

**Open Plenary Panel Presentation  
to the New Zealand Psychological Society's  
Annual Conference.  
Victoria University,  
Wellington**

**Challenges to Psychology in Aotearoa**

**Donna Awatere-Huata**

Kia ora tatou. I thought I'd begin by giving you some background into how I became a psychologist. As I was the first one, in my day it was a bit of a quirky thing. It was considered, not unique, but weird.

I was born and bred at Ohinemutu Pa which is in Rotorua, and my mother was of Ngati Whakaue descent. As you go into the pa these days our house is the brick house on the right as you go up towards the pa, and I still stay there. When I was eight I was sent up to Tokomaru Bay to live with my father's eldest brother.

It was a tremendous experience for me because Ngati Porou was experiencing the revival of the Te Kotahitanga movement, that flourished after WWII. Two of its great leaders, Ngoingoi Pewhairangi and Tuini Ngawai, renown composers at that time, were leading the movement and writing all of these waiata about the Treaty. That's where I learned about the Treaty, although I didn't know that I'd learned it at the time. I knew all these incredible waiata and it must have infused into me, so that later, when the activist movement was beginning in Auckland in the early 70's, all the learnings that I had about the Treaty came to fore.

A serendipitous event occurred when I was twelve years old. My mother came over from Rotorua to visit me in Gisborne and Kiri Te Kanawa was singing there. Kiri had a Pakeha mother. She been adopted by a Maori father and a Pakeha mother. Kiri sang, and had a wonderful voice. I had a very loud voice because I, like many Maori of my generation, was part of choral groups, haka parties or concert parties. We used to play a game in our haka team at Tokomaru Bay of seeing who I could drown out. My mother thought that because I had a loud voice, it meant that I could have a great voice. Kiri was five to seven years older than me. She was about seventeen then and had a great voice. My mother found out from her mother where she was learning singing, and it transpired that it was at St Mary's Convent in Auckland. So my mother the next year took me out of school in Tokomaru and we went to live in Ponsonby.

I went to St Mary's Convent. I sort of plunked away playing these witches and hags. They were all dreadful women murderers. I just played them all: murderous, incestuous, women with no teeth. You name it. All these beastly demon-like women. And of course I was stuck in control of *For*te so there was no way I ever got to a *Mezzo*, or get the high parts. So when I left school, Sister Leo from St Mary's Convent, sent me to university to do psychology because she wanted me to understand the intricate psychic nature of these beastly women. She thought that psychology was about Jung and Freud, and that I would learn about human nature and wouldn't be so distressed as I was. I wasn't as innocent as she thought, by the way. But while I was at university, I actually did fall in love with psychology.

It just fascinated me that you could predict behaviour, so they said, from clocking pigeons! The first year I just did psychology and I really had a thoroughly enjoyable time. The other thing that I really fell in love with was sensation and perception. I know people hate sensation and perception, but I loved it. To think that you could actually measure these. It just sort of explained a lot about life to me.

All that knowledge that has been gifted to us by generations of psychologists has come from a great tradition. I remember a woman who taught history of experimental psychology. It was with her that I started to twig to the cultural

limitations and the linear models of psychology, especially when her husband who had all these racial theories congratulated my husband on marrying me (I was married to an Austrian at the time), because he thought that it was only through intermarriage that Maoridom would be exposed to the intellectual genius of the western world! I've not seen it anyway.

That's when I began to get a few doubts about psychology. In 1969 I went over to Vienna and studied at a school that specialises in my voice. Now, I actually did my BA in secret. Sister Leo didn't know this. I was actually a full time music student, and I was being paid by the Maori Education Foundation to actually only study singing, not do a degree in psychology. I knew that if they knew that I was doing a Degree, they might cut my benefit. I guess like many others, I did it in secret anyway. I managed to get through and finished my BA without my parents knowing. And when I eventually came time to graduate and get the piece of paper, I asked my mother if she would like to come, and she said to me "oh, is that like School Cert?" I'd actually finished a BA, but they didn't know what that meant. I decided the year after to go back to university. I gave up music all together for a number of reasons. The major reason being my political background and the fact that I had some roles to play here in this country. If I had continued as an opera singer, these roles would have been denied to me.

So I decided I'd go back and do an MA. I remember being quite proud of myself and how I had done in my papers- that I had done okay. In those days it was just a great thing just to pass.

I finished the degree and didn't know what to do. I suppose I thought like most of you when you've finished your BA or MA, now what? In my day there was only educational psychology, that was about it. And in my day you had to go teaching first. So I dutifully went off and did my years postgraduate teaching. I did a thesis as I went back to do a Dip. Ed. Psych. By this time I was a full flight activist. I was involved in Nga Tama Toa, which was a movement that began in 1970 that was based around the Kotahitanga aims and objectives. They were two-fold then, that is: "Not a single acre more" and "Hold fast to the Maori language".

I have never forgotten; I did a paper about psychotherapy, and it was the first time that I'd actually come up against just the strength of the concept of individualism that you talk about. The therapy that we were studying was all about 'one to one'. I couldn't get comfortable with that notion. It just seemed to me that one to one wasn't a very good idea. In fact if you go 'one to one', then it precludes you going 'group to group'. It precludes you thinking about the big issues that got you into trouble in the first place.

So I have to say they failed me - can you believe that! I did what I believed was the genesis of some really great work about what Maori culture was all about and about the therapeutic roles that we had in our culture. Failing that paper really got my back up. I simply learned that if you want to pass you just give them what they want. Don't be clever. Don't be smart. Don't try to develop new models. If that's what they say, that's what they get back. Except, there is a little bit of your soul that goes with it every time you make those compromises. It's like a wife that gets beaten. Every time you say "...yes, darling I will have you back" you lose a little bit of your soul. I think that's what happened to me.

Eventually I finished my degree and they sent me to see the District Psychologist. I was the first Maori to ever have a discussion with him, can you believe that! He was nearly dead when he confessed that to me. He was actually dying. I had a soft spot for this old man because I was the first Maori and he stuck up for me. He sent me to Remuera as my first posting because he said I had a 'chip' on my shoulder about Pakeha people. Well, you can imagine that I went to Remuera with a 'forest of chips'. When I finally was sent out to Otara everyone was happy.

In those days, Otara consisted of 40-50% Maori and about 30% Pacific Islander. It was a Maori-Pacific community that was really in difficulty. It was a very stressful time actually being a psychologist. I never identify as a psychologist any more and part of it was just the trauma of trying to develop alternative models, and to do things that made sense to me as a human being, not as a Maori, but as a human being. So I tried to develop these alternative models that I got suspended for. I was charged with working "...contrary to our accepted mode of functioning". That would be the charge. This was because I'd like to have hui, and I'd like to call in everybody. I didn't like to do things according to their direction.

I was even charged once with "misuse of a building", which was for having a hui in a building. Thank God that Pakehadom has moved some what since then. But I can tell you I have just really bad memories of my eight years or so, as a psychologist. I finally got out.

I met this chap who insulted me one night about being a flunky of the state. That means being a psychologist and having my wages paid by the government. He wanted to see me one weekend. When I couldn't go because I had to work, he said "...ah you're just a flunky of the state, just like all the other beneficiaries. Do nothing." I was trying to explain to him what I did, and he wasn't a bit impressed. And I was thinking "Jesus, what do we do? What do we get paid for?" It was later that I came to see that really psychology is just part of the last big rip off of the state. We're able to do that because we've still got a little bit of the witch doctor status. We've got enough of the status of elderly white men that still spout the old words that seemingly give us respectability. But you know, they're going to die soon.

I'm no longer a practising psychologist, and I actually think that this is in-house business. I think it's time that psychologists cleaned up their act. I'm reminded of the haka party incident in Auckland: where the engineering students would do the haka. For years they were doing this mockery of the haka. They would get drunk and then they'd run off with women. They were just having a "good time" it was called.

But we had a women's group. One of the great things that I did do when I was at Otara was actually run women's groups. I used to call them 'family therapy', and that's how I got away with it. But they were actually black women's consciousness raising groups.

One of them actually had two women of whom you may have heard, Zena Tamanui, and Hilda Halkyard-Harawira. They were just tremendous organisers who just threw away my assertiveness gunk and how to be assertive with your husband about housework. They took it all into a whole new dimension. It was twelve women who actually went one night when the engineers were drinking and stopped them by force. Now that's the bad news. The good news is they never did the haka again. Sometimes you've got to take direct action.

What I have to say to psychologists, and why I'm not actually going to address the issue of your practice and your day to day functioning is that it shouldn't be necessary for a Maori like me to come in with force to change you. At some point you've got to take responsibility. You're not students. Those engineers were students, a lot of them came from a rural background. In those days blatant racism was fashionable. But it's no longer that fashionable, so you've got to take responsibility. It's you that has to take the responsibility for it, which is why I'm not going to do that.

We always say, us activists, you're either part of the problem, or you're part of the solution. And how true it is. At the end of the day you either are part of propping up a political system, with economic advantage to one group at the expense of the other, or you're actually part of deconstructing that system. You've got to choose which side of the line you're on. For some of you older people I don't expect you to make radical changes because I respect old people. If you're brought up in traditional psychology that has great value to you, and you're secure in it, and

you've been working in it for forty years, then I think it's a bit much for us young ones to expect you to suddenly turn around and start doing things radically different.

But I do say to many of you middle-aged people here and, especially for the young ones, that there is no excuse. You really have to get it together and start developing some models that are based on the tangata whenua.

I think that Pakeha have to become more like Maori, not the other way round. Now that may seem a little strange for you, especially the less you know about Maoridom. I had a very rural upbringing. Out in the sticks. I went from that experience to St. Mary's Convent where they sent all the elegant young Catholic girls in my day. It was a very elegant school. There were only 3 Maori. I learned in a very shocking way. One of the reasons why I am confrontational is because I learned this at school. I can honestly say that for five years I never had lunch with anyone. I can't actually remember a conversation with any girl that I did not initiate, and they did not carry on. I was never invited to parties. I was definitely an outcast. And yet I was part of a Maori concert party in Auckland, and I felt really part of the community. But at St. Mary's Convent I was really an outsider. It taught me to hold firm to a set of ideas and to be myself in the face of social opposition, or to decide that it doesn't matter what you say. I've got to hold true to that thing inside of me. And that was a very, very important lesson. When I became an activist, I was arrested 18 times. I spent three years in courts, six of them have been court cases involving jury trials, seven of them involved court cases which carried 7-14 years maximum sentences. I have been beaten in prison, I have had six internal searches. I've had the lot. It was much to endure, however much you can trivialise the radical experience. It is quite hurtful now to look back on what we went through as radical activists for the period of 1970 to 1981, 82, 83, and to look at the sort of gains that we have made, ...and they are miniscule.

An important question: Is psychology value for money? I was part of a review committee that looked at psychological services. The way I saw it is definitely that the consumer is not getting value for money. That includes Pakeha consumers. As for Maori consumers, it is definitely not value for money. So I think that there is a ripple happening in psychology and your day is going to come.

Now to the key issue of the Treaty, which to me is about sovereignty. I think we have to remember what the Treaty is all about. To me the Treaty was actually about the economic cartel that developed based on race. It's an economic and political cartel that continues today, and dismantling that, deconstructing that cartel is something that I believe concerns all New Zealanders. It's about the Maorification of New Zealand. It's about Pakeha becoming more Maori and not about Maori becoming any more Pakeha.

In our own minds we need to be very clear on the status of the Treaty. There is only one Treaty, the Maori text Treaty. Under this Treaty Maori keep their Tino Rangatiratanga, their sovereignty, and agree to governance by Her Majesty's government over her subjects here. To suggest that Maori on behalf of 100,000 fighting-fit people willingly ceded their sovereignty when there were only 1000 or so settlers here at the time is wishful thinking. But that is exactly what the Court of Appeal judgements would have us believe, what the Crown principals would have us believe, and what the Waitangi Tribunal would have us believe.

If there are two things that Maori debating the Treaty has reiterated since 1840 they are firstly, getting sovereignty, the right to exercise absolute authority on its own resources and its own people in their own way. In other words, by the tribe, for the tribe, and of the tribe. And secondly, that tribal rights can only be extinguished by explicit consent and by our active participation in this extinction. If this is so, you ask, how is it possible that you are all brought up on the English text Treaty under which Maori ceded sovereignty for ever. This was already possible through the acceptance by the courts of the English text Treaty. And this occurred in

1847 with the **Regina vs Symonds** case. Basically the justice in their judgement cited the English text Treaty as though it was the Treaty. And that judgement basically brought the English text Treaty into the courts at the expense of the Maori text Treaty. The economic impact of that judgement was that massive profiteering by the government was possible. In seven years 32.5 million acres was bought for 62,000 pounds and was sold at hugely inflated prices. The profits funded more immigration, stronger government, and further purchases of Maori land.

The significance of the Prendergast decision in 1877 was to bury even the English text Treaty. The economic advantage this created for Pakeha was that Maori rights to traditional lands, fisheries and forests which the English text Treaty purported to protect were deemed to be held at the sufferance of the Crown. The rationale for this, that in the case of primitive barbarians their rights must be subsumed under the rights of government, sealed the lid of the coffin of Maori economic and social prosperity, a lid which Ngata in the 1920s and 30s tried to lift and which the Labour government also made some efforts to lift, both with the Waitangi Tribunal established in 1975 and in 1984 with Hui Taumata and the development decade. Apart from these two attempts, and maybe the Councils Act of 1900, governments have made no serious attempts to redress the Maori economy.

The assumption of sovereignty made in the Regina vs Symonds case took the final step of the Constitution Act in 1852. The Act in theory made no distinction between the two races. However, in practice Maori were denied the right to vote. Voting rights were invited to men over the age of 21 who had freehold estate valued at 50 pound, who leased the estates with an annual value of 10 pound. The criteria were based on individual title, and Crown grants were the only land title accepted for voting purposes. Since most Maori property was held communally and was unregistered, few Maori males qualified to vote. Many others were excluded outright because electoral boundaries did not cover some large areas of Maori population.

The Constitution Act is the primary breach of Maori Treaty rights and throughout the 19th Century this was clearly identified by Maoridom. In 1860 Ngarongomai addressed a gathering called by Land commissioner McClean and Governor Browne at Kohimarama to discuss the Waitara dispute. He said:

*...If in the past days the Maori chief had been taken into the European councils to frame the laws for the land, there would not have been any separation into two sides.*

With the establishment of self government, the settlers in New Zealand had realised a powerful means by which to acquire the land, the fisheries, the waters, the minerals, the forests which would become the basis of the enormous wealth that would project New Zealand into the hierarchy of the wealthiest nations in the world.

Tony Simpson in 1979 accurately summed up the position of the settlers and Maori in terms of the economic potential of the establishment of Parliament:

*...the effect of the 1852 Act was to hand power over the land to precisely those who had a vested interest in dispossessing the people who owned it and at the same time to disenfranchise those who stood at risk of being disenfranchised.*

This advantage was secured in 1867 when the four Maori seats were created because Maori voters outnumbered Pakeha voters.

The economic advantages of the lands Pakeha have accrued have come not only through what has been taken from the Maori owners and used for themselves, but also in the loans, grants, various incentives and support for business growth. Not only was the land taken through Native Land Acts, NZ Settlement Act, The

Native Lands Rating Act, the Public Works Acts, Native Land Purchase and Acquisition Act, and hundreds of others, but governments made available loans and grants for development that were for Pakeha only. No money was made available at all for Maori land development until Ngata's time.

Similarly, Pakeha gave themselves enormous economic advantages in fishing. The Oyster Reserves Act of 1866, banned Maori from trading in oysters, and from then until 1900, Maori only, not Pakeha, were banned from commercial fishing in every other species. In the three periods when government has assisted commercial fishing in the 1880's, 1920's and 1960's, only Pakeha were given grants, loans and support. In fact the situation had deteriorated to the point where in the 1960's round of grants, Maori were not considered because, to quote the Chairman of the particular Fishing Committee, "...we had no idea Maori people knew how to fish". This is an unconscionable remark. But entirely understandable given that the objective of settler governments has been to create economic advantages for immigrants, without regard to the disadvantages this has created for Maori people.

Even today, there are entire cities built on land taken dishonestly from Maori. There are an entire electricity business, a television and radio business using Maori resources without consent. There is a large percentage of farmland which was also taken without explicit consent and without appropriate compensation. There is a network of roads, the land for which has never been paid to this day. There are businesses being run on our mountains, in our waters without any compensation being paid. Forests are grown mainly on Maori land. Major housing estates on Maori land were taken against the wishes of the owners. Maori land was taken and leased out to Pakeha at rentals set by the government, not the owners.

When we consider the enormity, and face the tragedy of the effects of these accumulated acts, it is easy to see why the property rights issue looms so large over us. There is also an infrastructure, the Waitangi Tribunal which supports the sorting out of these property matters. The Constitutional issue falls into the too hard basket right now. Given the Waitangi Tribunal's timidity on such blatant and obvious cases as Orakei, Te Reo, Muriwhenua, the coast is not clear for a serious, fearless discussion of this matter.

Now why can we not get changes? My business is about educating Pakeha people about Maoridom and understanding of Maoridom, especially for chief executives and senior managers. I work with them 15 at a time. We have them normally for a minimum of 3 days, a maximum of 5 days. It's really about getting them just to understand where Maoridom is coming from and to give them more confidence in dealing with Maori issues in a way that is going to be helpful for Maori people. Working with them, I see that their ideas about Maoridom are rooted in Victorian, colonial experiences and they really haven't got up to date.

Part of reason the why we're stuck back in those Victorian ideas derives from the capture of our economy into a Victorian mould. We have, until the last 9-10 years, been captured in a Victorian colonial economy. The trauma that you've experienced in the change over of our economy has been because we were beset with laws that had come from Britain. I mean, anyone with half a brain could make a connection between the decolonisation movement throughout the world and a decolonisation of the economy that we needed to get on with.

Britain sent us very strong signals throughout the 1950's and 60's that it no longer wanted to be mother Britain. And yet in 1981, Muldoon said "...around this table you can have people whose first loyalties are to the mother country". And then we wonder why we've had to put up with so much pain for a lot of our people in the last 10 years. That's because we've had to make the transformation from a Victorian economy locked into mother Britain, to one where we have diversified our markets and our product list.

The ideologies that promote individual Pakeha superiority and the superiority of the Pakeha culture that came over from Britain are misplaced. Not only has it

harmed our economy, but it's actually holding up the works in terms of Maori getting on with life, in terms of Pakeha actually identifying with this land.

I love looking at the art. But it's only recently that Pakeha have got brave enough to actually put a few Pakeha in their landscapes. Sooner or later we'll get Maori and Pakeha all in the picture and that's when we will know that we've come home.

Pakeha, the notion that you have to get through is that there's no mother Britain. And what's great about the younger generation is that they're being born at a time when the economic underpinning's of the new theology have already been set in place. And I hope that it moves and develops swiftly.

Muldoon represents that colonial mind set that allowed Pakeha to shut out reality at all costs; borrow and bank rather than face the facts that mother Britain was casting us adrift. It is also important to note that the economic decolonisation of the past 10 years was also the beginning of an identity crisis for many Pakeha. Pakeha have had to come to terms with Maori assertions of tangata whenua status. The Treaty, their cultural needs, Maori rejection of the superiority ideology, and Maori increased presence in government and business activities provide a stimulus to this.

Finally, I want to mention a project I'm involved with. I've been asked to critique the "parents as first teachers" programme that's been imported with the explicit intention of assisting Maori parents bring up children who will fit in better and be better at education and schooling. To me it is the last attack on Maoridom. It assumes American norms without any tailoring to any Maori or Pakeha norms. The whole 560 pages is a vicious attack on the remnants of the Maori whanau system. It is a determined effort to pull that apart and to force us into the nuclear model. It's offensive because it makes the assumption that we have nothing within our own culture that can heal our own trauma.

Two notions based on the ascendancy of Pakeha rights have sprung up recently. One is the argument that no-'one' must be made to suffer over what has happened in the past, the one that is referred to as a Pakeha. Heaven forbid that a Pakeha must be made to suffer. Maori are already suffering. Forget the statistics, just put your finger up to the ear and catch some blood. This dictum assumes that if the choice between a Pakeha suffering and a Maori suffering can be made well, then the Maori can be made to suffer just a little bit longer. And Maori leadership isn't complaining, probably because they are not suffering personally hard enough. The other notion is that Maoridom will bankrupt the country by our Treaty claims, as if Pakeha haven't already done that on their own. How about \$2 billion spend on a capital reconstruction of Marsden Point Refinery, or a \$2 billion propping up Synfuel. Eight hundred million to PetroCorp, the DFC and the Rural Bank write-offs, or the Meat Board and it's \$1 billion write-offs for farmer's debts or even \$600 million to the Bank of New Zealand. Let's put what's been considered as full and final settlement in perspective here. One hundred and thirty five million for the current commercial fisheries is an insult, even if consultation had been done appropriately, which it wasn't. The only other settlement is Ngati Whatua, and their \$3 million for 700 acres for the best real estate in Auckland. You can only think that Maoridom can keep on suffering, and that Maoridom is going to back up the country if you pay them a pittance. If you actually think that they are inferior and aren't worthy of anything, you still hold on to the Victorian mentality. And I'm afraid that's where a lot of Pakeha are, and I'm afraid that's where our politicians are, and I'm afraid (whisper) some psychologists.

Maori people are putting up with a lot right now. If governments can transfer \$20 billion in the past ten years for hand outs and write offs to Pakeha people who have endured little, then they can do a lot better than the \$150 million they've transferred to our people that have endured so much for 150 years.

The big issue is still the Treaty, and the need to re-negotiate this nation's management. The challenge is to design a political system that is based on Maori ways of doing things rather than Pakeha ways of doing things. To achieve this requires relinquishing colonial patterns of thinking and the certainty that pakeha people and their ways are superior to Maori. For psychologists the issue is their role in maintaining Pakeha economic and political power. It may well be that psychologists provide lousy value for money from the Maori point of view, but provide excellent value for money from the government's point of view. Kia ora.