So they all remain interrelated, even though we are doing our own things".

The meeting agreed that Pakeha change takes time, and that, using a river as imagery, each aspect "is pushed along from what's behind it, flows from what went before". While individuals may vary in their starting points, collective change appears to have

a developmental aspect, requiring earlier stages to be initiated, if not completed, before movement onto the next stage is possible. This means that educators can't "just put any old piece of information in at any old time". An interesting contrast to the developmental aspect was the general agreement that Pakeha are inclined to loop from new learning back to old views as they change, moving from being challenged back to being more comfortable in a cyclic manner.

I suggested that Pakeha change required letting go of old, familiar knowledge and old relationships and embracing new passions and new values, and that this was accompanied by discomfort, vagueness and tenderness as new growth took shape. Some participants found the notions of vagueness and newborn blindness very affirming of their vulnerable positions as Treaty educators: "That is so exciting, what you are saying about feeling blind…Because they [other Pakeha] do want the answers, and they do want us to provide them". Risking the loss of old views and embracing new values in workplaces, families and communities led to discussion of whether Pakeha change depended upon "bringing the family with us". The meeting agreed that when one's views change, relationships required re-negotiation: "As **we** change, and if they don't … the common ground **they** thought you were relating on is no longer there". It was suggested that "we have to find new common ground" and indeed Treaty educators in one area reported they had received requests to run workshops with spouses of participants. Some suggested that an interim step was connections with other Treaty workers: "We have to make … those on the same journey one of our families" while others insisted that eventually, in a longer time frame, collective Pakeha change depended on bringing our families with us: "Because ultimately, to make a difference in this country, the whole Pakeha family does have to came with us".

Throughout the theorising, responses to "where are we going with our work?" had included notions of relationship such as "trusting the other" and "agreed values and processes" rather than an identified destination. Pakeha processes of change were theorised as preparation for respectful relationship per se with Maori people. In considering more carefully the nature of this relationship, we asked ourselves: "what would be missing if Maori were not here?" The national meeting agreed that "a lot of people in this country don't have a sense of this being a journey towards a relationship that is desirable". We concluded that a boundary or limit on Pakeha change was our present inability to "name the gift we receive from Maori".

Several groups had concurred with: "We are building the journey with whoever else is on it" to suggest that New Zealanders can be divided, not along the lines of race, but on the basis of who is on a journey of building a new relationship between Maori and Pakeha. The national meeting concluded that it was important to create an inclusive theory of Pakeha change that did not neglect those not currently or consciously 'on a journey' because "people keep dropping on and off the journey" and "we are building the journey with people that we don't know are there". The meeting agreed that it was a continuous process in which "the building is constantly happening, it never reaches an end". Finally, a member who has since passed away summed up the feeling of the national meeting as:

> *"We are on an emerging journey together and welcome whoever comes"*
>
> (Catriona Budge, in Huygens, 2004, p. 91)

8.2 Metaphors for Pakeha change

In attending to a diversity of topics around the broad research question of how Pakeha change, the 10 Treaty educator groups offered a cohesive body of accumulated theory. The main alternative source of theorising came from the group who had moved from a primary focus on educating Pakeha about the Treaty and colonisation to a focus on preparing Pakeha emotionally for the journey of decolonisation. These differing emphases were linked, however, by a common agenda of decolonisation work among non-Maori. In my interpretation, a range of metaphors for Pakeha change processes were used, varying from clear developmental stages, wandering journeys of individual and collective change to more multi-dimensional spirals and webs for interacting processes through time and contexts. I describe these metaphors for change in detail, and then make some initial comparisons with the concepts of dominant group change reviewed in Chapter 3.

Opportunities for researcher and participants to evaluate the accumulated body of theorising came at several formal points, as well as being a continuous feature of the cumulative process. The pattern of groups adding to or borrowing from the work of their colleagues, as well as choosing to create entirely new imagery, served simultaneously as endorsement and critique of the accumulated theory. For instance,

when the two Otepoti groups created their spirals model of change, they suggested that the visible conscious journeys of individuals were miniature pathways, scattered throughout the wider collective movement. They borrowed elements from the pathway model created by their colleagues in Otautahi (flames of passion, white state of individualisation, bursts of inspiration), but used them to create spirals of individual and collective change that were recursive in time and place. Their new imagery thus endorsed the previous theory as well as moving away from a liner notion of time or progress in Pakeha change. In another example of critique functioning as endorsement, the "white fog of colonisation" was considered a powerful image, and stimulated critique in the form of groups adding imagery to show how cultural and institutional processes produced the Pakeha state of ignorance and misinformation. Finally, in the sessions in which two groups evaluated the spirals and pathway images, they considered both images relevant: "Both landscapes depict my journey – it is like a path and it is also iterative, like the spirals" (p. 36). Thus with the extent of endorsement, elaboration and consensual critique of each other's theorising, the participants' work may justifiably be treated as a whole, coherent body of theorising, and may be discussed as such in relation to existing theory.

8.2.1 Stages of individual change

All the metaphors for change applied to Pakeha as individuals and as a group, but I have emphasised individual processes here, and collective processes in the next section.

The first metaphor for Pakeha change was that, based on the Treaty educators' experience regarding their own learning and their reflections on the learning of others, Pakeha appeared to go through sequential stages of change – from ignorance to awakenings and awareness, and thence to learning and action. The process of awakening from an unaware state was theorised in the manner of Mezirow's (1990, 1991) 'disorienting dilemmas' which trigger transformational learning. The educators theorised that intellectual or emotional triggers for the Pakeha person such as a shocking statistic about Maori or empathy for a Maori person's experience led to disorienting realisations like Pakeha culture being "not the norm!?" and "not the centre of the universe!?" (p. 9). Equally, the Pakeha person might feel angry and disoriented at hearing information that was not familiar from their schooling or public

media. For instance, a common response from Pakeha is: "What weren't we taught this at school?" or "Why wasn't I told about this?" (p. 5).

The Pakeha person's realisations as they learned about the Treaty and the history of colonisation were thus theorised as awakenings from, and awakenings about, the current ideological hegemony. The process theorised here of 'discovering' an alternative history of the relationship between Maori and Pakeha to that disseminated through education and the media is similar to Gramsci's (1971) notion of a cathartic awakening from hegemonic commonsense. In contrast to the standard story's construction of Maori as grateful recipients of an advanced civilisation, when a Pakeha person hears that Maori have been successfully settled in the country for a millennium, it may "dawn" on them that:

> Maori had been here for 700 years before the Treaty, not just 30 years. Of course they had thought about how to live in this land, how to develop systems for society, for diplomacy, for conflict resolution, for every part of life…Maori weren't living here for 700 years just waiting for the Europeans to arrive! (Huygens, 2004, p. 17).

Such critical awakenings were examples of Gramsci's thesis that political education led people to a "series of negations" which repudiate the prevailing commonsense (Gramsci, in Adamson, 1980, p. 151).

The present theorising also provided some significant extensions and challenges to both Mezirow's (1991) and Gramsci's (1971) concepts of change. For instance, the educators were agreed that the change process, in their personal experience and in their work with other Pakeha, was not uni-directional. As they described it, a learner "goes backwards after each shift in worldview to what is known, especially under pressure. Therefore, a person needs a number of shifts" (Huygens, 2004, p. 17). Furthermore, the educators did not theorise the process of adopting new constructions of the world as primarily rational in nature, nor was increased rationality implied as a destination of such learning. On the contrary, a key factor in adopting new constructions of the world was the person's emotional response. Emotions such as fear and grief at the loss of known worldviews were theorised as preventing rational shifts in constructions. A comment on Pakeha learning was that: "On a conscious level they may express the fear that they will lose property, while at a subconscious level the fear is probably more about losing known worldviews" (p. 17). Groups also theorised a range of positive emotions that were equally common for Pakeha at this

stage, such as feelings of excitement and hope, as well as clarity and joy at perceiving a new future. These functioned to keep the Pakeha person open to, or seeking, further opportunities for new, disorienting information and to keep them moving to join with other Pakeha in some form of action for change in the external environment. One implication of such a non-rational, emotionally-dependent process of learning is that steady progress through the stages of change is not a given for Pakeha, since many could become stuck in cycles of discomfort or resistance at any point in the stages of awakening or learning.

Bateson (1972) captures the emotional significance of having our cognitive constructions challenged with his term 'epistemological discomfort' as he describes the distress felt by all mammals when the epistemological basis of a learned context for life is falsified in some way. When Pakeha are exposed to a more critical version of the history of colonisation in New Zealand, they experience a similar epistemological discomfort that their here-to-fore well understood world appears not to be constructed as they had believed. For instance, when Pakeha working in social services with longstanding constitutions and ethics based on humanitarian values of compassion and social justice discover the amount of legislative force used to impose assimilationist policies in New Zealand, they may feel deeply distressed. In interpreting this theorising, I considered various sequences of emotions that might be experienced by a Pakeha person undertaking critical learning about the history of colonisation. They may experience emotional shock or discomfort as they catch a glimpse of how a standard story was constructed during their childhoods, and who did it – their teachers, the school journals, their parents. They may experience a further shock when they consider the number of people in their current life who appear to actively promote the self-serving story – the government, the media, their employers. A final shock may come as they realise their own complicity in this 'deception', remembering their part in dinner table conversations and staff room arguments. They may well feel angry at the initial deception, grieved by the historical impact and ashamed at their ongoing complicity. Emotional states such as empathy, hope and optimism about the future were theorised as encouraging changes in world-view. Alternatively, a Pakeha person may feel angry at hearing the reassuring standard story differently told, blaming towards those who have created such tension, and adopt a posture of resistance towards any further exposure to such challenge.

Considering emotional responses as keys to change helps to explain a dominant group's resistance to new, more critical and less self-serving constructions of reality. In Gramsci's (1971) concept of catharsis there is an implied outcome of enhanced rationality for the ordinary person, whereas these educators theorised that Pakeha may resist and fear catharsis, or become stuck in cycles of alternating emotions such as guilt and denial. The Treaty educators theorised that guilt, blame, and denial seemed to be based on a Pakeha person feeling responsible for the current situation, feeling obligated to alleviate the ongoing consequences of past injustice, and feeling a call to act to restore balance. Rather than joining an army fighting for its own liberation, the prospect for the Pakeha person was to join a group who were dismayed about what has been done, and what can yet be done? It was these latter emotions (which are arguably more complex constructions built on the experience of emotional discomfort) that were theorised to lead to change being suspended if Pakeha become stuck in emotional cycles or 'freeze' in a posture of denying these feelings.

Feminist educator Megan Boler (1999) considers emotions a primary site of social control, and equally a site of political resistance that can mobilise social movements of liberation. As in the present theorising, she proposes emotions as a mode of resistance to dominant cultural norms:

> Emotions function in part as moral and ethical evaluations; they give us information about what we care about and why. Thus a primary and under-explored source for this transformation and resistance is our emotional experience as it informs both our cognitive and moral perceptions. Our emotions help us to envision future horizons of possibilities and who we want to become. (p. xviii)

Community psychologist Rebecca Campbell (2000) has also argued for the significance of emotions in initiating and sustaining social change work.

The Treaty educators evaluated the stages metaphor for Pakeha change as potentially useful in several forums. When planning an educational workshop, it allows an educator to consider which stage, or combination of stages, might apply to prospective participants in a workshop. Similarly, the stages model may also be used to describe the current state of the Pakeha population in Aotearoa. For instance, a large number of Pakeha might be described as being in an unawakened stage about racism, colonisation, the Treaty and Maori aspirations; many might be described as being in the stage of awareness, having experienced awakenings of some sort; many might also be described as being in the learning stage, having undertaken some

learning about racism, colonisation and the Treaty; and finally, some might be described as being in the action stage, where they are acting to change Pakeha institutions and are working to build a different, non-colonial relationship with Maori.

8.2.2 A journey of collective change

The second major metaphor used in the Treaty educators' theorising was that Pakeha people undertake a journey of change from a hegemonically-maintained state of individualisation and unawareness towards a more knowing and negotiated bipartisan ideal with Maori. Unlike the stages model, there are no particular stations along the journey. The journey metaphor grappled with the issues of unlearning a hegemonic construction of an individualised Pakeha cultural identity, as well as tackling the Pakeha lack of awareness of the impersonal colonial relationship.

At the start of the journey, the Pakeha person is in an individualised state of attitudes and feelings, based on misinformation and ignorance constructed and reinforced by institutions in Pakeha society, such as schools, the media, and government policy. Such theorising endorsed Gramsci's (1971) thesis that society's institutions maintain hegemony by continuous ideological education to reinforce the status quo. The educators considered the cultural, historical and institutional legacy of white supremacy to be the primary context in which individualisation of Pakeha takes place. When society's institutions have been constituted in ways congenial for the dominant cultural group, a cultural value of individualism obscures how these institutions operate in the dominant group's collective interest, and to the exclusion of other cultural groups. This allows Pakeha to believe they have been individually successful, regardless of their culture or ethnicity.

As part of the hegemony of individualisation and invisible cultural dominance, Pakeha were kept "angry, fearful and misinformed" (Huygens, 2004, p. 15), affirming Boler's concept of emotions as a site of social control. Absorbing hegemonic education, the Pakeha person learns to perceive the colonised as a threat to be resisted. Pakeha were theorised as angry about Maori seeming to have special privileges, and threatened by Maori aspirations which appeared to leave Pakeha without a clear place and identity in New Zealand. As Memmi (1965) might have put it, a colonial hegemony teaches the "small colonizer" to defend his limited individual interests against the perceived demands of the colonised in a rather blind, duped way,

unaware that he is protecting "infinitely more important" interests in local and global economies. A Pakeha person's lack of awareness of their dominant place in the colonial system naturalises this threatened, defensive posture, and renders normal Curle's (1971) "unpeaceful relationship" between Maori and Pakeha.

Movement along the journey of change was theorised as requiring collective learning among other Pakeha and between Maori and Pakeha. Since Pakeha culture values individualism and "any suggestion of collective change is invalidated or ridiculed" (p. 13), Pakeha people were theorised as being immensely reluctant to begin a process of learning about themselves as a collective because it is "counter-cultural work, and goes against the dominant cultural expectation that an individual needs to stay in control" (p. 12). When the journey of collective learning became uncomfortable, Pakeha were likely to fall "back into being an individual" since this was considered the "Pakeha cultural default position" (p. 9). This stream of theorising endorsed Freire's thesis that ejecting the dominator's myths is a collective rather than an individual task, requiring a type of cultural action "which negates culture" (1975, p. 16). The present theorising tackled a cultural myth specific to dominant groups with individualistic cultures. In the case of Pakeha, the educators theorised that our individualisation needed to be specifically negated through Pakeha people coming to understand themselves as a cultural collective, and developing skills for change that were consciously collective.

The theorising further tackled the issue of how building a sense of cultural collectivity addressed the emotional immobilisation and resistance experienced by Pakeha people faced with a new view of colonisation. The Treaty educators theorised that an appreciation of themselves as a cultural collective helped Pakeha to move through the emotional cycles of blame, guilt and denial because achieving a sense of collectivity "allows people to learn and reflect without feeling guilty, since they no longer blame themselves as individuals" (Huygens, 2004, p. 12). Indeed, one group theorised that "feeling victimised when thinking about colonisation and Treaty issues is a sign that the person has slipped back into individualisation" (p. 12). They explained that the most helpful intervention when this happened was "to build a sense of collective (rather than individual) responsibility for the direction of Pakeha/dominant group culture in the future" (p. 14). As Pakeha strengthened their sense of involvement in collective change, more positive emotional states such as hope, inspiration and courage became more likely.

The journey metaphor also offered some significant extensions and challenges to existing theory. In the Treaty educators' body of theorising, the destination of the journey was marked by a different type of hegemony – the integration into everyday matters for Pakeha of an understanding of the Treaty, so that a Treaty relationship between Maori and Pakeha became "a normal part of life" (Huygens, 2004, p.16). In the present theorising the new "normality" was clearly a matter for discussion between Maori and non-Maori, and depended on the quality of the relationship between them. A feature of the proposed ideal state was that it was based on a conscious connectedness to Maori: "a scary place of intimacy that we don't yet know much about!" (p. 8) through "supporting tino rangatiratanga and exploring honourable kawanatanga" and "finding common ground" (p. 9). It was a destination with "no blueprint, no familiar structure or hierarchy, but where there are agreed values and processes, where the Pakeha/dominant group will have a place and feel liberated" and will know "how to continue" the journey (p. 10).

The radically different nature of the new hegemony is evident in decolonisation theory, where divesting colonial controls and privileges is the antithesis of the colonial relationship. Envisaging such a radically different ideal society seemed to me an example of the utopian hope described by Freire as "engagement full of risk" (1975, p. 20). To Freire, announcing the transformation of a dehumanising reality requires utopian hope, and the courage of inspiration (p. 21). The open-ended and dialogic quality of the ideal state also suggested Freire's continuous cultural action for freedom.

The consistent focus on Pakeha developing a sense of connected destiny with Maori also provides a challenge to Memmi's (1965) "impossible historical situation" for the self-rejecting coloniser. As Memmi acknowledges: "If he wants to help the colonized, it is exactly because their destiny does concern him, because his destiny and theirs are intertwined and matter to one another, because he hopes to go on living in the colony" (p. 36). The educators' theorising that the destination of Pakeha change was the "common ground" of an "agreed relationship" with "no blueprint" (Huygens, 2004, p.10) emphasises that the relationship was intended as a negotiated one.

A question that arises with a journey metaphor is what triggers such a journey? The Treaty educators theorised that as children "we were born to connect" (Huygens,

2004, p. 31), and that our motivation towards connection prompted us to embark upon or proceed with a journey of change. The universal human passion for connection to others is like a flame that is doused as hegemonic cultural institutions begin their education for separation and colonisation. As people awakened to new possibilities in the Pakeha-Maori relationship, a rekindling of flames of "feelings of empathy, passion or hope" (p. 15) helped people begin and sustain a journey of change. Unlike the self-perpetuating cycles of negative emotions posited in the stages model, these cycles of rekindling positive emotions were ones "of rejuvenation, of re-membering the sense of connection held by children" (p. 31). These sentiments were in keeping with the humanism in Freire's liberatory theory, and also supported his focus on a collectively-oriented humanism. According to the educators, people needed to seek out other individuals of passion and be warmed by others' flames, to maintain motivation on a journey of change. Note the difference between educators' theorising about "wanting to connect to others" and the dominant discourse of 'we are all one people'. In positing a universal human desire for connection, these educators implied that such connection involved an appreciation of difference between human beings, rather than requiring, as does the 'one people' discourse, that non-dominant others put aside the ways in which they are different.

In taking further the notions of empathy and connection to others as motivating factors for Pakeha, the body of theorising gave consistent attention to the stimulus of "empathy and aroha" from Maori, learning "under the wing of Maori" (Huygens, 2004, p. 77) as well as to hearing stories of injustice from Maori. However, while Pakeha empathy might be awakened through hearing stories of injustice, the theorising emphasised an important next step:

> …not wanting to rely on Maori to feed what I know, so moving into other places to try and find that new knowledge, using other resources to continue the work. It is draining to Maori to keep telling their stories, so I saw those stories of injustice as a gift, a catalyst. (p. 77).

The person eventually sought out Pakeha "who were similarly taking such a role as activists or educators" (p. 22), and began the journey of building a conscious sense of collectivity with their own cultural group.

The metaphor of the journey or pathway to a destination was evaluated by the Treaty educators as compatible with Pakeha change occurring in stages, but emphasised

different aspects of the process, particularly the importance for Pakeha of becoming more conscious of culture held in common. It was evaluated by participants as useful for inspiring and guiding Pakeha participants in a Treaty workshop.

8.2.3 Spirals of conscious and unconscious change

The metaphor of recurring cycles or spirals was used by the Treaty educators to represent more fully the complexities and inter-connections educators saw in processes of change. When cyclic imagery is extended by a forward directional movement, denoting change over time or place, a spiral is created. Change becomes the spiral of movement of revisiting and re-viewing earlier contexts and constructions from a different angle. The spiral metaphor helped to link micro-processes within individuals, entwined individual and collective meso-level processes, and macro-processes of how a collective journey of change remained in motion. By layering the imagery, individual lives were considered miniature spiral journeys, dotted throughout the collective journey. The larger collective journey was depicted as the context for individual journeys. In spite of the obscuring fog of colonisation, individual journeys drew upon the inspirations, revelations and awakenings of others and made their own contributions to the collective change process. In this way, small sites of interaction drew upon cultural constructions, as well as helping to change these constructions. This strand of theorising endorsed the social constructionist view of the co-constructed nature of social and cultural change: "We don't know where the journey will take us – we are building the journey together with whoever else is on it with us"; and "We are building the journey with people we don't know are there" (Huygens, 2004, p. 91). Equally, the larger collective was on a journey spanning many individual lifetimes – one conclusion was that the emotional and cultural preparation required for decolonisation would take Pakeha seven generations (p. 29).

The spirals metaphor seemed to my peers and me particularly useful for representing links between processes of which people were conscious and those of which they were unconscious. Throughout the theorising, there was a theme of bringing to consciousness hidden or obscured aspects of the socio-cultural world for Pakeha. For instance, the white fog of colonisation was theorised as obscuring common humanity and dousing the "flames" of "connection" between people (Huygens, 2004, p. 31). The cultural conserve and the Pakeha cultural default were theorised as unconsciously held, affirming Gramsci's thesis that an individual's personality develops amid social,

political and cultural circumstances embodying assumptions about the world that they cannot initially identify. Pakeha change was considered to require "a pair of Treaty glasses" (p. 57) in the manner of a grandmother reminding children who are searching for lost treasures to put on their "nanna glasses" in order to see their environment in quite a different way. To achieve awareness of what was hitherto unconscious, Pakeha may "seek more knowledge about what really happened" thereby "moving consciousness to a deeper level" (p. 6) through a "journey of consciousness-raising" (p. 11) to reach what Freire (1975) called a "state of perceptive clarity" (p. 46). For instance, racism as a construct, learned in childhood within the cultural institutions of the family and early childhood education, was an example of unconscious learning. Learning about the Treaty was considered to "push deep-seated button for parents, bringing to consciousness patterns that have been set in early life, and challenging people to question what they want for the next generation" (Huygens, 2004, p. 78). Our theorising that Pakeha change involved "looking openly at cultural values underpinning colonisation" (p. 28) is a thesis about bringing to awareness that which is hidden through "personal forgetting, institutionalised forgetting" (p. 28). The link to external processes of change was made in the conclusion to this stream of theorising as: "Decolonisation is becoming more aware of this unconscious journey" (p. 32).

Though the fertile interplay possible in the spirals metaphor between conscious and unconscious aspects of change, unseen processes may be at work for many years until suddenly there is a visible outcome, a "spark" or "starbursts" of collective enlightenment (Huygens, 2004, p. 19 and p. 32). In the manner of Bateson's (1972) 'mindedness' as a shared property of a system, Billig et al (1988) consider that remembering (and forgetting) involve complex social processes that are not restricted to the mind of any single individual (p. 28). Sampson (1993) also reflects on the shared ownership of intelligence, treating the social and the cognitive as intertwined and essential aspects of one another (p. 132). He cites Middleton and Edward's term "collective remembering" (p. 130) to refer to this process. By linking individual and collective journeys so closely, and by intertwining unconscious processes so freely with conscious processes, the spirals metaphor of change affirms that small efforts at change may have unseen consequences that are manifested many years later.

The intertwined spirals metaphor also highlighted the importance of collective dreams and visions. The concept of conscious and unconscious individual journeys

inter-weaving in time and space with conscious collective journeys allowed for people and groups to "project" their visions, in Freire's (1975) terms, and to be informed by Mezirow's (1991) "horizons of possibility" referring to other Pakeha and Maori working for change.

In evaluation, the Treaty educator groups had an enthusiastic response to the spirals imagery, feeling that it expressed their current understandings of the nature of the journey of Pakeha change as well as allowing for future possibilities, e.g. "You move and change and come back to something you learned, and you are different" (Huygens, 2004, p. 35). Because the spirals image simultaneously captured the role of the head and the heart in change, the image was considered to be very helpful in expressing warmth and love directly, without words "getting in the way" (p. 35). The open-ended, multi-layered imagery seemed to express how Pakeha could work together with Maori, because it included values rooted in this country and its past, and allowed for Pakeha to respect and follow Maori cultural values. With its inspirational and hope-giving character, educators evaluated this metaphor as having potential for working with one's own community, or with a group already strongly committed to change. The holistic, systemic nature of the spirals metaphor commended it to working with groups (family, community or workplace) who want to envision a future, and who are prepared to consider very widely the actions needed to achieve their vision.

To me, the spiral metaphor seemed particularly useful for conceptualising the mutual impact of individual and collective processes of change, providing a meso-level approach to change. It also had value as a processual, future-oriented model of change (Lauer, 1980), encouraging dialogue between Maori and Pakeha about values and visions for the future.

Considering the spirals, journeys and stages metaphors together, the Treaty educator groups considered that they might be strategically suited to different audiences. When entering a workshop as an external educator, a participant suggested that she would prefer to use the pathway because "our culture *expects* us to have a road map" (Huygens, 2004, p. 36) and it would feel more appropriate to present a pathway of change. On the other hand, when working with a group in which she was a member, the spirals would allow for sharing visions, hopes and goals. Another suggested that the stages of change would be suitable for assessing the learning needs of Pakeha in a

prospective workshop, the journey of change as an inspirational planning tool for an organisation, and the spirals of change for inspiring a community's vision.

8.2.4 Mobile web of tangled change efforts

The final metaphor for change used in the theorising was an interacting and tangled web of connections between people committed to the Treaty, each involved in myriad processes of change. As with the spirals, the 'web of change' provided a helpful way of symbolising ever-moving links between people and processes in a complex society, itself blown about by larger winds, but nevertheless, holding together persistently 'even in stormy seas' like a ragged net or sea-raft. By hanging the web of change as a mobile from the sturdy arms of the Maori and Pakeha parties to the Treaty, "like two partners of different weights and lengths" and requiring an effort to "get balance with the different shapes" (Huygens, 2004, p. 56), the theorising captured the care needed to achieve a balance between two sovereign signatories to a treaty who are now numerically very different and who now live within a Western-style democracy. In particular, the mobile web metaphor allowed for the delicate but critical contributions to balance made by non-Pakeha immigrants, such as Pacific peoples with their ancestral links to Maori.

Many competing directions of change within the web highlighted the difficulty of assessing overall impact of change efforts within a limited timeframe. Work for change within a cultural group was theorised as potentially overwhelmed by temporary resistance or barriers, yet as having unseen consequences years or generations later "when they link up and… spark when every now and again we light a fire" (p. 57).

Providing a theoretical counterpart to the 'web of racism' posited for oppression, the 'web of change' metaphor affirms Gramsci's insistence on the complexity of hegemony. With its myriad, unpredictable connections between heritage, culture, activism, education and entertainment it reminds us of the "multiple contexts in which…alternative political outlooks may be prepared" (Adamson, 1980, p. 142). It seemed to me a very apt metaphor for a synchronic view of change – at any one time "you never know where the spark is going to be lit" (Huygens, 2004, p. 57). Equally, efforts at change sometimes "hang and don't go anywhere, then they link up and …every now and again we light a fire" (p. 57). Knitting and weaving were theorised

as the active element, implying the human agency of knitter or weaver to enable transformation: "Our workshops have that same therapeutic effect – from ignorance we knit together understanding" (p57). This metaphor was used not merely for literary effect – the approach used by Pakeha Treaty educators has indeed been to brainstorm with participants their existing knowledge of New Zealand history and race relations, and then to weave in additional material so as to cast the knowledge in a new light. Such weaving shows up the patterns of Pakeha colonisation and Maori response in way that suddenly makes sense to participants. Casting a spider to represent fear also suggested the active agency of a spinner, able to link all elements together. Reframing Pakeha fear of change in this way showed fear as amenable to being transformed into hope for the future.

In my view, the web metaphor was useful for considering Treaty educators' efforts towards Pakeha change in the context of wider national and global processes. The 'tangled web of change' provided a wide angle perspective in which Maori were simultaneously on a journey of change, as indeed were government policies, the global economy, and international human rights legislation, as well as those Pakeha resisting change or moving in opposing directions towards increased racism or individualism. Like the spirals metaphor, the web metaphor adopted a processual view of change, acknowledging the complexity and unpredictability of social change and capturing the messy way in which diverse cultural heritages and hopes for the future interacted. However, the web of change metaphor relied on a basic structure of the Treaty in place as a constitutional framework. The web of change thereby showed explicitly the potential of the Treaty as constraint, or equally as guidance, for how relationships between cultural groups may be constituted.

In overall consideration of the metaphors for change created in the co-theorising process, a full range of change processes for Pakeha received attention: inner psychic processes at work in personal change and wider cultural processes at work in collective change, as well as connections between Pakeha and Maori processes of change. There was frequent mention of the larger context of Maori assertions of tino rangatiratanga:

> Our Pakeha process is not what changes things – rather it complements the changes. No change happens in a dominant group without demands. So this theorising needs to show tino rangatiratanga moving as well. We need to put a circle of tino rangatiratanga around it, or show the moving demands of assertions of tino rangatiratanga. (Huygens, 2004, p. 21)

Throughout the theorising, change was theorised as a learning process, rather than a battle. There was no enemy constructed in the theorising. None of the metaphors for change involved 'combating racism' or 'banishing ignorance' or 'righting wrongs'. Cultural racism was constructed as rather an impersonal force as a form of cultural expression or interaction, exerting an influence by maintaining Pakeha in a state of individualised complacency and misinformation. Some groups made the point that a model must be neither blaming nor alienating of Pakeha, but rather must be respectful of ourselves and our culture: "We shouldn't criticise ourselves or make ourselves wrong by adopting a model that is blaming. We should respect the flame in all of us" (Huygens, 2004, p. 35). It was felt that blaming models may encourage Treaty educators to adopt a judgemental attitude towards participants in workshops, when for instance "someone may sound really racist, but it will turn out that they are friends with a really staunch Maori activist – we can't be judgemental" (p. 35). Neither did the theorising use a metaphor of 'enlightening the uninitiated'. Ignorance was acknowledged as a state in which all Pakeha find themselves at some point in their lives, including all Treaty educators. Pakeha were theorised as going through cycles of increasing understanding on particular issues, then cycling back to begin the cycle of learning again with a new set of issues. Indeed, the overall impression was one of immense love and forbearance by these Treaty educators of their own cultural group:

> I had to really love my own people. I needed to be absolutely prepared to listen to people in my own group and accept who and what they are, before I could bring them information. It has taken me years! (Huygens, 2004, p. 70*)*

In final evaluation, all the metaphors for change were essentially compatible, as indeed the Treaty educator groups demonstrated by layering the imagery on several occasions. The stages and journeys models provided a micro-level view of individual and collective journeys that sat well within the meso-level view of interacting journeys provided by the spirals imagery. These micro- and meso-level metaphors in turn sat easily within the macro-level view provided by the web of multiple directions of change in New Zealand society as a whole.

8.3 Theory for Pakeha changing

Taken together, the theorised metaphors for Pakeha change processes endorsed, challenged and extended the concepts of change reviewed in Chapter 3.

8.3.1 Endorsements of existing theory

The locally theorised processes for Pakeha change broadly endorsed Gramsci's (1971) and Freire's (1975) theories of changing, the primary bodies of relevant social and psychological theorising considered in this thesis.

The importance Gramsci placed on cultural hegemony, commonsense and political education was affirmed by the present theorising. Gramsci's thesis that the site of political education is the ordinary person moving from their common sense to a more critical view was also endorsed. Treaty education, as a form of political education, challenged the hegemonic Pakeha commonsense of how the relationship between Pakeha and Maori came to be structured as at present. By the studying the guarantees agreed in the Treaty and revisiting the history of local colonisation, Pakeha were invited to consider the hegemonic influences on their common sense, and to reflect upon how their cultural institutions constructed a standard story. As Pakeha learned about their place in historical processes, they were able to develop a critical view of colonisation, and come to consider themselves candidates for a new future.

The local theorising also endorsed Freire's theories of conscientisation, pedagogical dialogue and cultural action for liberation. Pakeha change was theorised as a social psychological process of becoming conscientised about an oppressive colonial relationship. The conscientisation took place among other Pakeha, and in dialogue with Maori. A key change strategy was the pedagogical approach of Treaty educators and Pakeha learners speaking together to relearn the history of the colonial relationship using a 'dialogue' model of renaming the world together. In much writing, conscientisation is treated as a property of a person, whereas this research supports Freire's insistence that it is an achievement of dialogue, an interactive achievement within a relationship between peoples, to "speak a new World into being". Finally, collective cultural action was theorised as a necessary and ongoing aspect of the process.

8.3.2 Challenges

The present theorising also extended and challenged Gramsci's and Freire's theories of change, and in so doing, reinforced some of the theoretical challenges raised in Chapter 3.

Firstly, the present theorising addressed a challenge implicit in existing theory – the ambivalence demonstrated by a dominant group towards their own political education. There is in Gramsci's political education, as in Mezirow's transformational learning theory, an implied outcome of enhanced rationality for the ordinary person as they undertake counter-hegemonic learning. However, the present theorising proposed that critical learning involves some emotional responses unique to a dominant group, particularly around fearing the loss of a self-serving world view, and resisting a sense of responsibility for the current social order. Pakeha may fear and resist the catharsis of critical learning, since it is after all, not 'rational' (in the self-interested rationalist/humanist paradigm) for a dominant group member to commit themselves to a reduction in their perceived privileges. In contrast, the Treaty educators theorised that emotions such as hope, empathy and feeling connected to Maori help to explain the 'non-rational' position that the Pakeha person finds themselves in.

Secondly, the present theorising endorsed Freire's notion of change depending on conscientised cultural action to eject the present dominator's culture. However, the precise manner in which such cultural action may occur, and specifically how a dominant group might undertake this significant process, is largely unexplored in Freire's work. The present theorising explored the vexed question of whether an individual's conscientisation processes necessarily lead to such collective cultural action. In a dominant culture which values individualism, it is not necessarily the case that personal conscientisation leads to collective action. The educators theorised that critical conscientisation is required with an individualised dominant group on the value placed on individualism, and on the collective nature of institutional racism. Conceiving of Pakeha change simply as conscientisation, dialogue and 'knowing together' misses the significance of Pakeha responsibility for the current order. The present theorising emphasised the necessity for Pakeha to establish a sense of collectivity before being able to take responsibility for the collectively enacted

character of institutional racism. Building skills and practice in conscious collective processes was considered necessary. The present theorising thus furnished detail about how a dominant group may undertake Freire's liberatory cultural action.

In summary, when the emphasis is laid, as the present theorising does, on emotional and interactional processes for Pakeha as a dominant group, many aspects of Pakeha change become clearer and are more adequately explained. These emphases on emotional and interactional processes contribute some significant innovations to existing theory.

8.3.3 Innovations

In my interpretation of the body of theorising we generated, three primary innovations took our theorising beyond the concepts reviewed in Chapter 3:
- the part played by emotional responses as Pakeha feel challenged to change self-serving worldviews
- the step of building a sense of collectivity among Pakeha
- the notion of an agreed relationship between Pakeha and Maori as a goal of change.

A fourth aspect of change, accepted as relevant for oppressed groups, was here considered also to be crucial for a dominant group:
- Pakeha needed to critically revisit the history of the Maori - Pakeha relationship.

These innovations will be briefly discussed to draw out their differences from how change is theorised for oppressed groups, and their particular significance to a dominant group. I will argue that these four theoretical innovations together comprise a consistent, coherent group of concepts with which to theorise change for a dominant group such as Pakeha.

Re-visiting the history of the relationship

The Treaty educators theorised that change was a process of Pakeha people revisiting their history in this country and coming to appreciate how their present social world came to be constructed – coming to understand how common cultural ideologies have shaped their worldview. As Billig explains (1995), ideology comprises the habits of behaviour and belief that combine to make any social world appear to those who

inhabit it as the natural world: "By this reckoning, ideology operates to make people forget that their world has been historically constructed" (p. 37). As a non-indigenous psychologist working with the people of El Salvador, Martin-Baro (1994) identifies "the recovery of historical memory" (p. 218) as one of the urgent tasks of a Latin American liberatory psychology. However, while re-telling history provides Pakeha with necessary "alternative knowledges" (Smith, 1999, p34) about the colonial past just as it does for indigenous peoples, the implications are different. Addressing the oppressed, Martin-Baro explains that recovery of historical memory means "recovering not only the sense of one's own identity and the pride of belonging to a people but also a reliance on a tradition and a culture…. rescuing those aspects of identity which served yesterday, and will serve today, for liberation" (Martín-Baró, 1994, p.30). His words help to clarify the contrasting implication for a coloniser group – that recovery of historical memory implies critiquing those aspects of yesterday's tradition and culture which will *not* serve today for liberation from oppression. In the present theorising, re-telling 'true' histories (Glover et al, 2006) for a dominant group such as Pakeha helps in deconstructing the distorted images of indigenous peoples, and distorted accounts of transactions between coloniser and colonised. Key features for Pakeha appear to be that the revisited history puts a greater emphasis on the experience of Maori, and gives a less flattering portrait of the dominant group. As argued in Chapter 2, the standard story of a dominant group's history is self-legitimising, obscuring or normalising the coloniser's indifference to the experience of indigenous peoples. Re-telling of history brings to a dominant group's notice their part in the present indifference to the other. Hence, new accounts of history which bring to attention this indifference are counter-cultural information, and create intellectual and emotional shock-waves.

Responding emotionally

As theorised here, Pakeha appear to share with oppressed groups many of the emotions associated with critical conscientisation – anger and blame at how much has been hidden, grief at loss of innocence, and shame at the implications of a lifetime of labouring under illusions and collusions, or equally fear of change to a known world, and anger at those who are suggesting change. However, we also theorised some significant differences for a culturally dominant group in the emotions associated with revisiting their history. As might be expected, feelings of responsibility and guilt were more prominent, since Pakeha were coming to appreciate that their cultural

group has asserted control of society to the detriment of Maori. Denial and defensiveness also seemed to be more prominent. Whereas for oppressed peoples decolonisation work might involve working with internalised self-attributions about being hopeless and useless, decolonisation with a dominant group here involved challenging internalised self-attributions of decency and fairness. Unlike the person in an oppressed group, the person in a dominant group such as Pakeha, with espoused cultural values of equality, justice and human rights, needed quite some assistance to come to critically appreciate why they were taught a Pakeha-centred view of New Zealand's history – to appreciate that the cultural group to which they belong has been active in maintaining ignorance and oppression. Such a new worldview contrasts strongly with the reassuring theme in the colonial standard story theme that contemporary social conditions are an inevitable outcome of historical processes and that people today are innocent inheritors of such a reality.

Building a conscious collectivity

Helping to build a conscious and critical sense of collectivity among Pakeha was theorised as the key step required to circumvent the obscuring nature of individualistic norms of thinking and action. This theorising provides a coherent response to the issues raised by Henriques et al (1984) about the individualism underpinning U.S. and U.K. antiracism interventions based on the prejudice-causes-racism thesis. He pointed to the inevitability, in using such individually-referenced interventions, of reinforcing individualism, thereby failing to influence a collective process like racism. In contrast, the Treaty educators' theorising focused unswervingly on racism as a set of processes enacted by Pakeha as a collective, and the ensuing need for consciously collective processes to change it.

The present theorising also threw into relief a tension for Pakeha as they develop their consciousness of collective change. Pakeha experience a two directional impulse as they pursue change - on the one hand, moving forward to become part of "a group that is changing" (Huygens, 2004, p. 18) and on the other, hanging back in order to "bring the family with us" (p. 88). This aspect of change addresses the critique raised in Chapter 3 that existing theory for dominant group change appears to assume a homogeneous dominant group. Our theorising suggested that there are such 'groups who are changing' within the Pakeha dominant group.

Preparing for relationship

The concept of Pakeha preparing for a mutually agreed relationship with Maori was an aspect of change that seemed to me unique to a dominant group. Building a relationship with Maori involved unfamiliar skills for Pakeha such as being able to "name the gift we receive from Maori" (Huygens, 2004, p. 89), learning how to agree on new values and processes, and relaxing about a negotiated, connected destiny. One group offered the words of a local kaumatua about Treaty education: "We are weaving people together so that they can be liberated" (p. 89).

Our reflections on how relationships were established between Maori and Pakeha activist groups were examples of how mutually agreeable relationships between coloniser and indigenous groups might be developed. The progress of groups on a strategic co-intentional journey, Maori asserting their rangatiratanga and Pakeha experiencing conscientisation, concerned a sequence of steps in the relationship. First the Pakeha person was unaware of the presence of Maori activist groups in their environment. While this was a historical observation of Pakeha awareness in the 1970s and 1980s, it is still the case that many contemporary Pakeha may be unaware of Maori socio-political entities around them, and unaware of the social or political aspirations held by these groups. Once awakened to the presence of Maori groups, the Pakeha person generally responded in a number of ways, including seeking eager access to Maori cultural knowledge. But part of the Maori strategy to avoid further Pakeha colonisation has been to exercise caution about the roles Pakeha play, so Maori groups may set conditions on Pakeha involvement. Eventually, often with the encouragement of Maori colleagues, and the high profile of some long-term Pakeha educators, the Pakeha person's desire for validation of their individual journey led them to seek out other Pakeha activists and embark upon a more collectively referenced, and supported, journey of change. As a result, a more strategic way of relating to each other was established that follows a more negotiated, co-intentional path. As the educators put it: "So they [Maori and Pakeha] all remain interrelated, even though we are doing our own things" (Huygens, 2004, p. 84) In this theorised strategy, Pakeha learn to support each other, to learn together, and to change together.

In the national meeting, I suggested a final interpretation of our theorising – that change by Pakeha towards a different relationship with Maori was created by living the relationship in daily life, i.e. not waiting for some future constitution or Treaty

resolution. Treaty educators agreed that: "The culture around us keeps making these different relationships [between Maori and Pakeha] invisible, and it is very difficult getting recognition of it" (p. 90). 'Getting recognition' of the desired relationship implied institutionalising it in the community or workplace context, having it grow and deepen as Maori and Pakeha responded to each other, and passing it on to the next generation of children, or staff in a workplace.

In my view, these theoretical innovations cohered together to furnish an adequate, consistent framework for a theory of dominant group change. Using cognitive, emotional, interactional and relational elements, the change processes that Pakeha were theorised to go through were:
- Relearning a history of the Pakeha-Maori relationship
- Responding emotionally to a shift in worldview about the colonial relationship
- Developing a conscious collectivity and anti-racism strategy as Pakeha
- Preparing for a differently-constituted relationship between Maori and Pakeha.

To critically revisit the history of the Pakeha-Maori relationship prompted 'epistemological discomfort' for a Pakeha person, and eventually led them to seek out other Pakeha for a more collectively referenced and emotionally supported journey of change. When Pakeha felt fearful at the open-ended nature of the journey, it was considered helpful to revisit their understanding of collectivity with other Pakeha, and their sense of connectedness to Maori. Increasing awareness of, and trust in, a process in which the individual was not in control helped Pakeha become part of a group that is changing within New Zealand society.

Overall, Pakeha change was theorised as specifically dependent upon growth in skills of collectivity as a cultural group, and skills in building a mutually agreeable relationship with Maori. These considerations suggested that working towards a different relationship between Maori and Pakeha required "cultural work" (McArthur, 1992) for Pakeha "trying to grow a new culture, live it, have it be responsive, and pass it on" (Huygens, 2004, p. 90).

These theoretical innovations will be evaluated in the Integration chapter for their contribution to a coherent theory of Pakeha change.

CHAPTER 9.0 STUDY 3
ORGANISATIONAL DISCOURSES OF TREATY-BASED CHANGE

> It is clear that the Treaty is about sharing power
> How powerful do you not want us to be?
> How can you be sure that your use of power is not limiting?
> What plans do you have with the power you already hold?
>
> Tangata whenua caucus at Treaty Conference 2000,
> in Huygens, 2000 et al, p. 43

This study examines the final data stream for my research on processes of Pakeha change – the linguistic constructions in use by Pakeha who had attempted Smith's "bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic and psychological" (1999, p. 98) divesting of colonial power. In my search for sites of alternative discourse to the standard colonial story, I argued in Chapter 5 that early adopters of Treaty-focused change in organisation might provide a third source of theorising on how Pakeha change. I saw their theorising as relevant to the experiential aspect of Treaty-focused change. I sought therefore, the "new, unfamiliar and initially difficult discourses" that Belsey (1980, p. 4) suggests are required to make meaning of new actions – in this case, the action of an organisation 'honouring the Treaty of Waitangi'.

Taking a critical discursive approach, the specific research questions posed for the study were:

What evidence is there of alternative discourses in use by Pakeha in organisations working to 'honour the Treaty'?
- What are the key discursive resources used by narrators in accounts of their organisational journeys?

In this study I treat discourse in two ways. In searching for 'an alternative discourse' about colonisation, I depend upon Foucault's notion of discourse as a recognisable collection of statements which cohere together, and which make sense in a particular historical period (Hall, 2001). However, I also focus on the

social actions (Wetherell, 2001) or 'discursive practices' (Davies & Harre, 2001) with which people actively produce social and psychological realities. To this end, I settled on the rather open-ended term 'discursive resources' to signify broad patterns in an emerging discourse, as well as accompanying procedures used by speakers[1]. I also use the more a-theoretical term 'themes' at times, since this was the term I used with participants.

My search for the particular 'discursive resources' that organisational speakers use to constitute an alternative social order relies on Wetherell and Edley's (1999) argument that broad patterns evident in data are representative of the discourse of the sample as a whole. They contend that while the analyst may examine speech generated in a highly specific discursive situation (such as a conference in this study) the interpretative or "psycho-discursive resources" (p. 353) used by speakers have a generality outside the specific context and are thus robust phenomena. For a study to be able to identify a pool of discursive resources available to a speaking community, the sample to be analysed must arguably include a majority of the discursive resources in common use. The organisational stories of Treaty implementation studied here were narrated by some of the known leaders in the field, such as feminist organisations (Huygens, 2001a; Pringle & Henry, 1994) and church communities (Nairn, 2002), as well as by staff working within institutions known in New Zealand for responses to the Treaty ranging from supportive to resistant.

Rather than searching for a unitary story, or common culture in an organisation, Boyce (1996), Barry (1997) and others assume that multiple stories exist in an organisation, and that the researcher has a role in identifying the diverse positions of the narrators. The notion of staff telling their stories of the organisation differently fits within a social constructionist paradigm of people actively making sense of their world. It suggests that storytelling is a form of theorising about one's world. This helped me to conceptualise the accounts examined here as 'narrative theorising' by narrators who were 'making sense of' organisational potential sources of the (potentially) new constructions required to enact new realities argued for in Chapter 4.

To examine the accounts of organisational Treaty journeys, I selected a method for tracing the system of dependencies of a discourse called critical discourse analysis (to distinguish it from discourse analytic methods in other fields). Potter

---

[1] My grateful acknowledgment to Tim McCreanor and Ray Nairn for this general term

and Wetherell (2001) describe critical discourse analysis as a new style of socio-psychological research used by psychologists and social policy analysts spanning the discursive and extra-discursive domains (Taylor, 2001, p. 8). The aim is to identify patterns and variations of language use and related practices, and to show how these constitute or create aspects of social and political life. Wetherell and Potter (1992) make the linkage of the social and the psychological explicit:

> Discourse analysis focuses above all on quintissentially psychological activities – activities of justification, rationalisation, categorisation, attribution, making sense, naming, blaming, and identifying. Discourse studies link those activities with collective forms of social action and thus have the potential to integrate psychological concerns with social analysis. (p. 2)

The form of critical discourse analysis described has been used by local researchers to examine patterns in Pakeha discourse which maintain colonial relations between Pakeha and Maori (Nairn & McCreanor, 1990, 1991). In their interpretation, the dominant Pakeha discourse of race relations positions Maori as the marginalised other with Pakeha culture and authority at the centre, and thereby helps to maintain oppressive social relations. Although not sourced from workplaces, the key discursive resources interpreted by Nairn & McCreanor (1991) below are fairly generally drawn upon in dominant discourse about Maori:

- good Maori/bad Maori – Maori fall into two groups - those who fit without difficulty into [Pakeha] society, and those who can't or won't.
- Maori stirrers – a tiny minority of bad Maori are trouble makers and radicals.
- unfair Maori privilege - having special treatment and rights is wrong and undemocratic.
- one people – unless we drop our sectarian interests, racial tension will grow. Biculturalism as a power sharing model is divisive, whereas multiculturalism is preferred where minority and immigrant groups add spice and colour to the mainstream.
- the Treaty – is a flawed historical document of no relevance today.

(McCreanor, 2005)

There has also been some work tracing the antecedents of our local colonial discourse. McCreanor (1997) found antecedents to the Good Maori/bad Maori pattern in a New Zealand Company handbook (Ward 1839, cited in McCreanor, 1997) produced to educate colonists about the native people already resident in New Zealand. In this handbook the dominant pattern functioned to divide the Maori population into those who would fit in with Pakeha goals for colonisation and those who would not.

My discourse analytic approach followed Nairn and McCreanor's (1990, 1991) adaptation of Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Billig et al's (1988) critical discourse methods, used here to identify key resources in an alternative, rather than a dominant, discourse. I considered the informants to be using discourse that enabled them to respond to challenges such as that expressed in the chapter's opening quotation, delivered at Treaty Conference 2000.

9.1 Organisations narrate Treaty journeys

9.1.1 The organisational narrators and accounts

The development during the 1980s of co-intentional work by Maori and Pakeha to intervene in the institutional racism of New Zealand's organisations was outlined in Study 1 *Developing Treaty theorising*. As described there, church and women's organisations took the initiative in responding to challenges, often delivered by their Maori members. Over time, they undertook antiracism and Treaty workshops for staff, and began making changes to their charters and mission statements, their work practices and organisational structures. Other non-government organisations followed suit in the later 1980s, including local bodies and tertiary education providers. In most organisations Pakeha and Maori who supported Treaty-focused change clustered together in interest or action groups. Some of these internal Treaty groups offered their organisations further education on the Treaty, and worked on changing constitutions, ethics, policies, and practices. Treaty Conference 2000 was advertised to tauiwi communities throughout the country "to affirm the Treaty" and "to bring together those working to integrate the Treaty in their sectors, organisations and communities" (Conference publicity, Huygens et al, 2000). Conference participants were invited to "bring your experience of Treaty work, institutional change work, education programmes, decolonisation work, strategising ideas and writings" (Conference publicity, Huygens et al, 2000).

Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000 (Huygens et al, 2000) contained 16 accounts by people working with the Treaty in their organisations or groups. The narrators told of Treaty journeys in five large tertiary education institutions, two metropolitan local councils and libraries, the national collective of women's refuges, a religious order, a national women's performing arts network, a national literacy organisation and a women's organic farm. Four of the accounts described

Treaty work in sites other than workplaces including a court case, a public meeting, a land occupation in a provincial city and an association of health promotion organisations. Thirteen accounts were narrated by Pakeha, and three by Maori and Pakeha co-presenters. All the accounts were of change in organisations serving the general public, i.e. they were not accounts of work in hapu-centred organisations or in those working to a kaupapa Maori or Maori philosophical value base. The accounts covered time-spans of three to 16 years during the period from 1984 to mid-2000, with most covering at least a decade of organisational work towards the Treaty.

The organisational narrators were long-serving senior staff and organisational leaders, including co-directors of smaller organisations, and directors, senior or middle management staff in larger organisations. Many were formal delegates for their organisations, while others were in Treaty interest or activist groups within their institutions. Most of the presenters attended the conference in work time as representatives of their workplaces, with their words open to scrutiny by their organisations. The workshop audiences were primarily Pakeha, since the conference scheduled a Maori caucus concurrently with the workshops.

9.1.2 Discourse analysis of organisational narratives

By selecting for analysis a collection of accounts by organisational presenters intending to 'affirm the Treaty', I was co-theorising with early adopters. However, rather than being positioned among them, as I was with my fellow Treaty educators in Study 2, I was stationed at a close proximity and affinity with their work. I read the 16 accounts from the position of a current Treaty educator and as a past worker for Treaty change within organisations and communities. I immersed myself in the accounts by reading them through until familiarity grew and I was able to respond to phrases and meaning within accounts as similar to elements seen elsewhere. Those elements were clustered together using coloured tags, and then copied electronically into a file labelled to reflect the cluster to which it was seen to belong. When, on a pass through the accounts, I identified no new elements, I examined each file to describe the nature of the similarity I saw in the first phase. If that could not be expressed in a single relatively simple sentence I considered that the elements lacked coherence and re-examined them. Re-classification, through close examination of the similarities identified in the initial readings enabled me to simplify the cluster, identifying smaller clusters that appeared to link to several others. For instance, a cluster of phrases I had initially termed 'authority', on closer examination could be separated into 'affirmations

and assertions of Maori authority' and 'invisible Pakeha authority' or 'dominance'. A further separation of 'affirmation of Maori authority' (by Pakeha narrators) and 'assertion of Maori authority' (by Maori and Pakeha co-narrators) enabled me to provide logically simple, clear descriptions of the resources, and to link smaller clusters such as 'obligation' and 'a sense of accountability' (to Maori authority) to the 'affirmation' resource.

9.2 Discourses for Treaty journeys in New Zealand organisations

In my reading of the accounts, the narrators used a number of discursive resources to describe the Treaty journeys of their organisations. These were, in order of their frequency of use over all the accounts:

- affirming Maori authority in Aotearoa New Zealand
- dissonance between what ought to be and what is, in the workplace and in the country
- discomfort and struggle for Pakeha, and danger for Maori in attempting to work with the Treaty of Waitangi
- we, the change workers on a long, hard journey
- striving towards a 'right relationship' between Maori and Pakeha.

I begin by describing in detail the themes of 'affirming Maori authority' and 'striving towards a right relationship with Maori'. These two themes appeared to me to be substantive alternatives to the dominant discourse with which Pakeha construct their socio-political reality. I considered them to be primary themes in an alternative discourse. The other three seemed to me to be resources needed by speakers to describe the process of producing and maintaining an alternative discourse – the intellectual dissonance and emotional struggle involved, and the significance of the collective voice in sustaining such alternative constructions. These process themes were by no means unique to this particular alternative discourse, but by their frequency of use, were obviously very necessary in constructing an alternative reality. Finally, I describe a number of lesser-used themes, and pick out one in particular, the 'assertive Maori face' to discuss in detail. Close consideration of this particular theme helped in theorising about the functions of an alternative discourse for Pakeha in the ongoing relationship between Maori and Pakeha in Aotearoa New Zealand.

9.2.1 Affirming Maori authority

The most frequently used discursive resource was that of 'affirming Maori authority, sovereignty or tino rangatiratanga':

> The most important thing Pakeha can do is consult – recognise rangatiratanga and respect it. Our consulting the tribe before we bought land was the most significant thing we have done – it has set the tone for our on-going relationship. (Earthtalk women's organic farm, in Cumberland & Pountney, 2000, p. 68)

I chose the term 'affirming Maori authority' to describe such a resource for two reasons. Firstly, critical psychologist colleagues drew my attention to expressions and readings of authority and agency in discourse analytic work. This helped me appreciate that I was reading these Pakeha narrators as affirming the authority of Maori, the authority of the 'other', rather than asserting authority for the self or their own cultural group. Secondly, the most frequent focus of their affirmation was of te tino rangatiratanga as named in Article 2 of te Tiriti o Waitangi, glossed in this thesis as 'unqualified authority' or 'complete authority'. It captures the sense of Maori being 'authors of' their own destinies, holding 'authority over' real resources, and being 'authorities' requiring to be treated with in permission-seeking and decision-making.

Narrators often explicitly described their acceptance of Maori authority in all these senses, including the authority of Maori to speak for themselves and to have right of approval and control in decision making within their organisations: "The National Collective of Independent Women's Refuges recognises and accepts Tino Rangatiratanga mo te Iwi Maori" (B. Campbell, 2000, p. 60). This narrator went on to quote from her organisation's charter: "We consensually affirm the right of approval by Maori caucus of Tauiwi core group nominations" thereby explicitly endorsing the authority of the Maori caucus at the highest levels of decision-making and governance.

Narrators often reminded the audience of the historical background to Maori political power in Aotearoa, and its affirmation during early contact with Europeans:

> The Declaration of Independence signed 28 October 1835 and subsequently acknowledged by King George (sic), had established that all sovereign power and authority is hereby declared to reside entirely and exclusively in...(Maori tribes)" (p.102) …[who] operated their political and economic life with the fullness of power that a sovereign people have. As a people they had total control of the conduct of their own lives and properties. (Literacy Aotearoa, in Nga Tumuaki, 2000, p. 104)

Such detailed justification for Maori authority is an indicator that 'affirming Maori authority' was a new discourse for Pakeha narrators, requiring what may be termed 'buttressing elements' to prop up the main resource. A 'sense of obligation under the Treaty' is one such buttressing resource:

> Te Tiriti o Waitangi imposes obligations on the Crown and crown agencies…
> (Manukau City Council in Oaks, 2000, p. 132)

> Tauiwi women, as members of the dominant Pakeha culture, or other cultures whose rights and legality to be part of this nation are vested in Te Tiriti O Waitangi, have an obligation to uphold our part of the agreement to that Treaty. (National Collective of Independent Women's Refuges, in B.Campbell, 2000, p. 58)

Another buttress to affirming Maori authority was 'a sense of accountability' to this authority:

> …the key problem is that moderation tends to be controlled by Pakeha; as with decision-making, I would suggest that it is fine for Pakeha to be involved, but they must be accountable to Maori.
> (Manukau Institute of Technology, in Herzog & Margaret, 2000, p. 84)

Maori authority is here implicitly affirmed through considering Pakeha control a problem, and buttressed by an explicit affirmation of being 'accountable to Maori'. The two buttresses of obligation and accountability were also used together:

> …the point of the Treaty (Article 2, Maori Text) is that Maori should have the final say with regard to things that they value, which certainly would include education; having said that, the very real question is which Maori (e.g., tangata whenua, comparable Maori organisations) – all that is clear is that for a tauiwi organisation, the relationship needs to be with a group which is accountable to Maori (not, for example, Maori within the organisation who are, usually, primarily accountable to the organisation).
> (Manukau Institute of Technology, in Herzog & Margaret, 2000, p. 82)

These Pakeha narrators were also expressing their disquiet at setting up accountabilities with non-independent Maori groups, heralding an issue raised by the Maori commentator discussed below.

The frequency and centrality of the narrators' use of 'affirming Maori authority' as a discursive resource suggested to me that it might be the primary shift that occurs in the thinking of people who become active in implementing the Treaty – the acceptance of Maori authority, as indeed spelled out in te Tiriti o Waitangi.

9.2.2 Striving towards a 'right relationship' with Maori

A smaller pool of narrators (eight of the 16) described working towards and briefly reaching what I have termed a 'right relationship' between Pakeha and Maori. I adopted this term from the Mercy Sisters' phrasing: "with a focus on whanaungatanga – a theology of right relationship" (Foy & Horton, 2000, p. 70). In their work in the Pacific region, the Sisters of Mercy had resolved to move from 'aroha' to 'tika' as a guiding philosophy, which may be freely translated as moving from relationships of compassion to ones of justice.

As an example of my analytic process, I began this theme under the title 'balance' to capture a quality in the accounts of narrators who were speaking with some sense of success about their Treaty journeys. They appeared to be describing how it felt to have arrived at the destination of a journey of change, and the rewards evident during such a journey. As I continued to read, I saw that although there were many delicate allusions to emotionally satisfying states such as balance, consonance, congruence, security and safety as destinations of a Treaty journey, the core destination was a 'right relationship'. But reading further, there appeared an equally strong emphasis on the earnest and intense effort required in 'striving towards' this particular quality of relationship. To confirm this reading of a 'right relationship' as the destination of effort in organisational Treaty journeys, I tested a viable alternative, that of justice as a goal, only to find that this was barely mentioned. Although the discursive resource of 'striving towards a right relationship' relied on a conceptual basis of a 'just relationship', the focus was on the relationship aspect. Having clarified the central resource of 'striving towards a right relationship' to my satisfaction, I concluded that allusions to emotionally satisfying states were buttresses to the primary resource.

The discursive resource of 'striving towards a right relationship' with Maori was used in accounts co-narrated by Pakeha and Maori, as well as by several Pakeha narrators. The primary resource was often buttressed by additional elements such as assertions of the significance of each party's independence, ongoing doubts about the practice of relating to each other, and openness to unexpected learning:

> It seems now that we can begin to develop a relationship between Pakeha/Tauiwi and Tangata Whenua within Magdalena Aotearoa which reflects the Treaty and is based on the two groups maintaining their individual sovereignty. We are at the very beginning of this process and in a way the journey is just now beginning.

> Questions arise as to the nature of our relationship. Does there have to be a relationship at all? Yet there is a strong desire for that. What kind of accountability is there between the two groups? What can we offer each other? (Magdalena Aotearoa women's performance network, in McNamara & Moore, 2000, p. 119).

Instead of maintaining the centrality of Pakeha judgements and for instance, unilaterally declaring biculturalism divisive, 'striving towards right relationships' projected the combination of urgency and diffidence we may experience when entering into a new relationship. Mingled with desire and doubt was the dimension of uncertainty about what a 'constitutionally correct' relationship between Maori and Pakeha might look like. The narrators seemed to grope for a way to describe their sincere attempts to "practise in the presence of history" (Awatere-Huata, 1993; Tamasese, 1993) and achieve a "culturally just encounter" described elsewhere as "an active balancing of the (cultural) needs of those involved that appropriately includes their peoples" (Nairn & The National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues (NSCBI), 1997)

In several accounts, joy and satisfaction flowing from achieving a 'right relationship' were implied. Although there was clearly intense effort, and the necessary time taken, a sense of destination and satisfaction were evident:

> It took 6 months for the right partnership to develop between those who actually designed the final image. (Magdalena Aotearoa women's performance network, in McNamara & Moore, 2000, p.118).

The two Pakeha narrators who had spent the longest time of all the informants in a Treaty-based relationship with their local Maori hapu expressed the legitimacy of two authorities at work in this relationship:

> We've learnt that it's ok for us to say no to some Ngaati Te Ata requests, as it is for them to say no to ours. (Earthtalk women's organic farm, in Cumberland & Pountney, 2000, p. 68)

In general, the 'right relationships' resource was used rather tentatively by the Pakeha narrators, suggesting that narrators were still in an early phase of developing and deploying the resource as they attempted a new discourse. There was less buttressing detail about procedural practices required than appeared for 'affirming Maori authority', although words like "co-operative", "partnership" and "closer" were used:

> A co-operative approach to this relationship also allows a positive scope for making decisions in the future related to Māori developments, people, and activities in Auckland City Libraries. (Auckland City Libraries, in Makoare & Birkbeck, 2000, p. 123)

I also perceived some evidence for a procedural buttressing element of 'trust and clarity', as used by these co-narrators:

> At Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology (NMIT) all Te Tiriti o Waitangi workshops are dual tutored by Maori and Pakeha in partnerships using a relationship approach… Trust between tutors, clear and cooperative roles, clearly defined boundaries between tutors, open and transparent approach. (Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology, in Wilson & Huffadine, 2000, p. 157-159).

Further discursive material would need to be examined to fully interpret the procedural buttresses that speakers use for the 'right relationship' resource. I saw 'affirming Maori authority' and 'striving towards a right relationship' as the two primary discursive resources required for these narrators to describe a substantively different social reality to that constructed by the dominant colonial discourses. In this sense, they were resources that I would consider as 'active' in constituting a new social reality.

A further two frequently used resources seemed to me to relate more to the process of constructing and maintaining an alternative discourse, and might be termed 'statives' – the states experienced when using a particular discourse. As an illustration, it is likely that 'complacency' and 'reassurance' might be among the states experienced by Pakeha when using dominant colonial discourses about Maori. In contrast, less comfortable states appear to be experienced when using alternative discourses, as suggested below.

9.2.3 Dissonance – between what ought to be and what is

The second most frequently used discursive resource was an expression of 'dissonance' between what ought to be and what was currently occurring in organisational and social environments. Narrators described intellectual conflict about the inconsistency between, for instance, beliefs about how things ought to be for Maori and the actual experiences in the organisation:

> In 1988, the then ARLA Federation was challenged by some of its membership to address the lack of representation and participation by Maori within the organisation (p102)…. Despite the development of an action plan in 1977 to provide services to Maori, the under-representation of Maori in 1988 was still evident. (Literacy Aotearoa, in Nga Tumuaki, 2000, p. 106)

For some narrators, the intellectual dissonance was between their organisation's policy and its practices:

> CIT was not meeting its Treaty objectives. There were no formally designated positions for Maori staff within management structures or on decision-making bodies; and no formal policies, procedures or practices related to implementing

Treaty objectives… Treaty initiatives (by staff) were not being followed through. (Central Institute of Technology, in McIsaac, 2000, p. 110).

The 'dissonance' resource was used when narrators had believed that their service was useful in promoting social justice, only to discover that serious disparities existed for Maori in society, for Maori users of their service, or for Maori staff in the organisation compared to non-Maori. As with the previous resources, narrators used historical buttresses to support their construction:

> the Hunn Report (as it become widely known) found that after more than a century of colonisation there were entrenched and significant gaps between the outcomes for Maori and those for Tauiwi (non-Maori) in the population as a whole. (Literacy Aotearoa, in Nga Tumuaki, 2000, p.103)

As with the affirmation of Maori authority, the historical genealogy of this resource may be found within the Treaty itself – the Maori text confirms the retention of Maori sovereignty, while the English text reveals the British belief that they had ceded sovereign power, and the narrators pointed to this:

> The Treaty consists of two texts, one in Maori, the other in English and there are several inconsistencies between the two texts. According to international law, any ambiguity of meaning between texts will be resolved according to the principle of Contra Proferentem, i.e. that the indigenous language text takes precedence. (Nga Tumuaki, 2000, p. 102).

In one account co-narrated by Maori and Pakeha narrators, the dissonance was theorised to be a direct consequence of accepting the legitimacy of Maori authority and aspirations:

> The social phenomenon of disparity between Maori and non-Maori within the context of New Zealand is a consequence of the English colonisation of Maori and the subsequent rejection of the Treaty of Waitangi. The issue of disparity is better described as the difference between where Maori currently are and where they want to be. (Literacy Aotearoa, in Nga Tumuaki, 2000, p. 103).

Considering the Pakeha narrators, I perceived their dissonance similarly to be an expression of the difference between where they currently were and where they wanted to be. In this they were describing the intellectual difficulty of using a discourse which affirms Maori authority and aims towards a just relationship with Maori when this is not what they see around them. In her research with Pakeha working to practise biculturalism, Maori researcher Campbell (2005) also found such a conflict between a colonial discourse and a 'post-colonial' discourse. As organisations, or teams within organisations, constructed an environment in which Maori rights and authority were affirmed, they were met with tension and discomfort from colleagues and managers. The narrator from the National Collective of Independent Women's Refuges succintly described 'dissonance'

as: "Problems associated with finding ways to work fairly in an unequal world" (B. Campbell, 2000, p. 61). Similarly, a sense of intellectual frustration between ideals and realities was reported in a review of staff views in a tertiary education institution:

> this review concludes there are large gaps between what CIT currently delivers in terms of its Treaty obligation, and what staff expect or believe should be happening. Responses indicate that the staff expectations of what should be happening, exceed the reality of what is happening. (Central Institute of Technology, in McIsaac, 2000, p. 113).

One narrator explained the source of dissonance for Pakeha in her setting:

> The Tiriti o Waitangi in a cultural safety context disrupts orthodox approaches to knowledge development; for example it challenges notions of ownership, power sharing, sovereignty and governance. (College of Humanities, Massey University, in Richardson, 2000, p. 153)

Narrators used 'dissonance' to explain their actions at many stages of their journey. In their view, it may have motivated them at the beginning:

> When we were alerted to the fact that our obligations to the Treaty were not explicit in writing and inconsistent in action, we took it further. (Wellington College of Education, in Bondy, Bull, & Smith, 2000, p. 53).

However, such a dissonant and uncomfortable state was seen as a stimulus to action. The links between dissonance for Pakeha and motivation to action were made explicit in this account:

> The continued Maori struggle for recognition of the Treaty has had the flow-on effect of motivating certain sectors of New Zealand to question and begin to change the values, structures and practices within their organisations. (Literacy Aotearoa in Nga Tumuaki, 2000, p. 103)

They used 'dissonance' to describe their experience much later, when they had worked for many years to affirm the Treaty only to perceive that the reality for Maori, and Maori users of their service, was still oppressive:

> Time after time we have had to be brought back to reality of how things are for Māori within institutions like ours, and without. (Wellington College of Education, in Bondy et al., 2000, 2000, p. 55).

Dissonance may have been their experience after many years of involvement in the lives of their Maori neighbours. The narrators who had the most longstanding experience of working in a 'right relationship', used a 'dissonance' resource to describe their response to cultural and material differences:

> We continue to learn about cultural differences. The more we get to know Ngaati Te Ata, the more we recognise the depth of some of those differences…We have an on-going concern about the imbalance of money and resources between us and Ngaati Te Ata families, and how best to be supportive without being patronising

or encouraging dependency. (Earthtalk women's organic farm, in Cumberland & Pountney, 2000, p. 68)

Finally, I also perceived 'dissonance' used as a resource to describe the frustration that narrators felt at being conceptually 'caught' inside their cultural views: "We have needed to be mindful of the fact that as Pākehā members of Ginger Spice we as the dominant group, and due to hegemonic forces, are likely to perceive goals and contexts in Pākehā terms" (Bondy et al, 2000, p. 55). It seemed to me that as narrators constructed more situations as dissonant, their discrimination became more elaborated, more sensitised, both to perceiving, and being receptive to, the situation for Maori, and to appreciating the limits of their own perceptions. For instance, in describing their education work, two narrators pointed out: "finding out that discrimination against Maori was legal disturbs people's notion of 'good race relations'" (Herzog & Margaret, 2000, p. 83), therein describing a person's psychological shift in worldview from that constructed by the standard story. While the situations for which the dissonance resource was used varied considerably, its frequent expression was a feature in almost all accounts narrated by Pakeha.

9.2.4 Discomfort and struggle

The third most prominent discursive resource in my reading of the organisational accounts was an often paired expression of 'emotional discomfort and struggle'. In naming this resource, I made a distinction between talk of dissonance or inconsistency experienced cognitively, and stronger expressions of discomfort, struggle, tension, fear, threat and vulnerability experienced emotionally or materially, such as: "there was a growing sense of discomfort and tension around Treaty issues" (Foy & Horton, 2000, p. 69). Although there were overlaps and combinations with the dissonance pattern, as in the quote below, narrators seemed to be describing the emotional and interpersonal cost of pushing for Treaty-based changes in their organisation:

> A small group of Maori and tauiwi staff at the Central Institute of Technology (CIT), unhappy about the institution's indifference to its Treaty responsibilities, took matters into own hands (sic). (Central Institute of Technology, in McIsaac, 2000, p.109).

These efforts were generally in a climate of social or emotional 'discomfort': "having to change, reflect or challenge traditional teaching approaches and stepping outside their comfort zones" (Richardson, 2000, p.154).

One narrator described the effect of new, discomfiting processes:

> For some non-Maori women, the splitting into caucuses for discussion was a new and threatening event. Questions, doubts, and fears surfaced. (National Collective of Independent Women's Refuges, in B. Campbell, 2000, p. 59)

The 'struggle' aspect of the resource was often linked with 'striving towards right relationship':

> …our partnership in creating that festival and the ongoing work of the network and our continuing struggle to implement the Treaty of Waitangi in the relationship between Tauiwi and Tangata Whenua in the way we organise, play and perform with one another. (Magdalena Aotearoa women's performance network, in McNamara & Moore, 2000, p. 117).

My impression was of the emotional cost for Pakeha of 'doing Treaty work' within an organisation – which, following the theme of 'affirming Maori authority', we could describe as the emotional cost of affirming Maori authority in a colonial setting. The consistent references to struggle and tension clearly covered innumerable difficult conversations and tense discussions in meetings where the here-to-fore predictable relationships between people were discomfited.

An important elaboration of the 'discomfort and struggle' resource in my reading was that non-Maori were described as suffering emotional costs of affirming the Treaty, whereas Maori were described as far more vulnerable and endangered, and as experiencing material danger to security and livlihood:

> The Pakaitore team points out how in some instances those who showed sympathy or solidarity with their people either lost their job or found it difficult to gain employment. (Getting On Moving On Network in Wychel, James, Cowan, & Fitzmaurice, 2000, p. 161)

Maori were likely to lose employment and have their departments closed: "there can be serious backlash on Maori (students/teachers)" (Herzog & Margaret, 2000, p. 81). A Maori-led effort to claim authority over a seabed resource provoked punitive legal reactions and was described by the Pakeha narrator as "a dangerous national precedent" (Armstrong, 2000, p. 47). She offered the advice "not to begin such an undertaking unless you are strong".

Now we can begin to appreciate how the two stative discursive resources support and link the two active resources – as narrators used discourse which asserted a different construction of reality, 'affirming Maori authority' and striving to build a

'right' and non-colonial relationship with Maori, they experienced two states:

(i)   intellectual conflict between their words and the incongruent reality they perceived around them, interpreted here as 'dissonance', and

(ii)   'discomfort and struggle' – for Pakeha, emotional tension from colleagues and managers, as previously predictable relationships between people became tense; for Maori, the additional struggle of material danger to livelihood.

9.2.5 We, the change workers on a long, hard journey

The last of the frequently used resources was one I have called a procedural resource, describing a necessary part of the process of using alternative constructions. I noticed a constantly recurring 'we' in many of the accounts, paired with a sense of togetherness on a long, difficult journey. In many accounts, the speaker's voice appeared to be 'we, the change workers'. This collective voice sometimes denoted teams of activist Pakeha staff, and sometimes networks of Maori and non-Maori staff working in coalition towards Treaty-based changes. At times, 'togetherness' (the original title I gave to this resource) was described explicitly:

> So we began this project as a collection of individuals, Tangata Whenua, Pakeha/Tauiwi, with strong personal connections to each other and to each other's work and certain shared beliefs or desires but not necessarily a defined political path. (Magdalena Aotearoa women's performance network, in McNamara & Moore, 2000, p. 117).

Often, narrators spelled out that the collective 'we' that was gathered in support of te Tiriti o Waitangi:

> …the approach has been to gather together people with an interest (people who are known for creating change and making things happen) and passion for the kaupapa of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. (Manukau City Council, in Oaks, 2000, p. 144)

A group of 'we, the change workers' undertaking such a journey of commitment became more bonded in the process and began to build 'right relationships':

> The legacies of Pakaitore are:
> -   highlighting division within the community about Treaty-related matters,
> -   a powerful set of shared experiences among the occupiers and Pakeha allies,
> -   a limited and provisional degree of trust between these two groups.
> (Getting On Moving On Network in Wychel et al., 2000, p. 161)
> .

The notion of togetherness as change workers was often buttressed by the notion of collectively undertaking 'a long, hard journey' as for this activist 'ginger' group within their organisation:

> The journey for Ginger Spice has been strewn with issues and questions, sometimes constructive, sometimes as obstacles we have had to overcome. (Wellington College of Education, in Bondy et al, 2000, p. 55).

In several accounts, imagery was used of a "crew" "embarking" together on the 'long hard journey':

> It is now up to a revamped crew to take over the shift for the next phase of the journey. (Central Institute of Technology, in McIsaac, 2000, p. 114).

Enduring hardships together during "storms" showed a bridge with the 'discomfort and struggle' resource:

> However, initiatives focused on greater Treaty or bi-cultural responsiveness will generally attract "racist", "elitist", or "separatist" accusations and these are storms that must be weathered. (Auckland City Libraries, in Makoare & Birkbeck, 2000, p. 130)

Finally, I perceived another small buttressing resource of 'earnest effort', which was often used as a bridge to the 'right relationship' resource:

> The inclusion of a Māori perspective into the library and information industries, in terms of exploring what being bicultural means, is now entering a second decade of earnest effort. (Auckland City Libraries, in Makoare & Birkbeck, 2000, p. 122)

Overall, the discursive resource of 'we, the change workers on a long, hard journey' makes explicit a necessary process for staff working to 'affirm Maori authority' and building a 'right relationship' between Maori and Pakeha – such workers for change needed to join with others to undertake a difficult journey requiring considerable time and effort.

9.2.6 Other significant themes

Further discursive resources were evident in several of the accounts (Huygens, 2001b). Of these, I have selected two that allowed a clearer interpretation of the two substantive primary resources.

The 'assertive face' and firm tone of Maori

In at least two of the accounts by Maori and Pakeha co-directors, I perceived a resource of assuming and asserting Maori authority. When Maori speakers led the account of the organisational journey, there was a difference in tone from the way in which Pakeha narrators spoke. I termed this resource 'the assertive face' of Maori after the title of one account, *He Awe Mapara*, and the authors' gloss as "a strong and assertive Maori face based on an ancient cultural description for both the distinctive Maori facial Moko (tattoo) and an industrious person" (Makoare & Birkbeck, 2000, p. 122). They explain that "the implementation of a Maori presence [in an organisation] needs to be approached assertively and with the expectation of hard work" (p. 122)

In contrast with the careful justifications of Maori authority made by Pakeha narrators, a 'firm tone' in these Maori-led presentations assumed the legitimacy of Maori authority:

> Since 1840, Maori have consistently sought maintenance of their rightful status within New Zealand and as such continue to pursue ratification of the Treaty of Waitangi…Rights and responsibilities bestowed by the Treaty have not been upheld. (Literacy Aotearoa, in Nga Tumuaki, 2000, p. 103)

The Maori-led accounts assumed that such rightful authority exists, that it is a valid form of authority, and that its absence merits criticism:

> The absence of the Treaty or a strategic approach will always result in superficially piecemeal attempts at exploring what a Maori presence in an institution can be. This is nothing short of irresponsible! (Auckland City Council Library, in Makoare & Birkbeck, 2000, p. 129)

These narrators did not explain Maori authority, or their accountability to it, but were firmly expressing and asserting it in their accounts. They did not feel the need to deploy many of the buttresses used by Pakeha narrators to support their affirmations of Maori authority. Demonstrating their insistence that such Maori authority be self-determined, and not muted by institutional authority, two co-narrators asserted:

> However it must not be acceptable that the extent of the Māori presence within an organisation be only as simple as the majority of staff or key decision-makers can cope with, because that is not biculturalism and does not provide for a Māori world view. (Auckland City Council Library, in Makoare & Birkbeck, 2000, p. 130).

In the third account co-narrated by a Maori and a Pakeha presenter, there was a more muted use of the 'assertive Maori face and tone' resource. In my reading of the account entitled *Urupare Rangapu (Response to Partnership)*, assuming

Maori authority, as shown in the list below, was expressed in conjunction with the 'right relationship':

> Feedback from students has indicated that this modelling of partnerships by tutors is a crucial element in their understanding of observing Te Tiriti o Waitangi in practice:
> - Tutors to be mandated by Iwi
> - Tutors need to take the time to meet the expectations of Iwi.
>
> (Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology, in Wilson & Huffadine, 2000, p. 157)

Examples of turning an 'assertive Maori face' towards the assumption that Pakeha in organisations are striving towards a 'right relationship' (rather than more directly asserting Maori authority) could also be seen in the other co-narrated accounts. Through emphasising the aspect of relationship rather than authority, such a muted, indirect use of the 'assertive Maori face' resource could be a strategic or diplomatic way of encouraging Pakeha change on the part of Maori speakers. Interestingly, using the 'assertive Maori face' to assume that Pakeha are 'striving towards a right relationship' allows Maori and Pakeha co-narrators to construct the long journey as proceeding without dissonance. In the three Maori-led accounts, the 'dissonance' resource was seldom used, and overlaid with the 'assertive Maori face'. The organisation which had most clearly achieved a constitutional framework based on te Tiriti described the process and purpose of the collective journey in these straightforward terms:

> These actions heralded the beginnings of a ten-year journey to a paradigm shift from a colonial model to one founded on Tino Rangatiratanga. (Literacy Aotearoa, in Nga Tumuaki, 2000, p.106)

Here the paradigm shift from Pakeha dominance to affirming Maori authority is not constructed as creating dissonance. The ten-year organisational journey achieves a 'paradigm shift' without requiring dissonance or struggle.

In one co-narrated account, a more positive mirror of dissonance was used – what I termed 'consonance, congruence and safety'. The narrator seemed to be describing how positive change may feel when new worldviews and reality are congruent:

> If we give people within the organisation new knowledge and skills in relation to the Te Tiriti o Waitangi but fail to provide a context for them to use these skills, they will soon loose the new skills. However if we give people new skills and knowledge then require them to undertake new tasks using the skills and knowledge, within systems that have changed, and if we have policy that rewards

and reinforces this behaviour then we are much more likely to have change that is lasting. (Manukau City Council, in Oaks, 2000, p. 141)

In a co-narrated account where the head of a Maori Unit did not use the 'assertive Maori face', possibly because he could not speak for the whole institution's commitment – he availed himself of this 'congruence, consonance and safety' resource. He describes the impact of dual tutoring by Maori and Pakeha tutors:

> Creates safety for students and tutors
> Demonstrate culturally safe practices
> It models Te Tirit o Waitangi in practice
> Creates a parallel process
> (Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology, in Wilson & Huffadine, 2000, p.158)

Upon reflection, my interpretation of 'dissonance", and 'discomfort and struggle' as resources for Pakeha narrators was validated by this Maori narrator emphasising their opposite as desirable – consonance and congruence between Treaty-derived principles and practice.

Depression of the lone researcher/activist

This theme was unique to one Pakeha narrator who was reporting on her research into senior management and departmental attitudes to her organisation's Treaty commitments:

> These investigations…provide a sad reflection of the monocultural racism reflected within the institute's educational culture…Few respondents had been involved in Treaty awareness or education sessions in recent years. (Central Institute of Technology, in McIsaac, 2000, p. 109).

Such sadness and depression were evidently related to the reported loss of Maori staff, and were followed by strong use of the rallying cry of 'we, the change workers' journeying on together:

> While this might appear depressing, the investigations have created a positive spin-off…It is ironic to observe that only through the disbanding of Te Komiti Maori that we have come together under another umbrella to support and carry on Te Komiti's work. (Central Institute of Technology, in McIsaac, 2000, p. 114).

Although further exploration and confirmation is required, this resource may suggest that when a Pakeha undertakes parts of the Treaty journey alone, such as reflective research, depression becomes a real risk. It is likely that for the 'long, hard journey' to be sustained, there needs to be a 'we' involved, with careful attention to collectivity and emotional support.

9.2.7 Credibility checks of discursive themes

Following the strong version of best practice in discourse analysis (Taylor, 2001a, 2001b) that I argued for in Chapter 5, I conducted several credibility checks of the discursive resources I had identified – a member check with the participating narrators, a peer check with other Treaty educators and researchers, and a personal reflection upon on feedback from a key Maori consultant in the area of organisational change. I also gained informal feedback when I presented the discourse themes to a research conference for not-for-profit organisations (Huygens, 2002b).

A detailed report of the discourse analysis was sent to each narrator and co-narrator (Huygens, 2001b), and almost all were interviewed by telephone for their views on the credibility of the discursive themes identified here. I asked: "Did you find my reading of the themes in your story credible?" I recorded their interviews with written notes and sent the notes to each narrator for approval. They showed an immediate grasp of the task of validation, and were energetic in their evaluation of my interpretations, although they generally commented on whether my themes matched their experience of their organisations rather than matching their narrated accounts.

All the narrators found most of the discursive themes credible, "interesting and validating" (Huygens, 2002b). They were enthusiastic about how affirming it was to read such interpretations: "so clarifying for me. I had thought about these things for years, and do think about them, and there they were, you had pulled them out". Many were delighted that research was occurring: that "someone was following up" and that "someone was thinking at a theoretical level about Treaty implementation in organisations".

Some narrators asserted that one or two of themes were not relevant to their accounts. A Pakeha co-narrator, while he affirmed each theme, felt that interpretations of 'dissonance', and 'discomfort and struggle' were a little negative, since he saw positive sides to these pressures (Huygens, 2002b). I would reflect that the Pakeha narrator, working closely as he did alongside a Maori organisational leader using an 'assertive face and firm tone' to assert Maori authority, may have had a more positive experience of 'affirming Maori authority' and 'striving towards a right relationship' than did narrators in other

organisations. The intellectual and emotional states he experienced may not have required constructions of 'dissonance' and 'struggle'.

Several other narrators pointed out that the journey to implementing the Treaty in New Zealand workplaces should not be treated as a linear progression, and that 'dissonance' and 'struggle' featured at every step. These comments served to confirm that the resources are indeed part of a discourse rather than a representation of a 'real world' journey. One observed that her organisation had "regressed eight years" (Huygens, 2002b) because a strong Maori theorist in their sector was ill and no longer driving change.

As a result of the telephone interviews, interesting additional data was gathered about the progress in organisational Treaty journeys during the eighteen months to two years since they had spoken at the conference. Three tertiary education providers reported that their organisational situations had worsened since 2000 (Huygens, 2002b). They described a feeling of retrenchment and increasing struggle to maintain initiatives led by Maori in previous decades, such as in the cultural safety movement. In contrast, two local authority managers reported that their organisations were doing well in their ongoing Treaty implementation. Directors of non-statutory organisations reported good progress in their Treaty journeys. However, a Tiriti-based organisation with Maori and Pakeha co-directors reported that government and funding bodies seemed to have increasing difficulty in relating to their dual authority structure.

I also undertook a credibility check with my peer Treaty educators, in a regional and a national meeting. Since most of my peers had also attended the original presentations by the organisational representatives, as well as dipping into the written accounts in the Proceedings, the peer credibility check was particularly robust. I asked my peers the collegial question: "Does my reading of these themes seem credible to you?" As with the organisational narrators, the Treaty educators responded to my interpretations from their own experience of working with organisations, and witnessing organisational journeys of Treaty work, rather than considering the actual conference accounts. There was general agreement that my interpretations of discursive resources were credible, and indeed very useful for conceptualising their education and change work. The comment of one Treaty educator - "they are *incredibly* credible!" (Peer feedback[2]), highlighted the

---

[2] Notes of peer feedback session held at Treaty Conference 2002.

affirmation and excitement felt by users of an alternative discourse at hearing their familiar resources articulated and validated.

I also presented the endorsed discursive themes in a paper at a national conference dedicated to research in the non-government and health sector (Huygens, 2002a). The audience consisted of representatives from not-for-profit organisations very similar to those who spoke at the Treaty conference. The session was very well-attended, and the ensuing enthusiastic discussion of organisational Treaty journeys suggested to me that my interpreted themes were instantly recognisable and credible to a wider audience of not-for profit organisational workers. They clearly found it validating and informative to hear articulated such constructions of their experience.

I checked my categorisation of the text samples in each theme file with a peer researcher experienced in analysis of New Zealanders' discourse of race relations. He endorsed the themes as credible in his view, and helped clarify subtle nuances in the usage and links between themes. In particular, he introduced me to the idea of speakers using buttressing themes[3] to 'prop up' a primary theme.

9.2.8 Feedback from Maori consultant

Finally, I sought critical feedback about my interpretations of change from an appropriate Maori representative, following the ethic of accountability held by Pakeha Treaty workers described in Study 1.

In a national follow-up workshop designed to extend the organisational narratives presented at Treaty Conference 2000, Maori and Pakeha representatives of a further eight non-government organisations were invited to narrate their organisational journeys of change[4]. A Maori organisational consultant and decolonisation theorist acted as a consultant and critic. After listening to detailed accounts very similar to those analysed here, he provided feedback. In doing so,

---

[3] Ray Nairn, personal communication, 2006.

[4] Treaty Practice Workshop, St. Francis Retreat Centre, Auckland, November, 2003. Arranged jointly by the Community & Voluntary Sector Taskforce, Pax Christi and the researcher, with Moana Jackson as consultant. This intensive national workshop was originally planned as an extension of the present study.

he was able to draw on his familiarity with many of the organisations represented at the workshop through past consultancy with them.

The essence of his commentary about the eight accounts were that while most of the organisational Treaty journeys showed admirable changes in structure and cultural learning, they were nevertheless still part of an assimilationist agenda. He explained that despite the best intentions of Pakeha and Maori alike, most efforts at change had developed Maori authority *within* institutions – whereas te Tiriti confirmed the right of Maori to freely constitute their authority in any way they chose. As he explained:

> The analogy to take is to respect the autonomy and self-determination of Maori as nations of hapu and iwi. The so-called partnership concept, working together accommodating each other's issues, and having parallel development, is like a monkey on our back, because it depends on power…we don't have the power, so in all these stories there is the frustration for Maori that it does not get what they want…But [Maori having their autonomy] will be healthy for everyone, for Pakehas too. (Jackson, Minutes of Treaty Practice Workshop, 2003).

Reflecting upon the organisations in the present study in the light of his feedback, the women's organic farm and the national literacy organisation were the only two organisations in relationships with a freely constituted Maori polity – the organic farm developed an accountable relationship with their local Maori hapu, and the literacy organisation had been re-constituted by Maori members and whanau, with the Pakeha staff invited to re-join a new organisation "founded on tino rangatiratanga" (Nga Tumuaki, 2000, p.106).

Overall, the credibility of my interpretations was well confirmed by the participating narrators and by peer educators and researchers. As discussed below, their feedback helped to clarify how the discursive resources linked together to form a coherent discourse for Pakeha. The feedback of a Maori theorist helped to clarify the limits of the discourse, and highlighted possibilities for future directions.

9.3 New discourses for new experiences

My attempt in this study to locate a coherent alternative to dominant colonial discourse depends on notions of 'a discourse' as a set of linked, historically-intelligible statements that bring a particular social order into being, and upon the concept of the 'discursive resources' used to actively produce these social

constructions. Searching for alternative 'discursive resources' to those used in dominant colonial discourse in these accounts of organisational Treaty journeys proved very fruitful. In this section, I explore the links between these alternative discursive resources, and establish whether they form a coherent, historically intelligible discourse.

An initial question is whether these resources are indeed substantive alternatives to the dominant discourse, or merely liberal versions of colonial constructions of Maori. The dominant discursive resources of 'good Maori/bad Maori' and radical Maori as 'stirrers' were not used by these Pakeha narrators, nor did they use a 'one people' discourse. Their Maori co-narrators, who led with the 'assertive Maori face', were certainly not speaking as the 'good Maori' prized by Pakeha in the dominant discourse. Indeed, the discursive resources used in these accounts of organisational Treaty journeys were not to be found in the dominant discourse, and were in my eyes an example of what Belsey (1980) refers to as a "new, unfamiliar and initially difficult discourse". These narrators used new discursive resources to construct accounts which grappled with the guarantees and implications of the Treaty applied to their day-to-day workplaces. Two of the primary discursive resources used by the Pakeha organisational leaders – 'affirming Maori authority', and 'striving towards a right relationship between Maori and Pakeha' – were radical departures from the dominant discourse, and deny or contradict most of its resources. The focus was on affirming the independent authority of Maori and striving for negotiated relationship, rather than on positioning Maori as marginal, ungrateful or as needing help, as in dominant discourse.

In my view, a discourse centred on 'affirming Maori authority' offers a primary alternative to the dominant discourse centred on Pakeha authority and Maori as the marginalised other. To use discourse which affirms and asserts the legitimacy of Maori authority in New Zealand is a substantive psychological and linguistic shift from discourse which positions Maori as unsuccessful in adapting to modern (Pakeha) society.

9.3.1 A coherent te Tiriti - supporting discourse

The question of coherence and consistency in an apparently counter-hegemonic discourse is not a trivial one, as Green and Sonn (2005) found in the pro-Reconciliation discourse - while including the desire to 'right wrongs', other

reconciliation discourse nevertheless drew upon the dominant discourse, and functioned to maintain the marginalised position of Aboriginal peoples.

A coherent alternative for Pakeha

The substantive discursive resources identified here for Pakeha narrators, of 'affirming Maori authority' and 'striving toward right relationships', appear to be active elements in an alternative discourse. These two resources seemed to me to hold a central position in an alternative discourse because they gave coherence and sense to the whole web of resources used by the narrators. 'Affirming Maori authority' and 'striving towards a right relationship' may be termed 'actives' in a discourse, since they are the psychologically pro-active choices made by the narrator in using an alternative to the dominant discourse. The frequency and centrality of the narrators' use of 'affirming Maori authority' in constructing their accounts of organisational change suggested to me that it might be the primary psychological and linguistic shift that occurs in the discourse of people who become active in implementing the Treaty – accepting the legitimacy of Maori authority in Aotearoa New Zealand. It takes Pakeha out of our assumed "central" position in New Zealand society and puts us in relationship to another cultural group with a central position of their own – Maori expressing their tino rangatiratanga.

The 'affirming Maori authority' discourse is thus a te Tiriti-supporting discourse. In contemporary terms, it takes its bearings from the Maori text, and the retention of tino rangatiratanga – unqualified Maori authority – agreed to in that text. The 'striving towards a right relationship' resource is a crucial partner to 'affirming Maori authority' for Pakeha working with the Treaty. Working towards appropriate relationship between sovereign authorities is a substantive resource in a discourse centred on affirming Maori authority. Indeed, taken together, the two resources broadly express the intent of te Tiriti o Waitangi, as many of these narrators explicitly intended.

In the light of New Zealand's colonial history, such an alternative discourse is a profound challenge to colonial discourses of indivisible (British) sovereignty. The remaining resources I identified for Pakeha narrators of 'dissonance', 'discomfort and struggle' and 'being together on a long hard journey' can be considered consequences of attempting such an alternative discourse about coloniser-indigenous relations. Maintaining an alternative discourse was constructed by

these narrators as intellectually difficult, as well as emotionally and materially risky. Critical discursive theorists agree that it is difficult to contest a dominant social reality using alternative resources:

> Discourse patterns limit what is easily communicated as an acceptable rendition of a particular social reality. Speakers who wish to contest that reality without drawing upon established resources for doing so have a vast amount more conversational work to do, and must take unparalleled risks in the process (McCreanor, 1995, p. 27*)*

McCreanor's (1995) argument explains why narrators so frequently buttressed the primary resources with historical justifications and moral implications. It also helps to explain why resources of 'dissonance' and 'discomfort and struggle' are required to construct the experience of using an alternative discourse in a colonial setting. The two versions of the Treaty present the dissonance very clearly – the draft treaty in English showing the British intention that indigenous authority would be given up, leaving British power at the centre, stands in contrast to the signed text of te Tiriti in the Maori language, making it clear that Maori polities retained their unqualified sovereignty in their country and were ceding a more limited power of governance to the settlers. People who 'affirm Maori authority' as in the Maori text of the Treaty find themselves surrounded by a dominant discourse which relies on the English version of the same treaty, drafted to extinguish that sovereignty. The government, the media, the Eurocentric academy and Eurocentric public discourse all proceed as though the English version were realised, and as though Maori hapu gave over their traditional sovereignty to the settlers. Maori hapu, activists and decolonisation theorists, as well as Pakeha Treaty workers, maintain a focus on the Maori text and the as-yet-to-be-(re-)-realised expression of Maori authority in Aotearoa.

Drawing upon Middleton and his colleagues' (1992) term "communal cognition" as a feature of organisational life, I would propose the term 'community of cognition' as useful here. Sustaining an alternative discourse appeared to require a supportive 'community of cognition' both to provide the inter-subjective validation required to speak a social order into being, and to provide the emotional and material support required when at risk of marginalisation. The discursive resources used by informants are thus 'resources' in two senses – components of their emerging discursive constructions and the means by which a nascent speech community (Fitch, 2001) become able to rename and re-configure their experiences and goals in alternative ways to the dominant discourse.

When considering whether a set of discursive resources forms a coherent discourse that allows a social order to be constituted inter-subjectively (Wetherell & Edley, 1999) one needs to consider the internal consistency of the discourse as well as the boundaries which distinguish it from other ideological patterns. One needs to ask the question – How precisely does this work to support collective sense-making? Thus, in this study, does it make sense to me as a Treaty educator that narrators perceived dissonance between the Treaty guarantees and their organisational environments, experienced emotional discomfort and struggle with organisational processes, and enjoyed a strong sense of togetherness with other Pakeha and Maori on a long, hard journey towards a particular quality of relationship? My response is – Yes. To affirm Maori authority through working sincerely with the Maori text of the Treaty of Waitangi produces mental and social dissonance for workers in most organisational environments constituted on Pakeha terms. The social action of adopting this discourse becomes a long journey of discomfort and struggle for Pakeha workers, and one of great potential danger for Maori. However, using this discourse leads to a strong sense of togetherness in a collective effort between Maori and Pakeha change workers. There is a sense of joy and satisfaction in experiencing, albeit briefly, a right relationship between Maori and Pakeha, and there is much new learning about how this new authoritative relationship works in practice.

Thus, these five discursive resources – 'affirming Maori authority', 'striving towards a right relationship', 'dissonance', 'discomfort and struggle' and 'we, the change workers on a long, hard journey' seemed to be firmly entwined, forming a connected web in which the use of one resource implied the next and so on. Such an interlocking internal consistency is a feature of all coherent, intelligible discourses. Taking all the primary discursive resources together, I saw them as forming a coherent, internally consistent narrative that created an alternative to the established standard story of Maori/Pakeha relations. To affirm Maori authority through working sincerely with the Treaty is to speak a different social order into life for New Zealand citizens, producing a creative intellectual dissonance and social tension in many organisational environments and social settings. To sustain this alternative discourse requires a collective validation and effort.

A Maori-led alternative discourse

The firm authoritative voice of the Maori-led presentations did not seem to rely on the same web of linked discursive resources. For the primarily Pakeha audience, the Maori narrators presented an 'assertive Maori face', which assumed (and

constructed) a self-determined Maori authority and projected a firm message that their institutions were expected to live up to Treaty-focused mission statements and strategic plans. They did not deploy resources of dissonance, struggle or discomfort, and used the 'right relationship' resource in an assertive way to promote 'congruence and safety' for Pakeha in their workplaces. These interpretations suggested to me that there are different discourses available to Maori organisational narrators, which this study has only lightly touched upon.

Overall, I concluded that these accounts provided evidence of at least two coherent alternative discourses to the dominant discourse. The first, most fully-displayed discourse is a web of resources and supportive buttresses, used by Pakeha narrators, clustered around 'affirming Maori authority' and 'striving towards a right relationship'. The second alternative discourse, led here by Maori narrators and displayed less frequently in the setting of a conference aimed at Pakeha/tauiwi, coalesced around a key resource of the 'assertive Maori face' which firmly assumed and expressed Maori authority.

9.3.2 A colonising or decolonising discourse?

Querying the alternative discourse identified in the present study with discursive analytical questions, such as – What does this discourse achieve? What functions does it serve? What possibilities does it enable? – my response is that affirming Maori authority 'undoes' Pakeha dominance. A speaker who affirms Maori authority and who strives for a mutually acceptable relationship is not assuming Pakeha dominance. The alternative discourse takes Pakeha out of the central position and put us in relationship to someone else with a central position of their own – Maori expressing their tino rangatiratanga, as guaranteed by the Treaty.

Querying the alternative discourse from a liberatory perspective, questions for the discourse analyst are – Which power relationships does a discourse legitimate? Does it call into being alternative futures? So another question is whether the new discursive resources were rhetoric, leaving the material situation unchanged, or whether they really were new discourse for new social practices. It is worth noting that the organisational contexts in which 'right relationships' were being pursued in this study were all characterised by increased authority held by Maori in governance and management. Examples of increased authority in the organisational accounts included powers of veto by Maori caucus; dual authority structures with Maori and Pakeha co-directors in two organisations; powers of

Maori self-determination and organisational leadership in strategic and procedural matters, and so on. Thus, the new discursive resources used by the Pakeha narrators did not legitimate the status quo. On the contrary, they were used to narrate deliberate changes made in workplaces to address the institutional racism enacted in New Zealand organisations. The new linguistic resources did not function as a 'liberal' discourse or rhetoric, leaving the material situation unchanged, but constructed actions for "authentic transformation of the dehumanizing structures" (Freire, 1975, p. 11). The new discourse 'spoke into being' organisational contexts transformed by Maori and Pakeha co-directors, dual authority structures, joint decision-making processes and powers of veto.

The Pakeha narrators struggled to name their transformed reality with each other and in dialogue with Maori as their social change partners, in the way that Freire describes the process of conscientisation: "…teachers and learners together, in the act of analyzing a dehumanizing reality, denounce it while announcing its transformation in the name of the liberation of man" (Freire, 1975, p. 20). The Maori narrators were certainly not being the 'good Maori' prized by Pakeha in the dominant discourse. Because they were refusing to occupy the dehumanised position created for them by the dominant discourse, their assertive stance required a different response – that of the affirmation central to the new Pakeha discourse. In other words, new discursive practices were needed to express new institutional practices, constitutional structures and interpersonal relationships, confirming the thesis that new discourses are integrally constructed in new social practices, and new social practices in new discourses.

Limits of new discourse

Although the narrators were clearly involved in sincere attempts to transform their institutions, the critical commentary offered by the Maori consultant about similar journeys of change suggested limits to the changes achieved thereby. In terms of the discursive resources identified here, pursuing 'right relationships' was frequently used by narrators to describe relationships between Maori and Pakeha embedded *within* their institutional structures. Since the organisations were generally governed by Western-derived constitutions, the significance of the constitutional independence of Maori polities was often lost. Te Tiriti o Waitangi guaranteed to Maori that their authority would continue to be freely self-determined, not accommodated within a British-derived constitution. In this study, the actual achievement of 'right relationships' in the manner intended in te Tiriti

was restricted to the two accounts where the Maori polity had indeed been self-constituted.

Conclusion

In summary, new discursive resources were identified in 16 accounts of organisational Treaty journeys through which Pakeha narrators 'affirmed Maori authority', and strove towards achieving a Tiriti-based 'right relationship' between Maori and Pakeha in their environment. Other resources were used to portray their difficulties in working sincerely and accountably with Maori authority. This Pakeha-led discourse constituted a coherent, pro-Treaty discourse used in New Zealand workplaces, offering a viable alternative to the dominant colonial discourse. Considering that many of the organisations or divisions within organisations had maintained their journeys of change for between three and 20 years, their new discourse resources could certainly be considered a sustained alternative to dominant colonial discourse.

In several of the accounts a second discourse was visible, led by Maori co-narrators using 'an assertive Maori face' and firm tone, which assumed the authority guaranteed in te Tiriti. The appearance of these quite different discursive resources in a Maori-led discourse served to clarify the boundaries of the Pakeha discourse. It also drew attention to the probability that, depending on the speaker's position in New Zealand society, there may be several coherent alternatives to the dominant discourse. In fact, these alternatives are likely to have influenced each other in significant ways during their development.

The Integration chapter will explore the interaction between the Maori-led and Pakeha-led discourses as a 'dialogue' between discourses.

CHAPTER 10.0 INTEGRATING

A LOCAL THEORY OF TRANSFORMING ACTION

> Pakeha change …by being part of a group that is changing.
> Treaty educator in Huygens 2004, p. 18

> Ultimately, to make a difference in this country, the whole
> Pakeha family does have to come with us.
> Treaty educator in Huygens, 2004, p. 88

In this chapter I draw together my interpretations of the early theorising of the anti-racism/Treaty movement, the contemporary theorising by Treaty educators and the narrative theorising contained in the organisational discourses about Treaty-focused change. I develop a proposal for Pakeha change processes as a local 'theory of transforming action' (Freire, 1975) applicable to how a dominant group may change.

Reviewing the thesis to this point, I presented Aotearoa New Zealand in Chapter 2 as a social context in which the standard story of a 'benign' colonial history has helped Pakeha to maintain oppressive relations towards Maori. In the context of a now 165 years-long challenge by Maori, some Pakeha/tauiwi began in the past 30 years to develop a more critical view of the colonial relationship and to contribute to an agenda for change. Liberatory and critical theory provided useful approaches for investigating how Pakeha change was theorised and constructed by these pro-Treaty educators and workers.

Three studies were undertaken from my position as a Treaty educator:
- In Study 1 *Developing Treaty theorising* I traced anti-racism and pro-Treaty theorising by Pakeha from its inception in the 1970s through to the late 1990s. The undertaking by some Pakeha to take collective responsibility for institutional racism developed into a campaign for Pakeha to learn about the history of the Treaty and subsequent colonisation.
- In Study 2 *Contemporary Pakeha theorising* I recorded a cycle of praxis by antiracism//Treaty educators in 2002-3. We proposed critical and emotional journeys of conscientisation for Pakeha about the past, present and possible relationship between Maori and Pakeha.

- In Study 3 *Organisational Treaty Discourse* I established that a counter-hegemonic discourse was in use in non-government organisations during 2000 to describe pro-Treaty journeys of organisational change. Primary discursive resources used by Pakeha organisational narrators were the 'affirmation of Maori authority' and 'striving towards a right relationship' between Pakeha and Maori.

In these concluding chapters I am now able to address my remaining research questions:

4) In what ways do the theorising of Pakeha change by Treaty educators and the organisational discourses contribute to an agenda of decolonisation?

5) What are the current challenges and emerging directions for processes of dominant group change arising from this research?

In the following sections I develop my thesis that (a) the theorising of Pakeha change in response to the Treaty of Waitangi has constituted a sustained counter-hegemonic discourse over the past 30 years in New Zealand, which (b) enables a dialogue between the Maori and Pakeha approaches to colonisation. To provide support for this, I weave together the praxis and discourse approaches to change - linking the liberatory notion of people undertaking an idealistic, willed project to announce a new world, with the critical notion of people struggling to deploy new discourses in order to construct new actions in the world.

At this point, it is helpful to recall two key features suggested for the formation of new discourse – namely its development and transformation from an existing discourse or set of closely connected discourses, and the range of discursive and material activities in relation to which such development occurs (Henriques et al., 1984). Following this view, in order to establish the existence of a new discourse about Pakeha responding to the Treaty, I point to its history, as well as to its formation inter-dependently with particular contexts. In critical terms, I propose a genealogy for the discourse. Not any genealogy for a new discourse is possible or warranted, since genealogies are constrained by established historical evidence (Henriques et al, 1984). Taken together, the three studies allow me to argue for a specific genealogy for a pro-Treaty discourse by Pakeha.

10.1 Activist praxis creates a new Pakeha discourse

The development of alternative constructions to those of the standard story of colonisation became possible as Maori and Pakeha activists from the early 1960s drew upon several streams of theorising about social justice to interpret the local situation. Pakeha/tauiwi activists and educators developed constructions of Pakeha change in dependency with a number of crucial sites of development, both material and discursive. They drew in particular on U.S. concepts of dominant group responsibility for institutional racism, and responded to a longstanding Maori focus on the Treaty and te tino rangatiratanga. Undertaking a practice of Treaty education for Pakeha aimed at institutions, they continued to develop their theorising in concert with organisational changes.

In summary, the new theorising and constructing of Pakeha change occurred in:
- dialogue with the theorising of Maori activists and educators;
- discussion among tauiwi/Pakeha Treaty educators in regional and national gatherings;
- consultation with Maori staff in organisations and sectors;
- workshops between Treaty educators and organisational workers;
- organisational efforts to honour the Treaty.

In my interpretation, the three crucial streams of theorising that met to create a pro-Treaty discourse for Pakeha were:
(i)   Maori theorising of the colonial situation;
(ii)   Treaty educators' theorising about Pakeha responsibility to change New Zealand's racist institutions;
(iii)   organisational workers' efforts to construct workplace change.

Each of these theoretical approaches interacted with each other and with their sites of practical activity and intervention. To illustrate this history and interdependency, I will take the primary organisational discursive resources in turn and trace their antecedents in the theorising and practices of antiracism and Treaty educators. Using praxis in the sense of conscious reflection and action, I show how each of the discursive resources was prepared for by the praxis of antiracism/Treaty workers, as well as being further developed and extended in the organisational work. For instance, I would argue that the conscious practice of collectivity by antiracism/Treaty workers was a preparation for constructing the world using 'we, Pakeha' or 'we, the change workers'. Similarly, I indicate how

the Treaty educators provided conceptual and strategic preparation for the struggle involved in using counter-hegemonic discursive resources and their associated practices.

Affirming Maori authority through revisiting the Treaty/te Tiriti

The concept of Pakeha/tauiwi affirming Maori authority was progressively constructed over time as groups and organisations attempted to honour the agreements in the Treaty. Pakeha 'affirming Maori authority' relied on the years of Pakeha praxis in the Treaty movement to "recognise Maori as tangata whenua" and "beginning to look at the basis of this country in the terms of a tangata whenua /Pakeha contract for a shared nation" (Aims of Project Waitangi, in Project Waitangi Resource Kits, 1986-7). The conscious practice of revisiting colonial history and the guarantees of the Treaty contributed to the new discursive practice of affirming Maori authority. As antiracism/Treaty workers focused increasingly on the concept of tino rangatiratanga in the Maori text, they constructed a Pakeha response to the Maori authority recorded there by developing ethics and protocols about Pakeha commitments under the Treaty. Critically revisiting the history of colonisation invited Pakeha to consider how the institutions of New Zealand society operate largely to maintain colonial indifference, and encouraged Pakeha to consider the constitutional relationship between Maori and Pakeha in New Zealand in the past, present and future. Relating respectfully to the self-determined authority of Maori thence became a key concept in changing the colonial Maori-Pakeha relationship for educators and organisational workers, and was practised in a number of new protocols and accountability structures.

Dissonance, discomfort and struggle – the emotional journey

A conscious practice of relating respectfully to the self-determined authority of Maori is in direct contradiction to the everyday colonial praxis of indifference or hostility to the indigenous other. The studies provided evidence that there is an intellectual and emotional demand placed upon those who affirm Maori authority in a colonial setting. The theorising in all three studies brought out the immense difficulty for Pakeha of learning to "relax about 'it'" (Huygens, 2004, p. 8) meaning tino rangatiratanga, or the self-determined authority of Maori. In endorsement of the cognitive and emotional tension surrounding such challenges to the Pakeha mindset, the Treaty educators emphasised how they worked with emotional responses, such as anger, fear, guilt, denial, and courage. The

decolonisation educators in particular had theorised how te Tiriti implied a practice of preparing Pakeha emotionally for the journey of decolonisation.

As with the other discursive resources, it took some time for educators to develop practices to prepare Pakeha for such a demanding emotional journey. It is hard to accept that by facilitating processes of conscientisation, an educator helps to create groups of Pakeha who find themselves in decades-long struggle in their institutions, families and communities. Treaty and decolonisation educators learned to work carefully with the states of dissonance and discomfort experienced by workshop participants as they faced the possibility and reality of a counter-hegemonic paradigm shift. Treaty educators identified among their useful tools "naming and affirming the dilemmas that Pakeha face" (see Appendix 8), such as working in a pro-Treaty organisation within a racist/colonial society. In keeping with their stated strategies of increasing facilitatory factors and decreasing inhibiting factors, they theorised that affirming dilemmas helped to both reinforce the dissonance accompanying pro-Treaty praxis in the New Zealand setting, while allaying the potential denial and resistance. Commenting on Boler's work on emotions and power in the educational process, Maxine Greene suggests that a new concern for transforming praxis may be the "pedagogy of discomfort" (Boler, 1999, p. xi). Greene considers, as did the local theorists, that "the discomfort is empowering" (ibid).

We, Pakeha honouring the Treaty – the collective journey

All three studies showed that a sustained process of change for Pakeha depended on conscious collective change: the early theorising of antiracism work emphasised Pakeha taking collective responsibility for institutional and cultural racism; the contemporary theorists highlighted the importance for Pakeha of "becoming part of a group that is changing" (Huygens, 2004, p. 18) and "taking the family with us" (Huygens, 2004, p. 88); organisational narrators used the collective voice in 'We, Pakeha' and 'we, the change workers' in narrating journeys of Treaty-focused change. As developed in the national discussion with Treaty educators, the Pakeha person's thoughts, feelings and actions on a journey of conscientisation about the Pakeha-Maori relationship required making new social connections and eventually depended on the development of new speech communities. As shown in the organisational discourse, it is these new collectives of 'we, the change workers' or 'we, Pakeha honouring the Treaty' who are able to maintain new discourses and may succeed in enacting newly constructed social practices in social and institutional contexts.

The collective focus was envisaged and planned for by the early Maori and Pakeha theorists of change. Early theorising by Pacific and Maori activists challenged Pakeha to understand themselves as cultural beings and to take collective responsibility for institutions constructed according to Pakeha cultural norms. The Treaty educators insisted on the importance of Pakeha moving from responding emotionally to new information into processes of collective cultural change. They theorised individual and collective processes as mutually dependent. Their metaphors of change were explicitly of a journey of finding others of like minds, or of an individual journey spiralling together and apart from collective journeys. They emphasised collective skills, collective membership of changing groups and collective conscious processes. They demonstrated collective work among Pakeha in their practices, namely (i) analysing the socio-political situation together (ii) supporting each other emotionally and (iii) effecting cultural change within their own group thereby helping to build the construction of Pakeha as a cultural collective within organisations.

An example of Pakeha/tauiwi collectivity being consciously constructed through organisational processes can be seen in the account by Women's Refuge after a decade of reflective work with parallel development in their organisation:

> At the 1999 Tauiwi gathering, it was agreed that the three main representations within our caucus – Pakeha, Asian, Tagata Pasifika can meet at any time to discuss specific issues. However, the caucus will have one voice when meeting with Maori. (National Collective of Independent Women's Refuges, in Campbell, 2000, p. 61)

Speaking with "one voice" in conversation with Maori was constructed as a necessary component of forming a 'right relationship' to follow the bilateral agreement in the Treaty. In their praxis, Treaty educators also learned how to construct a 'new' world of cultural collectives that gave expression to the Treaty promises:

> "Treaty groups taught me the language about being Treaty partners in working with Maori. They gave me solid ground as a Pakeha. If I hadn't met other workers…" (Waikato Antiracism Coalition, in Huygens, 2004, p. 68).

Thus, constructions of 'we, the change workers' or 'we, Pakeha intending to honour the Treaty' were strategically and conceptually prepared for by activist educators for Pakeha to use.

I concluded that the collective process was crucial for Pakeha change because, cultural values of individualism notwithstanding, our constructions of the world

are inherently social constructions, requiring validation in shared discourse and practice. While a whole society might not adopt a new worldview, the individual requires *some* of their peers to supply social validation for the new viewpoint. Pakeha working as individuals for change were considered 'lone flames', and their position associated with depression. Instead, "becoming part of a group that is changing" (Huygens, 2004, p.18) was theorised as a key aspect of dominant group change. My interpretation endorses the early strategising by Maori and Pakeha activists that in order to sustain a journey of counter-cultural change, Pakeha would need not only consciousness-raising about institutional and historical racism, but also skills in working consciously as a cultural collective.

Practising 'right relationships'

In my view, striving towards 'right relationships' was only nascent in the early praxis of antiracism/Treaty educators, tentatively introduced in statements such as "beginning to look at the basis of this country in the terms of a tangata whenua /Pakeha contract for a shared nation" and "moving towards a genuine bicultural and eventually multicultural society" (Aims of Project Waitangi, in Project Waitangi Resource Kits, 1986-7). Co-intentional relationships were initially practised between Maori and Pakeha activist and educator groups in their strategising for change and in their educational practice. In the early form, with Maori monitors to ensure critical delivery of historical information to Pakeha, they modelled the accountable relationships intended for institutions and constitutions. The praxis of Pakeha accountability to Maori focused on creating a trustworthy relationship between Maori and Pakeha. These relationships were constructed from their inception to give expression to the relationship recorded in te Tiriti between Pakeha kawanatanga and Maori tino rangatiratanga.

The contemporary Treaty educator groups all volunteered theorising about the significance of the relationship between Pakeha and Maori – Maori as challengers and stimulators of change; as supportive of learning and practising new arrangements; and as changing concurrently. In their theorising, key aspects of Pakeha change included (i) exposing Pakeha to the Maori experience of the colonial relationship, (ii) Pakeha consulting with Maori about change efforts and (iii) working towards a historically and culturally just relationship between Maori and Pakeha as a desirable goal for change efforts. Although Treaty educators initially used terms such as 'bicultural' and 'partnership', they began exercising increasing caution as government discourse co-opted such terms and used them cynically to deny Maori claims under the Treaty. Network Waitangi Otautahi

described their move in 1994 to the open-ended term 'relationship' in order to capture the commitment by Treaty educators to a future negotiated by Maori and Pakeha/tauiwi together. 'Treaty-based relationship' is a phrase now in common use among educators and in Treaty-focused organisations

In a recent example of a more explicit focus by Treaty educators on 'right relationships', the Rowan Partnership reported that the approach they use in their current workshops is to invite participants to think about their own experiences of relationships, and to think about how they would respond if a partner simply reneged on the relationship and walked away from it: "Would they accept that philosophically and carry on regardless?" They ask people to consider what the range of Maori responses might be, and provide illustrations from a politician's statements of indifference to "the consequences of his proposed actions, and put it in the context of the future of our nation" (group communication, 2005[1]). They reported that participants found this relationship-focused approach sobering and thought-provoking.

These brief illustrations show how the new discursive resources used in organisations can be traced to the conscious practices and sustained praxis of the early antiracism/Treaty movement and of activist Treaty educators.

10.1.1 New discourse & practices of 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty'

Taken together, the three studies point to a continuous and coherent discourse and practice of 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' that developed from local antiracism theorising in the mid-1970s. The 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse and practices developed in interaction with Treaty educational work in organisations, and in interaction with changes initiated in organisations. I have provided evidence in the studies that such a discourse was consciously constructed by the praxis of antiracism/Treaty and decolonisation educators in order to encourage institutional change. The conceptual resources in the discourse have supported journeys of organisational change enduring for between three and 20 years, proving themselves sustainable alternatives to a dominant colonial discourse. With such evidence of continuity from Pakeha antiracism activism to pro-Treaty organisational discourse, the discourse may appropriately be given the same name

---

[1] David James and Jillian Wychel, Treaty People e-community, 2 September, 2005.

as the conscious practice of the antiracism/Treaty movement - 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty'.

I will now argue that the education work by Treaty and decolonisation educators has played a crucial part in the spread of the 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse by making these conceptual resources widely available for constructing new responses to Maori challenges. New discursive resources were needed in order to construct new cultural relationships, new institutional practices and new constitutional structures for organisations. Where a sufficient number of organisations in a sector undertook Treaty education, new ways of constructing the relationship between Maori and Pakeha became known and were drawn upon. Some form of challenge from Maori staff, advisors or clients was most often the immediate catalyst for change in organisations, but the widespread impact of Treaty education in many of the non-government, community and social service sectors meant that staff were able to respond to such challenges using the conceptual resources introduced by Pakeha Treaty educators. Many of the organisational narrators mentioned as significant events in their organisational Treaty journey the challenges and education presented by Maori staff, or Treaty workshops delivered by Pakeha, or both. As staff in some organisations were moved to respond to Maori, they were able to find discourse in their sectors with which to construct a less resistant response than that offered by the dominant discourse. The availability of a 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse helped Pakeha move beyond the dominant assimilationist constructions of the Maori-Pakeha relationship. This conclusion also affirms Drucker's (2003) view of the particular strategic positions required for the spread of a social innovation – in this case, Treaty educators acted as translators and transmitters, and organisational workers were early adopters, of counter-hegemonic discourse and pro-Treaty practices.

Even though the Treaty educators themselves considered that they lacked regular contact, commenting: "We all work in such different areas, in different ways, with different groups, spread up and down the country. If we are lucky we manage to come here once a year, but the opportunities for exchange are limited" (Huygens, 2004, p. 80), in fact the 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse has remained remarkably consistent. The early theorising of Pakeha change by Pakeha/tauiwi activists in consultation with Maori and Pacific groups has proved a sustained counter-hegemonic discourse, although its conceptual resources have certainly developed over time. Despite their self-assessment as dispersed, Treaty educators have been a relatively well-coordinated speech community, using the methods of

local and national newsletters, local and national gatherings and inter-personal contacts, and most recently electronic communities. Such methods, employed by all marginalised groups not afforded access to public media, were here used by members of the dominant group to develop a counter-hegemonic discourse.

I am now able to respond to the question left unaddressed in critical discursive theory – of how localised sites of resistance become a viable new discourse. The theorising in the three studies combines to provide a proposal for how alternative discursive practices may develop and spread in interaction with crucial new practices. My thesis is that the cognitive praxis of the antiracism Treaty movement and the subsequent educational activity of Treaty educators provided a crucial avenue for the spread of a 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse among non-government organisations. A new discourse required a coordinated speech community of social actors undertaking a sustained praxis for change to themselves and to their world. The educators sustained their cognitive praxis in interaction with their local sites and in communication with each other through their national gatherings over a timespan of three decades. Thus, in the New Zealand setting, coordination of sites of resistance was achieved through a combination of consistent Maori challenge, an agreed undertaking by Pakeha antiracism workers to learn about the Treaty agreement and the sustained educational work of Treaty educators. Such coordination provided the conditions for and reinforced the growth of a coherent counter-hegemonic alternative to the established standard story of New Zealand society.

My thesis that a social movement has provided the intellectual coordination required to produce a new discourse endorses Eyerman and Jamison's (1991) conclusion that the intellectual activities carried out within movements provide a nursery for innovative cognitive praxis. In critical psychological terms, the organised movement to educate Pakeha about the Treaty provided the coordination of localised sites required to develop innovative discursive practices. My thesis also supports Henriques et al's (1984) insistence that the speaking subject forms a third, and neglected, feature in social constructionism's triad of power/knowledge/subject by which humans construct their worlds. A new discourse is not created in a disembodied way – it must be practised by speakers, coordinated into a speech community, and enacted in material situations in order to develop. These studies suggest that a social movement, as a collective subject, may be a critical feature in producing, coordinating and sustaining counter-hegemonic discourse and practices.

Finally, in response to the issue raised by local critical psychologist McCreanor (1997) – that where there are no spaces or resources to create alternative discourses, social change cannot emerge – I am able to respond that a social movement may dedicate itself to such a project. The undertaking by some Pakeha to learn about the Treaty created the conceptual space and practical educational resources to produce a new discourse of 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty'. Adult educator and community psychologist McArthur (1992) considers such counter-cultural activity among dominant group members to be "cultural work". I find the notion of "cultural work" useful to link the three concepts of (i) Eyerman and Jamison's (1991) cognitive praxis in a social movement, (ii) Freire's (1975) continuous cultural action for liberation, and (iii) Henrique et al's (1984) coordination of localised sites of resistance. The experiences documented here of dissonance, discomfort and struggle when undertaking such work appropriately evokes the labour involved when a culturally dominant group attempts to change their constructions of the world. In summary, I would suggest that the sustained praxis towards a new discourse of Maori Pakeha relations undertaken by the Pakeha Treaty movement be considered a form of cultural work or cultural labour by members of a dominant group.

10.2 Enabling a dialogue for decolonisation

The discourse and practices of 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' may now be considered in the longer timeframe of the 'dialogue' of colonisation between Maori and Pakeha introduced in Chapter 2. There I pointed to the brutal indifference displayed in Pakeha actions towards Maori during 165 years of colonisation, during which time Maori have never ceased from communicating their aspirations for a mutually agreeable future. It is now time to ask whether the 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse and practices make any difference to this situation.

In my view, 'affirming Maori authority' is a dialogue-enabling response for Pakeha in their relationship with Maori. The position taken by Maori in asserting their Tiriti-guaranteed authority calls for a response from Pakeha, for a reply to the invitation to develop a non-colonising relationship according to the Treaty agreement. Pakeha have the option of resisting and ignoring the invitation, or of entering a dialogue. Such a dialogue stands in contrast to the "ideological warfare" (McCreanor, 2005) created when Pakeha use the dominant discourse,

leaving Maori to protest and critique. When Maori narrators in Study 3 asserted the authority of the Treaty guarantees alongside Pakeha narrators who affirmed that authority, a coherent dialogue was enabled rather than a conceptual stand-off. My research suggests that the entire pro-Treaty discourse of 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' serves as a non-resistant response to the challenges posed by the 'assertive Maori face' in organisational life. The two discourses of 'the assertive Maori face' and 'affirming Maori authority' meet to speak to each other – each discourse needs the other to form a coherent conversation. The new linguistic and psychological resources constructed by such pro-Treaty discourse provide for a constructive conversation between Maori and Pakeha (and the new discourse also literally constructed new material resources for Maori use in organisations). For instance, one organisational narrator recounted that "They [Maori and Pakeha/tauiwi] entered into the long and continuing dialogue that was essential in the evolution of parallel development" (National Collective of Independent Women's Refuges, in B. Campbell, 2000, p. 58).

The radical nature of a respectful dialogue between coloniser and indigenous peoples is captured by critical social psychologist Edward Sampson (1993). Sampson suggests that dominant groups maintain constructions of their world that are "self-celebratory and monologic"(p. 4). These monologues construct a "serviceable other" (p. 4), one constructed to serve the particular needs, interests and desires of the dominating group. According to Sampson, in the Western mindset no real dialogue can be permitted with such a serviceable other, "lest in permitting others to speak in their own terms...the entire scheme of Western civilisation would collapse" (p. 13). He sees the sense of crisis that marks our times as a crisis "for the dominant groups whose once secure hegemony is being challenged" (p. 13). He emphasises that "a genuine dialogue, with two separable speaking and acting parties involved, cannot occur unless and until that other emerges from under the yoke of domination" (p. 14), and he credits social movements as the primary initiators of such dialogue. In confirmation of his view, reviewing the achievements of Treaty education over the past decades, Network Waitangi educators reported:

> Some organisations have entered processes aimed at shaping them along Tiriti-based lines, with varying degrees of success; this seems to be helping reduce the fears and lift the level of acceptance amongst a small number of Pakeha/Tauiwi that such an approach is possible without the world collapsing. (Network Waitangi, 1997, p. 14)

The portrayal of critical, authoritative Maori as 'bad' and 'stirrers' in the dominant discourse would be a form of such a self-serving Western monologue,

avoiding and resisting dialogue with the other party. In contrast, the 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty discourse' constitutes a reply from the oppressor that practises dialogue with the longstanding Maori discourse of asserting tino rangatiratanga. The deadlock created by a dominant monologue and Maori protest and critique is supplanted by a tentative new dialogue with a self-determining other. Indeed, at Waitangi in 1986, then Prime Minister David Lange commented that the way was now open for "dialogue between Maori and Pakeha to begin" (Hoult, 2000, p. 105), but the antiracism and Treaty educators of the day understood that a campaign such as *Project Waitangi: Pakeha Debate the Treaty* would be required to prepare Pakeha for such a dialogue.

As with the discursive resources, the proposed dialogue between the two discourses can be traced to the Treaty agreement - Maori asserting their authority, and Pakeha/tauiwi affirming that authority is a re-enactment of the Maori text of te Tiriti. Seen in this way, the dialogue becomes an enactment of a right relationship practised "in the presence of history" (Awatere-Huata, 1993; Tamasese, 1993). The discursive resources are therefore responses within a longer reflective dialogue of co-intentional decolonisation work by Maori and Pakeha. The 165-year-long call from Maori to 'honour the Treaty' was eventually met by Pakeha in the 1970s and 1980s with the response of Treaty education and organisational change efforts. In the 165-year timeframe of colonial contact between Maori and Pakeha, Pakeha have only belatedly begun to participate in a dialogue for decolonisation. The discourses of Maori asserting their authority, and Pakeha acknowledging and affirming that authority, can thus be seen as turns in a very slow dialogue about decolonisation work.

The practising of constructions that enable dialogue also allowed for continuous development of these constructions in response to the other party. The Maori consultant's critique (cited in Chapter 9) of assimilationist institutional changes, and his call for constitutional relationships in keeping with te Tiriti, were both rendered intelligible by the 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse. In a dialogue between the Maori-led discourse of asserting Maori authority and the Pakeha-led discourse towards building a right relationship, pro-Treaty organisational workers were able to understand the challenge to move from institutional to constitutional change.

10.3 A local theory of transforming action

I see Pakeha/tauiwi Treaty and decolonisation workers as having constructed, over the past 30 years, a local praxis-based version of a theory of transforming action to announce a new social order. Following Freire's (1975) encouragement that such annunciation relies on a theory of transforming action, I propose here my interpretation of our local theory of transforming action for Pakeha participating in decolonisation. In keeping with the exploratory nature of my theorising in Chapter 4 to link praxis with the production of new discourses, my proposal is of necessity a preliminary one needing much further reflection and development.

In conjunction with the theorists involved in each study, I propose that the 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse is constructed through Pakeha undertaking critical learning about colonisation, responding emotionally to the learning and through practising collective cultural work aimed towards a mutually agreed relationship with Maori. Such a theory-in-practice simultaneously announces a new world, constructs it discursively, and responds to its materialisation through reflection and evaluation in dialogue with Maori.

In my interpretation of the theorising documented in these studies, a local theory of Pakeha change has the following elements:

Towards a local theory of Pakeha change

1. In changing the colonial relationship with Maori, Pakeha need to be moved to constitute a new mutually agreeable relationship.

2. Constituting a new relationship involves Pakeha in creating new constructions and discourses of the history and future of the Maori-Pakeha relationship.

3. New constructions of the Maori-Pakeha relationship depend on Pakeha undertaking transformative cultural and institutional work such as that enacted as Treaty education and Treaty work in organisations and communities.

4. Transformative cultural work requires Pakeha to take responsibility for the structures and processes of cultural and institutional racism and to change the way they construct the historical, cultural and constitutional relationship between Pakeha and Maori.

5. The outcome of transformative cultural work is new discourses that affirm Maori authority in Aotearoa and that enable a dialogue between Maori and Pakeha about our aspirations for a shared world.

The specific processes of transformative cultural work for Pakeha may be seen as general to coloniser/dominant groups, as follows:

Transformative cultural work for a dominant group

A critical and emotional process of
- being responsive to the challenges by an oppressed group about their dehumanisation.
- being open to disorienting new information about society which provides 'news' of conflict in the relationship and destabilises comfortable dominant constructions of the shared social reality as 'democracy', 'justice', 'civilisation' or 'equality'.
- seeking new, counter-hegemonic information about the history of the relationship between the cultural groups.
- accepting responsibility within the dominant group for the outcomes of the dominant worldview.
- undertaking personal journeys of learning and change, drawing upon spiritual dimensions of reflection and growth.
- seeking support from within the dominant group for dealing with the disorienting and emotional impact of such alternative knowledge.

Collective change through
- learning together how to critically evaluate dominance – analyses from other settings and social movements being helpful for building analysis and methods for change.
- encouraging and supporting other dominant group members.
- learning to work with other dominant group members as a cultural collective for learning and action.
- organising to form a speech community to sustain attempts to construct a new world.
- developing and sustaining new social practices that re-constitute the dominant group's world view and use of power in relation to the oppressed group.

Working towards a mutually agreed relationship
- as a desired goal for the change effort.
- based on a view of humans as motivated towards loving and just relationships.
- that practises the relationship, usually in projects to advance the agreed agenda for change.
- that takes account of feedback from the other.

10.4 Extensions of previous theory

My interpretations of our local theorising of Pakeha change suggested a number of areas that appeared to be particularly significant for change in culturally dominant groups. In addition to endorsing and extending the broadly cultural approaches to change taken by Freire and Gramsci, the research participants contributed theorising in areas largely unexplored in previous theory. Emotional responses to new learning, collective cultural work among the changing group, and striving towards an agreed relationship with the other were all, in my view, innovative contributions to theorising social change.

Freire's (1972, 1975) thesis of change as personal, cultural and interactional was endorsed by the local theorising, as were his concepts of dialogue to conscientise a situation and the need for permanent cultural action for liberation. Here, the local process of a slow dialogue of conscientisation about colonisation was belatedly enabled by cultural work among Pakeha to demythologise the standard story. The goal of a mutually agreed relationship commits Pakeha to permanent cultural action in order to maintain such a dialogue for decolonisation. The present theorising also endorsed Gramsci's suggestions for transformation of hegemony through the "active self-dedication of a class to its own self-education" (Adamson, 1980, p. 144). However, the present theorising extended Gramsci's work by emphasising that a dominant group is privileged by the prevailing hegemony. Both Gramsci's approach to political education and Freire's approach to conscientisation required the addition of a critical analysis of institutional racism to improve their relevance to change undertaken by a dominant group.

In the Australian context, where some aspects of reconciliation discourses maintained colonial relationships, Aboriginal writer Kessaris (2006) concludes that narratives by Mununga (white) Australians which run counter to the dominant discourse of colonisation are important in the work of decolonisation. She notes that such critical counter-narratives tell the story of beneficiaries of colonisation who acknowledge their colonial privilege while working towards dismantling it, and so serve as a way of taking responsibility for racism. She also emphasises how important it is for white colonists' voices to speak "to their own mob" as allies with indigenous people. In the New Zealand context, Kirton (1997) considered that Pakeha needed to seek and resource processes that provided for constant dialogue and monitoring. He concluded that praxis is a vital source of

change, and recommended specifically that Pakeha get help from community and women's groups, and devise careful accountability relations with Maori groups.

The new learning experienced by Pakeha responding to the Treaty was clearly a transformational form of adult learning, involving entirely new ways of viewing a here-to-fore familiar world. However, extending Mezirow's (1991) approach to transformational learning, these studies showed that when the new world view appeared less comfortable than the old, the Pakeha person experienced emotional responses that may be unique to dominant groups. While some theorists have explored the place of emotion in social change (e.g. R. Campbell, 2000; Boler, 1999), further exploration of the emotional components of transformational learning is called for.

The local theorists of Pakeha change also included a spiritual dimension. 'Flames of passion' and connection to other human beings and universal urges towards just and loving relationships were considered spiritual elements that helped people respond in more open and empathic ways, and helped to motivate and link them on a journey of change. Freire, Gramsci and Curle all theorised a humanitarian spiritual aspect to change. In Curle's words "it may be impossible to make peace unless we all become more fully human" (1971, p. 25).

A difficult aspect of collective cultural change was the commitment to those that we feel we "can't leave behind" (Huygens, 2004, p. 87). The theorising of Pakeha change endorsed that individuals could and did chose new 'families', including Treaty activist groups, to support their journeys of change. Overall, however, there was consensus that in the longer time frame, conscientisation about the Treaty relationship was a necessary task for the whole cultural collective. As expressed by the research participant to open the chapter: "Ultimately, to make a difference in this country, the whole Pakeha family does have to come with us" (Huygens, 2004, p. 88).

In overall reflection on my research quest, it was in theorising the reply from the oppressor to the voices of the oppressed where existing theory fell silent. In Irigaray's (2002) thoughts about dialogue without words, or before words, "being on the way to speech is invited to modify its intention and its path in accordance with what an age presents as the task to be accomplished" (p. 40). In terms of the colonial situation in New Zealand, the task to be accomplished is decolonisation. In the words of Freire's opening sentiment to this thesis, the theme of the dialogue between coloniser and indigenous peoples is domination. As Network Waitangi

said rather ruefully in their report about Pakeha Treaty work to Maori gathered at
Waitangi in 1997:

> We tend to ensure that power is still in our hands… don't depend on us for
> revolution. That will come from Maori. Hopefully some of us will be with you
> then. (Network Waitangi, 1997, p. 14).

So Pakeha, in undertaking their historic task of constructing a praxis for *Pakeha
Debating the Treaty* in the 1980s, and in sustaining a 20 year discourse of 'Pakeha
honouring the Treaty' to dismantle colonial domination, may be seen as on the
way to speech about decolonisation.

CHAPTER 11.0 CONCLUSIONS

Weaving people together so that they can be liberated.
Maurice Gray, Upoko of Te Runaka ki Otautahi o Kai Tahu,
in Huygens, 2004 p. 89

…if we do not embark upon this new type of praxis that
transforms ourselves as well as transforming reality it will be
hard indeed to develop a Latin American psychology that
contributes to the liberation of our peoples.
Martín-Baró, 1994, p. 29.

My research aimed to explore the social and psychological processes of change experienced by Pakeha responding to the Treaty. I intended to contribute to international understanding of how we may participate in our own liberation from dominance-based systems such as colonialism. In the final chapter, I recall my major findings, and evaluate the impact of Pakeha change processes within a local agenda of decolonisation. I consider implications for theory and practice and the limits of the present research.

11.1 Contributions to local decolonisation work

By investigating in one research programme the history of a discourse, its current formulation and its use in contemporary organisational accounts, I was able to draw strong conclusions. My major finding was that an alternative to the 'best race relations in the world' discourse about benign colonisation in Aotearoa New Zealand has been developed and is in use by members of the dominant Pakeha group. Furthermore, I was able to conclude that a 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse is a sustained, coherent alternative to the dominant colonial and racist discourse about Maori and Pakeha in Aotearoa New Zealand. 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' is an anti-colonial discourse, affirming the Maori authority guaranteed in te Tiriti o Waitangi, and aiming towards a mutually agreed relationship between Maori and Pakeha. It is used in non-government organisations to construct changed institutional practices and constitutions. The discourse draws upon conceptual resources developed by activists and theorists in the antiracism/Treaty movement, passed into organisations through Treaty education

efforts from the 1980s to the present. Speaking from the non-government sector, many of the organisations narrating Treaty journeys had changed their institutional structures, and several had changed their constitutions to manifest the self-determined authority of Maori.

My second major finding was that pro-Treaty discourse and practices had developed over the past 30 years in ongoing interaction with Maori theorising and with changes implemented in organisational settings. In the organisations involved in this research, the 'affirming Maori authority' discursive resource enabled Pakeha to have a non-resistant and coherent interaction with Maori who asserted te tino rangatiratanga. Such a 'dialogue' stood in stark contrast to the conceptual stand-off between dominant Pakeha discourse and Maori protest. Furthermore, the consistent direction in theorising by Treaty educators and organisational narrators led beyond change in institutional practices towards change to the colonial constitution of the Pakeha-Maori relationship, both culturally (in discourse) and materially (in power and resource structures). Thus, by recognising and responding to assertions by Maori of their self-determined authority in Aotearoa New Zealand, the 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse and practices contributed to an ongoing 'dialogue towards decolonisation' of the New Zealand context.

11.1.1 The present studies

By placing discursive practices in the context of a historical 'dialogue' about colonisation between Maori and Pakeha, this research wove together a liberatory and discourse analytic approach to social change – a Freirean approach to groups conscientising a situation together, and a discourse analytic approach to identifying the patterns in their discourse over a particular historical period. The antiracism/Treaty movement proved to be a significant source of theorising about how a dominant group in a colonial context may change in response to indigenous challenge and critique. My findings endorsed Eyerman and Jamison's (1991) thesis that social movements provide sites for devising new ways of constructing the world. A key achievement of the Treaty education movement has been to introduce and sustain among a significant number of Pakeha, a counter-hegemonic discourse and practice in which Maori authority is affirmed. Through the 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse, assertions of Maori authority receive a non-resistant and facilitatory response, as heralded by the guarantees in te Tiriti.

The studies showed that organisational narrators used discursive resources not available in the dominant discourse to describe their Treaty journeys in organisations. Drawing upon the Treaty movement's theory and educational practices, new conceptual resources used in organisations affirmed the self-determined authority asserted by Maori and constructed a journey towards mutually agreed relationships with them. These discursive resources denied the portrayal of critical, authoritative Maori as 'bad Maori' and 'stirrers', and also denied a 'one people' discourse. Using such counter-hegemonic constructions involved Pakeha in emotional and collective processes theorised by Treaty educators as associated with 'being part of a group that is changing'. I interpreted the undertaking by Pakeha to create and sustain mutually-agreed constructions of the Maori-Pakeha relationship as "cultural work" (McArthur, 1992) or what I would term 'cultural labour', endorsing Freire's (1975) thesis that the routes towards liberatory change are personal conscientisation, dialogue with others and permanent cultural action.

11.1.2 Contribution to Pakeha change praxis

Interactions between positioning, method and validation criteria influence the direction a research project takes. My positioning as an insider researcher co-theorising with my peers encouraged methods that supported a reflective cycle of local Treaty work. I adapted research methods to achieve a high level of transparency and accountability between researcher and participants, which was in keeping with Treaty worker ethics and practice, and the ethics of participatory action research. My publishing of previously unpublished and ephemeral work, the innovative verbal and visual co-theorising process, and a consultative discourse analysis all gave participants a strong sense of involvement in an extended reflection on their practice. Treaty educators reported that the cumulative theorising process had a revitalising effect among networks and provided a sense of conceptual coherence to their work. The narrators of organisational Treaty journeys appreciated having their change efforts affirmed and linked to work in other organisations.

The cumulative theorising process we designed together provided a meaningful vehicle for Pakeha/tauiwi educators to reflect on 30 years of effort in decolonisation work with our own cultural group. Working in such a transparent way with each other's diverse theorising helped affirm our common direction in a field of endeavour notable for scanty public validation. Together, we constructed a collection of visual metaphors for Pakeha change processes, as well as gathering

narratives of Pakeha change, thereby contributing new media and material relevant to the local discursive context about decolonisation. The visual images were particularly powerful as a medium for sharing multi-dimensional and holistic concepts of change. Together with the written records of focus meetings and national conferences, these now form a useful repository of reflective praxis for Treaty workers.

My contributions to recording our praxis have come at a time when New Zealanders in general are shifting to electronic forms of communication and record-keeping, and at a time when a new generation of activists, electronically literate, are undertaking Treaty work. Both of these new developments mean that the paper-based means of communication, record keeping and accountability are less used, and the records of earlier theorising and ethics fading from view. This research and its electronic products may help to make links between the older written records and newer electronic forms as well as providing important source material for younger activists.

11.1.3 Evaluating the strategy of Treaty education

While I did not set out to evaluate the outcomes of Pakeha Treaty education, the present research into how Pakeha have responded to learning about the Treaty does provide an opportunity for evaluating the strategy of education for social change.

Recalling the original Project Waitangi campaign plan formulated in 1986 for *Pakeha Debate the Treaty*, the planning group stated: "It's to be a lengthy process of radio and television programmes, newly published resource books, voluntary organisations in discussions, and work in schools…" (Scott, 1986a). In the event, this did not take place in a year or even five years as planned. Indeed, it could be said to be still underway 21 years later. Freire's (1975) "permanent cultural revolution" (p. 48) is certainly an apt description!

A society debating the Treaty

In 1990, when the national office of Project Waitangi closed after 5 years of service, national coordinator Maryanne Haggie commented in *The Dominion:* "When Project Waitangi was launched in 1986, knowledge about the Treaty of Waitangi did not extend far past academic circles….There is no doubt that the Treaty has a higher profile, whether good or bad, than it did in 1986" (Haggie,

1990b, p. 55). She explained that when the project started, a survey showed that 6 percent of New Zealanders had read the Treaty. Surveys since have shown that that number has increased – a survey by the 1990 Commission after Waitangi Day, when the Commission published the treaty in full-page newspaper advertisements, showed that more than 30 per cent of New Zealanders had read it. There was a strong feeling among Project Waitangi people that they had contributed to raising the Treaty's profile. As Haggie (1990b) says:

> I think we've contributed to Pakeha understanding the treaty and understanding by middle New Zealand, which was always our stated target group. Our aim was always to put the Treaty debate into lay person's language as it's been confined very much to the legal and academic area and I think we've done that. (p. 55).

Contemporary Treaty workers occasionally attempt an estimate of how many New Zealanders have been affected by Treaty education:

> A testimony of our quiet unseen work over the years is the hundreds and thousands of lives that we've touched, and we know that they have changed. So we need to celebrate how many lives collectively we have touched and changed, and challenge the media and government 'Don't you go assuming what the bulk of New Zealanders think', because we have touched a critical mass of people. (Research participant, in Huygens, 2004, p. 81)

The participant went on to muse: "We've changed the collective consciousness, we've changed the movers and shakers, we've changed women mostly… and women change men!" (ibid).

The New Zealand Values survey (Perry & Webster, 1999) and other attitudinal surveys certainly confirm that New Zealanders are aware of the Treaty of Waitangi, and that there is a level of affirmation of Maori claims. Nationwide feedback in to the Human Rights Commission (2004-5) showed a widespread desire by Pakeha for more education about the Treaty. A growing interest by new immigrants to understand the present debate led to Pakeha Treaty educators being invited by ethnic community leaders to develop an educational programme appropriate to new migrants (Treaty Education for Migrants Group, 2006), in a project sponsored by the Human Rights Commission Race Relations team. This new immigrant-focused educational effort followed the learning philosophy of Pakeha Treaty education with a critical approach to colonial history, a legitimation of the Maori text, and a critique of Pakeha racism.

The campaign by Treaty educators to lead Pakeha in learning about the Treaty has undoubtedly had significant achievements: large numbers of public and social

services workers have experienced Treaty education; a modest number of organisations have attempted structural change; and there is a considerably higher level of public awareness of Maori claims and issues with Pakeha dominance than 20 years ago. I would summarise the general atmosphere in Aotearoa New Zealand as one of Pakeha grumbling and complaining about Maori claims, rather than a solid wall of public ignorance or resistance.

Although there are significant changes, we are clearly still short of positive understanding and constructive support by a majority of the population. A significant Pakeha-serving colonial hegemony has persisted even through the changes and challenges. The media has emerged as a powerful source of misinformation about the Treaty, and successive governments have disseminated ambiguous information about the Treaty. An unpredicted consequence of greater awareness of the Treaty is that, at this time, large groups of New Zealanders including the government draw upon the English version of the Treaty. In this version, Maori are understood to have ceded sovereignty to the British Crown and Pakeha dominance is assumed to be legitimated. In contrast and in response, the 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse has increasingly focused upon the Maori text of the Treaty with its confirmation of Maori authority and possessions.

Failure to alleviate situation for Maori

Treaty activist educators themselves would not generally declare the education strategy to have been 'a success' in terms of achieving change in New Zealand society that demonstrably benefits Maori. Most would concur with the Coordinator of Network Waitangi who in 2000 reflected on 15 years of activist and educational work: "the status of Maori health, employment and housing, despite all the anti-racism and Treaty work, is worse" (Way, 2000, p. 23). Speaking on behalf of antiracism and Treaty educators in 1997, Network Waitangi (1997) acknowledged that Pakeha success in all these areas "has been, and is likely to be, a matter for debate" (p. 14), and that there was a growing awareness among Pakeha activists and educators of the complexity of dealing with everyone's sense of disempowerment in the face of corporate globalisation processes. They concluded that:

> Tiriti education in the end has to do with motivating people to take action to change our society so that it does conform to the Tiriti and Declaration's intention and vision…maybe the task of Tangata Tiriti is mainly on the Kawanatanga side, to remove the barriers to iwi/Hapu exercising Tino Rangatiratanga, to both challenge and support the Crown and other Tauiwi to implement Te Tiriti o Waitangi, to model how an honourable Kawanatanga could look in our own institutions. (Network Waitangi, 1997, p. 14)

Not all Maori support tino rangatiratanga, and not all Pakeha resist it. As research participants pointed out: "The Treaty gap is not between Maori and Pakeha, but between those who know and support the Treaty and those who don't" (Huygens, 2004, p. 21). The Treaty movement's key achievement has been to sustain among Pakeha an alternative discourse and praxis based on honouring the Treaty at an institutional and cultural level. The conceptual roots of the alternative discourse used by narrators of Treaty journeys in organisations can be traced to the early praxis of antiracism/Treaty workers via the theorising of Pakeha change disseminated by Treaty educators. Secular Treaty educators did not do this alone, or even provide the initiative (which came from the churches) but the discourse may well have remained in church and legal settings if Treaty educators had not secularised the discourse and translated it into a cultural and organisational programme for Pakeha change.

Clearly the whole material and discursive context in which a dominant group operates is important. Kirton (1997) suggests that initiatives by hapu/iwi for self-determination initiatives changes have made the most difference (including their claims to the Waitangi Tribunal). While Pakeha processes of change are only part of the dynamic of change in Aotearoa, they are extremely important since Pakeha remain the culture-defining group in most of the country's public institutions. It is possible to track a long-term trajectory of change among ideological carriers, including legal, religious, and civic sectors, all of whom are still on the journey. My assessment is that Treaty education as a practice has contributed significantly to the discourses available to Pakeha involved in dialogue with Maori about a decolonised future.

The pro-Treaty discourse may certainly be described as a 'silent' discourse (Moewaka-Barnes et al, 2005; Tuffin et al, 2004) in certain sectors – the business sector, mainstream media, and parts of national and local government. The business and financial services sector were the least penetrated by Treaty education, and during the past decade of economic liberalisation in New Zealand, this sector has been in the ascendancy. The organisations that have sustained the 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse are primarily non-government organisations and associations, including professional associations, such as nurses, librarians, social workers, psychologists, lawyers, community workers and health professionals. In the legal arena, in social, health and educational services, and in non-government and civic services generally, a discourse of 'Pakeha

honouring the Treaty' is a robust discourse alongside others based on human rights, citizen equality, and multiculturalism.

Rather than settling for descriptions of discourse (or social practices) as simply dominant or resistant, the present research points to the function of discourses in relationships – do they enable a constructive conversation or negate such a conversation? How have the social practices constructed by these discourses influenced the progress of change in an oppressive society? In contrast to the ideological dehumanisation and monologue created by the dominant colonising discourse, in my view the 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse and practice has enabled a dialogue between Maori and Pakeha 'striving towards a right relationship'. A research participant raised an oft-expressed critique of the strategy of political education for members of a dominant group:

> Are we in fact not modern-day missionaries standing between/ intermediaries between the explicit power dialogue between Tangata Whenua and the 'others'? If we got out of the way would the dialogue not be more direct, empassioned, explicit? (Participant feedback form, 2003)

Countering this traditional doubt about skilful liberal assimilation of dissent, most participating groups theorised explicitly the crucial importance of their strategic role as 'translators' of assertions by Maori, or implicitly the value of Treaty education in helping Pakeha make a perspective shift about the Pakeha-Maori relationship. My response is that without the dialogue-enabling resources of a pro-Treaty discourse for Pakeha, Maori and Pakeha would be talking past each other. In this sense, the 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse forestalls a more violent resistance on either side, such as an increase to the Maori pressure for change, or an increase in the Pakeha resistance. Nevertheless, despite the value of new Pakeha pro-Treaty discourse and practice in enabling a slow dialogue towards decolonisation, Maori theorists have certainly expressed their frustration. Linda Smith (2004) has suggested that slow incremental change would not see any real change in our lifetimes: "This is too slow – we need to accelerate it!" Maori and Pakeha commentators over the past three decades would likely concur that while the new discursive resources of 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' are helping in the work of decolonisation, they have yet to be sufficiently widely accepted and deployed to challenge the constitutional and material structures of the colonial situation.

11.2 Contributions to international understanding

I have treated the New Zealand campaign to educate Pakeha about the Treaty of Waitangi as an explicit attempt to conscientise a dominant group. Treaty education may be seen, following Freire (1975), as a form of cultural action within a dialogue where colonised and coloniser speak together to conscientise the situation of colonisation. The present research has provided evidence of the theoretical and practical organising required for members of a dominant group to coordinate localised sites of resistance (Henriques et al, 1984) into a viable counter-hegemonic discourse. The steps taken by Pakeha/tauiwi antiracism/Treaty educators demonstrate a local strategic response to the opening paragraph of my thesis, in which I pleaded that our world urgently needs ways to encourage change in culturally dominant and privileged groups. Tracing the development of a counter-colonial discourse of race relations in a Western democracy makes a significant contribution to international theorising about decolonisation and social change.

Affirming indigenous viewpoints and authority

The affirmation of indigenous world views and political authority has far-reaching implications for all aspects of colonial life – for the status and methodologies of colonial law, philosophy and science as well as for constitutional, economic and social systems. In cultural terms, reducing Eurocentrism involves revealing and questioning the cultural values of the colonisers (e. g. Black, 1997; Kirton, 1997). Affirmation by a dominant group of the asserted authority of the 'other' in a context of asymmetrical power relations is a profound alternative to discourses which maintain dominance.

Theorising emotional components of change

It is possible, but unlikely, that the emotional cycles theorised in the present studies are specific to the culturally dominant group in New Zealand and the particular discourses of race relations and social justice we have here. Memmi's (1965) early theorising about the self-rejecting coloniser suggests that feelings of helplessness to change a colonial system, defeatism, denial and so on, may be shared in many colonial settings. If it can be argued, as the Treaty educators and I have done, that particular emotions are a key part of the social change process for coloniser or other dominant groups, then social movements are certainly leaders in

encouraging such an active and emotional response. Greenpeace Canada formulate their cry to activism as 'think globally, act locally, respond personally'.

Theorising change as a collective process

The present studies made a significant contribution by theorising explicitly collective processes of change for dominant groups. While Freire (1972, 1975) emphasised that conscientising change takes place *in* a human being *among* other human beings, the present studies highlighted that change takes place *between* human beings in what they share, i.e. it takes place in our cultural processes, and our shared symbolic systems, such as the discourses with which we create change to a social order. In Gramsci's (1971) terms, the present studies showed that just as hegemony is consensually produced, so must counter-hegemony be consensually produced.

A number of facets were theorised as important in such collective cultural work for a dominant group: remaining consistent in analysing oppression as collective; acknowledging the cultural nature of our world; responding with collective cultural and institutional work; and organising to become 'a group that is changing' within the dominant group, while aiming to 'take the family with us'.

The theorising of Pakeha change was founded on an understanding of the collective nature of oppression, which led to the conceptual partner of theorising the collective nature of change. Oppression was theorised consistently as a collective phenomenon – not only are some people oppressed as a collective because of their membership in a particular group, but the oppression is carried out collectively by an oppressing group. To change an impersonal, collective process requires shared social action. Theorists speaking in the Treaty movement and in organisational accounts focused consistently on a collective journey for Pakeha as a cultural group. While individual processes of conscientisation were acknowledged, and individual prejudice taken into account as a factor in educational work, the focus remained on how Pakeha may come to appreciate themselves as members of a cultural collective, and how to change what is enacted in the name of the cultural collective.

Combining the significance of the collective participation in change as well as oppression helped in appreciating the power and responsibilities of a dominant group. In the present research, Pakeha were identified as the culture-defining group, and Pakeha (i.e. public) institutions and organisations were targeted as the

site for change. The present studies have made a significant contribution by establishing that the dominant group needs to participate in changing the current hegemony, since they are responsible for its reproduction and maintenance.

My research showed the value of theorising about social change in what is recognised to be a cultural world. Treaty educators worked overtly to change Pakeha culture. For instance, the notion that Pakeha, as the culture-defining group in New Zealand, have an "unmarked" dominant culture (Black & Huygens, 2007) meant that strategising for change needed to take into account how to bring culture and power into view for a group blind to their cultural and institutional dominance. Rather than attempting to change an individual's prejudice, the focus in the present research on the shared nature of a hegemonic culture suggested that we may all contribute to changing the public discourse. No matter how intractably prejudiced our neighbour or family appear to be, we can contribute to changing the cultural resources they are drawing upon to construct their prejudice and their actions.

Theorising mutually agreed agendas and relationships

A further significant contribution made by the present research was the theorising of mutually agreed relationships as both a process and goal for decolonisation work and social change. The studies showed the importance of responsiveness to the indigenous party. The indigenous view of the shared reality was the stimulus for seeking new accounts of the oppressive colonial situation. Their agenda for change served as a strategic check of processes and goals for the dominant coloniser group. A mutually agreed relationship was an overarching goal for coloniser group members seeking a more hopeful future. The present research showed that a significant point of learning for Treaty workers was to avoid seeking to define the future relationship with Maori, but rather to focus on Pakeha responsibility to change our dominating institutions and universalising world views, so that a dialogue about a mutually agreed relationship would have the chance to develop. Furthermore, the present research showed that developing a mutually agreeable relationship between an indigenous and a coloniser group depended on the ability of the dominant group to grasp new, less self-serving views of both the history and the future of the relationship.

Freire had spoken in the early 1970s with local activists of the "co-intentional" nature of change, which was developed, in my interpretation of local theorising, into a dialogue about a mutually agreed agenda for change. As the present

research has shown, such an agreed agenda is not developed in one meeting, one year or even one decade. It takes a conscious praxis of response to the other over long time periods. The words of the Maori elder and the community psychologist that open this chapter are examples of such a slow 'conversation' about liberation and decolonisation – being invited to participate by the indigenous party "weaving people together" (Gray in Huygens, 2004, p. 89), yet needing to undertake our own "praxis that transforms ourselves as well as transforming reality" (Martin-Baro, 1994, p. 29), our own cultural labour for liberation. The resulting praxis – the ongoing process of reflecting and acting in dialogue with Maori – has indeed transformed these Pakeha Treaty educators and organisational workers as well as their reality.

Finally, the present theorising suggested that a dominant group may have a significant task in learning how to be *in relationship* with another group – for instance, coming to understand themselves as a cultural collective with manifest power; learning to operate consciously as members of a cultural group; and developing skills of negotiation between cultural collectives.

11.3 Implications for theory, research and practice

11.3.1 Implications for building theory

In general, the contributions made by the present research suggest that in developing theory relevant to change among coloniser and other dominant groups, the humanities and social sciences need to embrace the dialogic turn in social constructionism and relational approaches to change The present research calls for further theory-building on (i) the role of emotion and action in learning new world views (ii) the processes of collective change among coloniser and other dominant groups and (iii) developing mutually agreed relationships between coloniser and indigenous peoples. In general, theorising about the production and maintenance of alternative discourses would be welcome.

My research suggests a number of areas that require attention if we accept that culturally dominant groups need to participate in change aimed at reducing their dominance. In developing further theory in the areas of emotional responses to counter-hegemonic information and emotional components of active journeys of change, it would be fruitful to draw together work in diverse areas. Helpful

theorising is likely to be found in intervention-focused areas such as men's work with violence and offender programmes; family systems therapy; and peace and conflict resolution work.

New theory is needed about the collective nature of change in dominant groups, both at the cultural and the institutional level. Approaches to change which fail to encourage consciously collective change in dominant groups may be condemned, either naively or cynically, to failure, and may thereby function to maintain the status quo. There is a risk that such approaches may, as with prejudice-causes-racism theory, develop in self-serving ways that avoid change. The present research suggests that theory developed about dominant group change needs to remain linked to actual experiences of attempting to change the status quo.

My interpretation of the intellectual history of the antiracism/Treaty movement pointed to helpful contributions made by theory, abstraction and analysis from outside the local context. However, I would add the caution that such theory must be evaluated against the local mutually agreed agenda. In the New Zealand context, themes such as the cultural and institutional racism in the relationship between Pakeha and Maori are easily lost sight of if the context is widened to include global economic oppression. Thus, a theoretical implication of the present research is the value of maintaining a focus on local relationships of dominance, and the oppression structured into them.

Overall, the present theorising for transforming action demonstrates the generative value of theorising that arises out of action to change the status quo. The present findings imply the value of theorising the practice of *changing* – not merely interpreting the processes of change but inquiring of practitioners of change how they theorise their work. In other words, the reflective practice to be found in social change movements should be privileged in theory generation.

11.3.2 Implications for research

The present research suggested some clear avenues for researching change in culturally dominant groups:

1. **Continue to examine processes of dominant group change** through studying the praxis of known social change movements. The specific local nature of such theorising needs to be acknowledged in concert with seeking to abstract useful guidelines for other dominant groups working on change.

My research demonstrated the worth of studying communities of social change and anti-establishment movements in their own right, since these are nurseries for counter-hegemonic discourses. This implies seeking out counter-hegemonic discourses in use by identifiable speech communities, rather than just noting alternative discourses as 'resistant' or 'silent' discourses. Counter-hegemonic discourses carry both idealistic ethics for a changed world, and, most importantly, theory for achieving such change. In constructing theory about how a coloniser or other dominant group in a specific situation may change, social movements serve as important sites of new theory. Identifying the historical antecedents of counter-hegemonic discourses may help to theorise more clearly the cultural tasks involved in dismantling an oppressive hegemony. However, it is important that researchers treat the knowledge-producing value of alternative discourses with respect. Because of the risk of misunderstanding and misuse, interpreting the discourse of alternative 'communities of cognition' needs to be done with the participation and oversight of the speech communities involved.

2. **Align academic resources with social movements aimed at change for coloniser or other dominant groups.** The resources of the academy (graduate study, research funds) may be used to work alongside activists, to record and publicise their work in forms useful to them. The praxis and practice of local grass-roots social movements may be examined – both the theorising about what needs to change, and the practice of how to go about work for change. Movement members may claim resources for research, or scholars may work alongside members.

It behoves us as social constructionist and critical researchers to remember that speakers of both dominant and alternative discourses have a common destiny in the material world. In the terms of my thesis, the liberatory potential of tomorrow's discourses depends on the quality of counter-hegemonic discourses today. While we might find the sentiments of today's alternative discourses too 'radical', it is from them that change will come. As the present research found, it is a long, hard journey to build and sustain an alternative discourse to a colonial hegemony over the decades required for change in oppressive conditions.

3. **Use institutional resources to support dissemination of alternative discourses.** As I found in this research, it is likely that the theorising and strategising of social change practitioners may be restricted to unpublished and ephemeral writing, or be held in an oral tradition or records of meetings.

The resources of the academy may be helpfully used to record and disseminate liberatory alternatives.

Researchers wishing to promote sites of alternative discourse may consider using research resources in ways that advance the aspirations of participants, e.g. by convening conferences which serve as platforms for coordinating localised sites of resistance (the Young Maori leaders conference from which Nga Tamatoa sprang was such a conference (Walker, 1990)); by archival research to confirm and enrich the genealogy of alternative discourses; or by participatory workshops to study dilemmas and contradictions in the alternative discourse, and so on. All these uses of research resources may help to affirm and legitimate alternative discourses and may strengthen the theorising work of the particular speech communities sustaining them.

11.3.3 Implications for policy and practice

My research suggests that any organisation or government serious about enhancing the status of indigenous peoples in colonial settings must attend to the pervasive effects of institutionalised ignorance contained in the coloniser's glorious standard stories. Furthermore, in any educational effort with adults, they must attend to emotional processes of grief, loss, anger, and denial. The theorising about strong emotional reactions as normal in the present studies helps to explain why those teaching about the Treaty in assessed educational settings may struggle with classroom dynamics and assessment. In most educational settings it is difficult to privilege an emotional responses in assessed work (although the submitting of student logs assessed on evidence of reflective and critical progress is a compromise). It may also be difficult to highlight collective processes, since assessment is typically of individual work.

The type of information produced by educational and ideological agencies needs to change if we are to retell the history of the relationship between coloniser and indigenous peoples in less self-serving ways. This has started to happen, albeit slowly. For instance, in the publications of the government Treaty Information Unit, we can see a shift from previous public accounts of our colonial history as a glorious and mutually beneficial imperial advance to one of a more complex struggle between cultures. There are fewer assumptions made about Maori acquiescence. Maori traditions and achievements are less devalued. Both New Zealand historians and the legal profession have made shifts in their views of the Treaty. Ideally, in considering the ongoing calls to government agencies such as

the Human Rights Commission for more and better education about the Treaty, the 30 years experience of the antiracism/Treaty movement should be drawn upon to produce educational resources that facilitate Pakeha change.

Supporting the unique emotional processes experienced by a culturally dominant group exposed to unflattering accounts of their part in history requires the skills of educators and facilitators. Locally, government programmes since the 1986 - 1990 Project Waitangi campaign have avoided providing support for such emotional processes. The government's current insistence is upon 'Treaty information', rather than 'Treaty education', being made available to the New Zealand public. Small-group education, which allows for skilful facilitation of emotional responses, has never again found its way into government-sponsored programmes about the Treaty. The present research allows us to see the government's policy of information-only as a retreat from dealing with the emotional responses evoked by disorienting new information, and thereby as a retreat from effective change for a culturally dominant group.

11.4 Limits of present research

My research has been necessarily of an exploratory nature in an under-theorised field. To my mind, the main limits of my research have been in not exploring further the active and interactive nature of our counter-colonial constructions of the world. Firstly, I was not able to explore in any systematic way the structures and policies enacted through the 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse. As suggested in the Introduction, it would be valuable in New Zealand to do a 'stocktake' of institutional changes undertaken to honour the Treaty. Secondly, while providing a strong affirmation of the existence and vitality of one 'silent' discourse in use in non-government settings, I have not explored in any depth the interplay between government and non-government discourse. Nor has it been possible to explore in depth the nuances of the 'bicultural versus bilateral' discourse, both of which may and have been used locally to support and argue for change in the constitutional relationship between Maori and Pakeha.

Overall, my interpretations in the present research have yet to be aligned with a wide range of work in the critical and social constructionist traditions about Pakeha identity politics and discourses (e.g. Bell, 1996) and work by Maori and Pakeha researchers concerning alternative Pakeha discourse in organisations (e.g. Campbell, 2005). Further work would be valuable to explore the extent to which

the 'Pakeha honouring the Treaty' discourse interacts with and has influenced longstanding dominant colonial discourses such as those identified by Nairn and McCreanor (1990, 1991) and (McCreanor, 2005). Certainly New Zealanders who return to this country after many years away typically give anecdotal reports such as 'the way you [Pakeha] talk [about Maori] is really different from how it used to be….I really notice it coming back'.

My research was also limited by the time required to archive and publish relevant local literature. My cursory review of anti-racism work elsewhere does not do justice to the work of parallel social movements in other countries. The present research is therefore one small step towards a conversation with practitioners of dominant group change in other settings. Many aspects of dominant group change remain unexplored, but the present research helps to open the way for further study and reflection in this area, both locally and internationally.

Overall, I submit that the part played in social change by conscientisation among culturally dominant groups is a fertile area for further inquiry, reflection and the building of theory and practice. The present studies of Pakeha change in response to indigenous Maori assertions of their authority are evidence of the crucial new theorising to be found, as liberation psychologist Martin-Baro (1994) suggests, in our efforts to transform ourselves and our realities.

Whether counter-hegemonic discourses and organisational changes such as those documented here will develop sufficiently to help transform Western dominating cultures and the material conditions of colonisation for indigenous peoples remains to be seen. However, the widespread adoption of a Treaty-honouring discourse among Pakeha opens up increasing possibilities for constructing from a history of colonialism, a different future.

GLOSSARY OF MAORI WORDS

Entries are drawn from Ryan (1995) unless otherwise shown.

haka	dance
hapu	clan, sub-tribe
hikoi	march
iwi	tribe
kapa haka	dance team
kaumatua	elder
kawanatanga	government
mana	authority, control (Williams, 1971)
mana motuhake	autonomy, independence
mana whenua	political authority over an area claimed by a tribal group as a result of tangata whenua status, descent lines or conquest (Walker, 1990, p. 55).
maori	ordinary, native people
marae	meeting area for iwi and its buildings
nga iwi	peoples, nations
pa	village
Pakeha	non-Maori, European
rangatiratanga	kingdom, sovereignty, realm
tino rangatiratanga	tino adds 'absolute, main' to the noun (Ryan, 1995) endorsing a translation useful for non-Maori understanding of 'unqualified authority' or 'complete authority'
rohe	territory
taiaha	long club
tangata whenua	local people, native (Ryan, 1995). Hone Kaa and other Maori scholars translate *tangata whenua* as 'the people who are the land'
tapu	sacred
taonga	property, treasure
tauiwi	strange tribe, foreign race (Williams, 1971) may be used to denote all non-Maori.
te Ao Maori	the Maori world
Te Tiriti o Waitangi	The Treaty of Waitangi in the Maori language
tikanga	custom
waiata	song

APPENDICES

Appendix 1
Timeline of Maori and Pakeha actions and responses

Entries are adapted from the following works, which all take a critical approach to the 'standard story' of British colonisation:

Network Waitangi Taranaki (2000) Constitutional Change: Why All the Fuss About it Now?
Williams (1999) *Te Kooti Tango Whenua*
Belich (1986) *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*
Walker (1990) *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end*
Walker (1983) The History of Maori Activism. Paper presented at 15th Pacific Sciences Congress, Dunedin.
Dick Scott (1975) *Ask That Mountain* (extended version of *The Parihaka Story*, published in 1954)
Hawke's Bay Treaty workers Timeline (*The Net Working*, May 1991 – Aug 1992)
Waitangi Consultancy education kits, drawn from Waitangi Action Committee Education Kitset Tuatahi (early 1980s), Dick Scott *Ask That Mountain* and research by John Miller, Research Officer for Te Matakite o Aotearoa.

Maori actions & responses	Pakeha actions & responses
Maori society flourishing under hapu rangatiratanga and tikanga, covering all of Aotearoa New Zealand. **Maori Population** 100,000 – 200,000 or substantially more. **1831 Petition to King William IV** A meeting of 13 Rangatira at Kerikeri signed a petition to the King to ask him to "look after his hapu who are behaving in an uncivilised manner."	**early 1800s** European ships began visiting from Australia & America to trade for natural resources. Pakeha missionaries began arriving to establish mission stations, often on gifted land. Pakeha sealers and traders began to live in coastal settlements, mostly abiding by Maori laws apart from in the north where whalers on leave ashore were drunk and disorderly at Kororareka, the 'hellhole of the Pacific'.
1834 Flag chosen by northern Maori who issued warrants to trading ships to fly the flag and so avoid being confiscated. **1835** *He Wakaputanga o Te Rangatiratanga* **- Declaration of Independence** - signed at Waitangi on October 28 and later to clarify that: • All sovereign power and authority - "tino rangatiratanga" rested with Maori. • Maori would meet each year to make laws for "justice, peace, order and trade". • No "legislative authority" other than this would be recognised.	**1833 James Busby** arrived as kaiwhakarite (intermediary) or British Resident - facilitated choice of a national flag and encouraged the Declaration of Independence. **1839 British Colonial Office** dispatched Captain Hobson with instructions to annex New Zealand, i.e. to have Maori cede their sovereignty to the British. Resident missionaries translated Hobson's English draft into *Te Tiriti o Waitangi*, retaining key concepts such as 'tino rangatiratanga' from the Declaration of Independence because they knew Maori would never cede sovereignty.

Both the flag and the Declaration of Independence were formally recognised by the British Crown.	**Pakeha population** 2,000
February 1840 *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* - Maori text of Treaty of Waitangi – signed on Feb 6 at Waitangi. and later by over 500 leaders: • Gave British a lesser right of government - "kawanatanga". • Guaranteed Maori retention of "tino rangatiratanga" over all aspects of property and culture. They could sell land they wished to sell. • Guaranteed Maori equal rights with the British. • Spoken guarantee of spiritual freedom for all, including Maori custom - Many iwi and hapu did not sign, e.g. Te Wherowhero, who later became the first Maori leader of Te Kingitanga, as he had already signed the Declaration of Independence and felt that it said what he wanted to say. **1842-44 Hone Heke**, first signatory to the Treaty, cut down British flagpole in Kororareka (Russell) in protest at unilateral decisions made by British governor. At the fourth protest, the town was evacuated, and he and Kawiti sacked and burned it. **1843 Te Rauparaha**, signatory to te Tiriti, opposed New Zealand Company claim to land at Wairau. His appeal to Pakeha law failed, and he faced armed settlers. **1848 Fifty-three Maori owned vessels** of over 14 tonnes registered at Auckland. Coastal shipping largely controlled by Maori. **mid 1850s** Maori were producing half the colony's exports. In the Waikato there were 18 tribally owned flour mills, supplying Auckland settlers. Maori became less willing to sell land. **1852 – 58 Rise of the Kingitanga** Meetings of the principal North Island iwi cestablished a rohe tapu inside which no more land would be sold, under the protection of King Potatau Te Wherowhero, elected in 1858. **1858 Wiremu Kingi** told Governor he opposed the sale of Waitara land by his	**March, 1840** a Treaty copy written in English by Hobson was signed by 39 Maori. Maori were described as having "ceded to her Majesty the Queen of England, absolutely and without reservation, all the rights and powers of Sovereignty" but retained "full, exclusive and undisturbed possession of their Lands and Estates, Forests, Fisheries and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess…" It specified the Crown's pre-emptive right to buy Maori land offered for sale. **November 1840 Proclamation of Sovereignty** Hobson proclaimed British sovereignty over the whole of the country, and established a Legislative Council of Pakeha land-owning men. **1845 British troops** called from Sydney to quell Heke. British army no match for Maori strategy and fortifications, but Governor Grey announced victory and made peace. **1840 – 1865** Large tracts of land purchased by Government land agents. Hapu customary title extinguished over most of South Island and Stewart Island. **1852 New Zealand Constitution Act** Established beginnings of representational government known today. Allowed male property owners to vote for the House of Representatives, making Maori owning communal land ineligible to vote. Section 71 allowed Maori control of Maori areas. **1856 Depression in agricultural prices** seriously affected Maori commercial enterprise. Settlers' wheat farms also affected so they turned to sheep farming by squatting on large areas of Maori land and pushing for ownership. **1858 First population census** Maori 56, 049 – Pakeha 59,413 **Governor Gore Brown waived** Kingi's right of chieftanship. His nephew sold 600

nephew.

1860 Kohimarama Hui
The 200 Maori leaders attending viewed the Queen's representatives as having only a nominal sovereignty. Gathering produced *Te Whakakotahitanga o Te Tiriti o Waitangi* or the Kohimarama Covenant affirming te Tiriti o Waitangi.

1860 - 80s Parihaka
Te Whiti o Rongomai and Tohu Kakahi aimed to regain confiscated land and assert Maori control of Maori affairs in Taranaki. Their people began ploughing confiscated land and constructed fences across roads built through their cultivations. Hundreds imprisoned without trial.

1865 The King Country aukati
Wi Tamihana unsuccessfully petitioned for an inquiry into the Waikato War and the return of confiscated land. Tawhiao and his people then withdrew behind the confiscation line, called aukati by Maori. This effectively created a separate Maori sphere that was recognised by Maori and non-Maori alike. The aukati remained until 1879 when Rewi Maniapoto negotiated for a railway through the King Country.

1870 – 80 Maori autonomy movements opposed Native Schools. Kingitanga had its own Minister of Education.

1868 – 1909 Thirty-two Bills presented to House of Representatives by Members of Parliament for Maori seats. All sought to put in place new systems of land administration to give Maori greater control over determination of land titles. None became law.

1878 Kohimarama Conference Reconvened Ngati Whatua reconvened the conference at Orakei to discuss how to have the Treaty of Waitangi honoured and regain control from the Colonial Government. Over 300 people attended, including some from Nga Puhi and it was decided to begin regular meetings at Waitangi.

1880s Major depression affected tribes whose land had been alienated far worse

acres, resulting in Taranaki land wars.

Governor Gore Brown invited Maori leaders to Kohimarama, promising to respect mana Maori to avoid other iwi joining the Taranaki war. The Government saw this conference as a Maori ratification of the Treaty and of the Crown's sovereignty.

1862 – 64 Invasion of Waikato fomented by Auckland business men and bankers who stood to gain enormous profits from land sales. British army and local militia killed villagers and destroyed cultivations in the Waikato, Bay of Plenty and Taranaki. Defenders were declared rebels, and their land confiscated. Customary title to the lands of loyal tribes in the same areas was equally extinguished.

1863 Suppression of Rebellion Act identical to Irish Act of 1799. It suspended right of trial before imprisonment to "punish certain aboriginal tribes of the colony". Also confiscation of entire districts if "natives believed to be in rebellion".

1862/65 Native Land Courts Acts established the Native Land Court, designed to extinguish customary title on land remaining in Maori hands by substituting individual ownership for the rangatiratanga of hapu control. Fragmentation of succession meant that the land remaining in Maori hands became unmanageable.

1866 Oyster Fisheries Act Prevented oyster fishing by Maori, and leased Maori oyster beds to non-Maori commercial interests. *(prevented Maori selling seafood?)*

1867 Maori Representation Act
This created four Maori seats for which all Maori males over 21 could vote (without any property qualification). King Tawhiao (1884) pointed out: "one Native Member is returned for more than 20,000 persons, whereas one European Member is returned for every 5,000."

1877 Chief Justice Prendergast proclaims "the Treaty is a simple nullity" with no legal status.

1880 Maori schools receive curriculum taught in English and focused on

than Pakeha. Health and population declined markedly. Makeshift living conditions with no sanitation and infectious diseases created very low life expectancy and a high rate of infant mortality. Traditional remedies failed. Maori received little medical aid other than periodic innoculations. Seldom treated by doctors or admitted to hospitals.

1881 Ngapuhi Treaty Parliament or Runanga began
The Waitangi meetings of 1834 were revived. The new "Treaty of Waitangi" house opened at Te Tiriti o Waitangi marae. Governor invited to attend, but stayed away.

1881 Te Whiti and Tohu arrested by 2,500 troops and militia. Parihaka pa and cultivations ransacked, and over 1600 residents forcibly removed. Te Whiti arrested and imprisoned on subsequent occasions, as were other key leaders, for refusing to cooperate with dog tax, supplying alcohol, and for building on their confiscated land.

1882 Ngapuhi deputation to England appeals to the Queen for:
- A Royal Commission to investigate and rectify laws that contravene the Treaty,
- Permission to establish a Maori Parliament.

1881 King Tawhiao Petitions the Queen of England
King Tawhiao and four other leaders travelled to England to petition Queen Victoria about Maori self-government, as provided for in the 1852 Constitution Act. The delegation was snubbed and referred back to the New Zealand colonial government

1892 Waikato Kauhanganui King Tawhiao claimed the right under Section 71 of the Constitution Act to set up his own Great Council or Kauhanganui. Councils continued to be held until the 1920s, discussing Treaty rights, Maori political autonomy, roading and mineral rights, and land confiscation.

1892 - 1902 Maori Parliament Leaders of the Kotahitanga set up a Maori Parliament, meeting over a decade in 11 districts. They sought a limited sovereignty for mana Maori to control Maori affairs. Bills passed by the Maori Parliament were introduced into the Colonial Parliament, but were either ignored or defeated.

1893 Hone Heke elected Grand-nephew of his namesake, Hone Heke elected to

---

assimilation.

1880s Major depression in New Zealand. Immigrants arriving to no work, sweated labour in most trades.

Dog Tax, Alcohol tax etc, ostensibly aimed at tidying up Pakeha behaviour, but had a harrassing effect on Maori communities.

1883 Dr Alfred Newman said New Zealand the healthiest country in the world, disregarding Maori health, after stating "the disappearance of the [Maori] race is scarcely a subject for much regret. They are dying out in a quick easy way and are being supplanted by a Superior Race".

1886 Government dismissed as "unreasonable and absurd" King Tawhiao's petition for a Maori Council to administer Maori rights under the Treaty of Waitangi.

1890 Liberal Government bought over 5 million acres of Maori land in North Island at 5 shillings per acre (market price 30 pounds) for intensive dairy farms for settlers.

1891 Influenza pandemic Maori died at 4 times the rate of Europeans.

1891 Rees-Carroll Commission reported "intolerable difficulty" for settlers in acquiring land from Maori.

1893 Votes for Women Women were allowed to vote for the first time. The same Act also abolished the provision that allowed Maori men who met the property qualification to vote on the 'European' seats.

1893 Crown's right of sole purchase reintroduced, plus power to declare any area

Parliament as spokesman for the Kotahitanga. Put forward the Federated Assembly Empowering Bill to have a Maori Parliament with power to govern Maori, with: • an Upper House composed of Chiefs • a Lower House elected by Iwi The Assembly was to appoint committees of Local Government for Maori Districts.	of Maori land suitable for (Pakeha) settlement. **1894** When Hone Heke's bill was eventually presented as the Native Rights Bill, Pakeha MPs left the Debating Chamber to prevent it being debated.
1897 Young Maori Party A group of young Maori men educated in Pakeha academic institutions formed the Young Maori Party to take up the work of the Kotahitanga. Apirana Ngata, Peter Buck and Maui Pomare aimed to improve Maori health through modern sanitation, better housing conditions, access to health care and to revive Maori morale and prosperity through halting land loss. **1900 Maori Councils Act** Put forward by Maori MP, James Carroll, it gave Maori a very limited form of local government, adopting a policy of leasing rather than selling land and setting up local committees and sanitation inspectors. **1906 Rua Kenana and Maungapohatu** Rua Kenana established a self-governing community at Maungapohatu. In 1916, armed constabulary attacked Maungapohatu killing two men, and arresting Rua. His followers had to sell land cheaply to meet court costs. **1914 Te Rata visits London** The Waikato leader King Te Rata was given an audience with King George V in London on condition that he raise no contentious issues. No redress gained for Maori. **1915 Kauhanganui decision not to enlist for WWI** As a result of the Kingitanga decision not to volunteer for WWI, many Waikato Maori were arrested or imprisoned for refusing to report for duty. **1921 Ratana political movement and religion founded** Maori prophet and leader, Wiremu Ratana, formed a political party to address current social problems and past grievances by incorporating the Treaty into legislation. In 1924 he travelled to England with grievances about the Treaty of	**1896 Maori population** census at its lowest: 42, 113 – Pakeha 703,360. **1898 Old Age pension Act** for 'deserving persons'. Maori seldom qualified because of 'shares' in ancestral land, although these provided no income. Asians ineligible. Pakeha complained that the Maori Councils' leasing policies were unfair to Pakeha. The Councils were replaced by Land Boards, with Pakeha presidents. **1900 Department of Health** established in response to bubonic plague scare. Began to embody a philosophy of universal, rather than charitable, health care. **1907 Plunket Society** formed to raise healthy racial stock (Pakeha) in a healthy environment, focused on early child care. **1907 Suppression of Tohunga Act** Tohunga were forbidden to practice. Passed on grounds of concern for Maori health, but had effect of hounding Maori prophetic leaders, especially Rua Kenana. **1909 Native Lands Act** Allowed for Maori land to be used for roads and railways with no compensation paid. **1918 Influenza pandemic** Again kills Maori at 4 times the rate of Pakeha. **1918 Pakeha soldiers returning from World War I** are allocated farm land, but Maori soldiers ineligible. **1930s Unemployment relief** for single Pakeha males 15/- per week, single Maori males 7/6d if they were living "in the same manner as Europeans". Usually Maori

Waitangi. His petition was referred back to the New Zealand government.

1932 Ratana Petition calling for ratification of Treaty of Waitangi with 30,128 signatures presented to Parliament. Governments stalled until 1945, when they responded by agreeing to display a copy of the Treaty in every school.

1936 Ratana/Labour alliance Ratana formed an alliance with Labour Prime Minister Savage that led to the election of a Labour government in both 1946 and 1957, on condition that Labour would entrench the Treaty in statutory law.

1939 Tribal Committees Through the Maori War Effort Committee, Rt Hon. Paikea established 365 tribal committees to regulate education, welfare, housing, training, land use and development, and grievances. Paikea's dream was to convert these re-established tribal networks into a statutory Ministry of Maori Welfare.

1949 Kingitanga efforts to keep King Country dry King Koroki and Te Puea led a deputation of 600 Waikato Maori to Parliament in a vain attempt to keep alcohol out of the King Country, as promised by the Colonial Government in the 1870s.

1951 Maori Women's Welfare League set up as pan-tribal organisation with major thrust to improve Maori health, child care and pre-school education. It also passed a barrage of remits at its annual conferences aimed at influencing government policy.

1953 Trust Boards Maori began incorporating their land under Trust Boards to allow development as a total economic unit, thus finally to gain access to bank loans, stock and seeds. Supplies of Maori land sold by individuals began to dry up.

Maori now owned merely 3% of New Zealand, and were hamstrung from developing it. Government owned 50%, and 47% freehold under European title. (in 1983)

did not qualify. It was considered that they could grow their own food on their lands.

1938 Social Security Act finally delivered equality of access to individual benefits for Maori (and Asians) but ignored tribal basis of Maori society.

1939 Deputation to request that Maori be taught in schools received response from the Director of Education that "the natural abandonment of the native tongue involves no loss on the Maori"

1940 New Zealand celebrated 100 years of nationhood Speech made about "best race relations in the world". Methodist Church urged govt to write Treaty into law.

1945 Maori Social and Economic Development Act stripped the tribal committees of their autonomy and any responsibility for land. Maori wardens given welfare functions and required to be largely voluntary.

1940s and 1950s a period of Pakeha complacency about race relations. Policy of assimilation now informed legislation.

1950s Maori people encouraged to migrate to the cities. In 1936, 10% of Maori population was urban, but by 1961, this had increased to 40%, and by 1986 to 80.7%.

1951 Policy of "pepperpotting" Maori familes among Pakeha families to assist assimilation. Undermined cultural cohesion.

1953 Maori Affairs Act allowed government to compulsorily purchase Maori Land if deemed "uneconomic" and thus "waste land". Also stated "No marriage in accordance with Maori custom…shall be regarded as a valid marriage."

1953 Town and Country Planning Act prevented Maori from building on their land through zoning restriction. This forced many Maori to move from rural areas to cities.

1959/60 No Maoris No Tour protests included leadership from Pakeha activists.

	1960 Hunn report gave thorough statistical report of Maori trailing behind Pakeha in most areas. Recommended stepping up assimilation.
	1960 World Council of Churches established Programme to Combat Racism. Locally, Young Christian Workers (Catholic), Student Christian Movement and church groups became more aware of injustice globally and locally.
	Early 1960s Citizens for Racial Equality (CARE) founded with Maori and Pakeha members, focused on racism at home. In response to Hunn report, set up homework centres to support Maori school children.
1962 Maori Council formed by government to act as an advisory body on Maori policy. Regional Maori councils followed**.** Maori Councils developed considerable skill in monitoring Parliament, scrutinising legislation and making submissions to ministers and select committees.	**1966 Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Racial Discrimination** Signed by New Zealand government.
The 1967 Maori Affairs Amendment Act seen by Maori as the 'last land grab' by Pakeha. It triggered the Maori land rights movement in the next decade.	**1967 Maori Affaris Amendment Act** opened up membership of Maori land corporations to non-owners (i.e. Pakeha) and forced land owned by fewer than four people under one title into conversion from Maori to European land.
1967 Revival of Kotahitanga Movement Meeting at Otiria Marae, Kawakawa, to revive the Kotahitanga movement. Discussions included Maori self-determination, ratification of the Treaty of Waitangi and a symbolic unity under the Maori Queen.	**1967 Rating Act** subjected land to rates even though not producing income with Maori away in cities. Local bodies able to lease or sell Maori land to recover rates.
1968 Te Hokioi newsletter published by a radical Maori group in Wellington as a "taiaha of truth" about the role of the Maori trustee in disposing of Maori resources.	**1970 Halt All Racist Tours (HART) founded** Focused on racism abroad, particularly apartheid in South Africa.
1968 Maori Organisation on Human Rights (MOOHR) formed in Wellington. They opposed discrimination in housing, employment, sport and politics. Advocated recovering control of Maori reserved lands under perpetual leases to Pakeha.	**1973 Nelson Action Group** published "Justice and Race: A Monocultural System in a Multicultural Society" examining structural racism in court decisions.
	1970s Race Relations Office established
1970 Young Maori Leaders Conference convened by the Maori Council at Auckland University established **Nga Tamatoa** 'the young warriors'. They initiated legal aid, an employment office and a nation-wide programme for full recognition of the Maori language in education. Began protests at Waitangi to challenge Pakeha and	**1973 Auckland Committee on Racism & Discrimination (ACORD)** established with past members of Nelson Action Group to draw attention to structural racism. Met with Nga Tamatoa and Polynesian Panthers to develop an educational approach.
	1975 Treaty of Waitangi Act established the Waitangi Tribunal and Waitangi Day

their own elders about lost rights, e.g. to sell kaimoana under 1866 Oyster Fisheries Act. They raised the cry of "How much longer must we wait?"

1975 Maori Land March Te Matakite o Aotearoa welded localised grievances over land loss into a cohesive Maori land rights movement. Whina Cooper elected as president and Titewhai Harawira secretary. Led 30,000 people to Parliament under banner of "not one more acre of land" (to be alienated). Joined by some Pakeha.

1977 Occupation of Bastion Point begun by Orakei Action Committee to expose the dealings of past governments over the 700 acres of Maori land at Orakei declared "inalienable" by the Native Land Court in 1873. Supported by some Pakeha.

1977 Occupation of Raglan Golf Course taken under the Public Works/Defence Act.

1979 Waitangi Action Committee formed to continue the protests at Waitangi.

1979 Haka Party incident He Taua used direct action, after 25 years of negotiation, to stop engineering students at Auckland University performing a mockery of the haka.

1979 Mana Motuhake formed Matiu Rata, MP for Northern Maori, resigned from Labour Party, and formed a new Maori party called Mana Motuhake, ending the exclusive Labour/Ratana alliance.

---

on Feb 6 as a national day of remembrance.

1978 600 police with the army in reserve**,** arrest Bastion Point occupiers. The most powerful show of state force since the dismemberment of Parihaka in 1881, and Maungapohatu.

1980 Minister of Education threatened to ban play dramatising Maori grievances by Maranga Mai performance group from Managamuka. A parliamentarian complained to the Race Relations Conciliator, but complaint not upheld.

1981 Springbok tour protests supported by Pakeha who were then challenged by Maori to address homegrown racism and their responsibilities under the Treaty of Waitangi. A separation between Maori and Pakeha activism from here on.

1982 First Kohanga Reo at Wainuiomata to teach pre-school Maori children the Maori langauage and culture. By 1998, the number of Kohanga Reo had risen to 300.

1984 Hikoi ki Waitangi organised by Waitangi Action Committee and People Opposed to Waitangi (non-Maori) to highlight the dis-honouring of the Treaty

1984 Ngaruawahia Conference
Sponsored by Te Runanga Whakawhanaunga and the NZ Maori Council, the conference considered constitutional questions relating to the Treaty, followed by the

---

1982 Programme on Racism established by the Conference of Churches Aotearoa New Zealalnd. New Perspectives on Race training modified the confrontational methods of British Racism Awareness Training.

1984 People Opposed to Waitangi formed to work alongside Waitangi Action Committee. Eleven prominent church leaders arrested. Pakeha involved at Waitangi from here on.

1984 Anglican General Synod established a Bicultural Commission.

Conference at Waitangi. These conferences asked that Pakeha educate themselves about the Treaty of Waitangi, in preparation for dialogue with Maori in 1990, the 150th anniversary of the Treaty signing.	**1984 First National gathering of Pakeha anti-racism workers** held in Katikati called by Tauranga Men's Action Collective and Women's Reflection Action Group.
1984 Hui held throughout country in preparation for 150th anniversary of Treaty signing "to bring together collective opinions from Maori people to talk about and seek points of healing and reconciliation, in regard to the Treaty of Waitangi".	**1984 Neo-liberal economic and social policy** adopted by Labour government. Maori employment and welfare disproportionately affected.
	1984 Institutional Racism in the Department of Social Welfare, Tamaki Makaurau produced by nine staff as the Women's Antiracism Action Group.
1985 Te Runanga Whakawhanaunga at Waitangi brought these hui together. Prime Minister David Lange visited hui saying "the Maori discussion opened the way for the dialogue between Maori and Pakeha to begin. Before Maori and Pakeha develop the dialogue, we pakeha need to debate our actions and responsiblities as co-signatories to the Treaty of Waitangi." Attended by Pakeha church leaders and groups…	**1985 Ministerial Committee on a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare** chaired by John Rangihau published a critical report *Pu Ao Te Ata Tu (Daybreak)*. Became a model for delivering institutional services to Maori people.
	1985 Waitangi Tribunal legislation amended to hear historic claims dating back to 1840.
1988 Maori nurses initiate cultural safety education and hospital protocols to help all New Zealand nurses deliver culturally appropriate care to Maori.	**1986 Project Waitangi - Pakeha Debate the Treaty** campaign formed by Bob Scott of Programme on Racism, YWCA and trade unions to prepare Pakeha for dialogue. Produced educational material for communities and lobbied Parliament.
1990 National Maori Congress formed with the aim of whakakotahitanga. Backed by Sir Hepi te Heuheu, the Maori Queen and Mrs Reo Hura, leader of the Ratana Church. Support by iwi gradually declined, particularly after the Sealords deal.	**1986 National Collective of Independent Women's Refuges** adopted policy of parallel development for Maori and non-Maori women's refuges.
	1986 Constitution Act removed the provision in Section 71 of the 1852 Constitution Act that allowed for Maori districts to be set up under Maori control.
Radical Maori groups acted as monitors to Project Waitangi educators to ensure that a Maori view of the Treaty and experience of colonisation was upheld	**1987 Waitangi Consultancy** established in Wellington to work more specifically with government departments on institutional change to implement the Treaty.
	1988 Royal Commission on Social Policy gave prominence to the Treaty, suggesting principles of partnership, protection and participation. Recommended Treaty education.

1990 Tino Rangatiratanga Campaign to encourage those supporting tino rangatiratanga not to vote at either the 1990 or 1993 General Elections with the slogan, "Don't vote - it only encourages them." At the time of the Electoral Reform referendum, Maori groups including Tino Rangatiratanga and the Maori Congress, asserted that constitutional change was what Maori needed, not electoral reform.	**1989 Maori Fisheries Bill** Limited Maori commercial use of fish stocks to 10%, and extinguished forever their Treaty claims to fishing rights. **1988 Adult Reading and Learning Assistance** (ARLA) began constitutional change to increase Maori participation. Became Literacy Aotearoa, a new organisation based on tino rangatiratanga and guided by manaaki tangata principles. **1990 Coalition** formed by Project Waitangi openly criticised the government's 1990 Commission for its lack of emphasis on the Treaty. Government funding ceased. **1991- 1993 Electoral Reform Referendum & introduction of MMP** Allowed for all who identified as Maori (not only "half castes") to choose their roll. Maori seats now represented the same number of people as a General seat.
Maori unanimously rejected the Fiscal Envelope proposal at a series of consultation hui called by the Crown **1995-6 Hui at Hirangi Marae** Over 1,000 Maori attended Hirangi Marae near Turangi, called by Ngati Tuwharetoa Paramount Chief, Hepi Te Heu Heu, to debate issues of Maori sovereignty and to reject the Government's Treaty settlement strategy known as the 'Fiscal Envelope'. Over 2,000 attended two further hui. Recommendations about constitutional change. **1995 Treaty Celebrations at Waitangi** disrupted and cancelled. **1996 General Elections** Three Maori parties contested the election including: Mana Motuhake, as part of the Alliance, Mana Maori and Te Tawharau (linked to the Ringatu church). 15 Maori candidates elected.	**1991 Finance Act** Benefits reduced, family benefit abolished. Twenty per cent of Maori unemployed compared to 8.5% of non –Maori. **1994 - The 'Fiscal Envelope' -** Crown proposed a billion dollar settlement of all Treaty claims, removing Conservation land and natural resources such as gold, etc. from the settlement process. Introduced notion that Treaty settlements should be 'fair to everyone'. The Crown also ruled out any proposals for Maori self-determination. **1992 Appeals against cultural safety in nursing** requirement lodged and widely broadcast by public media. **1994 Kawanatanga Network** established by John Kirton in the Waikato. Held a series of national gatherings. Published "Proposal for a Te Tiriti-based Constitution" **1995** First large compensation settlement with Tainui **1996 Honourable Kawanatanga register launched** for tauiwi to sign who supported a constitution based on *He Wakaputanga, 1835* and *Te Tiriti, 1840*.

APPENDIX 2

BRIEF HISTORY OF NETWORK WAITANGI
1990 - 2002

Although the end of government funding in 1990 signalled the formal end of Project Waitangi, the regional groups "considered that the long term goal of ensuring that the Treaty of Waitangi was honoured was far from achieved and agreed to continue the task" (Network Waitangi Otautahi in Hoult, 2000, p. 111). The ongoing project of Treaty education and strong local cohesion prompted the groups to incorporate a national network calling itself Network Waitangi. Project Waitangi Hawkes Bay "took on the task of keeping the Project/Network flame alive" (Network Waitangi Otautahi in Hoult, 2000, p. 111). Some of the regional groups were already incorporated, or were in the process of incorporating as member-based societies, by 1990 there were Project or Network Waitangi groups in each of the four large urban centres and in several of the regions. Network Waitangi (Incorporated) was established as a national federation:

> to provide a network for groups and individuals who are working
> for a society based on the Treaty of Waitangi. Focused on Pakeha
> responsibility, membership of the national Network is open to
> groups of tangata whenua, people from the Pacific Island nations
> and other tauiwi which acknowledge and promote its aim.
> (Network Waitangi Otautahi in Hoult, 2000, p. 112).

During the 1990s a number of the smaller groups ceased meeting, sometimes because by now individual activist-educators were doing their Treaty education work as trainers within a particular organisation. These ex-members sometimes maintained a professionally supportive relationship with their peers, and continued to refer work to each other.

The original groups that remained active by 2000 were in the five main urban centres, and in Whangarei, the city closest to the annual Treaty celebrations. Network Waitangi Whangarei took an ongoing responsibility for Pakeha visibility in Waitangi protest action. Regional networks had formed in several areas as a way of bringing together smaller groups that had operated independently in the 1970s and 1980s. With small core memberships during the 1990s, these groups were happy to meet in larger networks, bringing with them the diversity of their earlier styles and foci. National gatherings of antiracism and Treaty workers were maintained annually or more frequently throughout the 1990s and 2000s with rotation of host responsibilities. In 2002, twelve years later after its formation, the incorporated structure of Network Waitangi was dissolved in favour of the informal national 'network Waitangi'. An electronic list-serve as well as an electronic discussion group called *Treaty People* was being effectively used by 80 people (personal communication, Treaty People moderator, 2005) to keep tauiwi Treaty workers in touch with each other, as well as providing a point of contact for Maori activists wishing to communicate with non-Maori. The numbers attending the national antiracism/Treaty workers gatherings have remained at about between 40 – 60) from 1984 to the present, with older members remaining,

and newer ones participating, including an emerging network of younger Treaty workers.

Project/Network Waitangi functioned as a formal clearinghouse/structure within a larger movement of Treaty education for Pakeha New Zealanders, and as an important coordinator of the secular activist educators in their regional groups and consultancies. The local antiracism/Treaty groups have maintained a dual role as activists and educators into the 21st century, as have some church bodies. When Maori activists or local hapu plan events, antiracism/Treaty workers may be called upon to provide leadership for Pakeha involvement or response. For instance, antiracism/Treaty workers in Whanganui played a key ancillary role during the Paikaitore occupation (Getting On Moving On Network & Project Waitangi Manawatu, 2000) in educating the city council and media, and running public seminars. From 2006, Network Waitangi Whangarei has led a series of critical 'state of the nation' addresses by Pakeha at Te Tiriti o Waitangi marae in acknowledgment of Waitangi Day. Past and present antiracism/Treaty workers were notable among the small number of Pakeha supporting the major Seabed and Foreshores hikoi to Wellington in 2004. Pakeha church organisers and secular antiracism/Treaty workers were active in organising over 600 critical submissions by Pakeha to the Seabed and Foreshores Bill during 2004.

APPENDIX 3

THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO
Waikato Management School

Consent Form for Participants (Updated 15.9.2002)

I have read the **Information Sheet for Participants** form for the study *Pakeha in organisations respond to the Treaty of Waitangi: processes for peaceful social change?* and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions about the study have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I also understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time, or to decline to answer any particular questions in the study. I agree to provide information to the researchers under the conditions of confidentiality I have agreed to below:

(please tick one or more)
I/we would like to remain anonymous throughout the study
_____

I/we would like our names attached to the workshop records stored as original data in the archives of the researcher, or other appropriate body such as a library archive or research centre
_____

I/we consent to identifying information being used in meetings with other participants _____

I/we consent to identifying information being used in the PhD study report and other reports arising from the research
_____

I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the **Outline of Research Project** form.

Signed: _____

Name: _____

On behalf of (name of group):_____

Date: _____

Researcher's Name and contact information:
Ingrid Huygens

Supervisor's Name and contact information:
 Dr. Maria Humphries

APPENDIX 4

Suggested format for workshops

1. **Introduction** to research & responding to questions - *researcher*

2. **Agreement** on workshop process and consent protocols - *together*

3. **Awareness** of ourselves as reflective practitioners – *together*

4. **Reflections** on Pakeha processes of change:

- What processes do we believe/experience Pakeha in organisations go through as they respond to learning about the Treaty of Waitangi?
- What keeps Pakeha moving through these processes?
- What seem to be facilitative factors? Inhibiting factors?
- What particular approaches or tools do we, as Treaty workers, think are working?

- participants sharing, creating, visualising, researcher recording if required.

Estimated Time – 2 hours

Between sessions, researcher types up record of theorising session.

FOLLOW UP WORKSHOP

1. **Checking** record of first theorising session – *researcher and group*

2. **Presenting cumulative theorising** of previous groups visited - *researcher*

3. **Integrating** cumulative theorising with own group's work - *group*

4. **Considering values and risks** of theory generated so far - *group*

5. **Closing** - participation in research from here on - *together*

APPENDIX 5

Letter to pilot groups

Dear [individual names]
Re: Permission to revise research process

I'm writing to pick up where we left off in the research process. Thank you for approving the record I made of our meeting earlier this year. I have also visited the Whangarei group, and found much to reflect on about the best processes to use for this research. I have been struck by how it does not take a long meeting to generate worthwhile material (our March meeting was short, and yet generated very rich material), and how each group highlights a different area of 'elaborated knowledge'. I imagine this diversity reflects the individual strengths and collective history of each group, as well as the dynamics of the meeting. For instance, Whanganui-a-Tara generated lots of fascinating thoughts about Pakeha emotional responses, while Whangarei discussed in detail the initial awakenings experienced by Pakeha, among many other things covered in both meetings.

Taking all this into consideration, I have now refined the method to a 'cumulative theorising' process, whereby I travel to meet with groups and individuals around the country, record the discussion, and incorporate this into a growing map of theory about Pakeha conscientisation processes that I show at each successive meeting. I'll probably carry a coloured cloth map around with movable 'bits' and velcroed sheets – could be lots of fun! I would ensure that all participants had the opportunity to contribute in a second round - either by meeting with the group a second time, or sending the cumulative picture for comment. The cumulative theorising takes shape quite quickly, as you can see in the attached summary I have made of the material to date…..

Looking forward to seeing you at the 2002 conference…

Ingrid Huygens
September 2002

Appendix 6

A Letter of Appreciation

We, the *Walking the Talk Treaty Conference 2005*, want to record our appreciation of the contributions made by Ingrid Huygens in the course of her research into how Pakeha change. Her disciplined systematic approach has brought order and structure to a field that has been developing rapidly. Until now a coherent framework has not been apparent. Ingrid's trail-blazing process has established a framework that enables different work to be properly reviewed.

We like the way she has worked within the movement's own conventions and practices with sensitivity and skill, keeping her perspective entirely appropriate to our New Zealand practice. Because she has been respectful and enabling, and used our proven processes, she drew out truthful cooperation from a group that is generally very suspicious of research.

Our work, in itself, has been at times groundbreaking but her skills have enabled this work to lead to further extension of theory. A research process which is creative and participatory has opened ideals, remembrances and understandings of journeys that have been made and stimulated new pathways for understanding.

There is a second aspect of Ingrid's work that we very much appreciate. Through outstanding bibliographic and archiving work she has put together a major resource of international importance for the field of deliberately changing the knowledge and behaviours of dominant groups. Members of our network of Treaty of Waitangi workers who have hosted international academic visitors have been delighted to share these resources. This has already proved particularly significant in feedback from visitors from Scandinavian countries who work in relation to Saami peoples.

While international implications are a relatively small part of our concerns, they are, nonetheless, important. It is always exciting to talk to people in other countries and find common threads as well as differences of detail.

From our experience with resources that originate in other contexts, we know that they can sometimes point in helpful directions. However, for us, having our own specific materials is the most important part. Ingrid's work is now seen as seminal for our field.

30 April 2005

Signed by Mitzi Nairn on behalf of the research participants

APPENDIX 7
PROGRESS REPORTS ON MY CO-THEORISING

The first report was made to participants in the two pilot groups, peer mentors and supervisors.

FIRST PROGRESS REPORT after two focus meetings

Ingrid's cumulative summary of material generated by:
Network Waitangi Whanganui-a-Tara 14.3.2002
Network Waitangi Whangarei   28.4.2002.

Three markers of Pakeha conscientisation
At this early point in gathering the theorising of the Treaty educator groups around the country, I see three broad markers in Pakeha conscientisation. These may change, and further markers may emerge as we continue to accumulate and revise our theorising in the months ahead.

I visualise these growing and shifting descriptions as cairns that that the traveller passes while tramping in rocky country…If the cairn is a valuable marker in a good spot, it accumulates stones added by passing groups. Others cairns are neglected because few pass that way, and the wind scatters the stones. So it is with these descriptions – they may be built upon as useful guides, or passed by for new ones to grow as we continue to accumulate our theorising during this year.

1. The first marker is an awakening through receiving new information, a shock to a Pakeha person's view of the world, realising that Pakeha are not the norm or the centre of the universe. Mezirow's 'disorienting dilemma' may be helpful here.

2. The second marker is a range of emotional responses to the disorientation – anger, blame, guilt and denial. This marks a cluster of processes that can last a short or long time, and in which Pakeha can become enmeshed in endless cycles. Kate Birch (1995 p. 50) has mapped these processes, and Kubler Ross's work on loss and grief may also be useful.

Treaty workers/educators have a range of methods to help Pakeha integrate their new knowledge – working with knowledge and feeling, content and process, using storytelling and engaging methods. For the facilitator, it is a balancing act to accommodate everyone's learning styles.

Between the second and third markers comes a long time of what happens next - feeling and thinking? Action and reflection? Individuality vs collectivity? – not clear yet.

3. The third marker is a movement towards conscientisation – both a consciousness and a conscience - moving one's consciousness to a deeper level, and finding a new, scary relationship with tangata whenua and with this land, as well as relaxing about tino rangatiratanga. The Pakeha person feels more aware of their own culture, as well as caring about justice for others and finding common ground with others. There is a sense of spiritual as well as political openness.

At the moment I visualise these processes as a river, like the Whanganui, with a source and a destination, and with deep, dark whirlpools in which Pakeha people can become

enmeshed as they circle around feeling angry, then resistant, or feeling guilty then paralysed, and so on. At times, the current of the river or their own paddling moves them on to new outlooks.

Reflections on theorising so far…….

This study acknowledges that any theorising is only an optional description (or social construction) of experienced processes. My supervisor suggested that we reflect using the following question as we theorise: "What are the risks associated with framing Pakeha conscientisation in this way?" I would add: "What is the value of framing Pakeha conscientisation in this way?"

Framing Pakeha conscientisation as beginning with a shock of awareness at new information, and having as destination a greater awareness and common ground with tangata whenua implies that the starting point is blindness or separation from others (or, as Mitzi pointed out, a situation where extreme 'othering' has occurred). Conceiving of Pakeha conscientisation in this way has the value of inviting interventions that attempt to increase a person's awareness of their society and to encourage relationship with others – certainly a positive, liberatory approach.

On the other hand, this approach has the risk of looking like the cultural sensitivity approach. Ramsden and other NZ nursing theorists have been critical of cultural sensitivity as an aim because it focuses on the individual (and the privileged individual) changing their attitudes without necessarily any accompanying change in resources or shifts in power to influence society. The British Racism Awareness Training model may also sit in this area.

Framing the second milestone as involving emotional processes has the value of focussing the skills of the educator towards enabling those emotions to be experienced appropriately, and without getting stuck in endless cycles. On the other hand, conceiving of it like this does risk focusing too much attention on feelings and personal growth, rather than concentrating on changes in behaviours and context. The 'healing of racism' approaches known in North America may sit here.

Finally, framing the destination for Pakeha as moving our consciousness to a deeper level and finding common ground with others and the environment evokes spiritual and religious journeys. This is very heartening!! However, there is a very important risk to viewing the destination in this 'universal' way - without an emphasis on the current relationship with tangata whenua and an existing land, the Pakeha journey remains isolated and self-centred. As I see it, if there is no justice aspect in the spiritual journey of the privileged person, then their journey never intersects with the liberation journey of the oppressed person, and the destination will not mark new relationships between people.

A final thought - the first and second markers describe individual responses for the Pakeha person, while the third ideally describes connection and collectivity. Upon reflection, it does seem appropriate in a process of conscientisation (of 'knowing together') that Pakeha should move past individualism to collectivity, and to an increasing understanding of the structural elements in colonialism and racism. It is from this place that engagement with Maori comment can occur, so that the journey of Pakeha conscientisation has a chance of linking with the journey of tangata whenua.

Ingrid Huygens
13.9.2002

The second report was made to my peer mentors and supervisors at the midway point in the theorising.

SECOND PROGRESS REPORT after 10 focus meetings

Ingrid's cumulative interpretation of records and material generated by:

Network Waitangi Whanganui-a-Tara	14.3.2002
Network Waitangi Whangarei	28.4.2002.
Network Waitangi Otautahi	9.4.2003 and 10.4.2003
Waitangi Associates	9.4.2003 and 12.4.2003
Network Waitangi Otepoti	14.4.2003 and 17.4.2003
Freedom Roadworks	16.4.2003 and 17.4.2003

Four South Island groups have now had the opportunity over two theorising sessions each to integrate the recorded theorising of other groups with their own. Two groups in the North Island have contributed initial sessions, but have not yet had the opportunity to reflect on integration. Four groups in the North have yet to join the process.

At this midway point in the planned meetings, the Treaty educator groups have described a variety of staged and cyclic processes for Pakeha conscientisation, each with features and characteristics. As researcher, I perceive that new views of how Pakeha change are still coming up, so the data gathering has not yet reached saturation point. Novel descriptions and integrations may be offered as the cumulative theorising continues through eight further meetings, as well as affirmation of common themes.

Now, after ten theorising sessions with Treaty educators, I can report that each group's theorising provides a comprehensive explanation in itself of how Pakeha change, and each depiction has internal cross-referencing, consistency and integrity – in my words, each group's theorising 'hangs together to make a complete explanation'. There are also many common markers that all groups refer to, such as emotional responses, new worldviews for looking at themselves and others, and building common cause and relationships with tangata whenua.

However, each group has independently focussed on a slightly different area. It is as though all the Pakeha Treaty educators share a common landscape, with common landmarks, but we have camped in different spots, and come to know our particular area well. In social constructionist terms, it is as though Pakeha Treaty educators are working from the same map, but each group has explored some parts of the landscape more thoroughly, and is therefore able to draw in finer detail about these areas as they describe their map for the researcher. The cumulative effect is of parts of the landscape (or, more correctly, the map) progressively being illuminated in fine detail as the theorising builds around the country.

At this stage, no group has disagreed with or rejected another's theorising when they have heard the previous groups' work. Each group has given a nod to the cairns built by previous groups and made some effort to include them in their map. This is leading to an expanding depiction of Pakeha processes, covering individuals and collectives, institutions and activists, conscious and unconscious processes. So, a wide-ranging consensus is being built, with groups broadly affirming, and very interested in, the 'specialisation' and detail in particular areas provided by the others.

An example of this progressively greater clarity and expanding detail appearing independently on the map is as follows: In their pictorial record, NW Whangarei sketched a mere outline of a process whereby Pakeha move cyclically, by both feeling and thinking processes, from being an individual to being part of a collective. Pakeha may easily 'fall' back into acting as individuals, since this is the Pakeha 'cultural default position', as members of the group described it. With no awareness of NW Whangarei's sketch, NW Otautahi framed their theorising of Pakeha processes primarily as a journey from individualisation to collectivity. They incorporated thinking and feeling processes whereby Pakeha may loop back on the journey as a result of various emotions, insecurity or a victim mentality, and re-enter the flow from individualisation to collectivity at an earlier stage. Thus, an area merely outlined by one group was given rich detail by another. As well as this, an interesting tension was set up between NW Whangarei's cyclic notion and Otautahi's loop-backs on a linear journey. From my experience so far of cumulative theorising by Treaty educators, I then expected another group, independently of the others' material, to shed further light on this area, or possibly to provide a third option allowing for both linear and cyclical processes. Indeed, NW Otepoti contributed the notion of Pakeha undertaking spiralling journeys through time, in which individuals as well as Pakeha collectives revisit the same issues over and over again through time, and respond differently depending on their previous experiences.

In summary, the cumulative theorising process is proving to be a viable method for gathering complex qualitative data. It appears to be tapping into cultural knowledge held in common by all the Treaty educator groups, as well as recording diversity and tensions between theories held by groups living and working in different local contexts.

The themes I have identified so far are:

- From ignorance to action
- Awareness through awakenings
- From individual awareness to collective awareness
- Being part of a group that is changing
- Responding to Maori with a sense of connected destiny
- Preparing ourselves emotionally to understand our place in colonisation
- Spiralling weave of the individual, the unconscious and the collective unconscious.

I am VERY excited about this turn in the cumulative theorising!!!! [regarding unconscious processes]. I will check back, but I recall that Waitangi Associates and/or Freedom Roadworks agreed that although much happens unconsciously, one of the tasks of Treaty or decolonisation work is bringing some aspects of the collective or cultural unconscious to consciousness, so that it is revealed and can be examined by the person. They can then chose whether they agree with their unconsciously held beliefs in the light of their current understandings. This puts all of us in the category that Freire puts the oppressed into – unconscious of our own cultural and socio-political influences.

A trend in the cumulative theorising so far is that educators *seem* to be focussing on Pakeha in a very general way and thereby on cultural rather than institutional racism. I have checked this with each group, and they have each reassured me that their entire work is with people in organisations (workshops for 'the public' are uncommon). Still, I am a bit worried that the material so far leaves unarticulated the sterling work in our wee country about institutional racism. Maybe I should just relax, because the organisational narrators are supplying much more of a focus on organisational issues.

The feedback from these focus groups was that they had deeply appreciated the opportunity and encouragement to share personal journeys. Although most networks had worked together for years, they had usually not taken the opportunity to listen to each

other's personal stories. While these focus meetings tended to become long, participants were delighted about the material they had shared. Networks fed back that it had been a unique opportunity to hear each other's stories in detail.

I have also recorded the thoughts of each group about (i) tools for educators, (ii) facilitatory and inhibitory factors and (iii) values and risks of theorising in this way. However, during the second sessions of the workshops it has not always been possible to pass on material from previous groups, and at other times this section has been very cursory. Therefore these records will be included in the final stage of the cumulative theorising process as part of the compendium booklet I send out for comment to all groups around the country prior to the national Treaty conference. Every participant will then have a chance to comment on the tools, factors and values and risks identified by other groups.

Ingrid Huygens
June 2003

My interpretations continued to develop over the following ten meetings, and were discussed formally at the national focus meeting in Section 8.1.3.

APPENDIX 8

Strategies & tactics by Treaty and decolonisation educators

- *Encouraging the work of the heart*

Network Waitangi Whanganui a Tara were clear that a key tactic was "getting people out of their heads" (p.6) and "involve people's affect" (p. 19). Educators needed to attend to both emotional and relational aspects of change, moving participants "from head responses to heart responses" (p. 6). *Network Waitangi Whangarei* also considered that people needed to be reached through all their senses, and used stories, and respectful deep listening to achieve this.
.

- *Engendering an emotional state of trust*

Both *Freedom Roadworks* and *Rowan Partnership* considered that an emotional state of trust was essential for Pakeha to change, which facilitators needed to create in workshops. Methods to achieve this included modelling respect of participants and their personal histories, as well as creating, in the words of *Waitangi Associates*, "a safe environment for people to ask outrageous questions". Beyond this, *Freedom Roadworks* emphasised Pakeha trusting themselves, their community and the country in moving towards hope-giving possibilities for the future. *Rowan Partnership* suggested that facilitators also needed to build a sense of trust in Maori. As a way to contradict stereotypes about 'the other' as being unreasonable and unpredictable, they paid attention to humanising Maori, emphasising the rationality of Maori actions, and the predictability of Maori responses to colonisation. This functioned to allay fear and promote a sense of trust so that people were open to information to help them make sense of contemporary challenges.

- *Relaxing about "it" and allaying fear*

A number of groups made the point that allaying fear was a primary tool they used in workshops, because they believed fear was a strong inhibitory factor. *Network Waitangi Whangarei* worked to "help people relax about 'it' in the same way that sex educators do!" (p..8). This was a strategy to defuse fear about a future in which Pakeha related to Maori who were expressing their tino rangatiratanga.

- *Building appreciation of cultural & power differences*

Network Waitangi Otepoti suggested that it was important both to give Pakeha a sense that they are a people with a culture and to question Pakeha processes and values. Helping people develop a critical analysis of "our own power, others' power and institutional power" (p.26) was deemed important. *Network Waitangi Otautahi* identified the importance of starting where the group is at with their values and aspirations, then building clarity about the difference between Pakeha dominant culture and Maori indigenous culture, followed by "presenting the Treaty as a solution" (p.14). A specific tool was the Stripo exercise to help dominant group people experience the minority position.

- *Working with relevance*

Another key strategy was that participants needed to be convinced of the relevance of new knowledge, and its connection to daily issues. *Waitangi Associates*….
Already covered?

- *Preparing Pakeha for the emotional journey of decolonisation*

Rather than focusing on the Treaty texts, *Freedom Roadworks* work on equipping tauiwi (emotionally and analytically) for a journey of decolonisation – working with "the emotional baggage about being on a land is not ancestrally yours" (p.27). They help non-Maori look at the difference between migration and colonisation (which changes the new environment forever) and to explore hopes and visions for family, community and country. They have come to accept that the work of creating a "different inheritance" (p.29) of colonisation is a long term investment, which they consider may take seven generations.

- *Linking to others who are changing*

Tamaki Treaty Workers and *Waitangi Associates* expanded on the concept of linking with other Pakeha activists, and with Maori in a Treaty-based relationship: "linking people into being part of a group that is changing"(p.18). Indeed, a common tactic used by workshop facilitators was to assist those in an organisation ready for the action stage to have planning time together. The group acknowledged how complex the relationship aspect was - "Knowing that it is about power, and trying to enact a *different* way" (p.43) of being in relationship with Maori, including the importance of the " ordinary 'relationships' part" such as boundaries and assertiveness.

- *Naming and affirming contemporary dilemmas*

The *Rowan Partnership* used tools such as naming and affirming the dilemmas that Pakeha face, for instance when working in an organisation obliged to honour the Treaty or become bicultural, when "a very different anti-Treaty view is pervasive throughout the country." (p.60)

- *Arousing a sense of responsibility for justice without guilt*

Several groups acknowledged that in the past they had used more simplistic strategies for arousing feelings about justice. *Waikato AntiRacism Coalition* recalled: "Our experience, and the strategy we went on to use, was 'shock and challenge' about what we didn't know as educators, about what we weren't taught a children by parents or school" (p. 67). *Hawkes Bay Treaty Workers* focused on arousing empathy and feelings about justice, while downplaying guilt with quotes such "Guilt has no place in the Treaty debate – the challenge is personal responsibility" (Consedine & Consedine, 2001).

- *Confrontation and challenge*

Originally a coalition of antiracism groups, *Waikato AntiRacism Coalition* recalled that their tactics were to conduct "raids on institutions" (p.76) through challenging institutional leaders or more planned educational interventions. They noted that this was an edgy, risky activity, often producing ambivalence and puzzlement in target groups. They reflected that their knowledge levels were "far short of the mark" for the task of engaging Pakeha in institutions. Another

longstanding educator from *Hawkes Bay Treaty workers* acknowledged that in the past Treaty eductors had used a more harsh approach of expecting people to change through emotional shock and turmoil. The first generation of activists exposed to a shocking new view of our colonial history assumed that others required the same experience: "We changed, why can't you?" (p. 53). While the group continued to believe that the timeline of colonisation, although confrontational and challenging, was the single most powerful tool for Pakeha change in a workshop setting, they now accept that people need to go at their own speed: "some people take five years, and they need to take their families into account" (p. 54).

REFERENCES

Abel, S. (1997). *Shaping the news: Waitangi Day on television*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Adamson, W. L. (1980). *Hegemony and revolution: A study of Antonio Gramsci's political and cultural theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Aguilar, J. (1981). Insider research: An ethnography of a debate. In D. A. Messerschmidt (Ed.), *Anthropologists at home in North America: Methods and issues in the study of one's own society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ansley, B. (1987, June 13). Not the money but the land. *Listener, 116,* 55-57.

Antiracism and Treaty worker national gatherings (1984 – 2000). In Project Waitangi Inc records. Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.

Apps, J. (1985). Lifelong learning explained. In H. Long, J. Apps & R. Hiemstra (Eds.), *Philosophical and other views on lifelong learning*. Athens: University of Georgia.

Awatere, D. (1984). *Maori sovereignty*. Auckland: Broadsheet Magazine Ltd.

Awatere-Huata, D. (1993). Challenges to psychology in Aotearoa. In L. W. Nikora (Ed.), *Cultural Justice and Ethics*. Waikato: National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues, New Zealand Psychological Society.

Barrett, M. (1993). Feminism. In W. Outhwaite & T. Bottomore (Eds.), *Dictionary of Twentieth Century Social Thought* (pp. p236-238). Oxford: Blackwell.

Barron, J., & Giddings, L. (1989). Perspective shift: Self-reported experiences of six women who attended a two-day anti-racism workshop. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 1-32). Manukau: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind: Collected essays in anthropology, psychiatry, evolution and epistemology*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Belich, J. (1986). *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian intepretation of racial conflict*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Belich, J. (1996). *Making peoples: a history of the New Zealanders from Polynesian settlement to the end of the nineteenth century*. Auckland: Penguin.

Belsey, C. (1980). *Critical Practice*. London: Methuen.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise on the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London: Sage.

Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, C., Gane, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A. (1988). *Ideological dilemmas*. London: Sage.

Black, R. (1997). *Beyond the pale: An exploration of Pakeha cultural awareness*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Psychology Department, University of Waikato, Hamilton.

Black, R., & Huygens, I. (2007). Pakeha culture and psychology. In I. Evans, J. Rucklidge & M. O'Driscoll (Eds.), *Professional practice of psychology in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 49-66). Wellington: New Zealand Psychological Society.

Bolak, H. C. (1996). Studying one's own in the Middle East: Negotiating gender and self-other dynamics in the field. *Qualitative Sociology, 19*(1), 107-130.

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

Bondy, A., Bull, A., & Smith, P. (2000). Addressing the Treaty in teacher education. In I. Huygens et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 53-57). Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Bottomore, T. (1993). Marxism. In W. Outhwaite & T. Bottomore (Eds.), *Dictionary of Twentieth Century Social Thought* (pp. 365-368). Oxford: Blackwell.

Burman, E., Aitken, G., Alldred, P., Allwood, R., Billington, T., Goldberg, B., et al. (1996). *Psychology discourse practice: From regulation to resistance*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Burns, P. (1980). *Fatal success: Expose of the New Zealand Company*.

Campbell, B. (2000). Kawanatanga: A tauiwi perspective. In I. Huygens et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 58-61). Tamaki Makaurau/ Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Campbell, B. (2005). *Negotiating biculturalism: Deconstructing Pakeha subjectivity.* Unpublished PhD, Massey University, Turitea.

Campbell, R. (2000). The emotionality of social change. *The Community Psychologist, 32*(5), 16-18.

Carabine, J. (2001). Unmarried motherhood 1830-1990: A genealogical analysis. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data* (pp. 267-310). London: Sage.

Cesaire, A. (1972). *Discourse on colonialism* (J. Pinkham, Trans.). New York & London: Monthly Review Press.

Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. *Social Problems, 33*(6 Special Theory Issue. (Oct. - Dec)), S14-S32.

Comstock, D., & Fox, R. (1993). Participatory research as critical theory: The North Bonneville, USA, experience. In P. Park, M. Brydon-Miller, B. Hall & T. Jackson (Eds.), *Voices of Change* (pp. 103-124). Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Consedine, R., & Consedine, J. (2001). *Healing our history: The challenge of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland: Penguin.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cumberland, T., and Pountney, C. (2000). Learning to be good neighbours. In I. Huygens et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 58-61). Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Curle, A. (1971). *Making peace*. London: Tavistock Publications.

da Silva, S. (1994a). Treaty of Waitangi education: A policy issue - responding to resuscitation; the Pakeha Treaty. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 33-43). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

da Silva, S. (1994b). Treaty of Waitangi education: A policy issue - no going back; the outcome of Treaty of Waitangi education. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 44-58). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Department of Internal Affairs. (1940). *Making New Zealand: Pictorial surveys of a century* (Vol. 1). Wellington: New Zealand Government.

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

Dudgeon, P., & Fielder, J. (2006). Third spaces within tertiary places: Indigenous Australian studies. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 16*.

Durie, M. (1998). *Te mana te kawanatanga: The politics of Maori self-determination*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Eisler, R. (1987). *The chalice and the blade*. New York: Harper Collins.

Elias, M. J. (1994). Capturing excellence in applied settings: A participant conceptualiser and praxis explicator role for community psychologists. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 22*(3), 293-318.

Ellsworth, E. (1992). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through repressive myths of critical pedagogy. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy* (pp. 90-119). New York: Routledge.

Essed, P. (1990). *Everyday racism*. Claremont, CA: Hunter House.

Eyerman, R., & Jamison, A. (1991). *Social movements: A cognitive approach*. University Park PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse. *Discourse and Society, 4*, 133-168.

Fanon, F. (1967). *The wretched of the earth*. Ringwood, Australia: Penguin.

Feagin, J. R., & Feagin, C. B. (1978). *Discrimination American style: Institutional racism and sexism*. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class? The authority of interpretive communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fitch, K. (2001). The ethnography of speaking: Sapir/Whorf, Hymes and Moerman. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader* (pp. 57-63). London: Sage.

Fox, D., & Prilleltensky, I. (1997). Preface. In D. Fox & I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Critical psychology: An introduction* (pp. xiii-xvii). London: Sage.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge*. Brighton: Harvester.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Freire, P. (1975). Cultural action for freedom. *Harvard Educational Review Monograph, 1*.

Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). London: Penguin.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy and civic courage* (P. Clarke, Trans.). Lanham, ML: Rowman & Littlefield.

Freire, P., & Shor, I. (1987). *A pedagogy for liberation*. Houndsmills: Macmillan Education.

Gergen, K. J. (1994). *Toward transformation in social knowledge*. London: Sage.

Gergen, K. J., & Gergen, M. M. (1991). Towards reflective methodologies. In F. Steier (Ed.), *Research and reflexivity* (pp. 76-95). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gerzon, R. (1988). Justice, equality, respect for differences. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 59-69). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Glover, M., Dudgeon, P., & Huygens, I. (2005). Colonisation and racism. In G. Nelson & I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Community psychology: In pursuit of liberation and well-being* (pp. 521 - 545). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Gramsci, A. (1971). Selections from the Prison Notebooks. In Q. Hoare & G. Nowell Smith (Eds.). London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Green, M. J., & Sonn, C. C. (2005). Examining discourses of whiteness and the potential for Reconciliation. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 15*, 478-492.

Greenland, H. (1984). Ethnicity as ideology: The critique of Pakeha society. In P. Spoonley, C. MacPherson, D. Pearson & C. Sedgwick (Eds.), *Tauiwi: Racism and Ethnicity in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Greenwood, S. (2000). Reflections on the anti-racism classsroom. *The Community Psychologist, Spring 33*(2), 30 - 32.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gurnah, A. (1984). The politics of racism awareness training. *Critical Sociology*.

Gurney, J. N. (1985). Not one of the guys: The female researcher in a male-dominated setting. *Qualitative Sociology, 8*(1 Spring).

Gutierrez, G. (1974). *A theology of liberation*. London: SCM Press.

Haggie, M. (1990a). Untitled review of progress and challenges for 1990s. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 70-73). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Haggie, M. (1990b, October 30). *The Dominion,* p. 55.

Hague, K. (1989). Recent moves by the state. In H. Yensen, K. Hague & T. McCreanor (Eds.), *Honouring the Treaty: An introduction for Pakeha to the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 113-125). Auckland: Penguin.

Hall, S. (2001). Foucault: Power, knowledge and discourse. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 72-81). London: Sage.

Hamerton. (2000). Privilege and oppression in feminist research with Pakeha women in Mulvey, A., Terenzio, M., Hill, J. and Bond, M. (eds) Stories of relative privilege: Power and social change in feminist community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 28*(6), 911-916.

Harris, B. (1997). Repoliticizing the history of psychology. In D. Fox & I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Critical psychology: An introduction* (pp. 21-33). London: Sage Publications.

Henriques, J. (1984). Social psychology and the politics of racism. In J. Henriques et al. (Eds.), *Changing the subject* (pp. 64-81). London: Methuen.

Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C., & Walkerdine, V. (Eds.). (1984). *Changing the subject*. London: Methuen.

Herzog, C. (1996). Locating Treaty education within adult education. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 74-78). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Herzog, C. (2000). Overview of tauiwi Treaty work in Aotearoa. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 98). Manukau, New Zealand:: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Herzog, C., & Margaret, J. (2000). Te Tiriti in tertiary education courses. In I. Huygens, M. Maclachlan, H. Yensen, K. Huijbers & P. Reid (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 79-85). Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Honneth, A. (1993). Frankfurt School. In W. Outhwaite & T. Bottomore (Eds.), *Dictionary of Twentieth Century Social Thought* (pp. 232-235). Oxford: Blackwell.

hooks, b. (1994). Feminist politicization. In M. M. Gergen & S. Davis (Eds.), *Toward a new psychology of gender: A reader* (pp. 533-539). New York: Routledge.

Hoult, S. (2000). A study of Project/Network Waitangi. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 102-120). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Human Rights Commision. (2004-5). *Treaty Community Dialogue*. Retrieved August 2007, from http://www.hrc.co.nz/home/hrc/

Humphries, M. T., & Martin, B. (2005). Diversity ethics: A compass pointing to relationality and reciprocity for navigating turbulent seas. *The International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management*, 1235-1240.

Hunn, J. K. (1961). *Report on Department of Maori Affairs, with Statistical Supplement (24 August 1960)*. Wellington: Government Printer.

Huygens, I. (1988). Empowering our natural communities - an alternative to prevention. Paper presented at the 24th International Congress of Psychology, Sydney.

Huygens, I. (1997). Towards social change partnerships: responding to empowerment of oppressed groups with voluntary depowerment of dominant groups. Paper presented at 6th Biennial conference of Society for Community Research and Action, Columbia, SC, U.S.A.

Huygens, I. (1999). An accountability model for Pakeha practitioners. In N. Robertson (Ed.), *Proceedings of Maori and psychology: Research and practice symposium* (pp. 17-22). University of Waikato: Maori and Psychology Research Unit.

Huygens, I. (2000a). Feminist power sharing: Lessons for community psychology. In Mulvey, A., Terenzio, M., Hill, J., Bond, M., Huygens, I., Hamerton, H.R., and Cahill, S. (Eds). Stories of relative privilege: Power and social change in feminist community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 28*(6), 883-911.

Huygens, I. (2000b). The role of dominant group conscientisation - reflections on social change education in Aotearoa New Zealand. In J. Margaret (Ed.),

Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002) (pp. 121-132). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Huygens, I. (2001a). Feminist attempts at power-sharing in Aotearoa: Embarrassing herstory or significant learning towards Treaty-based structures? *Feminism & Psychology, 11*(3), 393-400.

Huygens, I. (2001b). Journeys away from dominance: Dissonance, struggle and right relationships - the journey to accepting indigenous authority. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 133-145). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Huygens, I. (2002a). *Emerging Pakeha interpretations of social justice for indigenous people in New Zealand.* Paper presented at the Eighth Trans Tasman Community Psychology Conference, Perth, WA.

Huygens, I. (2002b). *Journeys of change in values based organisations: organisational stories of Tiriti implementation.* Paper presented at the 6th Biannual Australia New Zealand Third Sector Research Conference, Auckland.

Huygens, I. (Ed.). (2004). *How Pakeha change in response to te Tiriti: Treaty & decolonisation educators speak – Collected focus group records*. Tamaki Makaurau Auckland: Treaty Publications Group.

Huygens, I. (2005a). *Carrying the Treaty in our Hearts: Treaty educators speak 2003*. (Video/DVD). Auckland: Treaty Publications Group.

Huygens, I. (2005b). Scholar in a social movement: Recording the collective praxis of social change workers. *The Community Psychologist, 38*(2), 47-49.

Huygens, I. (2006). Discourses for decolonisation: Affirming Maori authority in New Zealand workplaces. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 2006*, 363-378.

Huygens, I., Maclachlan, M., Yensen, H., Huijbers, K., & Reid, P. (Eds.). (2000). *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000: tauiwi communities come together to affirm the Treaty of Waitangi and explore the future of Aotearoa*. Glen Innes, Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group Private Bag 47 094 Ponsonby.

Irigaray. (2002). *The way of love*. London: Continuum.

Jackson, M. (1988). *The Maori and criminal justice system, He Whaipaanga Hou, A new perspective*. Wellington: New Zealand Department of Justice.

Jackson, M. (2000). *The Treaty of Waitangi and constitutional change.* Paper presented at the Treaty Conference 2000, Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland.

Jackson, S. M., & Cram, F. (2003). Disrupting the sexual double standard: Young women's talk about heterosexuality. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42*, 113 - 127.

James, D. (1992). A Land Rights Struggle 300 years ago. *The Net Working, Feb*, 4 - 6. In Project Waitangi Inc records. Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.

James, D. (1996). Bicultural and Treaty education. In J. Benseman, & M. Scott (Eds.), *The Fourth Sector: Adult and community education in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 327-336). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Jones, J. (1997). *Prejudice and racism (2nd edition)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Katz, J. H. (1978). *White awareness*: University of Oklahoma Press.

Kawanatanga Network. (1996). Paakeha/Tauiwi Discussion Paper on Future Constitution. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 156-163). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Kelsey, J. (1989). Rogernomics and the Treaty. In H. Yensen et al. (Eds.), *Honouring the Treaty: An introduction for Pakeha to the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 126-140). Auckland: Penguin.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2005). Particpatory action research: communicative action and the public sphere. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research 3rd edition* (pp. 559-603). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kenrick, K. (1991). Update on Network Waitangi. *The Net Working, November*, 3-4.

Kerner Commission. (1968). *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*. New York: Bantam.

Kessaris, T. N. (2006). About being Mununga: Making covert group racism visible. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 16*.

Kieffer, C. (1984). Citizen empowerment: A developmental perspective. *Prevention in Human Services, 3*, 9-35.

Kilminster, R. (1993). Praxis. In W. Outhwaite & T. Bottomore (Eds.), *Dictionary of Twentieth Century Social Thought* (pp. 507-509). Oxford: Blackwell.

King, M. (1985). *Being Pakeha*. Auckland, New Zealand: Hodder & Stoughton.

Kirton, J. D. (1997). *Paakeha/Tauiwi: Seeing the unseen: Critical analysis of links between discourse, identity, 'blindness' and encultured racism*. Kirikiriroa, Hamilton: Waikato Antiracism Coalition.

Kress, G. (2001). From Saussure to critical sociolinguistics: The turn towards a social view of language. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse Theory and Practice: A reader*. London: Sage.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics and social constructionism* (pp. 257-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lauer, R., H.,. (1982). *Perspectives on social change*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

L'Estrange, M. (1987). Learning anti-racism. *Broadsheet, April*, 23-25.

L'Estrange, M., & Richardson, M. (1987). The Treaty of Waitangi: A Pakeha perspective. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty Work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 164-180). Manukau: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Lichtenstein, B. (1997). Grace, magic and miracles: a 'chaotic logic' of organisational transformation. *Journal of Organisational Change Management, 10*(5), 393-411.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic enquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Luke, C., & Gore, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Feminisms and critical pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.

Makoare, B., & Birkbeck, A. (2000). He Awe Mapara; Reshaping the Maori Face of Auckland Libraries. In I. Huygens et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 58-61). Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Maori Advisory Unit. (1985). *Maori Advisory Unit report*. Tamaki Makaurau: Department of Social Welfare.

Margaret, J. (2002a). *Pakeha Treaty work: An annotated bibliography*. Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Margaret, J. (Ed.). (2002b). *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished Material*. Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Marshall, J. (1993). Women managers: travellers in a male world. In S. Jackson (Ed.), *Women's studies: Essential readings*. New York: New York University Press.

Martin, B., Humphries, M. with Te Rangiita, R. (2005). A two-hulled waka: Managing diversity in a Pacific mode. *International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations, 3B*.

Martin-Baro, I. (1994). *Writings for a liberation psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McArthur, V. (1992). Cultural work: an approach to empowerment and community building. Paper presented at 4th Biennial conference of Society for Community Research and Action, Williamsburg, VA.

McCreanor, T. N. (1993a). Mimiwhangata: Media reliance on Pakeha commonsense in the interpretation of Maori actions. *Sites, 26*, 79-90.

McCreanor, T. N. (1993b). Settling grievances to obscure sovereignty: Doug Graham's trade goods for the year 2000. *Sites, 27*, 45-73.

McCreanor, T. N. (1995). *Pakeha discourses of Maori/Pakeha relations*. Auckland: University of Auckland.

McCreanor, T. N. (1997). When racism stepped ashore: Antecedents of anti-Maori discourse in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 26*(1), 36 - 44.

McCreanor, T. N. (2005). 'Sticks and stones may break my bones …': Talking Pakeha identities. In J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Te Aiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 52-68). Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.

McCreanor, T. N. (2006). Discourse, media and health in Aotearoa. In K. Dew & A. Matheson (Eds.), *Health and inequality in Aotearoa* (pp. in press). Dunedin: Otago University Press.

McFarlane-Nathan, G. H. (1994). *Cognitive behaviour therapy and the Maori client*. Paper presented at the Psychological Service Annual Conference.

McIsaac, C. (2000). Identifying institutional racism: Researching a tertiary institution's commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi charter provisions. In I. Huygens et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 58-61). Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

McLintock, A. H. (1958). *Crown colony government in New Zealand*. Wellington, N.Z: R.E. Owen, Government Printer.

McNamara, M. (2001). The Treaty and the discourse of protest. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)*. Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

McNamara, M., & Moore, P. (2000). Tino rangatiratanga in the performing arts: The story of Magdalena Aotearoa. In I. Huygens et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 58-61). Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Memmi, A. (1965). *The coloniser and the colonised* (H. Greenfield, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Mezirow, J. (1978). Perspective transformation. *Adult Education, 28*(2), 100-110.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J., & Associates. (1990). *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare. (1988). *Puao-te-Ata-Tu (Daybreak), The 'Rangihau Report'* after Chairperson John Te Rangi Aniwaniwa Rangihau. Wellington.

Ministry of Health. (2006). Decades of disparity III: Ethnic and socio-economic inequalities in mortality, New Zealand 1981-1999. *Public Health Intelligence Occasional Bulletin, 31*.

Moewaka-Barnes, A., Gregory, M., McCreanor, T., Nairn, R., Pega, F., & Rankine, J. (2005). *Media and Te Tiriti o Waitangi 2004*. Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Kupu Taea: Media and Te Tiriti Project.

Moon, P. (2002). *Te ara ki te Tiriti: The path to the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland: David Long.

Moon, P. (2007). *The newest country in the world: A history of New Zealand in the decade of the Treaty*. Auckland: Penguin.

Nairn, M. (1989). Changing my mind - transitions in Pakeha thinking. In H. Yensen, et al. (Eds.), *Honouring the Treaty: An introduction for Pakeha to the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland: Penguin Books.

Nairn, M. (1990). Some liberation theory. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 201-202). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Nairn, M. (1990). *Understanding colonisation*. Auckland: Workshop material distributed by CCANZ Programme on Racism.

Nairn, M. (1992). Changing and adapting. In M. Nairn (Ed.), *Programme on Racism collected newsletters 1985-2002* (Vol 27, pp. 1-2). Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Nairn, M. (2000). The future of the Treaty of Waitangi. In I. Huygens et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 9-13). Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Publications Group.

Nairn, M. (2001). Decolonisation for Pakeha. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 203-208). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Nairn, M. (Ed.). (2002). *Programme on Racism collected newsletters 1985 -2002*. Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group, Private Bag 47904, Ponsonby, Auckland.

Nairn, R. (2007). Ethical principles and cultural justice in psychological practice. In I. Evan, J. Rucklidge & M. O'Driscoll (Eds.), *Professional practice of psychology in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Wellington: New Zealand Psychological Society.

Nairn, R., & McCreanor, T. (1990). Insensitivity and hypersensitivity: an imbalance in Pakeha accounts of racial conflict. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 9*(4), 293-308.

Nairn, R., & McCreanor, T. (1991). Race talk and commonsense: patterns in Pakeha discourse on Maori/Pakeha relation in New Zealand. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 10*(4), 245-262.

Nairn, R., & The National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues (NSCBI). (1997). Cultural justice and ethics in psychological practice. In H. Love & W. Whittaker (Eds.), *Practice issues for clinical and applied psychologists in New Zealand* (pp. 127-135). Wellington: The New Zealand Psychological Society.

Narayan, U. (1988). Working together across difference: Some considerations on emotions and political practice. *Hypatia, 3*(2), 31-47.

Nelson Action Group. (1973). *Justice and race: A monocultural system in a multicultural society*. Paper presented at the New Zealand Race Relations Council Conference, Palmerston North.

Nelson, G., & Prilleltensky, I. (Eds.). (2005). *Community psychology: In pursuit of liberation and well-being*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Network Waitangi. (1997). The role of tangata tiriti/tauiwi tiriti activists in the struggle for tino rangatiratanga (draft). *Project/Network Waitangi Newsletter, June*, 13-16. Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.

Network Waitangi. (1993). *Kawantanga Register*. In Project Waitangi Inc records. Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.

Network Waitangi. (2001). Protocols and ethics for Network Waitangi Tiriti workers. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 214). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Network Waitangi Taranaki. (1992). Putting prejudice into perspective, *The Net Working* (Vol. February, pp. 2). Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.

Nga Tumuaki. (2000). Strategies for Treaty Implementation. In I. Huygens et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 58-61). Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Nicolson, M. (1988). Medicine and racial politics: Changing images of the New Zealand Maori in the nineteenth century. In D. Arnold (Ed.), *Imperial medicine and indigenous societies* (pp. 66-104). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Nikora, L., & Thomas, D. (1989). What's in a word? *New Zealand Journalism Review*(Autumn).

Non-Maori Anti-Racism and Treaty Workers 8th Gathering. (1996 July). Press release, in *Project/Network Waitangi Newsletter June (1997)* (Vol. June). Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.

Oaks, C. (2000). An approach to achieving organisational change: Case study of Manukau City Council and the Treaty of Waitangi. In I. Huygens et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 58-61). Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Oram, R. (2004). Treaty lecture series. Trinity Cathedral, Auckland.

Orange, C. (1987). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland: Allen & Unwin.

Orland-Barak, L. (2002). The theoretical sensitivity of the researcher: reflections on a complex construct. *Reflective Practice, 3*(3), 263 - 279.

312

Pacific Peoples' workshop. (1996). Resolution on Decolonisation for Indigenous Peoples of the Pacific. *Aotearoa Youth Network newsletter, 38*(October), 18.

Park, P. (1993). What is participatory research? A theoretical and methodological perspective. In P. Park, M. Brydon-Miller, B. Hall & T. Jackson (Eds.), *Voices of Change* (pp. 1-19). Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Paul, G. M. (1991). Mitzi Nairn: Christian feminist and anti-racism worker. *Broadsheet,* 25-29.

Peace Movement Aotearoa. (2007). *Declaration for the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.* Retrieved December 2007, from http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/indig.htm

Peace Pacific. (2001). Peace Pacific at Treaty Conference 2001. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished Material (2002)* (pp. 218-221). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Peace Pacific. (2002). Waitangi 2002 - Peace Pacific Report. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished Material (2002)* (pp. 222-225). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Perry, P., & Webster, A. (1999). *New Zealand politics at the turn of the millenium: Attitudes and values about politics and government.* Palmerston North: Massey University.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour.* London: Sage.

Prilleltensky, I. (1990). Enhancing the social ethics of psychology: Toward a psychology at the service of social change. *Canadian Psychology, 31*(4), 310-318.

Prilleltensky, I., & Fox, D. (1997). Introducing critical psychology: Values, assumptions and the status quo. In D. Fox & I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Critical psychology: An introduction* (pp. 3-20). London: Sage.

Prilleltensky, I., & Nelson, G. (1997). Community psychology: Reclaiming social justice. In D. Fox & I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Critical psychology: An introduction.* London: Sage.

Pringle, J. K., & Henry, Y. E. (1994). *Diversity in women's organisations: Maori and Pakeha.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of Women's Studies Association Conference, Auckland.

Project Waitangi Otautahi. (1991). Timeline of history of Project/Network Waitangi. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002).* Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Project/Network Waitangi. (1986 - 2002). *Newsletter/The Net-working*, Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.

Project Waitangi. (1985-1990). Records of meetings and correspondence. In Project Waitangi Inc records. Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.

Project Waitangi. (1986-7). *Resource Kit Parts 1, 2, 3, 4.* In Project Waitangi Resource Kits. Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.

Project Waitangi (1986) *Pakeha culture pilot kit.* In Project Waitangi Resource Kits. Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.

Puao-te-Ata-Tu (Daybreak). (1988). *The 'Rangihau Report'* after Chairperson John Te Rangi Aniwaniwa Rangihau. Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare. Wellington.

Rappaport, J. (1981). In praise of paradox: A social policy of empowerment over preventio. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 9*(1), 1-25.

Rappaport, J. (1987). Terms of empowerment/Examplars of prevention: Toward a theory for community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 9*, 121-148.

Richardson, F. (2000). The experience of teaching cultural safety in a nursing education programme: implications for Tiriti of Waitangi education. In I. Huygens et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 58-61). Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Riger, S. (1984). Vehicles for empowerment: The case of feminist movement organisations. *Prevention in Human Services, 3*, 99-117.

Riger, S. (1993). What's wrong with empowerment? *American Journal of Community Psychology, 21*, 279-292.

Ritchie, J. E. (1992). *Becoming bicultural*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers and Daphne Brasell Associates Press.

Ritchie, S. M., & Rigano, D., L. (2001). Researcher - participant positioning in classroom research. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 14*(6), 741 - 756.

Royal Commission on Social Policy. (1988). *Towards a fair and just society*. Wellington: Government Printer

Rude, G. (1980). *Ideology and popular protest*. London: Lawrence and Wisehart.

Ryan, P. M. (1995). *The Reed dictionary of modern Maori*. Auckland: Reed.

Sampson, E. (1993). *Celebrating the other: A dialogic account of human nature*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Sassoon, A. S. (1993). Hegemony. In W. Outhwaite & T. Bottomore (Eds.), *Dictionary of Twentieth Century Social Thought*: Oxford: Blackwell.

Schwandt, T. A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 118-137). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schwandt, T. A. (1998). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and Issues* (pp. 221-259). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schwandt, T. A. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics and social constructionism. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 189-214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Scott, B. (1985). Letter to the Pakeha Caucus of the Waitangi Coalition, August 1. In Project Waitangi Inc records. Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.

Scott, B. (1986a). Project Waitangi launching. In M. Nairn (Ed.), *Programme on Racism collected newsletters 1985-2002* (Vol. 6, pp. 1). Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Scott, B. (1986b). The debate about confrontation!! In M. Nairn (Ed.), *Programme on Racism collected newsletters 1985-2002* . (Vol. 3, pp. 1). Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Scott, D. (1975). *Ask that mountain: The story of Parihaka*. Auckland: Heinemann & Southern Cross.

Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C. (1976). *Racism in American Education: A model for change*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Serrano-Garcia, I., & Lopez-Sanchez, G. (1992). Asymmetry and oppression: pre-requisites of power relationships. Paper presented at annual convention of American Psychological Association, cited in Watts & Abdul, 1994.

Sharp, A. (1990). *Justice and the Maori*. Auckland: Oxford University Press .

Sibley, C. G., & Liu, J. H. (2004). Attitudes towards biculturalism in New Zealand: Social dominance orientation and Pakeha attitudes towards the general principles and resource-specific aspects of bicultural policy. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 33*(2), 88-99.

Simpson, T. (1979). *Te riri Pakeha: The white man's anger*. Martinborough, New Zealand: Alister Taylor.

Sinclair, K. (1971). Why are race relations in New Zealand better than in South Africa, South Australia or South Dakota? *New Zealand Journal of History, 5*(October), 121-127.

Sloan, T. (2005). Globalisation, poverty and social justice. In G. Nelson & I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Community psychology: In pursuit of liberation and well-being* (pp. 309-329). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonising methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Auckland, New Zealand: Zed.

Smith, L. T. (2004). Treaty lecture series. Trinity Cathedral, Auckland.

Spoonley, P. (1988). *Racism and ethnicity*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Stavenhagen, R. (2006). *Mission to New Zealand: Report by Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous peoples*. http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/srnzmarch06.pdf Retrieved December 1, 2007.

Sutherland, I. (1940). *The Maori people today: A general survey*. Christchurch: Whitcombe & Tombs.

Tamasese, K. (1993). Interface of gender and culture. In L.W.Nikora (Ed.), *Cultural Justice and Ethics*. Waikato: National Standing Committee on Bicultural Issues, New Zealand Psychological Society.

Taylor, S. (2001a). Evaluating and applying discourse analytic research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 309-330). London: Sage.

Taylor, S. (2001b). Locating and conducting discourse analytic research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 5 - 48). London: Sage.

Te Kawariki. (2000). *20 years of protest action 1979-1999*. PO Box 546 Kaitaia: Te Kawariki.

The Treaty of Waitangi and Social Policy Discussion Booklet No.1 (1987). Royal Commission on Social Policy, Wellington.

Thomas, D., & Veno, A. (Eds.). (1994). *Community psychology and social change: Australian and New Zealand perspectives*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Thompson, R. (1975). *Retreat from apartheid: New Zealand's sporting contacts with South Africa*. London: Oxford University Press.

Towards A Fair and Just Society (1988). Royal Commission on Social Policy, Wellington.

Treaty Education for Migrants Group. (2006). *Tangata tiriti - Treaty people: An interactive workbook on the Treaty of Waitangi*. Tamaki Makaurau: Auckland Workers Educational Association.

Treaty of Waitangi Information Programme. (2005). *the Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington: State Services Commission.

Tuffin, K., Praat, A., & Frewin, D. (2004). Analysing a silent discourse: Sovereignty and tino rangatiratanga in Aotearoa. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 33*(2), 100-108.

Tyler, F. B. (1992). Ethnic validity: A model for families on uncharted seas. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless, 1*, 203-222.

van Dijk, T. A. (1987). *Discourse and the reproduction of racism*. Amsterdam: Cres.

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Princples of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society, 4*(2), 249-285.

Vanderpyl, J. (1998). An unstable achievement: Conflicts in feminist collective organising. *Women's Studies Journal, 14*(1), 7-40.

Vanderpyl, J. (1998). Rape Crisis Bicultural Politics: the 1980s 'difference impasse'. Paper presented to the 7th Australian Women's Studies Conference, Adelaide.

Waikerepuru, H., & Nga Kaiwhakapumau i te Reo Incorporated Society (The Wellington Board of Maori Language). (1986). *WAI 11 Finding of the Waitangi Tribunal relating to Te Reo Maori*. Wellington: Government Printer.

Waitangi Action Committee. (1984). *Te Hikoi ki Waitangi 1984*. Tamaki Makaurau: Waitangi Action Committee.

Waitangi Action Committee. (1985). *Te Hikoi ki Waitangi 1985*. Tamaki Makaurau: Waitangi Action Committee.

Waitangi Consultancy Group. (1987). *Prospectus*. In Project Waitangi Inc records. Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.

Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.

Ward, A. (1974). *A show of justice: Racial 'amalgamation' in nineteenth century New Zealand.* University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Watts, R., & Abdul-Adil, J. (1994). Psychological aspects of oppression and socio-political development: Building young warriors. In R. Newby & T. Manly (Eds.), *The poverty of inclusion, innovation and interventions: the Dilemma of the African American underclass*. Rutgers, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Waugh, P. (1993). Feminine fictions: Revisiting the post-modern. In S. Jackson (Ed.), *Women's studies: Essential readings*. New York: New York University Press.

Way, K. (1988). Towards biculturalism: a model for moving from monoculturalism to biculturalism and racism intervention. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha Treaty work: Unpublished material (2002)* (pp. 241-242). Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

Way, K. (2000). Directions for Pakeha Tauiwi in strengthening the Treaty. In I. Huygens et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 17-23). Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Weber, L. R., & Carter, A. I. (2003). *The social construction of trust*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Wellington Working Group. (1985a). *Draft of proposal for a nation-wide discussion on the Treaty of Waitangi*. In Project Waitangi. (1985 - 1990). Records of meetings and correspondence. In Project Waitangi Inc records. Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.

Wellington Working Group. (1985b). *Minutes, 5 November*. In Project Waitangi. (1985 - 1990). Records of meetings and correspondence. In Project Waitangi Inc records. Wellington: Alexander Turnbull Library Manuscripts & Archives.

Wells, A., & Budge, C. (2000). Workshop on values that underlie constitutions. In I. Huygens et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 58-61). Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Wetherell, M. S., & Potter, J. A. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wetherell, M., & Edley, N. (1999). Negotiating Hegemonic Masculinity: Imaginary postitions and psycho-discursive practices. *Feminism & Psychology, 9*(3), 335-356.

Williams, D. (1999). *Te Kooti Tango Whenua: The Native Land Court 1864-1909*. Wellington: Huia.

Williams, H. W. (1971). *Dictionary of the Maori language*. Wellington: GP Publications.

Wilson, T. T. N., & Huffadine, M. (2000). Urupare rangapu (Response to partnership). In I. Huygens et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 58-61). Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

Wilson, W. (1973). *Power, racism and privilege: Race relations in theoretical and sociohistorical perspectives*. New York: Macmillan.

Women's AntiRacism Group. (1984). *Institutional racism in the Department of Social Welfare*. Tamaki Makaurau (Auckland): Department of Social Welfare.

Wychel, J., James, D., Cowan, B., & Fitzmaurice, R. (2000). Working for change: Whanganui journeys since Pakaitore/Moutoa Gardens. In I. Huygens et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 58-61). Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference Publications Group..

Yensen, H., Hague, K., McCreanor, T., with Kelsey, J., Nairn, M., & Williams, D. (Eds.). (1989). *Honouring the Treaty: An introduction for Pakeha to the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland: Penguin.