



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Research Commons

<http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/>

Research Commons at the University of Waikato

Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.

**DECOLONISING PĀKEHĀ WAYS OF BEING:
Revealing third space Pākehā experiences**

A thesis submitted in fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Education

at

The University of Waikato

by

MICHEAL W. BROWN

THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO

2011

Abstract / Waitara

This thesis asks two central questions. First, what kinds of experiences occur when Pākehā become interested and involved in te ao Māori (the Māori world)? Second, how might sharing of these experiences help other Pākehā better understand their relationship with Māori? The account is grounded in concepts of colonisation and the coloniser/colonised relation, Othering, Whiteness, hybridity and the third space, biculturalism, theories of movement between groups, and decolonisation. It particularly drew on Homi Bhabha's notions of the third space to theorise and explain the process of change that occurred for 13 Pākehā involved in te ao Māori. Utilising a qualitative design based on grounded theory and in-depth interviewing the research investigated their "lived" experiences and their choice to encounter then engage with te ao Māori. It is their experiences that I interpret in this thesis as "third space Pākehā experiences".

Through my employment of grounded theory methodology to analyse the korero (stories) I collected, I argue that a transformative process of change occurred for the 13 participants because they became interested and engaged more in ongoing experiences of te ao Māori. I interpreted this process as "Pākehā decolonisation". In my analysis I found that at the individual level decolonisation helped these Pākehā bridge gaps that emerged as "differences" between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā which led them to develop a new and enriched understanding of themselves. Their engagement with te ao Māori produced exciting and rewarding experiences, the richness of these is revealed in the storylines. Also, their ongoing experiences moved towards effective strategies to engage in discussions with other Pākehā about te ao Māori, which were respectful to both Māori and Pākehā cultures. I interpreted this development as the "Pākehā educating Pākehā" strategy. My analysis also suggested that five key thematic elements - or what I call five "occurrences" of Pākehā decolonisation, existed within each participant's third space experiences. They were: 1) all participants chose to engage in many diverse *encounters with te ao Māori*, 2)

this led the individual to their discovery of *ngā wairua o te ao Māori* (values of the Māori world), 3) as well as to experiencing *Othering* experiences from Pākehā, 4) the ongoing choice to engage with te ao Māori developed into awareness and experience of sites/locations where *equality* between Māori and Pākehā existed and, 5) and it was through confrontational experiences that these Pākehā began to learn successful *Pākehā educating Pākehā* strategies which they employed when engaging with other Pākehā about te ao Māori. These five occurrences happened frequently and infrequently across participants and they occurred in multiple settings as well as during different decades of their lives. Nonetheless, the choice to enter into these experience(s), whether at the time of occurrence - or on reflection at a later stage - emerged as a defining of their “journey” into te ao Māori; a journey of enriched, insightful and meaningful experiences that helped these Pākehā develop a more sophisticated understanding of te ao Māori and their relationship to Māori within that world. Thus, these Pākehā discovered that exploration into te ao Māori was a benefit to themselves as individual Pākehā.

This thesis is an applied research study that draws from Homi Bhabha’s (1994) theory/concept of hybridity and movement between groups. I employed this approach because I was concerned with movement by a group member (Pākehā) toward another group (Māori). The research conceptualises Bhabha’s (1994) “third space” as an “experience” rather than a permanent positioning and explores ways in which change occurs for non hybrid group members who engage in the third space experience and, that a third space vocabulary exists for talking about shared experiences that does not put one’s own identity at risk.

The main contributions of this research are threefold. Firstly, when Pākehā enter into te ao Māori they encounter third space experiences that reveal new and enriched ways to experience te ao Māori, and they develop a more sophisticated view of the Māori and Pākehā coloniser/colonial relation, its history, as well as present relations and pathways for future equal engagement. Secondly, third space experiences offer a “way forward” for Māori and Pākehā relationships that suggests

an alternative to contestation and confrontation. Third, third space experiences provide a pathway toward a Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy; an accessible and practical outcome of a positive and rewarding alternative decolonisation process which helps other Pākehā discover a deeper understanding of their place in New Zealand. I argue that decolonisation and the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy helps Pākehā learn from their lived experiences of “being Pākehā” - a phrase coined by historian Michael King (1985, 1999b).

Acknowledgements / Ngā mihi

Academically, undertaking a doctorate degree is a truly glorious experience. There are many people that I wish to thank who have pushed me, supported me, been there for me when I cried, and celebrated with me in my achievements.

Firstly, I thank my supervisory team, Monica Payne, Ted Glynn and Toni Bruce. These three people kept their faith in me when at times I pushed their limits. They never faltered in their belief that I “had it in me”. I thank them for their guidance, their insight, their patience and their high regard for the work that I produced. I would not have completed this thesis without their input.

Secondly, I thank my family and friends. The journey I have taken has been littered with stumbling blocks, hurdles and great walls that I have had to climb over to reach my goal. Those of you who love me, who have supported me, know the difficulties I have had to endure over the course of my studies. I thank you all for your honesty and your openness, especially during the times I drew so heavily from you. You encouraged me to carry on when at times I questioned my own abilities both in academia and in my own personal life. You showed me that it was ok to hold on to hope, when all else seemed lost. The love and support you extended to me will remain with me forever. I thank you for that.

Thirdly, and most importantly I thank the two people in my life that continue to give me the greatest joy - my children Bailey and Ella-rose. I thank you for being my reason to hope. I treasure each moment with you. It is I that shall walk in the shadow of you both. It is I that shall learn from you as you grow. I love you both dearly.

Contents / Kai

Abstract.....	
Acknowledgements.....	
Forward / Kupu whakataki.....	12
He mihi.....	15
My journey	15
CHAPTER ONE / Te wāhanga tuatahi: New Zealand context.....	25
Introduction.....	25
CHAPTER TWO / Te wāhanga tuarua: Theoretical premises	40
Introduction.....	40
CONCEPTUALISING MOVEMENT BETWEEN GROUPS.....	41
Colonisation.....	41
REVEALING THE THIRD SPACE	51
White sympathizers.....	54
Profeminist men	56
Pākehā Māori	58
DECOLONISATION.....	75
Pathways to change.....	75
Pākehā decolonisation	83
CHAPTER THREE / Te wāhanga tuatoru: Methodology	100
Introduction.....	100
Research design.....	100
Methodological approach.....	102
<i>Stage one: Data collection</i>	103

<i>Stage two: Conceptual ordering, coding</i>	104
<i>Storylines</i>	106
<i>Biographical introductions</i>	107
<i>Storylines: Constructivist approach</i>	108
<i>Method</i>	109
<i>Participants</i>	109
<i>Recruitment</i>	110
<i>Location</i>	111
<i>Demographic</i>	112
<i>Anonymity</i>	113
<i>Biographies</i>	115
<i>Ethical considerations</i>	115
<i>Data collection</i>	116
<i>Consent and interview procedures</i>	116
<i>Recording interviews</i>	116
<i>Interview process</i>	117
<i>Monitoring my actions: Reflexivity</i>	118
<i>Transcription</i>	119
<i>Analysis</i>	120
<i>Stage one: Conceptualising concepts</i>	120
<i>Stage two: Subcategories</i>	124
<i>Stage three: Storylines</i>	131
CHAPTER FOUR / Te wāhanga tuawhā: The people in the study	132
Introduction	132
Lisa	133

Francis.....	134
Susan.....	138
Simon.....	141
Helen.....	142
Glen	145
David	148
Brenda.....	151
Cindy	153
Jack.....	156
Alice	158
Betty	160
Joseph	163
Storylines.....	167
CHAPTER FIVE / Te wāhanga tuarima: Storyline One: <i>Encounters with te ao Māori</i>	169
Introduction.....	169
Encounters with te ao Māori.....	170
Encountering criticism from Māori	193
Summary	196
CHAPTER SIX / Te wāhanga tuaono: Storyline Two: <i>Ngā wairua o te ao Māori</i>	198
Introduction.....	198
Ngā wairua o te ao Māori.....	199
Summary	208
CHAPTER SEVEN / Te wāhanga tuawhitu: Storyline Three: <i>Othering</i>	210

Introduction.....	210
Othering.....	210
Racism (institutional)	211
Othering by Māori	217
Moving toward a third space perspective	220
Summary	221
CHAPTER EIGHT / Te wāhanga tuawaru: Storyline Four: <i>Equality</i>	223
Introduction.....	223
Equality	223
Summary	229
CHAPTER NINE / Te wāhanga tuaiwa: Storyline Five: <i>Pākehā educating Pākehā</i>	231
Introduction.....	231
The Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy	233
Te Tiriti o Waitangi.....	239
Summary	245
Conclusion: <i>Pākehā with third space experiences: Practitioners of Pākehā change</i>	246
The journey continues	246
People, events, concepts / Ngā kupu me ngā tikanga	252
List of Appendices	255
Appendix 1: Timeline of Māori and Pākehā actions and responses	256
Appendix 2: Key Government Acts	264
Appendix 3: Introduction Letter and Information Sheet.....	266
Appendix 4: Referral Form	268

Appendix 5: Consent Form	269
Appendix 6: Interview Question Guide	270
Appendix 7: Subcategories: frequency of occurrence	271
Appendix 8: Participant exemplars.....	276
References / Whakapuakanga.....	284

Proverb / Whakatauki

“E kore e piri te uku ki te rino”

Translation: *“Clay will not stick to iron”*

This proverb comes from Te Whiti o Rongomai. In the 1870s land sales were progressing strongly in Taranaki and New Zealand in general even though organisations had been established to try to stop these. It was at this time the proverb was voiced. The time came at Parihaka when no further land was being sold to Pākehā. The land purchasers and surveyors noticed that the closer they got to Parihaka the less land was being sold to them. The thinking of some of the Pākehā towards Te Whiti was reflected in the following statement, “His lack of desire for our money and valuables will mean we cannot make our fortune”. This ranagira was talking about Māori retaining their land at Parihaka and having no desire to buy the goods the Pākehā were trying to sell to enable them to purchase land. This thought is embodied by Te Whiti in his proverb, “Clay will not stick to iron when it has been dried by the sun”. According to tradition, the iron is the Pākehā, the clay are Māori and the connections between Pākehā buyers and Māori land sellers was the water, that is, money. Come the time when money runs out, that is, the water dries up, the ties between the two parties will be broken . . . *In the past, the focus of this saying referred to the sale of land by some Māori to Pākehā to make money. There is also a caution that when all the land was sold the wooing and courtship of the tribes by outsiders would stop. Money dissipates quickly in maintaining your survival; however you can live off the land forever. These days it is thought that the meaning of this proverb talks about Māori and Pākehā living together as one and how they can never be alike. However, perhaps this explanation demeans the teachings of Te Whiti as he was a staunch believer in keeping the peace. Another offshoot for us is that if two peoples are to live together, we need to find another path so that we may live in peace and end the arguments between us. His greatest aspiration is that we should all live in peace* (McGrath, 2003, p. 21, italics in original).

Forward / Kupu whakataki

I begin this thesis with an introduction to my past involvement with te ao Māori and reasons for undertaking the study. I then offer a brief history of the Māori/Pākehā coloniser/colonised relation in the New Zealand context, discussing key processes that led to colonisation, the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the “standard story” (Fish, 1980; Nairn & McCreanor, 1991) of New Zealand history that came out of early interactions between Pākehā and Māori. Here I draw on key aspects of early European (Pākehā) and Māori engagement that led to the marginalisation of Māori ways of being in favour of Pākehā ways of being, whereby the dominant positioning of the later was aligned with the superiority of Whiteness, and was established as such in New Zealand society through its institutions and policies. My focus then turns to discussions about the Treaty, or Te Tiriti o Waitangi and its impact on the makings of an *us/them* relation. In this discussion, I acknowledge the shifting power imbalance that occurred in favour of Pākehā from first contact onwards, whereby Māori, in the early to mid 1800s, had the balance of power through population numbers, war prowess and land wealth. I close this section discussing popular conceptualisations of what being Pākehā means for Pākehā in New Zealand today.

In the theoretical concepts/perspectives part of this thesis, I discuss processes of colonisation and constructions of white in the global and local context. I explore Orientalism and its processes of Othering, as well as theories of Whiteness to demonstrate ways in which Othering sustains white as superior in an *us/them* relationship. I then move my discussion to hybridity, an outcome of interbreeding or “mixing” (Brah & Coombes, 2000, p. i), and then more specifically, to Bhabha’s (1994) concept of the third space. Here I explore the third space as an experience; a positive and empowering experience that can assist, influence, change and teach people. I then apply this concept to a range of settings where movement between groups occurs and align my discussion toward processes of change. Here, I take a

robust look at a range of current theories/perspectives which look at change processes employed by, and experienced by individuals as they move toward alternative ways of thinking about their positioning in society. I then relate these change processes and experiences to the New Zealand context. The outcome of this discussion is my interpretation of a Pākehā decolonisation model that serves as an effective model for Pākehā to employ should they choose to engage more with te ao Māori.

The methodology section provides an account of my qualitative approach to the study discussing grounded theory as a method for qualitative inquiry and in-depth interviewing as an appropriate method for collecting qualitative data. I outline my methods, participant recruitment and participant involvement, ethical considerations and interview content collection procedures and transcription and end by showing how grounded theory methodology helped to inform my conceptualising, facilitating, theorising and analysing the data collected from the 13 participants involved in the study.

In the final part of the thesis I introduce participants to the reader through brief co-constructed biographies of each. The presentation of my findings in the form of narratives, or storylines then follows. In the storyline chapters I examine the behaviours, contexts and experiences of the participants to illustrate how their lived experiences suggested to me a process of decolonisation involving five key occurrences that could be usefully conceptualised as involving:

1. Encounters with te ao Māori
2. Ngā wairua o te ao Māori
3. Othering
4. Equality
5. Pākehā educating Pākehā.

Note: English translations for Māori words, terms and/or concepts referred to in this thesis have in the first instance been taken from the works of Moorfield (2000) and/or Ngata (1993).

He mihi

E ngā reo, e ngā mana, e ngā kārangaranga maha, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou katoa.

Ko Micheal tōku ingoa

No Waikato ahau

Ko Pirongia te maunga

Ko Waikato te awa

Ko Bailey rāua ko Ella-rose a māua tamariki

No reira, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou katoa

Nā, Micheal W. Brown

My journey

I am a New Zealand Pākehā. I have two wonderful multicultural children. As a child growing up in the 1970s-1980s, I lived in Tokoroa, a small rural town located in the Waikato/King Country region of New Zealand. At the time, Tokoroa was noticeably populated with Māori and Pacific peoples, most of who worked in the local forestry industry. I attended a predominantly Māori school and played rugby for the Tokoroa Pirates, a predominantly Māori team. My friends were Māori, my neighbours were Māori, and my parents worked with Māori. As a child growing up in rural New Zealand in the 1970s and 1980s I did not think that my childhood was too far removed from that of other Pākehā children growing up in rural New Zealand.

It was not until much later in my life, probably around my early twenties, that a change in thinking occurred for me. I began to realise that I had never been forced to enter any kind of Māori initiative. I hadn't been pressured by my parents, or Māori friends, by my schoolmates or teammates to enter into any formal education, or training system that required me to learn or become more knowledgeable about te ao Māori. I just happened to be a Pākehā male, living in rural New Zealand, just like

many other Pākehā. At this time that I understood that my encounters with te ao Māori weren't that special, because te ao Māori, or Māori people were all around me. I realised then, that if I ever wanted to find out more about te ao Māori, it was going to be my choice.

Today, my way of being is informed by my being a Pākehā, living in New Zealand, being open and willing to engage with Māori and through having an openness to accept that te ao Māori exists today as it has done from the time Māori first arrived to New Zealand. Ultimately, my way of being Pākehā is relational to Māori, in that my being Pākehā is informed by the ways in which the Pākehā/Māori relation impacts on me and my understanding of Pākehāness. Thus, my openness to te ao Māori has developed over the years, not because I have had it forced upon me by my parents or at school, or at work, and not because I have always had a deep connection with any one Māori person. Rather, it has developed because I am well aware that Māori and Pākehā ways of being are relational, in that they impact on one another. Thus, I choose to accept that to a certain extent a colonial and postcolonial relationship between Pākehā and Māori has and will continue to exist. Important to note here is that my experiences with te ao Māori were never thrust upon me, they were simply there for me to happen upon, occurred in many different settings and at multiple stages of my life. Today, they are experiences that help me to connect with my own values those values I have learned from te ao Māori, such as whakapapa (genealogy), whānau (family), manaakitanga (to support, take care of or give hospitality to), whenua (land), tikanga (Māori protocols/way of doing things) and mana (prestige, status, and charisma). I appreciate these values and I apply them to my own life, whenever I can. For example, I believe I have become a better father, son, sibling and brother because of my experiences of whakapapa, whānau and manaakitanga, in that I have learned how to incorporate and apply these values to situations and contexts in my own unique Pākehā way.

Today, I am an adult Pākehā academic living in New Zealand conducting my research with Pākehā who have some interest in te ao Māori. My research is

informed by my experiences of being a Pākehā living near Māori or within driving distance of a Māori event, a Māori initiative, Māori protest movement and popular Pākehā opinion about these. I accept that as a Pākehā I am an “outsider” to Māori initiatives. I am proud of being Pākehā. However, I am not that proud of the way some Pākehā behaved and behave in New Zealand society and sometimes my opinion of Māori, Māori events/issues and/or grievances, as well as Pākehā responses to these may differ from those of other Pākehā. Academically, I articulate these occurrences as my “journey” of choice: a journey which uncovers better ways for me to respectfully interact with Māori and Pākehā. I now feel that it is a journey I must share with other Pākehā, so that they too might discover more rewarding and less confrontational experiences with te ao Māori; so that they too might develop a more enriched understanding of their own Pākehā ways of being.

Personal exemplars

This study centres on the different kinds of experiences that occur when Pākehā embrace Māori ways of thinking into their understanding of themselves and their world. Specifically, my focus is on Pākehā and the lived experiences they have when they move towards te ao Māori and how these experiences help inform a Pākehā decolonisation model. Here, I share some of my own experiences so that the reader can gain some insight into the ways in which I have experienced my own decolonisation process.

When I was 18 years old, I played for a local softball team that consisted primarily of adult Māori men. I was the youngest member, and only Pākehā, on the team. One afternoon while playing a game, a police car pulled up alongside the softball diamond. Two Pākehā policemen stepped out of the car and walked towards “Chucker”, our team’s pitcher. Chucker, a heavily-built 40-year-old Māori with facial moko (tattoos), spoke with the policemen for a short time. One of the policemen placed handcuffs around Chucker’s wrists. All three then returned to the police car. It drove away. Chucker was replaced with another pitcher. We ended up

losing the game. No one in the team spoke of the incident. It was received in a “matter of fact” kind of way, as if these kinds of events occurred regularly for Māori and required no discussion: it was just part of what it meant to be Māori. This initial encounter made me question what Māori might think about themselves in relation to Pākehā; that Māori often might perceive themselves as the lesser of the two peoples in an *us/them* relation. I began to see that Māori felt differently than I did, because they had different experiences from me. I felt upset by this. Regardless of how much I mourned for equality or mourned for Māori to be more fairly represented in society I knew that I would never understand how Māori truly felt because I was a member of the Pākehā group who constructed their reality.

When I was 30 years old my wife and I moved to Dunedin to begin our Bachelor degrees. It was 2000 - the start of the new millennium. In the first few weeks at the University of Otago I was struck by how few Māori attended the university, or lived in the wider Dunedin community. By this time in my life I had come to understand a lot more about Māoridom or Māoritanga (a Māori way of doing things; also see Rangihau, 1992). But in the first few months at university I found it difficult to adapt to a context where Pākehā far out-numbered Māori. Because I had already begun to relate ngā wairua o te ao Māori with my own Pākehā values I chose to immerse myself in Māori studies. I took Māori language/culture papers and completed a Master’s degree in Indigenous Studies. Being among Māori views rather than among Māori people helped me to find pathways between Māori and Pākehā values which I applied later to my own research into Pākehā ways of being.

When I was travelling to Whakatane to interview one of participants for this study, I was listening to talk-back radio. The subject was Māori sovereignty. Conversation centred on Tama Iti, a Māori activist. The general tone of these discussions was geared towards separatism between Māori and Pākehā, with Tama Iti the central “actor”. Most of the callers self identified as Pākehā. Their comments were a direct attack on Tama Iti’s views of Māori sovereignty. Collectively, they quickly moved toward the popular Pākehā perception that Tama Iti’s views were

common to all Māori in that Māori in general were unhappy with their lot: that any approach by Pākehā to “give in” to Māori demands would surely be at the expense of Pākehā. I began to see similarities existed in the processes employed by Pākehā to “Other” Māori and the ways in which Pākehā sometimes “Othered” me. I interpreted this as a between-Pākehā Othering process. For example, when I wear a tino rangatiratanga t-shirt (a black t-shirt with a red, white and black Māori sovereignty flag on the front) I am mindful that some Pākehā are perplexed, bemused at my wearing the t-shirt because I do not look like a Māori. I cannot offer a complete explanation as to why Pākehā are perplexed or bemused by this. Generally, I am a person who doesn’t really care that much about what other people think of me or of my dress sense. When I attend Māori events, I do not try to dress like Māori (if there is such a dress code). The same applies when I am among Pākehā, or at Pākehā events. However, regardless of where I am, I am mostly looked upon by Māori and Pākehā as Pākehā. This puts me in a difficult position at times, especially when I am around other Pākehā who feel comfortable expressing their negative opinions about Māori, or a Māori event when no Māori are present. I have been in these situations many times. Each time, it is the general tone of these conversations that reminds me of this; Pākehā continue to see themselves as a superior group of people. Earlier on, my response to these situations was aggressive. More recently I have learned to become nonaggressively proactive, educating Pākehā about the benefits of te ao Māori, encouraging them to see that knowing something about te ao Māori, is knowing something about being Pākehā.

Informing the thesis

While I was studying te ao Māori at university, I began to realise that very often Māori were Othered by Pākehā and that the stereotype was essentially negative. However, because I spent most of my time at Te Tumu (the Māori department at the university) where a number of Pākehā worked or were students, I also became aware that not all Pākehā Othered Māori in this way. This led to my Master’s research: an

investigation into the ways in which Pākehā interest in te ao Māori reveals Pākehā prejudices toward te ao Māori.

My dissertation entitled; *Orientalism in contemporary Aotearoa: In-group Pākehā (IGP) versus out-group Pākehā (OGP): The Othering of Pākehā in contemporary Aotearoa: A Pākehā perspective* (Brown, 2004) argued that Pākehāness is contestable because being Pākehā depends primarily on assumptions that Pākehā make about themselves, their connection to history, their past and their ongoing relationship with Māori. I found that when Othering experiences occurred, negative reactions by other Pākehā toward Pākehā interest in te ao Māori were revealed because many Pākehā view Pākehā interest in te ao Māori with some suspicion. Involvement in te ao Māori by other Pākehā may be understood as a hidden agenda with some personal benefit. For example, one participant in this study commented (pp. 38-39):

If the support and activity is an honest belief, and is maintained with full integrity, for the purposes of the betterment of ‘all’ Māori, as well as ‘all’ other nationalities in this country, including Pākehā, then I have no quarrel with such support. However . . . when that support for Māori issues is used to denigrate other persons, then I do have a reaction, because my experience has taught me that there is very often a ‘hidden agenda’ that is not disclosed. Are Pākehā who support Māori issues discriminated against? Yes, of course they are, by both Māori and Pākehā. Why? Because of the history of Pākehā bleeding heart do-gooders.

An important finding was that Pākehā interest in te ao Māori should reflect equality, rather than promote one group over another. For example, another participant stated (p. 48):

I believe in one nation and in one nationality regardless of skin colour. Māori and Pākehā live side by side today and in better harmony than most other countries seem to. There are of course the radicals and extremists from both Māori and Pākehā. Unfortunately their opinions and views tend to be exploited by the media to the point where the opinions of the few are blown up out of proportion and therefore appear to be the opinion of the majority. This in turn does absolutely nothing for racial relations within our country. I have no problem whatsoever with Pākehā supporting Māori issues or, alternatively, Māori supporting Pākehā issues... everyone has the right to believe in, and support an issue. However I believe that in some instances

where a Pākehā supports a Māori issue, they would come across instances of discrimination and scrutiny. In the final breakdown though I believe it takes a strong individual to make a stand against what is considered to be their 'group' or race. It takes an equally strong person to be accepting of this individual and stand beside them irrespective of their colour, race or ethnic background. Ultimately, to stand for one's belief is what matters the most.

Overall, however, that Masters research raised many unanswered questions about Pākehā interest in te ao Māori, being Pākehā and Pākehā and Māori relationality which in turn led to the present study.

Mapping the research

My Masters research highlighted to me that I had preconceived views about the ways in which Pākehā experiences of te ao Māori are articulated by other Pākehā. Primarily, these related to ways in which Pākehā might express disdain toward Pākehā interest in te ao Māori, an assumption that led to the initial direction of my PhD research being an investigation into processes of Othering that occur when Pākehā become involved, or align themselves with te ao Māori. However, after I analysed the korero of the participants I found that Othering was just one element of their experiences. Although participants were frequently exposed to Othering experiences these experiences did not always emerge as a central part of their overall involvement with te ao Māori. More significant were their ongoing experiences with te ao Māori and the ways in which these helped to inform their knowledge of te ao Māori. Also, these were experiences that helped the participants develop a new and enriched understanding of their own Pākehā ways of being, and how being Pākehā was relational to ways of being Māori because of an *us/them* relation that has, and continues to exist in New Zealand society. What followed led me to adjust my initial assumptions. Rather than limit my research to Othering processes, I reorientated the research more toward alternative understandings of being Pākehā. This redirection involved a more robust investigation into multiple contexts and theories that explored movement between groups. In order to explain ways in which such movement might be associated with ways of being, I began to research movement between groups

more broadly. I explored theories of Orientalism (Said, 1978, 2003), Whiteness (Dyer, 1997; Frankenberg, 1993, 1997; Hill, 1997, 2004; Warren, 2003), hybridity (Bhabha, 1994; Brah & Coombes, 2000), border crossing (Giroux, 1992), nationalism (Hall, 1992) and biculturalism (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999a; Hindmarsh, 2000; O’Sullivan, 2007; Ritchie, 1992; Spoonley & Pearson, 2004). This reading resulted in another significant shift in my research direction. I was investigating multiple theoretical approaches, interweaving them with theories of movement between groups as researched more literature. As a result, I became more familiar with a wide range of experiences that occurred within same groups which in turn led to two stages of engagement with the literature. For example, I explored the experiences of white Americans involved in the civil rights movements in America in the 1960s, and I explored the experiences of men involved in first wave feminism in Britain. It was not until sometime later in my research that a connection emerged between these two groups. Thematically, I discovered that the pursuit for equality in each of these two *us/them* relational contexts, emerged as a common experience of the people involved in these two diverse contexts. This revelation led me to refine the direction of my research further. I became more interested in exploring the experiences of white sympathizers and profeminist men, to find out whether these experiences might shed light on the experiences of Pākehā involved in te ao Māori. A concept that emerged from this exploration was “in betweenness”.

In the New Zealand context, Collins (2004) and Meredith (1998) demonstrate that “in betweenness” (p. 1) helps to explain the positioning Pākehā of mixed descent hold when discussions of place arise. Bell (2004b) argues that Pākehā of mixed descent are labelled “in between” (p. 134) because they have the ability to move back and forth between two groups (Māori and Pākehā). Because my research was specifically concerned with movement by Pākehā toward te ao Māori, and not with Pākehā of mixed descent, I related Bell’s (2004b) interpretation of inbetween movement with Bhabha’s (1994) concept of the third space and interpreted this movement as third space experience(s) - a discourse that provides a vocabulary for talking about shared experiences. In this thesis, third space experiences are discussed

as positive and empowering experiences that occur when Pākehā become more open and receptive to the influences of te ao Māori. It is the body of third space knowledge that comes out of these experiences that I argue has potential to assist positive change in Pākehā ways of being and in the way Pākehā and Māori view each other. Because it is third space Pākehā experiences that highlight the relational impact being Pākehā and being Māori has on each other.

It has taken five years to complete this study. During this time many changes have occurred in New Zealand and in the wider global context. When I began my research, New Zealand had a Labour-led coalition government led by a white female, and the President of the United States of America was a white American male. In 2010, New Zealand now has a National coalition government led by a white male in coalition with the Māori party and Barack Obama - an African American male - is President of the United States of America. Thus, changes in the political dynamic of New Zealand as well as global events, impact on how people choose to become informed about identity politics, how people relate ways of being, and how people make sense of *us/them* relations they may find themselves in. When President-elect Barack Obama gave his victory speech to a group of more than 125,000 Democrat supporters in 2008, he referred to the changing times:

This election had many firsts and many stories that will be told for generations. But one that's on my mind tonight is about a woman who cast her ballot in Atlanta. She's a lot like the millions of others who stood in line to make their voice heard in this election except for one thing: Ann Nixon Cooper is 106 years old. She was born just a generation past slavery; a time when there were no cars on the road or planes in the sky; when someone like her couldn't vote for two reasons - because she was a woman and because of the color of her skin. And tonight, I think about all that she's seen throughout her century in America - the heartache and the hope; the struggle and the progress; the times we were told that we can't, and the people who pressed on with that American creed: Yes we can. At a time when women's voices were silenced and their hopes dismissed, she lived to see them stand up and speak out and reach for the ballot . . . She was there for the buses in Montgomery, the hoses in Birmingham, a bridge in Selma, and a preacher from Atlanta who told a people that "We Shall Overcome". Yes we can. (Obama's Acceptance Speech, 2008, para 21-27)

Obama's speech highlighted that equality, indigenous and gender representation in America are fluid: they are continuously changing and evolving. Globally, reasons why changes occur depend greatly on the actors involved, their experiences, and how these experiences have potential to impact on and inform a society and its politics. In the New Zealand context, understandings about Pākehā ways of being, Māori ways of being, and the relational impact each has on the other in terms of colonial and postcolonial perspectives, has been challenged by both peoples in terms of their own experiences. However in Pākehā society and in Pākehā politics, Pākehā ways of being have continually been negotiated as the preferred way of doing things. Thus, new and enriched understandings of being Pākehā from a positive and empowering third space perspective might deepen and enrich the dialogue that takes place about what it means being Pākehā in New Zealand today.

CHAPTER ONE / Te wāhanga tuatahi: New Zealand context

“Hineruhe, te wahine nāna i tū te ata hāpara... It is Hineruhe, maker of dawn. A new dawn is symbolic of renewed opportunities (Trad.)” (Grace & Grace, 2003, p. 16)

Introduction

Symbolically, for European/British settlers, New Zealand represented a new dawn, a new life in a new land. However, early contact between settlers and Māori tribes in the 1700s led to many unforeseeable changes for both groups (Salmond, 1991, 1997). In this chapter, I discuss briefly the effects of colonisation on Māori, the reasons for and impact of the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi on the coloniser/colonised (Pākehā/Māori) relation, and formations of the term “Pākehā”. Specifically, this chapter sets the scene for my later discussions about the coloniser/colonised relation Pākehā and Māori share in terms of New Zealand history, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and Pākehā and Māori ways of being. I also point out here that in general, the “standard story” (Fish, 1980; Nairn & McCreanor, 1991) of New Zealand history and Pākehā/Māori relations draws from Pākehā discourses, whereby Pākehā ways of being are intertwined with White ways of being, in that both are normalised, naturalised and legitimised as being of superior natural order. Thus, the standard story of New Zealand history is retold in a manner whereby Pākehā emerge as ‘winners’ because Pākehā are heir to the positive historical constructions of being that have been developed out of White as superior thinking. It is from this standpoint that popular stories of Pākehā/Māori relational history tend to point towards Pākehā worldviews as a step forward for all New Zealand: toward a better and more advanced society. With this in mind, this chapter will offer a brief outline of the key historical events that helped shape the ways in which Pākehā and Māori viewed the Pākehā/Māori relation from the 1800s to today. A more nuanced

discussion about processes of colonisation and the effects these had on colonial and postcolonial understandings of Pākehā/Māori relationality will occur in the theoretical discussion that comes later in this thesis. Also, a thorough outline of key events in this relationship as well as a timeline of Māori and Pākehā actions and responses from 1831-1996, is included in the Appendices (Appendix 1) of this thesis.

Te ao Māori before colonisation

Māori had been in occupation for at least 800 years before European/British settlers arrived (Belich, 1996; Walker, 1990). Ranginui Walker outlined traditional Māori society as having a coherent social structure which was centred on waka (ancestral canoe links) from which iwi (tribe), hapū (sub-tribe) and whānau (extended family) descend. The basic Māori social unit included four generations: kaumātua and kuia (elderly male/elderly female), mātua (parents), tamariki (children) and mokopuna (grandchildren). As whānau expanded, hapū were formed. Traditional hapū consisted of three classes: rangatira (chiefs), tūtūā (commoners) and taurekareka (slaves). A fourth class also existed, known as tohunga (experts, skilled people, or priests). Walker argued that precolonisation Māori had functioning systems of knowledge, education, justice, and of collective ownership of land and resources. The element that connected all of these was whenua (land). It is through whenua that the intrinsic link to Papatūānuku (earth mother) and Ranginui (sky father) existed and developed into understandings of whakapapa (genealogy) and tikanga (protocols).

Colonisation of New Zealand

Exploration into the Pacific Ocean in search of Terra Australis began with Ferdinand Magellan from 1520 to 1521. Although Magellan had no success with locating and naming New Zealand, *Terra Australis* appeared in a map of the Pacific Ocean published in 1589 (Belich, 1996). In 1642, Abel Tasman a navigator for the Dutch East India Company, discovered what was thought to be the western shore of

Terra Australis but which in fact turned out to be the West Coast of the South Island of New Zealand. Tasman's view that the land was unfavourable along with the time and distance to get to reach it meant that New Zealand was not occupied by Europeans until 1769 when Captain James Cook arrived and raised the Union Jack declaring New Zealand as belonging to England (Belich, 1996).

Musket trade and a debilitated Māori society

Trade was not only an important element of control pertinent to reasons for British colonisation of New Zealand, but also a colonial method employed by settler societies to gain dominance over their subordinate (Walker, 1990). In brief, when Port Jackson was established in Sydney in 1788 a shipping route and means for frequent contact to occur between Australian-based European traders and Māori allowed for more trade opportunities. This increase in contact laid the foundations for the dominant economic positioning Pākehā had over Māori to occur in later years, because it was these early contacts that led to the exporting of flax, timber, whale and seal products, and to permanent whaling stations being established. Thus, trade between European and Māori became a regular occurrence. In a later development, to further establish trade alliances between iwi and European settlers, Māori women of high status were married to captains of industry (Belich 1996; Orange, 1987). Thus, this early phase of trading between settler and Māori was marked by respect and reciprocity, "characterised by economic welcome" (Walker, 1990, p. 78) from Māori. For example, Captain Cook introduced potatoes to New Zealand which Māori incorporated into their diet. To form further ongoing trade relations with settlers Māori encouraged ship-jumpers and ex-convicts to live among Māori. Known as "intermediaries" (Bentley, 1999, p. 11) these settlers helped Māori trade with visiting European ships. In return, they were given land and wives to bind them into particular iwi (Bentley, 1999). By 1814, missionaries had arrived near established trader bases in the Bay of Islands and the Far North. The missionaries' role was twofold: to advance trade and to civilise Māori (Walker, 1990). Although missionary officials were perceived by Māori to be peacemakers, their involvement in trade led

to musket trading between Māori and Europeans in the 1820s which resulted in a decade and a half of destructive musket warfare between Māori iwi (Belich, 1996; Walker, 1990). Through the trade of muskets, by 1835, Māori became a debilitated society. It was not until the Reverend Henry Williams instructed missionaries to stop selling muskets and assume the role of educating Māori that Māori numbers in society began to grow once more. However, this process of settler government helping Māori survive in the “New England” (Osterhammel, 1997) through exposure to European education was premised by the notion of power and control, of dominance over the colonised, and led to the marginalisation and near-destruction of Māori language. These efforts were most evident in the colonial establishment of Christian schools to convert “Maori from heathenism to Christianity . . . from barbarism to civilisation” (Walker, 1990, p. 85). Thus, although the early coloniser/colonised relation began as one of reciprocity and respect through trade, it moved more toward elements of hierarchical order in that Māori ways of being were deemed barbaric while settler ways of being were seen to represent progress. Thus, earlier foundations laid to ensure the dominant economic positioning of the settler led to the settler’s claim that New Zealand was a New England. The method to cement this notion within New Zealand society was to establish settler dominance via agreement between British settlers and Māori.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi: A document for coexistence

For New Zealand historians the most significant event that occurred during early contact between settler and Māori was the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Consedine & Consedine, 2005; Orange, 1987; Walker, 1990). Generally, the signing of Te Tiriti on February 6th 1840 provided a starting point for dialogue to occur about past, present and future coexistence discussions that take place between Pākehā and Māori. In her history of Te Tiriti, Claudia Orange (1987) outlined the impact this document had on not only Pākehā and Māori trade, but also the coloniser/colonised relation.

For Orange (1987), the story of Pākehā and Māori coexistence and the ways in which settler dominance became legitimised, began in the early nineteenth century, after trade links between New Zealand and Britain had already been established. In 1835, two years after British resident James Busby arrived in the Bay of Islands to protect traders and settlers, he initiated the Declaration of Independence - an assurance by the colonial office that Māori would be protected, as long as this protection was consistent with due regard to and the interests of His Majesty's subjects. Although the Declaration was signed by 34 Māori chiefs of the Confederated Tribes of New Zealand (sometimes referred to as the United Tribes of New Zealand), problems of intertribal conflict and disagreements between Māori and Pākehā continued (Orange, 1987). Then, in 1837 Captain William Hobson was sent to New Zealand to investigate these problems. In the same year, he sent a report back to the London Colonial Office noting his concerns about intertribal fighting, prolific crime rates among British settlers and the ongoing trade disagreements between Māori and Pākehā. Hobson felt that Busby could not solve these problems through the employment of military force because Māori had become advanced in warfare. This led to the decision to annex New Zealand in a peaceful manner. However, to achieve annexation the British government needed sovereignty over New Zealand and could be obtained only with the consent of Māori (Orange, 1987). This situation led to the Secretary of State for the Colonies Lord Normanby, instructing Hobson in 1839 to gain the free and intelligent consent of Māori (Orange, 1987). The themes of Normanby's instruction centred on gaining control of British subjects, establishment of a civil government, employment of land purchase agreements and recognition of Her Majesty's sovereignty over New Zealand (Cheyne, 1975).

The intent to gain consent from Māori is the significant reason why Te Tiriti o Waitangi was required. However, for both Pākehā and Māori, discussions about this document are often fraught with contestation, primarily because two versions exist: the English language version drafted by Hobson in 1840 and the Māori language version translated by Henry Williams and his son Edward in the same year (Consedine & Consedine, 2005; Orange, 1987; Walker, 1990). For Orange (1987),

discrepancies in and contradictions between the two have been and continue to be an ongoing source of contention. As a general overview, these relate to interpretations of the following three articles:

1. Article One: All rights and power of sovereignty
2. Article Two: Exclusive and undisturbed possession of Māori lands, estates, forestry, fisheries and other properties
3. Article Three: Rights of British citizenship (Orange, 1987).

It is in past and present discussions around these three articles that contradictions between the two continue to be relevant today (Consedine & Consedine, 2005; Orange, 1987; Walker, 1990). What remains consistent throughout these discussions is that from Te Tiriti's inception onward, several different agendas have been promoted or influenced by different groups (i.e., iwi, missionaries, land speculators, or Pākehā representatives of the Crown) (Kawharu, 1989; Orange, 1987). For example, it is an accepted view across Pākehā and Māori that of the 512 Māori Chiefs who signed the Māori version, 346 signatures were gained because missionary officials had some influence over Māori (Orange, 1987). This is a key point to consider because it relates to the dominance of Pākehā/white ways of thinking. For example, Christianity had a clear impact on Māori ways of being in that Māori were influenced by the mana of the missionaries. However, in some cases missionary involvement employed deceptive methods to gain more signatures (Orange, 1987; Walker, 1990).

In the decades following the signing of Te Tiriti discussions between Māori and Pākehā about contradictions that arose from the two versions centred primarily on sovereignty and governance and their translations, the words *kāwanatanga* (function of governance by the Crown) and *tino rangatiratanga* (absolute authority autonomy of Māori). William's translation of the English version into Māori did not clearly spell out the implications of *kāwanatanga* and *tino rangatiratanga*, or the impact that annexation and colonisation would have. Thus, there was an imbalance

of power between settlers and Māori in favour of the settler. The dominance of settler power was soon enforced through various Government Acts that ensued (see Appendix 2) which marginalised, disenfranchised and quashed any hope Māori had of regaining their once dominant status; maintaining their tino rangatiratanga (Orange, 1987; Walker, 1990). In 1974 the New Zealand Government set up the Waitangi Tribunal (Orange, 1987) to investigate grievances between Māori and the Crown that occurred after the 10th of October 1975. However, no power was given to readdress breaches to Te Tiriti that had occurred before this time (Temm, 1990). This clear intent to omit earlier breaches ensured that Pākehā (the now emergent dominant group) remained in power over Māori. Thus, a clear signal was given to Māori; that Pākehā were not going to leave New Zealand; that Pākehā dominance would be maintained by Pākehā and their institutions. It was not until 1985 that the Tribunal began to investigate breaches that occurred from its inception in 1840 (Consedine & Consedine, 2005; Walker, 1990). However, in the effort to maintain Pākehā power, settling any grievances that had been proven by the Waitangi Tribunal investigations was often minimised by successive governments, in that restitution for Māori was scant (Consedine & Consedine, 2005). It has not been until the last decade, when senior Māori Ministers have been involved in settling breaches of Te Tiriti by the Crown that any significant settlements have occurred. Some more recent settlements have been milestones for Māori (i.e., since 1985, there have been more than 1000 claims lodged with the Waitangi tribunal with a total value of about \$600 million: Commercial Fisheries [\$170 million], Waikato-Tainui raupatu [\$170 million] and Ngāi Tahu [\$170 million] make up the bulk of this) (Treaty FAQs, 2010). Many further claims are still in progress. However, the value of these settlements represents only a small fraction of the values of the lands and resources lost.

Makings of an *us/them* relation

For Beatson and Shannon (1990), coexistence between Pākehā and Māori relates to the coloniser/colonised relation. Thus, they suggest the history of coloniser/colonised coexistence can be meaningfully conceptualised as comprising

five stages. The first, from 1769-1860 was a period of initial “contact and co-existence” (p. 138) when Māori, having the clear majority of the population, were able to maintain their dominance over Pākehā. According to Beatson and Shannon, it was during this stage that it seemed possible for two ethnic groups along with their respective political economies to equally coexist primarily because they needed each other (i.e., Māori wanted to acquire new technology, goods and techniques from the British, while the British needed access to resources: the most important being land). In this early stage Māori remained dominant over Pākehā. For Howe (1977), one reason for this was because Māori had considerable autonomy due to Māori land ownership being collective and permanent. Also, Māori had prowess in warfare:

The most interesting characteristic of Maori-white relations in the years before 1830 resulted from the fact that at the time the Maori’s feeling of self-confidence and of superiority towards the Europeans was totally justified. The Maori could have destroyed all the Europeans in New Zealand at any time with little difficulty. (Wright, 1959, pp. 40-41)

However, Māori did not use their warfare expertise because they viewed the settlers as important traders and teachers of new skills and technologies (Wright, 1959). Nevertheless, Pākehā settlers felt resentment toward Māori because Māori held the balance of power (Pearson, 1989, 1990). For example, the physical supremacy of Māori in relation to any trade privileges afforded to the European settlers resulted in the beginnings of an uneasy coexistence between Pākehā and Māori whereby dominance became contentious, ambiguous and difficult to define. The situation was summarised best by Belich (1986) in his description of coexistence between Māori and Pākehā during the first ninety years when he wrote: “if Europeans mistreated Maoris, they would be killed . . . if Maoris mistreated Europeans, trade would stop” (p. 19).

Beatson and Shannon’s (1990) second stage, the period from 1860-1890 was characterised as a period of war and moreover, “consolidation of Pakeha political and economic power” (p. 146). During these decades the Pākehā political system became entrenched, normalised as the *status quo* and was rendered as such under the

authority of the Crown which began to take land from Māori through various means. For example, the 1862 Native Lands Act was designed to break down Māori communal ownership of land; the 1864 Native Reserves Act saw land reserved for Māori put under settler control; the 1864 Public Works Land Act enabled Government to take land from Māori and to compensate only those Māori who were considered loyal natives, and the 1880 West Coast Settlement Act stipulated that any Māori in Taranaki could be arrested without a warrant and jailed for two years if they hindered in any way the surveying of property (Beatson & Shannon 1990; Walker, 1990) (also see Appendix 2). To prevent land confiscation and to gain some form of indigenous representation and power and autonomy, many Māori tribes joined together in resistance. The King movement in the Waikato region is one example (Beatson & Shannon 1990; Walker, 1990). However, resistance tactics employed by the King movement led to the arrival of more British troops in New Zealand and a decade of land wars throughout the centre of the North Island ensued, decimating a once dominant Māori population. In the early 1870s a new opportunity arose for Māori to prevent land confiscation - passive resistance. Passive resistance emerged out of the leadership of Te-Whitu “the prophet of peaceful co-existence” (Beatson & Shannon 1990, p. 148). Passive resistance was an attempt by Māori to regain some autonomy in their own country, or in other words, to regain some level of authority over their own affairs and ways of being. However, Pākehā institutions set up to marginalise Māori increased in the following years and new methods were employed by Pākehā authorities to further strengthen the social order of New Zealand i.e., Pākehā on top. At the individual level, there was rejection of the collaboration between Pākehā and Māori and acceptance of Pākehā ways of being as natural and ordinary in relation to Māori ways of being, which were viewed by the Pākehā institution as primitive and savage. Thus, Pākehā dominance was normalised and legitimatised in the political and economic institutions established by Pākehā, for Pākehā.

The third stage, from 1890-1935, was a period in New Zealand’s history where the Liberal government of the time introduced social reforms which gave New

Zealand the reputation of being “the social laboratory of the world” (Beatson & Shannon 1990, p. 155). Significant here is that this new societal discourse addressed equality disparities and led to new ways of being a New Zealander. For example, in 1893 women were afforded the right to participate in elections and the Old Age Pension was introduced to “soften the harshness of social life” (p. 157). In the decades that followed Pākehā ways of being became conscientised in the minds of the general New Zealand public through the development of the “national character” (p. 158) of New Zealand, and stereotypes of a/the typical Pākehā Kiwi male, “. . . in gumboots and black singlet, dedicated to rugby, racing and beer” (p. 158). Thus, although the shaping of Pākehāness (as separate to being British) began in these decades, ways of being Pākehā reflected Pākehā dominance/superiority over Māori in that these early conceptualisations failed to acknowledge that being Pākehā was relational to being Māori, in other words, failing to acknowledge that te ao Māori had anything of value to contribute to Pākehāness or the Pākehā informed national character of New Zealand (a perception that has continued to be evident in New Zealand society and its institutions in the following years). Thus, it was the failure of the Pākehā government of the time to accept that te ao Māori had something of value to add to New Zealand society that resulted in the emergence of a new academically educated group of Māori in the first decades of the twentieth century which led to the development of a New Zealand discourse about the Pākehā/Māori relation which critiqued (from a Māori/subordinate perspective) the ways in which Pākehā superiority and dominance had been and was being maintained. For example, the Young Māori Party led by Apīrana Ngata, Peter Buck and Maui Pomare, fought for Māori rights, community health programmes and economic reconstruction amongst tribal groups who had been marginalised through loss of land and resources. It was these Māori leaders who promoted the idea “to survive in a modern world, Maori people must become proficient in the skills of the Pakeha” (Beatson & Shannon, 1990, p. 162).

Beatson and Shannon (1990) argued that a fourth stage, from 1935-1984, revealed the political dominance of the “The Welfare State” (p. 166). In terms of the

Pākehā/Māori relation, Pākehā population in the cities remained high while the population of Māori was generally scattered among iwi groups throughout the country. Māori in search of employment began to move toward the cities away from their traditional resource base (whenua/land), much of which had been removed from them. This movement contributed to the further erosion of Māori authority, their language and ways of being. Thus, Māori were forced to assimilate into a Pākehā world because it was Pākehā ways of being that had been naturalised as ordinary and legitimised as such through the established and ongoing colonial, economic and political actions and discourses of the time.

Beatson and Shannon's (1990) fifth stage, the "de-regulated economy" (p. 180), was the period between 1984 and 1990 when a "user pays" system was introduced by the Pākehā government. For Māori, this was another time of struggle. Nonetheless, extending on from the efforts of educated Māori in the earlier decades, Māori political and social representation became more prevalent and was strengthened by the re-examination and recognition of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Aided by the Iwi Transition Agency which was formed in 1989, which helped to restore the tino rangatiratanga Māori had lost in previous decades, more robust, open and equal discussions between Māori and Pākehā about the contradictions of Te Tiriti took place. However, while acknowledging this many Māori still felt that the Pākehā government's attempt to fulfil its obligations - to address the historical wrongs that had occurred, was not adequately resourced, while many Pākehā still felt their government gave too much consideration to Māori. Hence, the *us/them* relation remained as a topic of great confusion and contestation and continues to be the case in the present day

The term "Pākehā"

In 2010, discussions about the Pākehā/Māori relation continue to revisit what being Pākehā and interacting in a respectful manner with Māori, might mean for both

peoples. For many Pākehā, the origin of these discussions lies within the model of assimilation, considered by many Pākehā to offer a better way forward for New Zealand. The “we are all one people” notion promoted by some Pākehā reflects this viewpoint (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999a; Hindmarsh, 1995; McCreanor, 1995; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). However, this discourse minimises the significance of indigenous rights, that is, Māori rights, Māori language, Māori ways of being and fails to recognise the importance of equality between groups as being an essential component of a “good society” (Prilleltensky & Fox, 1997). Therefore, for many Pākehā the decades between 1990 and 2010 were a time when Māori grievances were highlighted and when the government’s responsibility to honour Te Tiriti was beginning to be addressed. It was in these years that a re-examination of Pākehā ways of being and more specifically, exploration into the term Pākehā and ways in which the term fits with the Māori/Pākehā relation in terms of the national character of New Zealand, took place. In this thesis, my general employment of the term Pākehā follows Michael King’s (1985) argument that Pākehā as a descriptive noun which has meaning, relevance and appropriateness within the New Zealand context and its history. For many Pākehā the term is not generally seen to be overly contentious (King, 1985). Therefore, my employment of the terms Pākehā, Pākehāness and Pākehā ways of being refers to the people of New Zealand who represent the general culture of the wider white settler population of New Zealand; a group of people that are relational to Māori yet different in some way to Māori. Thus, I align my thinking toward King’s (1985) thinking, that the terms Pākehā and Māori serve as “a kind of shorthand to describe two broadly separate though not homogenous cultural traditions . . . two different forces in New Zealand by which people can choose to organise their lives” (p. 13).

I now briefly discuss the basic evolution and meaning of the term Pākehā in New Zealand’s recent history from the 1950s to the 2000s. A more detailed discussion of settler and postcolonial Pākehā constructs and the ways in which these impact on general Pākehā ways of being will appear later in my theoretical discussion of this thesis. Nevertheless, I include here a brief discussion of the origins of Pākehā

to highlight its relevance in relation to discussions about biculturalism and multiculturalism that have occurred over recent decades.

According to Paul Spoonley (1991), a Pākehā academic who grew up in New Zealand, the term Pākehā “seldom appeared” (p. 146) in the 1950s and 1960s. Spoonley argued that it was not until the 1970s that this term related to a “specific cultural group” (p. 148). Spoonley also pointed out that in the 1980s employment of the term Pākehā had become a “political statement” (p. 146). During the 1980s Michael King’s book *Being Pakeha* (1985) gave further credence to the term as describing people who were distinctly different from their British-forebears. In 2000, Rose Black articulated the term as:

A unique and indigenous word for the non-Maori settler of Aotearoa/New Zealand [that] implies an acceptance of Maori as a separate cultural entity . . . a relationship with Maori as a Treaty partner, a cultural identity for people of Northern European origin and a sense of uniquely belonging to Aotearoa/New Zealand. (Black, 2000, p. 1)

In the 1990s discussions about Te Tiriti o Waitangi, biculturalism, and Pākehā/Māori relationality continued to emerge in conversations about being Pākehā (Spoonley, Macpherson & Pearson, 2004; Vasil, 2000). For Hindmarsh (1995), the 1990s were a time when many Pākehā refused to enter into debates about sovereignty because many felt that past Te Tiriti grievances did not need to be resolved. However, not all Pākehā felt this way. In the 1990s Pākehā became notably divided in their views about biculturalism (Hindmarsh, 1995). Some believed in the discourse of “we are all one people” (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999a; Hindmarsh, 1995; McCreanor, 1995; Wetherell & Potter, 1992) and in the notion that integration of Pākehā and Māori culture should occur. However, others were more in favour of honouring the obligations of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and tino rangatiratanga, promoting equality not assimilation as a way forward for New Zealand (Hindmarsh, 1995; McCreanor, 1995).

The multicultural nature of the population of New Zealand in the 2000s has moved discussions about Pākehāness and biculturalism towards multiculturalism. Archie's (2005) *Skin to skin: Intimate, true stories of Maori-Pakeha relationships* demonstrated how mixed relationships between Pākehā, Māori, Pacific Islander, Chinese and Asian peoples moved discussions about New Zealand's demographic from bicultural to multicultural. However, this position on multiculturalism as defined by Black (2000) whereby Pākehā are at located at the centre, is a position that is not consistent with Te Tiriti o Waitangi which would locate Māori *and* Pākehā at the centre with all other seeking to establish relationships with a bicultural centre.

If we are to find a better solution for Pākehā and Māori relations any exploration into this must surely begin with an examination of Māori and Pākehā relationality - where both peoples are at the centre, particularly when discussing colonial and postcolonial history, sovereignty, tino rangatiratanga and the place of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in our past, present and into our future. In the New Zealand context, investigations into biculturalism do situate Pākehā and Māori as central. However, when discussions about biculturalism began to emerge in the 1980s these discussions were informed by radical antiracism practices in the USA and Britain (Spoonley 1988; Potter & Wetherell, 1987) which led to government implementation of biculturalism through policy that did not incorporate the *practice* of biculturalism (Kelsey, 1991). As Kelsey (1991) stated:

Biculturalism is a policy (although often not a practice) whereby Maori staff and cultural behaviours are accommodated within the broader framework of neo-colonial institutions, while Maori community agencies are given superficial administrative responsibility but remain dependent and subservient to Pakeha power brokers. It is a soft option which avoided addressing Maori self-determination and provides a modern day, more culturally sensitive and saleable form of discrimination. Many who consider themselves progressive stress the need for Pakeha to understand and embrace biculturalism – and assume the extent of any further concessions to Maori will depend on how far and fast Pakeha are prepared to move along this path. (pp. 43-44)

In 2011, as in previous years, the examination of biculturalism inevitably leads towards discussions about multiculturalism. A reason for this may be because

the story of New Zealand's history has relied on multiple perspectives, views, silences and truths to achieve a specific portrayal of Māori and Pākehā relationships which is palatable to the general public and in favour of Pākehā (Huygens, 2007). Therefore, discussions about multiculturalism today may appear more relevant to New Zealand society because these discussions relate to the current New Zealand demographic, whereas discussions about biculturalism began many years ago when the demographic of New Zealand was quite different. Nevertheless, what is explicit about biculturalism today is that it situates Pākehā and Māori relationality in a postcolonial relation that recognises being Pākehā is separate from being Māori.

CHAPTER TWO / Te wāhanga tuarua:

Theoretical premises

“Nā Tāne i took, ka mawehe a Rangī rāua ko Papa, nāna i tauwehea ai, ka heuea te Pō, ka heuea te Ao’... It is by the strength of Tāne that Sky and Earth were separated and Light was born... a metaphor for the attainment of knowledge or enlightenment (Trad.)” (Grace & Grace, 2003, p. 62)

Introduction

This thesis is drawn from the postcolonial debates and politics of colonisation, the coloniser/colonised relation, decolonisation, and theories of postcolonialism and movement between groups (e.g. Ashcroft, Griffiths & Tiffin, 1995; Bhabha, 1994; Giroux, 1992; Giroux & McLaren, 1994; Spoonley, 1995; Young, 1990, 1995, 2001, 2004). In this chapter I explore a range of postcolonial concepts/theories that help inform ways in which *us* and *them* binaries have been and continue to be perpetuated in a society. Here, I employ the term *dominant group* to describe a/the cultural group whose culture constitutes the implicit norm for the broader society (Tyler, 1992). I explain a range of processes that occur when members of this group choose to move back and forth between their group and another group and I demonstrate various pathways these members take when engaging with other groups. Primarily, the chapter explores complexities and difficulties that exist for these dominant group members in various societal settings when transformation from dominant ways of thinking to alternative ways of thinking occurs. Thus, my focus here is to explore theoretical perspectives, concepts and pathways dominant group members might take to change the way they view themselves and their others.

In *Conceptualising movement between groups*, I first discuss colonisation and its processes in the European and British context and the effects of colonisation on the colonised and coloniser. I look at the theory of Orientalism and focus on the

ways in which Othering processes have informed, intertwined and conceptualised Whiteness as a race/culture that is the superior/dominant group in societies where an *us/them* relation exists. In *Revealing the third space*, I then explore Bhabha's (1994) hybridity and the third space as a lived experience. Here I look at various contexts where third space experiences occur and thus, provide a vocabulary or discourse for talking about and showing ways in which third space interactions disrupt assumptions group members may hold about movement between groups. Following on from this, I locate my argument to the New Zealand context, demonstrating ways in which the experiences of eighteenth and nineteenth century "Pākehā Māori" (Bentley, 1999; 2007) were conceptualised as third space experiences. In part three, *Pathways to change*, I discuss what happens when movement occurs between groups. Here, I look at explanatory theories and pathways of change for dominant group members as they engage with another group. I end the chapter on decolonisation - a pathway to change that serves as an effective tool to help group members seek new and enriched relationships with other groups.

CONCEPTUALISING MOVEMENT BETWEEN GROUPS

Colonisation

The origin of European colonisation goes as far back as least as far as the fifteenth century, when the Portuguese utilised the technologies of geometry, ship building and gunpowder to sail around the world and impose their rule upon non-European "discovered peoples" (Thorn, 2000, p. 10). For Osterhammel (1997), colonisation was informed by religion, racism and validation of these. For example, the *Inter Caetera Bull* of 1493 gave legal validation to Spain's claim to America, ignoring the rights of indigenous peoples and creating assumptions and myths about Spain and its indigenous peoples (Davenport, 1917; Osterhammel, 1997). The *Inter Caetera Bull* was a proclamation to take over land and culture and led to the development of the *Requirement*, a doctrine to justify the forcible imposition of the rights proclaimed (Spanish, French & English Settlement, 2008). Although the

Requerimento offered indigenous peoples the blessings of Christianity and the protection of the Spanish, Portuguese, French, and/or English Crown, if they did not accept the conditions the Crown had the legal right to employ military force. This situation led to many indigenous peoples being killed or scared into submission (Osterhammel, 1997). From the fifteenth to nineteenth century European colonisation extended to Asia and the Americas and developed into imperialism: that is, the European endeavour to obtain new economic markets spread the word of Christianity and move discovered peoples from barbarianism toward a European/British model of civilisation (Thorn, 2000). Thus, “European colonisation was founded upon inequality, exploitation, and even genocide inflicted by white upon non white peoples” (Thorn, 2000, p. 4).

In general, academic discussions about colonisation centre on imbalances of power and its processes in the coloniser/colonised relation. For Young (2001), the origins of these discussions emerged from indigenous peoples’ politics in colonised societies and extended to indigenous peoples’ re-visitation of the coloniser/colonised relation in countries where the coloniser remained dominant. What followed was a more robust and sophisticated exploration into postcolonial theorising of the power imbalances that occur between colonised and coloniser groups - and more specifically - processes of colonialism (Spivak, 1999). These discussions were encompassed within the frame of postcolonialism because:

[Postcolonialism] . . . names the activities by which new subaltern histories, new identities, new geographies, new conceptualizations of the world . . . are fashioned and performed, and seeks through them to redress current imbalances of power and resources in the pursuit of more just and equitable societies. (Young, 2001, p. 66)

Emphasising that colonisation involves unequal power relations is important for this study because it helps explain how a nation can systematically, economically and politically exploit its indigenous peoples - dispossessing them of their land, culture, beliefs, language, and social structures. For example, for Native American Indian writer Vine Deloria Jr., power imbalances between the coloniser and colonised

were predicated on an expression of dominance and superiority which was based on the colonisers' belief that they had the right to take over lands occupied by their subordinate. For Deloria, this belief was expressed in racism and religion and validated in law (Deloria & Lytle, 1984). Deloria referred to this power imbalance through the metaphor of a bully taking something from someone without that person having any consideration for the rights of those who had been bullied (Deloria & Lytle, 1984).

For Osterhammel (1997), writing about British colonisation practices, colonisation involved two phases. The first was discovery of new land. The second involved the systematic and bureaucratically supported economic exploitation of that land by the coloniser. Enriques (2000) - writing about process of colonisation in general - expanded on this second phase by suggesting it was meaningful to conceptualise exploitation as proceeding five key steps. In brief, they were:

1. Denial and Withdrawal – the colonialists deny the very existence of a culture of any merit among indigenous people.
2. Destruction/Eradication – the colonists destroy and eradicate physical representations of the symbols of indigenous cultures.
3. Denigration/Belittlement/Insult – new colonial systems are created within indigenous societies (i.e., colonial churches, colonial-style health delivery systems, new legal institutions). These colonial systems of power denigrate, belittle and insult the continuing practice of Indigenous culture.
4. Surface Accommodation/Tokenism – whatever remnants of culture remain are given token regard.
5. Transformation/Exploitation – traditional culture is transformed into the culture of the dominating colonial society (Enriques, 2000).

Because an important element of British colonisation was the establishment of a “New England” (Osterhammel, 1997), various methods were employed by the coloniser to marginalise indigenous people from their land, culture and resources.

This approach led to colonial law and religion being informed by colonial peoples and thus, becoming the unquestioned and unchangeable “given” of the institutional status quo (Enriques, 2000; Osterhammel, 1997). To institutionalise colonial dominance in law, religion, education and society lends its hand to the manifestation of the Other as the subordinate group.

I now explore the theory of Orientalism with a focus on processes of Othering central to Orientalism and the negative and/or positive impact these processes have on the ways in which one group views another. Here, I highlight that Othering processes have a direct relationship with colonisation because in postcolonial countries, subordinate peoples are often encouraged, directed or forced to assimilate their way of thinking into the colonial way of thinking. If subordinate peoples rebel, or fight to remain independent of, or disconnected from dominant ways of thinking, they may be Othered as different, strange or ultimately inferior. Later, I draw from Said’s (1978, 2003) Orientalism and Sardar’s (1999) explorations into Othering, to demonstrate how similar Othering processes have had a negative effect on Pākehā entering into te ao Māori.

Edward Said’s pivotal work *Orientalism* (1978) opened up discussions about culture, society, politics, and a plethora of intersecting arguments about history and the West. Implicit within Orientalism exists the *us/them* relation, an ongoing element of interaction between the West and its Others. Like Said (1978), Sardar (1999) also maintained that the origins of Orientalism - and more specifically the maintenance of processes of Othering, began with Christendom’s encounters with Islam which led to Islam being Othered as the “original site of Western desire . . . a lure to the desires of Western civilization” (p. 2). Broadly speaking, Islam was conceptualised as “East”, “elsewhere”, “Other” to Christianity and the West. Thus, the *East/West* relationship was developed into *conceptual* distance, “a concept separable from any purely geographical area” (Sardar, 1999, p. 24). Conceptual distance was maintained by the West through execution of its power and control over another group (Goldberg,

1993). For Sardar (1999), the politics of power and control in the twentieth century are an expression of Orientalism at the global level, because:

the old European colonialism has been replaced by neo-imperialistic superpower politics of a single superpower . . . Orientalism is transformed into an expression of globalized power and becomes both an instrument for exercising that power and containing perceived threats to that power. (p. 110)

Connected with power and control is the maintenance of differences between groups and the ways in which these are constructed and interpreted. In Said's (2003) Afterword to his original 1978 work he pointed out that "construction of identity . . . involves establishing opposites and 'others' whose actuality is always subject to the continuous interpretation and re-interpretation of their differences" (p. 332). Thus, projected differences are relational in that they are sustained by established negative stereotypes of the subordinate group. Establishing stereotypes then maintaining them gains traction when there is mystification of the Other (Eagleton, 1991; Said, 2003). In a similar vein, Pincus (2006) suggested that Othering stereotypes remain constant because the Other is constructed as "*unlike the dominant group in profoundly different, usually negative, ways*" (p. 17, italics in original). In other words, members associated with a subordinate group are characterised as "*bad, unworthy, or deeply discredited because of the category that he or she belongs to*" (p. 17, italics in original). Thus, movement towards a subordinate group is seen as movement away from progress. Hence the development of the expression "going native" which in itself does not draw from individual experiences but rather, is more about the efforts employed by dominant group members to exert their control and maintain their positioning as dominant to those peoples deemed their subordinate.

In general terms, notwithstanding elements of mystery and desire, history has shown that the West interprets the Other in a negative manner - an interpretation that occurs because of the West's desire to control and dominate. Said (2003) alluded to this phenomenon when describing the events that followed the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on the United States. Referring to the West's "will" to dominate, Said

argued that there was “a profound difference between the will to understand for purposes of co-existence . . . and the will to dominate for the purposes of control” (p. xiv). Within processes of Othering it is this imperative of control that functions as a central element in order to maintain boundaries within an *us/them* relation (i.e., civilised vs. going native; white ways of being vs. Other ways of being). Nevertheless for Said, boundaries are locations where identity is contested, fought over and interpreted within an *us/them* relation and it is the contestation of these boundaries that involves “varying degrees of projected inferiority and strength” which “testify to a willed imaginative and geographic division made between East and West” (p. 201). In this thesis, my employment of the *us/them* relation specifically relates to the Pākehā/Māori relationship whereby the dominant group (Pākehā) and their ways of being are positioned as *us*, while movement by individual Pākehā away from this way of being are seen to represent movement toward *them*. Thus, for Othering processes to be effective, the dominant group (Pākehā) must maintain its boundaries and its projected superiority over their Others (i.e., Māori and/or Pākehā who align themselves with te ao Māori). Pākehā employment of the “going native” strategy is one method of maintaining *us/them* boundaries in that Pākehā movement toward or alignment with te ao Māori, is generalised as movement away from progress - away from being Pākehā.

Connected with boundaries is Said’s (2003) conceptualising of “*latent* Orientalism” and “*manifest* Orientalism” (p. 206, italics in original). Latent Orientalism described the underlying negative and inferior assumptions one group had toward another group. For example, in the New Zealand context, latent Orientalism would describe the unconscious and unquestionable certainty held by European settlers arriving to New Zealand in the eighteenth century that the British were superior to Māori. And, even though first settlers were of working class, their hierarchical status to Māori remained as such because British settlers viewed Māori as their conquerable inferior (Orange, 1987; Walker, 1990). Said (2003) introduces the terms manifest Orientalism as the expression of latent Orientalism - through words, actions, policies and government Acts, to distinguish between conscious

beliefs and conscious behaviours. Although the practices of manifest Orientalism might change or evolve over time, they remain an expression of latent Orientalism. For example, in New Zealand Othering words employed by British settlers during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries described Māori as savage, primitive, backward, barbaric (Bentley, 1999, 2007). It was the employment of manifest Orientalism through government Acts (see Appendix 2) that led to the marginalisation of Māori language, culture and tikanga (Walker, 1990). Mandated through government policy, then established by way of institutionalised racism, this manifest expression of latent Orientalism was widely employed by successive New Zealand governments from the nineteenth century onwards. As Said (2003) writes, it is through processes of Othering that the basic assumptions of latent and manifest Orientalism are revealed, i.e., the “stability, and durability” of latent Orientalism and the “stated views” of manifest Orientalism (p. 206). Conceptually then, it is the stability and durability of latent Orientalism that informed the settlers view of Māori and it is through manifest Orientalism that beliefs about the differences between British worldviews and Māori worldviews were maintained.

Within this research study latent and manifest Orientalism are useful concepts to consider because they explore ways in which dominance was normalised, legitimised and rendered ordinary in New Zealand society and its colonial institutions which were set up to educate Māori. It was these institutions which were driven by the assumption that Pākehā ways of being were beyond reproach because of the hierarchical positioning and social status Pākehā held over Māori. Thus, Pākehā ways of doing things were institutionalised as forward thinking while Māori ways of being were Othered as inferior, barbaric, savage, in need of enlightenment (Bentley, 1999, 2007; Walker, 1990). Thus, differences in opinion about Pākehā and Māori worldviews were the result of Othering processes that had their foundations laid in nineteenth and twentieth century stereotypes of Pākehā and their subordinate - Māori (Bentley, 1999, 2007; Orange, 1987; Spoonley, 1999a; Walker, 1990). Essentially, when Pākehā choose to align themselves with Māori, whether that be through full immersion into te ao Māori, or through an individual’s choice to engage with te ao

Māori in some form (i.e., learning about Māori history, ways of being, protocols, te reo, tikanga) there is always potential for these Pākehā to be Othered by Pākehā. Othering occurs because the positioning of Māori as native, inferior, or below Pākehā has been embedded in constructions of white/Pākehā as the location of higher order in the Pākehā/Māori relation. It is the naturalisation of hierarchical order, i.e., Pākehā on top - that lends its hand to the exploitation of differences between Pākehā and Māori. Thus, the underlining assumptions of Said's latent and manifest Orientalism, that interpretation of differences remains a significant element of Othering processes, can be applied to Whiteness theory and the ways in which Whiteness is naturalised and rendered ordinary.

Investigations into Whiteness have primarily been concerned with historical and contemporary understandings of white as an identity marker, (Dyer, 1997; Feagin & O'Brien, 2003; Feagin, Vera & Batur 2001; Frankenberg, 1993, 1997; Hill 1997, 2004; Young, 1990, 2004). Ruth Frankenberg (1997), a pioneer in the field of Whiteness studies, observed that early explorations into Whiteness theory considered "the place of Whiteness in the contemporary body politic in Europe and the United States" (p. 2). Frankenberg's research involved "examining how white dominance is rationalized, legitimized, and made ostensibly normal and natural" (p. 3). Guess (2006) and Sullivan (2006) note that it was an established understanding that white ways of thinking have been legitimised and promoted as natural, as progress. Thus, for Frankenberg (1993, 1997), Feagin et al. (2001), Guess (2006) and Sullivan (2006), it can be suggested that Whiteness is informed through the durability of latent Orientalism (Said, 2003) which itself has been informed by the foundations of white as superior which were laid in the development of Eurocentric knowledge (Amin, 1989; Battiste, 1996; Goldberg 1993). Drawing on the work of Barthes' *Mythologies*, Eagleton (1991) suggested ways in which Eurocentric knowledge legitimised then promoted Whiteness as *the way of being*:

A dominant power may legitimate itself by *promoting* beliefs and values congenial to it; *naturalizing* and *universalizing* such beliefs so as to render them self-evident and

apparently inevitable; *denigrating* ideas which might challenge it; *excluding* rival forms of thought perhaps by some unspoken but systematic logic; and *obscuring* social reality in ways convenient to itself. Such ‘mystification’, as it is commonly known, frequently takes the form of masking or suppressing social conflicts, from which arises the conception of ideology as an imaginary resolution of real contradictions. (Eagleton, 1991 pp. 5-6, italics in original)

For Goldberg (1993) and Battiste (1996) it was the mystification of Whiteness as superior that is connected with racial hierarchy. For example, Goldberg argued that in the sixteenth century “hierarchy was the definitive feature of the universe” and that “domination of inferior by superior was considered a natural condition” (p. 25). Similarly for Battiste (1996), racial hierarchy or racial classification, was informed through Eurocentric knowledge because Eurocentric knowledge positioned Whiteness above anything else. This reasoning led to racial boundaries, classifications, “zones”, of “modernity or civilization or development” (p. 226). Thus, a clear distinction was made between the binary of civilisation and savagery. For example, the Middle Ages were a time when Whiteness represented civilisation while non white was characterised as the “*monstra* (monstrous)” of the Middle Ages, or “the *Savage Man*” (Goldberg, 1993, pp. 22-23, italics in original). The durability of these latent Orientalism stereotypes (Said, 2003) led to later conceptualisations of non white being associated with “violence and lascivious sexuality” (Goldberg, 1993, p. 29) i.e., the “Savage Man”, “Exotic”, “Oriental”, “Negro” and/or “Indian” (p. 23). For Appleby (1994), these stereotypes continued into the eighteenth century at which time they were incorporated into the Western heroic model of science (Appleby, 1994). The heroic model employed a process of experimental methods to measure racial hierarchical order and human truth - a method of privileging white as civilised over non white (Appleby, 1994). In the nineteenth century the status of white as superior was maintained though the stated views of manifest Orientalism (Said, 2003). This was revealed in the legacy of Enlightenment philosophy that is, its refusal “to acknowledge influences of other cultures” (Goldberg, 1993, p. 33). From the twentieth century onwards, investigations into Whiteness continued to reveal manifest Orientalism (Said, 2003) because they drew upon Eurocentric knowledge and Enlightenment philosophy. For example, Bonnett (2000) argued that the colour

white represented the “ultimate marker of power and modernity . . . a symbol of the natural, a sign beyond dispute” (p. 143). In the work of leading African-American feminist author bell hooks (1992) the experiences of white people reflected their “deep emotional investment in the myth of ‘sameness’” which reflects the “primacy of Whiteness . . . a sign informing who [white people] are and how they think” (p. 167). hooks found that white women confronted with African-American women’s views of Whiteness responded “with disbelief, shock and rage” because this was often the first time that these white women were “compelled to hear observations, stereotypes” (p. 167) that revealed Whiteness to be a site of privilege. Thus, hooks argued that a marker or symbol for Whiteness was privilege. This is evident when she pointed out that “white students respond with naive amazement that black people critically assess white people from a standpoint where ‘Whiteness’ is the privileged signifier” (p. 167).

In the twenty-first century discussions about Whiteness theory involve more current “widely socialized ideologies and omnipresent practices [that have been] based on entrenched beliefs about white superiority” (Feagin et al., 2001, p. 3). Feagin et al., argued that a contemporary examination of Whiteness must consider that ideologies and practices associated with being white have been naturalised as ordinary and thus embedded in the thinking of white populations and that this has occurred because of processes involving “widespread ways of feeling, thinking, and acting . . . [which are] deeply embedded in . . . white-centred-society -- in its culture, major institutions, and every-day rhythms of life” (p. 3). When connected with Said’s (2003) concepts of latent and manifest Orientalism, I adopt the view that Whiteness and its dominant positioning in social order has remained as dominant because of manifest Orientalism and the stated views white people have toward non white peoples. Drawing on a Foucauldian perspective, the politics of truth and those institutions that seek to produce and sustain that truth, it could be theorised that Whiteness is a concept “linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it” (Foucault, 1980, p. 133). Although a Foucauldian perspective may fit with my argument that Whiteness is maintained through processes whereby

unequal power imbalances exist between groups, I am more concerned with the individual experiences of people rather than with institutions of power. More specifically, my interest is in the kinds of experiences that occur for individuals who go against the *status quo* of their group. It is these people who represent an alternative view of their own group and ultimately, disrupt assumptions of individual group member behaviour.

REVEALING THE THIRD SPACE

Homi Bhabha is the leading theorist on hybridity and the third space. Ultimately for Bhabha (1994), it is through conceptualisations of the third space (as a location where negotiation of place occurs between groups) that “innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself” (pp. 1-2) emerge. In this study I extend Bhabha’s conceptualisation of the third space to an informative experience that occurs when movement between groups impacts on *us/them* relationships. Specifically, I look at ways in which individual movement between groups as a third space experience provides a vocabulary whereby individuals involved in this movement have a space to talk about those experiences that occur for them and around their movement. Important to note here is that it is movement between groups that has potential to either advance or hinder progress between groups. For example, Hoogvelt (1997) suggests that such movement has potential to lead to “a kind of superior cultural intelligence owing to the advantage of in betweenness, the straddling of two cultures and the consequent ability to negotiate the difference” (p. 158), while Meredith (1998) suggests that movement between groups helps people to “translate, negotiate and mediate affinity and difference within a dynamic exchange and inclusion” (p. 3). Also important to consider is that movement between groups highlights differences, in that the characteristics and traits associated with members of a given group are “patrolled . . . contested, defended, and fought over” (Lewis and Mills, 2003, p. 623). In noting this, I point out that my employment of the third space as an experience adopts Bhabha’s (1993) view that third space dialogue engages people in a process of translation, in that it is in the

translation of differences between groups that involves the fundamental third space component of all forms of communication. This is especially the case when dialogue between groups lends its hand to the revisitation of characteristics associated with hierarchical order, or ways of being and the *us/them* relation. For Bhabha, it is the third space perspective that challenges a/the dominant group's claims to racial hierarchy or social order in this relation. Thus, third space discourses shed light on ways in which hierarchical order has been legitimised, normalised or naturalised as ordinary, while third space perspectives offer a space whereby these ways of being may be critiqued with rigour. In this thesis, my employment and adaptation of the third space experience as a discourse for talking about movement between groups, looks more toward the shared experiences of third space actors and the ways in which their experiences disrupt essentialisms or truths associated with dominant and subordinate ways of being. For Bhabha, disrupting truisms from a third space perspective enables the mediating forces that take place when ways of being are contested to be critiqued with more rigour because it is the third space experience that highlights the ambivalence that exists in the construction of what is seen to be true. About this he writes:

The 'true' is always marked and informed by the ambivalence of the process of emergence itself, the productivity of meanings that construct counter-*knowledges in medias res*, in the very act of agonism, within the terms of a negotiation (rather than a negation) of oppositional and antagonistic elements. (Bhabha, 1993, p. 22)

Therefore, I have adopted Bhabha's (1993) view that the third space is a location where truth about ways of being are teased out, critiqued and expanded upon from a third space perspective. And, I adopt the view that the third space experience seeks to break the ordinary positioning white/Pākehā hold over Māori by challenging Pākehā dominance and by challenging Pākehā claims to social order from a third space Pākehā perspective. By doing this, I highlight that counter claims by Māori to this Pākehā positioning can have a positive and empowering effect on Pākehā. Thus, it is third space dialogue that engages Pākehā and Māori in a process of translation that critiques what is known as truth. And, as Bhabha points out, although the third

space may be a location of struggle, the benefits of investigating third space experiences are clear, in that third space experiences offer an alternative perspective to national histories - or what is seen to be historically true, because the third space experience turns the mirror upon ourselves. He writes:

. . . we should remember that it is the ‘inter’ - the cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the *in-between* space – that carries the burden of the meaning of culture. It makes it possible to begin envisaging national, anti-nationalist histories of the ‘people’. And by exploring this Third Space, we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of ourselves. (Bhabha, 1993, p. 35)

In this thesis, I employ the view that third space dialogue enables movement between groups to be understood as an individual experience, regardless of cultural identity. I take this stance because experiences of the third space occur outside of absolute identities in that Bhabha’s (1993) discourse is derived from the experiences of hybrid identities, or mixed identities, not fixed identities. Thus, Bhabha’s view that the third space represents a hybrid, changing space, “the *in-between* space” (p. 35) is helpful for this study in that the inbetween space is experienced by individuals as they navigate through perceived *us/them* constructs. Hence Bhabha’s argument that there exists no true or pure cultural space, other than what is seen to be known. Thus, communication and translation between groups along with negotiation of that movement, takes place regardless of the context in which this occurs, or the actors involved, because the *us/them* relation is an underlying concept that is continuously applied and employed when movement between groups occurs. In relating the coloniser/colonised *us/them* relation to the New Zealand context I adopt the view that third space Pākehā are Othered by some Pākehā because of their third space experiences, in that it is third space Pākehā experiences that highlight the location of “*in-between* coloniser and colonised . . . the space of cultural interpretative undecidability produced in the ‘present’ of the colonial moment” (Bhabha, 1993, p. 206). I also point out here that in New Zealand hybridity has generally been linked to Pākehā/Māori hybrids that is, half-castes, ngā tangata awarua, white Māori, and white natives (Bell, 2004b; Collins, 1999; Papastergiadis, 1997). It is these individuals of mixed descent who uncover what Bell (2004b) referred to as “a space between

essence(s) and identity” (p. 134) because for Bell (2004b) the lived experiences of hybrid identities help advance cultural exchanges between Māori and Pākehā. For Papastergiadis (1997) hybridity in the New Zealand context represents a positioning between Pākehā and Māori cultures that involves movement or transition between groups. Drawing on the work of Collins (1999), Bell (2004b) also referred to “transition” (p. 129) as movement from one culture to another. Bhabha (1994) considers that this transition occurs at the point where “cultural differences ‘contingently’ and conflictually touch” (p. 207), while Lewis and Mills (2003) describe transition as movement between boundaries, or “arbitrary dividing lines” that are “patrolled . . . contested, defended, and fought over” (p. 625). In the New Zealand context it is the challenging of boundaries between Māori and Pākehā that involves constant review and rewriting of New Zealand’s history because as Binney (1987) states, “Historical rewriting conveys an inevitable subjectivity, as well as a new objectivity, which enables people to see the past, and the present, afresh” (p. 16). Therefore, in New Zealand, exploration into past third space experiences allows for a more robust investigation into conceptualisations of being Pākehā today.

In general, it is my view that third space experiences provide a discourse for talking about inbetweenness that can be discussed, offered and given, without fear that one’s own identity is put at risk, because third space experiences are just that; an experience not an identity. I also suggest that third space experiences can be positive and empowering experiences of the inbetween. I am encouraged to speculate in this way because of evidence of the experiences of white sympathizers and profeminist men.

White sympathizers

On the evening of December 1st 1955, African American seamstress Mrs. Rosa Parks boarded the Cleveland bus in downtown Montgomery, Alabama, America. The law of the time stated that African-Americans could not sit at the front of the bus, even if seats were available. Mrs. Parks’ refusal to sit at the back of the

bus triggered the activist phase of the Montgomery Bus Boycott movement and subsequent civil rights movements that followed in America during the 1950s and 1960s. White Americans who supported the boycotts were known as white sympathizers (The Montgomery Bus Boycott, 2000b). These individuals, men and women, supported the boycott movements for varied reasons. For example, the Men of Montgomery (MOM), a group of white businessmen primarily concerned with the loss of profits suffered due to the large numbers of people boycotting the bus services, supported the movement, as did the Women's Political Committee (WPC), a group of white women concerned with the injustices that were occurring. The WPC was instrumental in helping organise subsequent boycotts after Mrs. Parks' arrest (The Montgomery Bus Boycott, 2000b). The Freedom Riders movement began in the aftermath of the Montgomery Bus Boycott (Arsenault, 2006). On May 5th 1961 the Freedom Riders, a group of African and white American men and women, boarded buses, planes, and trains to challenge the deep South's noncompliance with a US Supreme Court decision that prohibited segregation in all public transport facilities. On their journey through the Deep South, the Freedom Riders bus was attacked by a group of white American anti-boycotters. On arrival at their destination in Alabama on May 14th 1961, the Freedom Riders were met by anti boycotters, carrying lead pipes and baseball bats. Soon after the event, 350 of the Freedom Riders were placed under arrest and given a six-month sentence for breach of the peace, while the anti boycotters received no punishment (Arsenault, 2006).

This example is useful because it provides evidence of third space experiences that adds complexity to an *us/them* relation that existed in America in the 1960s. For example, in an article in *The Montgomery Advertiser* Sheenan, a white sympathizer wrote, "I would like to make it a matter of record that there are white bus riders in Montgomery who are honouring the request of our collared [sic] friends by refraining from patronizing the city lines in an effort to express our sympathy" (Sheenan, 1956). This account was clearly in contrast to the white anti-boycotters reinforcement of the *black/white* binary. For example, an article written by a white anti-boycotter in the same publication referred to African Americans in the following way:

You are indebted to the white people of Montgomery for life itself . . . the white doctor brought most of you into the world. The white man . . . furnished your jobs and a place to live . . . Now suppose the white people of Montgomery would not hire you any longer or give you a place to live, where would you go . . . (Hill, 1956, para. 4)

This example points toward privilege being given to Whiteness. And, it is from this privileged space that the stated views implicit in manifest Orientalism are uncovered, reflected in the comments of another white anti-boycotter in the same publication:

In every stage of the bus boycott we have been oppressed and degraded because of black, slimy, juicy, unbearably stinking niggers. My friends it is time we wised up to these black devils . . . If we don't stop helping these African flesh eaters, we will soon wake up and find Rev. King in the White House. LET'S GET ON THE BALL WHITECITIZENS. (Preview of the 'Declaration of Segregation', 1956, para. 3-4. Capitals Original)

These comments show that differences of opinion occurred within white American society during the civil rights movement which led to opinions about the black/white American relation being blurred, disrupted and contested. This occurred because there existed in society at that time, concern for equality from white American men.

Profeminist men

Concern for equality is a common theme within third space experiences. For example, from the first wave of feminism onward men have been actively involved in promoting gender equality (Banks, 1987; Flood, 1997; Jardine & Smith, 1987; Kimmel, 1987). Banks (1987) demonstrates that British men became involved in first-wave feminism during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, because they engaged in a process where advocacy for gender equality was the intended objective. In addition, the involvement of pro-feminist men in feminism paid little regard to their positioning as men. Instead, their involvement was premised on their “compassion for women as victims, or when the issue appear[d] to be a matter of

justice” (p. 123). Thus, these men endorsed processes of change that led to “the idea of complementary gender roles” (p. 118). For example, Banks referred to the movement against the Contagious Diseases Acts in Britain during the mid to late nineteenth century – a piece of legislation which allowed policemen to “arrest prostitutes in ports and army towns and bring them in to have compulsory checks for venereal disease” (Spartacus Educational, 2008). Banks (1987) writes that many men “wanted to bring men’s sexual behaviour under stricter control, not simply for the sake of women, but for the sake of morality in general” (p. 125).

For leading pro-feminist author Michael Flood (1997), men involved in feminism generally do so because they are concerned with gender equality, to “bring about gender justice and equality” (Flood, 1997, para. 2). Their support for gender equality meant that pro-feminist men rejected their own positioning in the men/women binary in favour of engaging in processes involving “alliances and relationships” with women in their efforts to disrupt the “‘us against them’ model” which was based on “a ‘war between the sexes’” (Flood, 1997, para. 30). For Kimmel (1987), supporting advocacy for equality was also a process men in America engaged in when they chose to become involved in first-wave feminism. For Kimmel then, men’s pursuit of complementary relations between men and women, and men’s support for women’s education, women’s suffrage movements, and birth control issues, would ultimately “benefit men” (p. 273) because men involved in feminism were well aware that advocacy for equality between groups does not favour one group over another.

It is important to point out here that a significant element of movement between groups involves maintenance of “pre-conceived” or “stated views” (Said, 2003) about group behaviour. When men support feminism, they disrupt general stated views and/or characteristics of men (Banks, 1987; Flood, 1997; Kimmel, 1987). For example, Banks (1987) showed that men who supported the feminist movement in Britain in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were viewed by anti-feminist men as “traitors to the masculine cause” (p. 123). However, men involved in

feminism had a different view of themselves, choosing not “to share the fears of the anti-feminists that the emancipation of women would ‘unsex’ them” (Banks, 1987, p. 114). In this anti-feminist/pro-feminist men gender context, pro-feminist men disrupt and challenge generalised characteristics of maleness. By challenging stated views about maleness, men involved in feminism participate in third space experiences which involve a process of change that has potential to transform society:

Men have a vital role to play in the transformation of gender relations begun by feminism and the women's movements. Profeminist men are welcome and important participants in this process. And by taking up gender justice as a personal commitment and a political goal, by living our lives in ways that make a difference, we both help ourselves and change the world. (Flood (1997), para. 31)

Equality then, is clearly an important element of third space experiences. It is the pursuit of equality that involves what Said (2003), Bhabha (1994), Hoogvelt (1997), Meredith (1998) and Hall (1990) interpret as the negotiation and mediation of conceptual distance and differences. Third space experiences uncover an alternative perspective of group differences. Flores and Moon (2002) suggest that an alternative perspective of group differences highlights ways in which essentialist thinking can be disrupted. Thus, third space experiences provide insights into group differences because they “highlight the many possible allegiances, some of which [are] rendered invisible by identity politics and essentialism” (p. 201).

Pākehā Māori

I now turn to the New Zealand context and explore ways in which third space experiences have to date, been articulated by Pākehā in a generalised and negative manner, that is, as going native or as movement away from progress and relate this with processes of Othering. I reiterate here that historically, movement by Pākehā toward te ao Māori reveals familiar language associated with the lexicon that is “going native”, in that because these Pākehā have moved towards te ao Māori or taken up a position that aligns themselves with Māori, for whatever reason that may be, they are Othered in a generalised manner; in a manner which repeats the language

employed by dominant groups to exert control over their Other. Nevertheless, to revisit Flores and Moon (2002), movement between groups does reveal a common third space experience because it is movement that draws “attention to the spaces between borders, such as those separating race, class, and nation” (p. 201).

In New Zealand colonial history, movement by a Pākehā toward te ao Māori has been described as a transculturite experience (Thorp, 2004). However, as Thorp (2004) and Bentley (1999, 2007) point out, although the term transculturite described movement between cultures it generally indicated detachment from one group and coming under the influence of another. In the late eighteenth and the early-to-mid nineteenth century Pākehā who moved toward te ao Māori were thus labelled because they were “temporarily or permanently detached from one group, and entered the web of social relations that constitute another society, and came under the influence of its customs, ideas, and values to a greater or lesser degree” (Thorp, 2004, p. 5). Trevor Bentley (1999, 2007) - a leading New Zealand historian in the field of ‘Pākehā Māori’ research considered that the eighteenth, nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were a time when there was no need for Pākehā to think about their ethnicity or culture and thus, no need for them to become interested in Māori culture or to enter into a process of change that enabled them to learn more about Māori. Those few Pākehā who did seek to find out more were seen by most Pākehā of the time to have strayed from what was considered a normal Pākehā way of doing things and were called Pākehā Māori - the culture-crossers of New Zealand’s colonial history (Bentley, 1999, 2007).

Bentley’s (1999) discussion of Pākehā Māori history not only demonstrated Othering processes in which Pākehā Māori were negatively portrayed but also revealed the more positive influence Pākehā Māori had on Māori and Pākehā interactions. For example, he referred to Pākehā Māori as “intermediaries between races”, a “third kind of New Zealander” (1999, p. 11). He found that because Pākehā Māori inhabited “the zone where Māori and Pākehā cultures merge” (Bentley, 2007, p. 11) that their experiences were “neglected by anthropologists and historians

interested in the study of acculturation and race relations” (p. 11). One possible reason for this neglect is that Pākehā Māori might have threatened the subordinate positioning of Māori *vis-à-vis* Pākehā. Therefore, efforts to maintain Pākehā social order over Māori extended to Pākehā Māori in the early nineteenth century because they were negatively stereotyped and Othered by Pākehā also. For example, “going native” meant that Pākehā Māori “were perceived by colonial authors to have rejected the world of progress, enlightenment, civilisation, order and morality and embraced a life of paganism and lawlessness” (Campbell, 1998, p. 4). Thus, Pākehā Māori were described as having “gone native” or “betrayed European values” (Bentley, 2007, p. 12). These kinds of negative stereotypes extended to processes of Othering and were an effort to exert Pākehā dominance because Pākehā Māori were Othered as being of “unsavoury, promiscuous character . . . over fond of alcohol and violence . . . almost more savage than the natives themselves” (Bentley, 1999, p. 10), or as “Pākehā from the most revolting side . . . greedy, covetous individuals who only put their mental and civilised supremacy to evil uses” (p. 221). Pākehā Māori James Caddell was Othered in this way:

This man . . . had been so accustomed to the sort of life led by savages that he had become just as much a cannibal as any of them. He had embraced all of their ideas and their beliefs, had believed in all of their fables, and had fallen in with all their customs . . . he was regarded as a very dangerous man . . . Caddell had lost his language as well as European customs, and soon became transformed, from an English sailor-boy, into the dauntless and terrifying New Zealand Chief. (Bentley, 1999, pp. 125-126)

Pākehā Māori Joshua Newborn (the prisoner) was also negatively Othered as violent and cannibalistic:

The prisoner, who was drunk . . . was exceedingly violent at the station-house, and vowed vengeance against the constable who took him there, threatening to feast upon his heart, and ‘lick his chops with his blood’ and during the greater part of the night he appeared to be dancing his war-dance in his cell, and screeching at the top of his voice. (Bentley, 1999, p. 93)

A further example is the way an unknown Pākehā Māori in the settlement of Whakatumutumu was negatively Othered as savage:

Near Whakatumutumu, on the Mokau, there resides a European, or Pākehā Māori, who has become almost more savage than the natives themselves: he is partially tattooed, and clothes himself in a mat or blanket; he has at least six wives, and adopts all the habits and the manners of the Māori people. (Bentley, 1999, p. 118)

Campbell (1998) viewed negative stereotypes of Pākehā Māori in the early nineteenth century as centred on “slogans” of “degeneration” (p. 4). Thorp (2004) believed that this framing occurred because Pākehā Māori resisted the Pākehā world of “progress, enlightenment, civilisation, order and morality” (p. 4). Thus, Pākehā Māori were treated by Pākehā as individuals who were “more degraded than the natives themselves” (p. 5). It was not until the mid-nineteenth century onwards - when Pākehā Māori were involved in aspects of trade and cultural exchange - that stereotypes of Pākehā Māori began to represent the changing dynamics of colonial New Zealand. For example, in the mid-nineteenth century, Pākehā Māori involvement in trade led to “dual and contradictory images of ‘good and ‘bad Pakeha-Maori” (Bentley, 2007, p. 2). Bentley (2007) writes:

Dominant images of Pakeha-Maori often fall into two broad categories in the colonial texts: those who were acceptable to Pakeha society and those who were not. Bad Pakeha-Maori were those who, close to Maori, rejected, resisted or failed to meet Pakeha norms, standards and expectations. Good Pakeha-Maori retained their European values and, often dignified and entrepreneurial, were easily incorporated into Pakeha myths of contact and settlement. (p. 306)

According to Campbell (1998), Pākehā Māori involved in trade helped advance Pākehā/Māori relations and as a result were “recognised by historians as being on the right side of history” (p. 4). However, as Bentley (2007) pointed out, stereotypes of Pākehā Māori were “crowded with judgements, values, illusions, and moral postures” that emerged from the narratives of specific nineteenth century Pākehā Māori identities; that is, “the Taupo ‘specimen’, Frederick Maning, Charles Marshall, Richard Barrett, Hans Tapsell, Barnett Burns, John Rutherford, James Caddell, Kimble Bent, and Jacky Marmon” (p. 306). These narratives were generally

written *by* mainstream Pākehā *about* Pākehā Māori men. However, there were some accounts written by Pākehā Māori themselves.

Bentley (2007) says “seventeen nineteenth-century Pakeha-Maori are known to have written or dictated accounts of their lives among Maori and many of these narratives were subsequently published” (p. 14). Most notable of these are Frederick Maning’s *Old New Zealand: A Tale of the Good Old Times* (Maning, 1863), Kimble Bent’s *The Adventures of Kimble Bent: A Story of Wildlife in the New Zealand Bush* (Cowan, 1911), and James Tapsell’s *A Trader in Cannibal Land: The Life and Adventures of Captain Tapsell* (Cowan, 1935). These men’s narratives demonstrate their introduction to, engagement and full immersion in te ao Māori in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Bentley (2007) claims that these narratives were contrived, because the Pākehā Māori who wrote them “were under pressure from editors or publishers to confirm the cultural stereotypes their readers had about Maori”. Their stories brought attention to “Cannibalism, headhunting and violence” (p. 14), rather than the experiences of Pākehā Māori themselves. For example in Bent’s 1911 narrative - although the first few chapters are dedicated to his initial contact with Māori in 1865 and provide background to his decision to “live with the Hauhaus [sic]” (Cowan, 1911, p. 5) and to never “ever see a white man again!” (p. 26) - the majority of his story is about Māori warfare, cannibalism and Māori customs. Bentley (2007) suggested that narratives of this kind were “widely read as ‘inside’ accounts” (p. 15) of Māori life, and reinforced the negative stereotypical beliefs Pākehā had about te ao Māori during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

According to Bentley (2007) it was these mid-to-late nineteenth century stereotypes that led to the reframing of Pākehā Māori as “New Zealand pioneers” (p. 306) and “agents of progress” (p. 298). Positive stereotypes continued into the early twentieth century because Pākehā Māori formed trade alliances and therefore held “an important place in contact history” (p. 300). However, from the mid-twentieth century onwards stereotypes continued to support the “dual and contradictory

images” of mid-nineteenth century Pākehā Māori. Jane Campion’s movie *The Piano* (1993) attempted to capture this lifestyle in a story set in mid-nineteenth century New Zealand in which a Scotswoman marries a New Zealand frontiersman and later formed a relationship with Baines, a retired Pākehā sailor who identified strongly with Māori. Baines was portrayed as a dual and contradictory Pākehā Māori who rejected Pākehā norms but nonetheless was still an agent of progress (Perkins, 1996).

Stereotypes of Pākehā Māori in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were conceptualised as inbetween that is, “between essence(s) and identity” (Bell, 2004a, p. 134). Research on the lived experiences of these Pākehā Māori uncovered an alternative perspective of colonial history. Thus, in the twentieth century, Pākehā writers of New Zealand history began to merge aspects of te ao Māori with their own understanding of what it meant to be Pākehā. Bentley (2007) observed:

Some Pakeha writers were attempting to resensitise themselves to issues of ancestry and national and cultural identity... In *Being Pakeha* (1985), Michael King maintained that he was ‘in parts of his spirit, Maori’... Carol O’Biso, an American, in *First Light* (1987), described her spiritual and cultural transformation during her association with the Te Maori exhibition. James Ritchie, in *Becoming Bicultural* (1992), also explored this transformative process, and how he empathised with Maori. These interests arose partly out of the writers’ desires to reinforce New Zealand Pakeha identity as unique, and long-prevailing ideologies that encouraged Pakeha to identify themselves as native to New Zealand. (Bentley 2007, p. 262)

In exploring Pākehā and their relationship with New Zealand history in this way these writers of New Zealand history employed a postcolonial approach to meanings of being Pākehā and thus, different ways of being emerged which challenged the ways in which history had been recorded. For example, Reilly (1986) investigated colonial narratives to show that interpretations of Pākehā involvement in history depended greatly on who was recording history, who was reading history, and for what purposes. For other historians, Te Tiriti o Waitangi was a site of further investigation.

In the standard story of New Zealand history (Fish, 1980; Nairn & McCreanor, 1991), Te Tiriti o Waitangi was generally considered by historians to be a blueprint - or living agreement between Māori and Pākehā: two communities whose interests are regulated through negotiation and compromise (Cox, 1993). Although educating Pākehā about Te Tiriti employs postcolonial thinking that is, “to change the way people think” (Young, 2003, p, 7) and is an attempt to encourage change at the individual level, early discussions about Te Tiriti often failed to address how Pākehā were different from British citizens. These discussions gave little attention to the possibility that differences might exist between Pākehā and the British because being Pākehā was generally not considered any different from being British until the nineteenth and early twentieth century (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999a). Then, in the mid to late twentieth century discussions about expectations of Te Tiriti uncovered more robust explorations into what it meant to be Pākehā *and* distinct from Britain. It was these discussions about being Pākehā and distinct from being British that become more sophisticated, leading to the relationship Pākehā had with Māori and to the notion of “we are all one people” (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999a; Hindmarsh, 1995; McCreanor, 1995; Wetherell & Potter, 1992) and the relationship this had with aspects of tino rangatiratanga (Bell, 1996a, 1996b, 2004a). Fleras and Spoonley (1999a) consider that the late twentieth century was a time when tino rangatiratanga emerged as a central element of conversations about the “foundational myth of ‘he iwi kotahi tatou’ (‘we are all one people’)” (p. 22). However, as they point out, defining what tino rangatiratanga meant for Pākehā was “a challenge” (1999a, p. 26) because the concept was one that evolved and changed and was also dependent upon Pākehā perceptions of biculturalism. Pākehā also found it difficult to pin down the meaning of the term Pākehā (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999a, 1999b; King, 1985, 1999a). For some New Zealanders, the Māori word “Pākehā” as a general term to describe white New Zealanders was simply “unacceptable”, considered by many Pākehā to be a term of “abuse” (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999a, p. 105). And, many Pākehā New Zealanders still felt that their British heritage had more relevance to them because they did not feel that any significant differences between New Zealand’s colonial history and Britain’s history existed (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999a). Thus, ambiguity

surrounding the term Pākehā led to its meaning and its relationship to Māori in the New Zealand context being explored more extensively by academics in their pursuit of understanding how the term has been understood and applied in New Zealand's history. This occurred because the early settlers who arrived to New Zealand in the 1800s developed their own sense of Pākehāness and ways of being which evolved over the following decades and merged into a more localised account of what being Pākehā and living in New Zealand meant for them, a way of being that was separate in some way from being British. Two key concepts came out of these explorations - settler Pākehā and postcolonial Pākehā. Generally, settler Pākehā of the late 1800s were of a higher social order than Māori (Barclay & Liu, 2003; MacPherson & Spoonley, 2004; McGregor, 1996; McGregor & Comrie, 2002; Walker, 1996). For Bell (2004a), Lawson (1995), Maclean, (1996) and Turner (1999a, 1999b) characteristics of settler Pākehā were informed by cultural hierarchy (Appleby, 1994). Thus, characteristics, traits and the ways of being of these Pākehā, were associated more with British norms rather than being associated with the influences of New Zealand, or the Pākehā/Māori relation that became more evident in future decades. Then, a shift occurred when settlers to New Zealand began including aspects of Māori culture with their own culture in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (Bell, 2004a; Lawson, 1995). In some cases, these Pākehā did so in their effort to lessen the burden of homelessness (Lawson, 1995, Turner, 1999b). While for Bell (2004a, 2004b) this form of cultural appropriation was an attempt to romanticise Māori culture with what it meant being Pākehā and distinct from Britain. However, for Jones (1999, 2002) appropriation was more about the methodical approach by British settlers to gain knowledge and power over Māori. Nonetheless, appropriation did move the discussions about characteristics of what being a Pākehā New Zealander might mean away from what being British might mean by localising the discussion more within the New Zealand context and within ways in which being Pākehā related with the more pressing and relevant Māori/Pākehā relation that became the main focus of inquiry. Thus, in the twentieth century, studies were more concerned with the Pākehā/Māori relation than they were with explorations into differences between being British and being Pākehā. For example, Tilbury's (1999)

study into Māori and Pākehā cross-cultural friendships found that although Pākehā had some “resistance” (p. 280) to accepting that Pākehā and Māori might represent one people, the idea did appear to improve Māori and Pākehā relations. This study reflected the findings of an earlier study by Allport (1954) who found that contact between peoples’ breaks down barriers and improves cultural relations.

Currently, it is postcolonial theory that has arguably superseded the outdated settler Pākehā discourses. Simply put, postcolonial theory employed in the New Zealand context endeavoured to reorient the way Pākehāness was understood by transforming the conditions of exploitation that occurred between Māori and Pākehā in New Zealand’s history. In doing this, a space for the Māori voice to be heard was revealed. Thus, the Pākehā/Māori postcolonial relation emerged at the centre of discussions about what being Pākehā means today. And, it is through the employment of postcolonial thinking that the connection between Pākehāness and Whiteness as a normal, natural and ordinary way of being emerged (Jackson, 1999). For example, Pākehā writers involved in the Network Waitangi Project found that being Pākehā was closely related to Whiteness because both concepts revealed characteristics associated with dominant group membership in an *us/them* relation (Bell, 2004a; Consedine & Consedine, 2005; Huygens, 2002; Huygens, Black & Hamerton, 2003; Margaret, 2002a, 2002b; Nairn, 1989, 2001; Sneddon, 2005; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). In the mid 1980s historian and biographer Michael King moved the focus away from this relation by locating the discussion more on the connection Pākehā had with Māori. Demonstrated in his own appreciation of Māori values and tikanga, King argued that acceptance and an appreciation for te ao Māori led to a more enriched perspective of what it meant to be Pākehā. Through his work, King argued that Pākehā should be encouraged to become educated in te ao Māori so that they might feel more comfortable claiming New Zealand as their home. In *Being Pakeha Now: Reflections and Recollections of a white Native* (1999b), King rewrote his original work for the “new social and cultural climate” (p. 9) asserting that like Māori, Pākehā have a spiritual and emotional connection to whenua (the land). He encouraged Pākehā to talk about this connection, to talk about what he referred to as

“Pākehā culture” (p. 7). Through revisionist writing (Belich, 1986) what developed out of this work was a new and enriched understanding of Pākehāness (Campbell, 2005; Huygens, 2002; Margaret, 2002a, 2002b; Nairn, 2001) that revisited past power imbalances between Pākehā and Māori. For example, Bentley’s (1999) revisitation of Pākehā Māori and the important role they played in early New Zealand society in relation to trade and cultural relations between Māori and Pākehā is an example of revisionist writing or postcolonial thinking that helped academic and social writers of Pākehāness explore what being Pākehā meant in the twenty-first century (Consedine & Consedine, 2005; Johnson, 2005; Slack, 2004; Sneddon, 2005). And, although the characteristics of Pākehāness may be gender based or changeable (Ballara, 1986; Bell, 1996a, 1996b), King’s *Being Pākehā Now* (1999) did demonstrate ways in which Pākehāness had been associated with the “New Zealand male stereotype” (Phillips, 1996, p. vii) as demonstrated in Phillips *A Man’s Country* (1987, 1996). A common theme within these works was that Pākehāness was understood in terms of the historical, political and/or cultural conditions of the time. For example, events during first contact and subsequent Pākehā and Māori engagement such as Pākehā and Māori land wars (Walker, 1990), Te Tiriti o Waitangi grievances (Orange, 1987), Māori sovereignty issues (Archie, 1995; Melbourne, 1995), the emergence of the kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa movements (Hingangaroa Smith, 1997, 1999) and of *whare kura* (Māori secondary school) and *wānanga* (Māori university) movements extended discussions about where Pākehāness fit within New Zealand’s national culture. It is these discussions that led to (re)interpretations of national identity (Sinclair, 1986; Hall, 1992) because Māori and Pākehā ways of being were now understood as relational, in that they impacted on one another. For example, our national rugby team’s rendition of the haka *ka mate* and the more recent *kapa o pango haka* connects Pākehā and Māori ways of being to a New Zealand way of thinking that is distinct from the greater global environment (Jackson & Hokowhitu, 2002; Hope, 2002). However, this interconnectedness emerges as contentious when the notion of “we are all one people” is revisited (Hope, 2002). I suggest that this occurs because Māori are viewed by some Pākehā as receiving special consideration from the New Zealand government. For example, in his emotive 2004 *Nationhood*

speech, then New Zealand National party leader Don Brash, suggested no special consideration for Māori should exist, arguing that such consideration was part of a “dangerous drift towards racial separatism in New Zealand” (Brash, 2004, para. 7). He believed that there should be:

no basis for special privileges for any race, no basis for government funding based on race, no basis for introducing Maori wards in local authority elections, and no obligation for local governments to consult Maori in preference to other New Zealanders. (Brash, 2004, para. 86)

Brash’s speech made previous discussions about equal rights and Pākehā/Māori relations (Ritchie, 1971; Ritchie, 1978) more fraught with controversy because he chose to ignore the relevance of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and contemporary New Zealand political life. Also, Brash’s speech failed to acknowledge the efforts of previous governments and their endeavours to address historic grievances that arose from major violations of Te Tiriti by successive governments since 1840. Nevertheless, in the twentieth and into the twenty-first century, Pākehāness generally referred to “New Zealanders of a European background, whose cultural values and behaviour have been primarily formed by the experiences of being a member of the dominant group of New Zealand” (Spoonley, 1993, p. 57). However, it is difficult to demonstrate which values and experiences helped inform this view. For example, mid-to-late nineteenth century characteristics of being Pākehā were informed by British and Christian norms while early twentieth century characteristics were more aligned with “New Zealand national character”, or “Kiwi men” (Beatson & Shannon, 1990, p. 158). From the late twentieth century onward discussions into Pākehāness evolved further through explorations into Pākehā responses to Māori events, issues and grievances associated with Te Tiriti o Waitangi claims and/or past government acts which marginalised Māori (see Appendix 2) which helped these Pākehā understand what Pākehāness meant for them. For example, Archie’s (1995) work discussed the responses of Pākehā to issues related to tino rangatiratanga and Te Tiriti o Waitangi, while King’s (1985, 1999b) work discussed Pākehāness as relational to te ao Māori. These works demonstrated that discussions about Pākehāness had moved towards

discussions of biculturalism. And, what emerges as significant with research into biculturalism by both Māori and Pākehā authors (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999a; O'Sullivan, 2007; Rata, 2005; Ritchie, 1992; Spoonley et al., 2004; Vasil, 2000) is that biculturalism research should acknowledge the importance of Māori and Pākehā as the founding peoples of New Zealand. About this, Fleras and Spoonley (1999a, p. 237) wrote:

In contrast with multiculturalism, which reduces all cultures to similar levels by treating them as the same, biculturalism acknowledges the special status of founding peoples as 'first among equals'. The concerns and priorities of the two foundation peoples rather than those of recent immigrants are seen as taking precedence in establishing the social and political agenda, without necessarily denying the rights of multicultural minorities to full and equal participation.

Thus, biculturalism's concern is coexistence of two cultures where equal respect is given to the values and traditions of two peoples and the implications of this to a nation's institutional laws and practices. However, for Mason Durie (2004) there are implications with the execution of biculturalism as a practice in institutional settings. He articulates this as a bicultural continuum:

Biculturalism has a range of meanings that can be represented across a bicultural continuum; at one extreme a type of cultural exchange, at the other an independent or semi-independent Māori organisation. Initially the bicultural objective was simply to introduce Māori values and cultural norms into the public sector so that Māori staff and clients could feel greater affinity with the department's processes. Later, because the cultural focus did not seem to address the essential functions of state departments, Māori groups (largely state employees) argued for making the department's core business more relevant to Māori. (pp. 12-13)

Therefore, for institutional biculturalism to be postcolonial in design that is equally effective for Pākehā and Māori, the values, traditions and ways of being of both peoples must be deployed equally within society and its institutions. O'Reilly and Wood (1991) had previously articulated this shared value systems as "co-existence" (p. 321):

the co-existence of two distinct cultures, Māori and Pākehā, within New Zealand society with the values and traditions of both cultures reflected in society's customs,

laws, practice, and institutional arrangements, and with both sharing control over resources and decision making. (p. 321)

Thus, from a postcolonial thinking standpoint, biculturalism would be concerned with the implementation then execution of shared Māori and Pākehā resources. However, as Hall (1992) points out, it is the practical application of biculturalism as a mode of thinking that may result in a reordering of characteristics, stereotypes and conceptualisations. In the New Zealand context Pākehāness and its relationship to Māori are associated with what Hall refers to as “*national* identity” (p. 291, italics in original) whereby Pākehāness remains at the top of social order. Nonetheless, the intent of biculturalism remains consistent, in that Māori and Pākehā are connected through history and belonging to the “stories which are told about it, memories which connect its present with its past, and images which are constructed of it” (Hall, 1992, p. 293).

From a postcolonial perspective, biculturalism should bring balance to Māori and Pākehā relations. However, Brash’s (2004) view of nationalism that is, that there should be no special consideration given to Māori and that the obligations of Te Tiriti o Waitangi should be ignored - is clearly disruptive to biculturalism because this approach does not recognise the type of relationship between Pākehā and Māori that postcolonialism requires. Therefore, New Zealand does not function as a postcolonial society in the true sense of the concept because in order for a society to function as postcolonial, equality between the coloniser and the colonised must appear in all settings and levels such as equal representation at policy level, in education, and in the development, implementation and delivery of strategies that reflect equality for both peoples. Nevertheless, in New Zealand we are more fortunate than some other colonised countries because we have open and ongoing dialogue between Pākehā and Māori at both the societal and individual levels. What I am suggesting is that although New Zealand does not function as a postcolonial nation, postcolonial thinking is employed at the societal and individual levels through the work of Pākehā and Māori writers of history and Pākehā/Māori relations such as King (1985) and

Walker (1990). Furthermore, individuals living in New Zealand - whether they be Pākehā or Māori, do have the ability to move toward postcolonial thinking should they wish to do so either individually or collectively and it is this ability to move that represents the hope of the nation of becoming postcolonial. However, hopes for societal betterment can also lead to ideals in which the relationality of societies peoples merge “into one cultural identity, to represent them as belonging to the same great national family” (Hall, 1992, p. 296). For example, nationalism at the societal level constructs “identities by producing meanings about ‘the nation’ with which we can *identify*” (Hall, 1992, p. 293, italics in original). Therefore for Hall (1992):

national identities are not things we are born with, but are formed and transformed within and in relation to *representation* ...where a nation is not only a political entity but something which produces meanings – *a system of cultural representation*. (Hall, 1992, p. 292, italics in original)

Although Hall’s (1992) early perspective may be useful to explore further, from a postcolonial thinking perspective at the individual level, national identity does not explicitly explain how or why individual lived experiences of biculturalism and nationalism are experienced differently for each individual. Further, national identity does not specifically shed light on the kinds of experiences that occur when Pākehā explore their own third space experiences and ways in which these might impact on their individual understanding of the greater national family they belong to. One reason for this may be because early Pākehā views about biculturalism, nationalism and Pākehā and Māori relationships reflect what Nairn and McCreanor (1990, 1991) suggested at the time to be popular Pākehā opinion about New Zealand.

In their work, Nairn and McCreanor (1990, 1991) analysed an extensive body of literature relating to Pākehā and Māori relations finding that in general, most Pākehā saw Māori as the problem with Pākehā/Māori relations and viewed Māori as the peoples who should find a solution to national issues of equality so that Māori could learn to fit within the more popular Pākehā view of New Zealand society. No suggestion was given that there might exist in individual Pākehā an alternative

opinion about this. Moreover, there was no suggestion that Pākehā should look into themselves so that they might develop an alternative Pākehā view of their place in New Zealand society. Kirton (1997) suggested that this lack of motivation by Pākehā to search for new and enriched ways of being Pākehā may have resulted in Pākehā being unable to perceive New Zealand society as racist. Nevertheless, there are various Pākehā who have always had a degree of involvement with Te ao Māori and have put forward alternative views that differed from popular Pākehā opinion (e.g. Sutherland, 1940). For example, in 1954, Dick Scott - a Pākehā journalist, published a book, *The Parihaka Story* and then a later edition, entitled *That Mountain: The story of Parihaka* (1975). In these works Scott mourned the fact that Parihaka was not even located on government published maps of New Zealand. The popular Pākehā view of the time was that Parihaka had no place in New Zealand's geography. In the mid 1970s, *Justice and race: A monocultural system in a multicultural society* paper was presented to the New Zealand Race Relations Council by a Pākehā activist group - the Nelson Action Group (1973). This paper critiqued the Pākehā New Zealand justice system by offering a third space perspective of Māori involvement in the New Zealand Court system. In *Te riri Pākehā: The white man's anger*, Simpson (1979) advocated a third space view toward te ao Māori representation as well as Māori and Pākehā relations. Simpson suggested that in general, Pākehā were angry at Māori primarily because of the history Pākehā and Māori share and the ongoing contentious issues that arise from this. Simpson's view was in contrast to popular Pākehā opinion - that New Zealand was not a racist society. In another example, in the mid 1980s the Department of Social Welfare came under scrutiny from a group of Pākehā staff members. In collaboration with Māori staff, these Pākehā found that some Pākehā were involved in occurrences of institutional racism within the department (Women's AntiRacism Group, 1984; Māori Advisory Unit, 1985). Then, in the late 1980s, Claudia Orange's study, *The Treaty of Waitangi* (1987) extended Scott's (1954, 1975) and Simpson's (1979) work by providing a third space perspective of New Zealand's history which was in contrast to the popular perspective held by a number of prominent Pākehā historians of that time. Then, in 1989, *Honouring the Treaty: An introduction for Pākehā to the Treaty of Waitangi*

was published by Pākehā academics (Yensen et al, 1989). This publication focused on the responsibility Pākehā should grasp to address Pākehā and Māori relations in relation to Te Tiriti issues. The publication was a direct and supportive Pākehā response to the work of pioneering Māori academics Donna Awatere (1984) and Ranginui Walker (1990). Hence, when Pākehā involved themselves in Māori initiatives they disrupted popular Pākehā opinion. I argue that this occurs because Pākehā involvement in te ao Māori reveals a third space experience of Pākehā and Māori relationships; a third space experience of what McCreanor (2005) refers to as the “standard story of race relations” (McCreanor, 2005, p. 65) in New Zealand.

In general, the standard story of New Zealand history reflected Pākehā and Māori engagement as harmonious (Fish, 1980, Nairn & McCreanor, 1991, 2005). For example, McCreanor (2005) concluded in his review of Pākehā discourses from 1979-2002 that in general Pākehā society:

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 of race relations in the world. (p. 65)

To show how a more accurate description of Pākehā/Māori relations might sound like, McCreanor (2009) in a later publication offered this example as popular Pākehā opinion:

This country needs to get over this politically correct rubbish about colonisation. We used to have the best race relations in the world before a few radicals started stirring up trouble with the Maoris filling their heads with ideas and hopes that are completely unrealistic. All this nonsense about the Treaty which is ancient history that I wasn't party to, has gotten even the good Maoris, riled up, demanding and troublesome, thinking that they should get land and compensation. The problem is that Maori culture can't foot it in the modern world and it's being swept aside the same way the Maori did to the Moriori – at least we didn't eat them. Maoris are pretty upset about this but they've started ramming their language and their powhiris and their tangis down our throats. They need to move on and forget about losing what they never owned, pick up the spade, put on the suit and put their shoulder to the common wheel for the national good. We're one people now, kiwis, and we don't want Maori rights for this and that, privileging them and dividing our country. (p. 9)

Consedine and Consedine (2001) demonstrated that a similar Pākehā view existed when they argued that Pākehā in general, felt that Māori have “had a good deal” (p. 101). It is this popular view held by some Pākehā and the scant attention given to a third space view that sustained popular Pākehā views as superior. In another study by McCreanor (2005) about Pākehā history and engagement with Māori, McCreanor concluded that the standard story had persisted. McCreanor also added that there existed a new Pākehā view that Māori had received unfair privileges at the expense of Pākehā.

It is popular Pākehā opinion about Pākehā and Māori relations in New Zealand that clearly suggests change for the better is in the hands of Māori. This is because in general, tensions for Pākehā revolved around the problematic binary Pākehā and Māori share from first contact onward. Māori activism, Māori claims for better representation in government were responses by Māori to achieve tino rangatiratanga and equality within this binary and reflected a postcolonial way of thinking in order to promote change in New Zealand society. However, it is popular Pākehā opinion that suggests Māori must change their view about New Zealand society. In other words, change for the better has nothing to do with Pākehā changing the way they see Pākehā/Māori relations. I argue that it is the involvement of Pākehā with Māori that helps Pākehā view popular Pākehā opinion as inaccurate. For example, Meredith (1998) found that Pākehā interest in te ao Māori (i.e., learning about reo, tikanga, or whakapapa) helped Pākehā transform their understanding of “culture and identity” (p. 4). This transformation occurs when Pākehā “reconcile and overcome the embeddedness of past antagonisms” (p. 4). I take the position that Pākehā who enter into experiences of te ao Māori reconcile past antagonisms because they learn to develop a new and enriched third space perspective of New Zealand society. It is this postcolonial way of thinking that offers a powerful starting point for Pākehā to learn from and to develop a different view of their Pākehāness and the ongoing relationship Pākehā and Māori share.

DECOLONISATION

In this section I take a general overview of border pedagogy (Giroux, 1992) then focus more closely on decolonisation as an effective pathway of change employed by minority or subordinate group members engaged in an *us/them* relation. I then tease out ways in which subordinate groups are ideologically and economically viewed in society and localise my focus toward the New Zealand context and, specifically, the development of a decolonisation model for Pākehā. I discuss current Pākehā models of decolonisation where biculturalism is promoted. I then relate my discussion to wider theoretical perspectives of movement between groups discussed in the earlier sections.

Pathways to change

From a cultural perspective, when members of one cultural group take steps to understand another cultural group, cultural relations between groups often changes for the betterment of both groups. For example, Allport (1954) found that contact between different peoples advances cultural relations. A main focus of this study is to demonstrate ways in which some dominant group members (Pākehā) become postcolonial in their thinking *because* they choose to engage in Māori perspectives/views of society. Importantly, I acknowledge here that in most of the theoretical work carried out around movement between cultures or groups the general focus has been on subordinate populations. Little attention has been given to the reasons why dominant group members may choose to adopt or include another cultural group's perspectives as means to "better" understand themselves, but the opportunity to cross borders was always the privilege of the dominant group. Because discussions around movement by dominant group members are limited, I have chosen to include the more robust current theories and perspectives that explore subordinate peoples and their reasons for movement, and consider what they might have to offer to my theorisation of movement by dominant group members, as a pathway to change.

Henry Giroux's (1992) border-crossing is one concept employed by theorists to understand processes of change that occur when movement occurs between groups of people. Principally, border-crossing related to a subordinate group member's movement toward a more dominant group and was generally conceptualised as not resulting from the individual's choice (Giroux, 1992). In contrast, this study postulates that Pākehā make the individual choice to move freely back and forth between their world and te ao Māori. Therefore, while border-crossing in its original form may not be the most appropriate concept for this study, Giroux's theory of "border pedagogy" (p. 28) is useful because it represents postcolonial thinking in that, discourses designed to rewrite "the relationship between the margin and the center by deconstructing the colonialist and imperialist ideologies that structure Western knowledge, texts, and social practices" (p. 27). And, when applied to movement between groups it is postcolonial thinking that unravels master narratives, truths and boundaries that seek to maintain boundaries between peoples. For example, as a theory, feminism recognises the "importance of challenging, remapping, and renegotiating those boundaries of knowledge that claim the status of master narratives, fixed identities, and an objective representation of reality" (p. 26). Thus, border pedagogy sheds light on the relationship between knowledge, power and differences, representing these as the practice of construction of knowledge within relations of power. Giroux writes:

At question here is the issue of who speaks, under what conditions, for whom, and how knowledge is constructed and translated within and between different communities located within asymmetrical relations of power. (p. 26)

When applied to the New Zealand context, I suggest that understandings of Pākehāness are constructed and translated through popular Pākehā opinion. This occurs because Pākehāness has primarily been informed by Pākehā (the privileged group). As Giroux (1992) pointed out, "those who are privileged... [are] privileged by virtue of the legacy of colonial power" (p. 28), a notion that fits within the Pākehā/Māori relation whereby a critique of Pākehāness represented a postcolonial thinking approach toward challenging "existing boundaries of knowledge" in the

pursuit of “creating new ones” (p. 28). Importantly, Giroux made the argument that when theoretical or conceptual boundaries of knowledge are challenged, new and enriched understandings of theory emerge which represent “a vital source for developing a politics of identity, community, and pedagogy” (p. 32). Thus, challenging the ways in which identity is contested when individuals move away from their identity group toward another, opens up dialogue about this movement and dialogue about the ways in which movement between groups might occur. Antonio Gramsci, writing about culture and political leadership in Italy in the early 1900s, pathways of change for the “ordinary people” were conceptualised in his theorisation of hegemony and commonsense which he developed during the rise of fascism in Europe. Gramsci argued that if change was to occur for the ordinary people it was the consent of the ordinary people that was required in order for the ordinary people to overcome the ruling class’s control or hegemony of that society, because the *status quo* of a society was maintained when the ordinary people consented to be governed by the ruling group’s ideas of what was best for them. Thus, reform was achieved by rejecting this positioning. However, in doing so, there may be some disadvantage to the ordinary people (Sassoon, 1993). Simply put, Gramsci (1971) theorised that counter hegemonic learning informed by the ideological consensus of the ordinary people helped to inform processes of change in society. Adamson (1980) later described this as a process of “active self-dedication of a class to its own self-education” (p. 144). Thus, I adopt this view that education as a pathway to change for a society and its peoples can be effective. For example, in the New Zealand context, Pākehā may comply with popular Pākehā opinion simply because they have not taken the opportunity to educate themselves otherwise. I suggest that Pākehā may be viewed as complacent about Pākehā/Māori relations and to practices of colonisation because they have maintained a “commonsense” (Gramsci, cited in Adamson, 1980, p. 151) approach to society in that the social, cultural and political environment in which Pākehā exist has been developed “amid concrete social, cultural and political circumstances which [he/she] not only does not choose but which embody assumptions about the world which [he/she] cannot initially even identify” (p. 149). Therefore, if Pākehā are to enter into a process of change they

should work through “a ‘series of negotiations’ which expose and repudiate the prevailing commonsense” (p. 151). The outcome being that these Pākehā engage in a change process that leads them to becoming practitioners of change, whereby they learn to employ counter hegemonic approaches to critique popular Pākehā opinion and thus, develop tools to address the concept of conscientisation as described by Freire (1975).

Paulo Freire (1975) explored processes of change that occurred at the political and societal levels from a psychological perspective when he theorised the ways in which illiterate farmers in Brazil addressed the oppressive practices of the Brazilian hegemonic political system (Freire, 1972, 1975, 1996). Like Gramsci’s concept of organic intellectuals (Adams, 1980, p. 143), Freire’s (1975) theories of pedagogical dialogue and the conscientisation of that dialogue by group members, placed much emphasis on education within groups as a key process to define, describe then maintain social order. Although Freire’s theory was primarily concerned with cultural action leading to liberation, he clearly acknowledged that subordinate groups are conscientised by another group’s “socio-cultural reality” (p. 27) because conscientisation occurred when group values, culture and ways of being were inserted and normalised in a society. Freire (1975) argued that members within a group challenged other members in that group through dialogue that disrupted the “dehumanizing reality” (p. 20) of their society and thus, become conscientised by their own liberation.

In the New Zealand context, when Pākehā educate each other about te ao Māori for example, by participating in Tiriti workshops, protest movements, or action groups, they become conscientised to an alternative way of thinking about New Zealand’s history, Pākehāness, and Māori and Pākehā relationships. However, generally conscious raising strategies of this kind may promote collective awareness more than individual enrichment. For example, Huygens (2007) demonstrated that Pākehā Tiriti workers felt it more productive when the delivery of Tiriti workshops was seen to represent a collective approach, i.e., “speaking with one voice” (p. 133).

However, this approach positions Pākehā within the coloniser/colonised relation as a collective group and does not necessarily address individual Pākehā perspectives or experiences associated with Tiriti issues. I suggest that Pākehā participation in conscious raising strategies helps Pākehā see the benefits of decolonisation models for Pākehā because it is these strategies that help Pākehā see that any process of change in a postcolonial relation should begin with the colonised group, rather than the coloniser. Tunisian writer and academic Albert Memmi (1965) argued that awareness of practices of colonisation helped members of the coloniser group understand a colonised perspective of colonisation and thus, understand ways in which the coloniser had failed to accept or give credence to another group's worldview. When applied to the New Zealand context, Pākehā may learn to become more aware that Pākehā institutions are the accepted norm today because colonial law was imposed as the only law because Māori law had been disregarded and suppressed during the colonial years (Walker, 1990) and that this is one reason why any discussions about Māori forms of law prior to colonisation no longer carry any weight within the legal discourses of New Zealand (Consedine & Consedine, 2005). Pākehā may also learn to become more aware that Colonial government Legal Acts of land confiscation, language suppression, culture eradication, and assimilation were employed by Pākehā to control and suppress Māori. I suggest that regardless of whether Pākehā are educated or uneducated about New Zealand colonial history and the racist attitudes that followed, attempts by Pākehā to change popular opinion about our history are likely to be resisted by other Pākehā, because the responsibility for the ills of colonisation are located with Pākehā. Thus, I suggest that it is up to Pākehā to enter into te ao Māori so that they may walk alongside likeminded people, regardless of culture or gender and become active participants in a process of change and resist implied essentialisms when discussions of culture or gender are raised. Profeminist men do this. For example, although feminist theory is primarily concerned with the emancipation of women as an oppressed group, intersections do arise between race and gender that render essentialist views of these constructs ambiguous. For example, bell hooks (1994a) argued that although white American and black American women were equally involved in a process of change to emancipate all

women, black American women come from a position of being doubly oppressed because they were oppressed by gender *and* culture. Nevertheless, both groups engaged in a conscious raising process of change in America because they were united in their efforts to promote equality for all. I argue that when men become involved in feminism, a similar double oppressive element unfolds. This occurs because men in general are viewed as the dominant gender and thus, profeminist men may not embody a popular male approach to feminism. The result being that they are the subject of prejudices from other men, e.g., “traitors” (Banks, 1987, p. 123). Nevertheless, the involvement of profeminist men in feminism does suggest that change can occur in society through the efforts of likeminded individuals. Another example as evidence of this is the involvement of white sympathizers involved in the civil rights movement in the 1960s discussed earlier, and which I revisit here.

When prejudice between groups occurs, actors in institutions of power (i.e., government officials, educators, business men/women) work together to institutionalise oppressive practices through education, policy and in general society. Referring to the oppressive practices employed by officials, educators and white antiboycotters in America during the 1960s, Feagin and Feagin (1978) described this process as the “prejudice causes discrimination model” (p. 2). Primarily, institutionalised racism in education facilities was an area where the model was most effective (Feagin & Feagin, 1978). Jones (1997) regards this as institutional racism that lent itself to two other discriminatory processes: 1) personal racism, where ongoing exposure to institutional racism enabled negative stereotypes or attitudes towards other groups to manifest, causing him/her to discriminate further against another group, and 2) ethnocentric racism, where values, beliefs and ideals of one group were embedded in society and were endorsed by the domination of that group over another (Jones, 1997). These two processes were maintained at both the individual and societal level and because of this, can help inform positive change at both these levels. For example, the civil rights movement was a pivotal time in black American history, where change began to occur for black as well as white Americans in general society. At the individual level, white sympathizers began to see

themselves as different in some way to the white antiboycotters. However, prior to 1960, the black American voice had little impact on white society, and the concept of a white sympathizer had not been imagined, because up until 1960 America society was a place where white dominance was normalised and legitimised as ordinary (Hill, 1997, 2004). Thus, movement by white sympathizers toward issues of advocacy and equality represented an alternative view, an alternative discourse to those views held by white antiboycotters. Ultimately, it is the white sympathizers who found effective ways of withdrawing their collusion in normalising and legitimising the ongoing white discourses that discriminated against black America.

In New Zealand society increasing recognition is given to the relationship Māori and Pākehā share. This is seen in the ongoing dialogue given to the problems and ambiguities/uncertainties in relation to past grievances, oppressive practices and unequal Pākehā/Māori relations. Although Māori and Pākehā may view issues of sovereignty, tino rangatiratanga and the responsibilities of Te Tiriti o Waitangi differently, in general, these discussions are in the open and have been since 1840 (Consedine & Consedine, 2005). Thus, Māori have had time to employ postcolonial thinking that is, time to employ effective practices to address institutional racism at both the societal and individual level. For example, the institutional reviews of *Puao-te-Ata-Tu* (1988) were a milestone for Māori and helped to inform future organisational responses to institutional racism. Similarly, the Royal Commission on Social Policy (1988) and Jackson's (1988) review of the criminal justice system critiqued the oppressive practices associated with colonialism (i.e., the marginalisation of a Māori way of doing things), highlighting these as pathways to institutional racism.

In New Zealand, investigations into oppressive practices generally focus on institutions where racism toward Māori might be manifest. As discussed in earlier sections, Pākehā have been, and continue to be, involved in these discussions, supporting, advocating and standing alongside Māori (e.g., Māori Advisory Unit, 1985; Nelson Action Group, 1973; Scott, 1975; Simpson, 1979; Women's

AntiRacism Group, 1984; Yensen et al, 1989). At the societal level, I suggest that when Pākehā align themselves with anti-racism or anti-oppressive processes, these Pākehā choose to participate in a process of change with other like-minded people and thus, engage in their own change process. At the individual level, I argue also that Pākehā can become postcolonial in their thinking by entering into a change process, without necessarily having to be part of any particular group or movement or initiative collective. And, although much has been written about the sudden emergence of Tiriti based programmes in the 1980s, generally discussions about the ways in which Pākehā individuals become postcolonial in their thinking remain on the periphery because it is collective Pākehā views of biculturalism that remain as a central focus. Notwithstanding this, Tiriti programmes do embody postcolonial thinking, because they offer Pākehā the choice to enter into discussions about Māori and Pākehā history, and its relevance to Pākehā today.

Like theories of feminism and anti-racism, decolonisation focuses on how members of a group (typically the less dominant group) change their thinking. As pointed out by Gramsci (1971) and Freire (1972, 1975, 1996), education was a key area where processes of change take place. But, as Feagin and Feagin (1978) pointed out, education was also a site where institutional racism can be manifest. Thus, educational facilities, work programmes and conscious raising initiatives often fail to address all perspectives. In general, the theories I have discussed so far have been developed to help individuals transform their understanding of oppression, marginalisation or disenfranchisement from hegemony, domination, and/or oppressive practices and are theories that consider the collective direction a community might take to overcome oppression or racism, or issues of unequal gender or culture relations. I now turn to the motivations and reasons why individuals within a dominant group (such as the participants in the present study) might choose to enter into a change process - specifically decolonisation. I draw from this discussion my development of a Pākehā decolonisation model.

Pākehā decolonisation

New Zealand is very different from most former British colonies because Pākehā, who now to a greater or lesser extent still identify as British, remain in the numerical majority. Nonetheless, most Pākehā have the potential to evolve their understanding about the relationship they share with Māori, because in general, Pākehā do not fear that the Pākehā/Māori binary will change. In the British (British/European) context, the term decolonisation first appeared in the 1940s and described the formal process of Britain/Europe handing over governance and control to the indigenous inhabitants of a colony (Smith, 1999). Decolonisation as a process gained traction in the 1940s because this was a decade when Britain no longer had the economic or political resources to “hold onto what they had” (Thorn, 2000, p. 6). However, this weakness, or lack of power, meant that colonisation, a process premised by physical occupation then economic and political exploitation, moved towards neo-colonialism (Young, 2001) or re-colonisation (Glover, Dudgeon, & Huygens, 2005).

British decolonisation was generally more concerned about the economic and political interests of the colonial power than it was with equality between settler and indigenous peoples (Thorn, 2000). This meant that British decolonisation involved the swift “retraction, redeployment and redistribution of British and European influences” (Darwin, 1988, pp. 6-7) which led to divisions and conflicts between ruler/settler and indigenous peoples. In other words, British decolonisation failed to address decolonisation as a “long-term process involving the bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic and psychological divesting of colonial power” (Smith, 1999, p. 98).

In the New Zealand context, decolonisation has until now been exclusively used to inform and analyse the processes employed by Māori that involve a critique of colonisation and its effects on Māori (Smith, 1999). It is within processes of decolonisation that discussions about Te Tiriti o Waitangi claims, land protests or occupations, Māori rights and tino rangatiratanga unfold. However, when Māori

engage in these discussions, their views are often labelled by Pākehā as activism, especially when these discussions draw out a popular Pākehā response to the Māori experience of colonisation (Kennan, 2008). Although some Pākehā have been/continue to be involved with Māori as activists, in general it is Māori who take centre stage when decolonisation is discussed in New Zealand. This is because decolonisation in the New Zealand context encapsulates a conscious raising initiative with practical outcomes for Māori; an initiative that seeks to bring balance to previous events and processes that have marginalised, exploited, and disenfranchised Māori from their land, culture, and resources (Smith, 1999). It is these processes of colonisation that led to New Zealand national culture becoming “that of the colonists and their descendents” (Mulgan & Sanders, 1996, p. 129) and ultimately led to twentieth century Māori resistance movements such as land protests. Māori began to establish their own pathways toward a process of decolonisation. However, these early attempts of Māori to make changes in New Zealand society continually met with Pākehā hostility because the hegemonic discourse was informed by assimilation not biculturalism as a way forward for New Zealand society (Harris, 2004; Walker, 1990). This reaction by Pākehā reflects popular Pākehā opinion of the time; that Māori might disrupt the Pākehā/Māori binary which was in favour of Pākehā. Thus, Māori involved in processes of decolonisation were stereotyped as activists because they were the members of society who gained some benefit from their actions. Because of this situation the starting point for a Pākehā decolonisation model is clearly different from that of a Māori model, because Pākehā have nothing to lose by entering into decolonisation, in that Pākehā remain as a dominant group member. And, it is unlikely that in the New Zealand context decolonisation for Pākehā would move society to a postcolonial nation status, whereby equal representation in government policy, initiatives and delivery would represent an equal 50/50 split between Pākehā and Māori decision makers. Thus, it is my view that decolonisation for Pākehā is helpful to Pākehā because it opens up a pathway to change whereby Pākehā have potential to develop a more equal and reciprocal relationship with Māori that offers Pākehā the possibility of becoming postcolonial in their thinking, in a nation that remains changeable.

So how might societal models of decolonisation help inform ways in which Pākehā might individually decolonise? As touched on in an earlier section, Memmi (1965) pointed out that the coloniser is heir to the benefits of colonisation such as status, wealth, education and cultural hierarchy which extend to the colonisers disfigurement, thus, colonisation “disfigure[s] the colonizer” (p. 147). Simply put, I suggest that this disfigurement is realised in the conscientised dominance implied in Pākehā *being* the coloniser. When Pākehā enter into a process of decolonisation they begin to unpack ways in which Pākehā have been materially privileged by British ways of thinking about colonisation, privileged by colonial practices that have normalised, legitimised and rendered ordinary the dominant positioning of Pākehā as natural and above Māori. Thus, through decolonisation the disfigured Pākehā comes to terms with the idea that dominance (when associated with the colonial positioning of Pākehā) disfigures Pākehā ways of being by rendering as normal the historical ways in which Māori were marginalised and disenfranchised from their way of being. Thus, I suggest that Pākehā have the potential to move towards a decolonising position by finding ways and means of withdrawing their collusion to the prevailing colonial discourses that have placed Pākehā as dominant and at the top of hierarchical social order. I argue that when individual Pākehā enter into a process of decolonisation, they begin to see how Pākehā dominance is a disfigurement, and they learn to become more aware of new discourses that refute discourses which normalise Pākehā dominance. This happens because Pākehā learn to become more critical of themselves and of the after effects of colonisation at first the societal level, and then later the individual level.

At the societal level, Thorn (2000) pointed out four general interpretations of a decolonisation model:

1. British decolonisation and the decline of the metropole, where Britain decided “it was no longer in their economic or political interests to stay” (p. 6)

2. The bipolar world of the superpowers model which came after the Second World War and was driven by “a fundamental re-distribution of world power in favour of the USA and USSR” (p. 6)
3. The rise of nationalism brought about by nationalism’s intent to liberate colonised peoples in Asia and Africa
4. “Decolonising the mind” (p. 7) which is primarily concerned with Kenyan intellectual Ngũgĩ wa Thiongó’s argument that the colonised are doubly alienated (Ngũgĩ wa Thiongó, 1986).

Ngũgĩ wa Thiongó’s (1986) argument connects white men with a process of change because decolonisation is evaluated on the “white man’s terms” (Thorn, 2000, p. 7). In brief, Ngũgĩ wa Thiongó (1986) demonstrated that the story of colonised peoples was retold through the white man’s “rose-coloured view” of the events leading to, during and after decolonisation (Thorn, 2000, p. 7). Also important to point out here is that the story of the colonised as told by the coloniser connects societal and individual experience. Franz Fanon (1963) earlier argued that it was the connection between the societal initiative and the individual experience that had impact at the societal level. Fanon suggested that in order for decolonisation to occur at the societal level, men must free themselves from colonisation at the individual level. In doing so, they learn to become new men in society. In other words, an individuals’ participation in decolonisation helps them become new decolonised men. I argue that despite the gender bias in Fanon’s language, conceptually, his notion of a “new man” can be applied to the positioning of the coloniser, and his/her efforts to become less disfigured by colonisation through learning how to become “fully a person” (p. 37) or fully postcolonial in their thinking.

In the New Zealand context and from a postcolonial thinking perspective, decolonisation models employed by government and delivered to groups of people in various settings such as Tiriti o Waitangi workshops help Pākehā engage with New Zealand history, where emphasis is placed on the relationship Māori and Pākehā share (Huygens, 2004; Orange 1987). This engagement involves participation by

Pākehā in a relationship building process between Māori and Pākehā (Huygens, 2004) that seeks to help Pākehā become more critical of themselves in relation to their own experiences of te ao Māori, thus connecting the societal initiative with the individual experience. It is this ethos of postcolonial thinking, to find a better way of doing things, to change the way people behave “to produce a more just and equitable relation between the different peoples of the world” (Young, 2003, p. 7), that connects the societal decolonisation experience with the individual experience. For example, Strobel (2001) understood decolonisation at the individual level as being about “learning to love one’s self again, of seeing one’s self as important enough to think and write about, of learning to face the truth and learning to tell the truth” (p. 50). hooks (1994) also considered individual decolonisation to be about healing one’s self - an holistic process that involved a connection between the individual and his or her community. hooks understood this process in terms of 13 sequential steps or stages involving the interrelationship of friendship, work, parenting, love, physical health and spirituality and their role in repairing the damage colonisation caused for the individual and his or her community, namely:

1. Learn to face and tell the truth.
2. Learn critical affirmation.
3. Have a vocation, a sense of calling.
4. Lessen stress. Be healthy.
5. Overcome addictions and co-dependency.
6. Learn creative dreaming and thinking: Create new images and self-representation.
7. Deal with grief.
8. Develop a passionate life. Love your body.
9. Learn to love.
10. Live in a community.
11. Let go of bitterness.
12. Love, the Earth, love your ancestors.
13. Practice spirituality (hooks, 1994).

hooks (1994) suggests that these 13 steps help people to decolonise because they encapsulated five specific learning experiences of:

1. Learning to face the truth about co-dependency and methods to overcome co-dependency
2. Learning to dream and think of new ways to self identify
3. Learning to deal with grief
4. Learning to let go of bitterness
5. Learning to understand the significance of spirituality (hooks, 1994).

When entering into decolonisation, learning experiences that follow a sequential process can help individuals become more postcolonial in their thinking. For example, Strobel (2001) demonstrated that sequences, or stages of learning were helpful for decolonising Filipino Americans in the USA because they helped each individual go through healing processes that emerged out of, “the wounded collective memories of colonized peoples” (p. 51). In the New Zealand context it is because Pākehā have access to Tiriti workshops, biculturalism training groups or government instructed decolonisation initiatives consistent with a stage or sequential model, that they become more postcolonial in their thinking about how Pākehā opinion had been “conscientised” (Hingangaroa Smith, 1999, p. 37) and institutionalised in education and health settings. In practical terms, it is these Pākehā who are more generally aware that Māori approaches to education (i.e., kōhanga reo, Kura kaupapa, Te Wānanga o Aotearoa) and health (e.g., Whare Tapa Wha model) provide practical solutions employed by Māori to address the negative outcomes brought on by processes of colonisation. Therefore, as New Zealand Pākehā we are quite fortunate because Māori do not exclude us from these settings. Indeed, Māori are typically very welcoming. Because of this, Pākehā are afforded opportunities to become more postcolonial in their thinking about themselves and the coloniser/colonised relation. It is the acknowledgement of this connection between the coloniser and the colonised that Hawaiian Poka Laenui (2000) suggested is the starting point for a decolonisation model to be effective in societies where both coloniser and the colonised remain.

Laenui's (2000) decolonisation model is useful because it connects the experiences of the colonised with the coloniser. Although Laenui related these experiences as *phases* of decolonisation, they do not necessarily unfold sequentially, or in stages, instead they "...can be experienced at the same time or in various combinations" (p. 152). In brief, Laenui's five phases are:

1. Rediscovery and recovery: people who have undergone colonisation live in a society that is a constant and overwhelming reminder of the superiority of that society over the indigenous one. The phase of rediscovering one's history and recovering one's culture, language and identity, becomes a fundamental element to the movement for decolonisation.
2. Mourning: people in mourning often immerse themselves totally in the rediscovery of their history. This phase may also be expressed in great anger and a lashing out at all the symbols of the coloniser. Great anger and frustration experienced as a result of the victimisation of indigenous peoples.
3. Dreaming: possibilities for a better social order are expressed, considered through debate and consultation. Decolonisation is more than simply placing indigenous or previously colonised people into the positions of the colonisers. Decolonisation involves re-evaluation of the political, social, economic, and judicial structures themselves and the development of new structures that can hold and house the values and aspirations of colonised peoples.
4. Commitment: people combine their voices in a clear statement of the desired direction.
5. Action: a proactive step taken based on consensus of the people (Laenui, 2000).

I draw from Laenui's (2000) framework as my Pākehā decolonisation model seeks to advance relationships between Pākehā and Māori. I reiterate here that the

starting point of decolonisation for Pākehā is different from that of Māori and therefore, involves a different approach. However, current investigations into ways in which Pākehā and Māori decolonise do suggest that the coloniser/colonised relation is important. For example, Archie's (2005) exploration into Māori and Pākehā intimate relationships demonstrated that discussions within these relationships revisit a coloniser/colonised relation. In Barnes (2006), investigation into Pākehā family experiences of kura kaupapa, the colonial relation was also implied. Therefore, I take the stance that the coloniser/colonised relation is a known and accepted binary in New Zealand society and has been the centre of debates about nationalism, the notion of "we are all one people", and issues of biculturalism. Revisiting this relation continues when expectations of Tiriti o Waitangi arise.

For many Pākehā, discussions about biculturalism or Tiriti o Waitangi grievances are more often addressed at Tiriti workshops or in formalised settings, rather than in their everyday lives. Thus, decolonisation models are generally encountered within educational institutions, or at marae, or in formal settings where attendance by Pākehā is not necessarily by choice. I am not suggesting here that such programmes are not successful, or unhelpful to Pākehā. For example, *Te Hui Pumaomao* (2002) was an example of a Tiriti and biculturalism training workshop that helped Pākehā and Māori to decolonise. Alex Barnes, a Pākehā who attended one of the workshops during 2002, wrote about the learning experiences he had while attending one of these workshops:

I had heard of "decolonisation" before. It had been included in a number of articles I had read, and had been mentioned countless times. For many years, the *Pakeha* [dominant white] culture in Aotearoa/New Zealand had initiated programmes on cultural safety and awareness. However, I found them to be tokenist and superficial towards both indigenous peoples and ethnic minorities. These programs acknowledged cultural difference, but failed in dealing with it. They lacked substance and ignored the political nature of relationships that had formed over time. They acknowledged, but did not change or challenge Pakeha dominance and understandings. Then I . . . participated in *Te Hui Pumaomao*, a decolonisation programme . . . We were discussing issues of power imbalance and institutional racism within an open forum. To my knowledge, this had never taken place before. The emphasis was on the constructive roles young Pakeha can adopt in building real

relationships with Maori, as opposed to blaming individuals, who had little to do with the current systems of oppression and inequality. We realized we had to be open to unlearning behaviours taught by the dominant system/paradigm. But I also understood that unlearning behaviour is a hard and complex thing to do, especially when surrounded by an environment that actively discourages it. What I learned in the decolonisation workshop is this: Being part of the dominant culture is not a bad or shameful thing. Instead, it creates an opportunity to make conscious, constructive steps in understanding the people of the land. It is obvious to me that the challenge starts with myself, with my pronunciation, practice, values and everyday thinking. Decolonisation brings with it the challenge of personal development, which will in time re-shape partnerships, families, communities and nations. (Barnes, 2002)

Through attending *Te Hui Pumaomao*, Barnes (2002) became more aware that postcolonial thinking was helpful for Pākehā. However, education and awareness promoted through these formalised forums may still have potential to lead to mere tokenism. For example, Spoonley (1995) found that initiatives promoting the relationship between decolonisation and Tiriti o Waitangi were often of this kind, especially when they were characterised by the desire of Pākehā to “restore the integrity of colonised peoples, and to create space for their institutions, practices and values” (p. 94). Nonetheless, *Te Hui Pumaomao* is an example of an education programme that was helpful for Pākehā because it helped them become postcolonial in their thinking about te ao Māori and about the relationship Māori and Pākehā share, a topic focused on by two more recent studies, Jellie (2001), and Campbell (2005).

Jellie’s (2001) and Campbell’s (2005) separate studies provided examples of how Pākehāness, biculturalism, and decolonisation might be interconnected when meanings of “being Pākehā” are explored. Jellie’s (2001) study, which involved 12 Pākehā learners of te reo, argued that Pākehā become postcolonial in their thinking through learning and developing an understanding of te reo and tikanga Māori. Through the employment of a quantitative questionnaire method, Jellie uncovered two significant findings: 1) when Pākehā learn more about te ao Māori, they develop awareness of movement back and forth between two worlds, and 2) there were three significant reasons why Pākehā chose to learn about te ao Māori, because they had affinity with te ao Māori, because they had advocacy for social equality, or because

they were influenced to do so by family or friends. What is also significant about Jellie's study was that overall, the experiences Pākehā had of te ao Māori were positive and rewarding. Specifically, Jellie looked at the *experiences* Pākehā had when they were engaged in learning te reo and the ways in which these experiences helped to explain what being Pākehā means. Jellie's study was primarily concerned with explorations into the term Pākehā and its connection with te reo Māori for Pākehā, rather than with investigating the overall experiences of Pākehā who engage with Māori in different contexts. Nonetheless, she does suggest that when Pākehā learn about reo they develop empathy for te ao Māori because they have positive experiences (i.e., enrichment is gained from learning about another culture; a sense of privilege that Pākehā have access to learn te reo; a feeling of comfort that Pākehā can engage in settings which promote te ao Māori (Jellie, 2001). However, Jellie found also that Pākehā involvement in te ao Māori (specifically within Māori learning institutions) can lead to negative experiences, especially when these Pākehā are exposed to negative comments or negative stereotypes about Māori from other Pākehā. Another significant finding was that Jellie's participants felt that their knowledge of te reo was at times a burden, because they felt there was some responsibility to uphold the knowledge they had learned. Although the study did not go into specific detail as to why participants felt this way, she does suggest that knowledge gained from te ao Māori is knowledge that should be imparted to other Pākehā.

Campbell's (2005) study explored biculturalism and, more specifically, what it meant to be bicultural for a group of self-identified Pākehā-bicultural practitioners of psychology. Campbell found that, for these Pākehā, becoming bicultural involved engagement and commitment in changing contexts and settings which were often constrained by "essentialising assumptions" (p. 110). These assumptions related to the Pākehā/Māori relation. Her participants used metaphors such as a "battle" and a "journey" to describe their experiences of movement back and forth within this relation. They also referred to the terms "heart biculturalism" and "fake biculturalism" (p. 178). Campbell suggested that heart biculturalism occurs when

Pākehā are receptive and open to learning about te ao Māori, are respectful and compassionate towards te ao Māori, and have openness to “working through aroha” (unconditional love) (p. 178). In contrast, fake biculturalism is simply considered as “tokenistic” (p. 178). Thus, for Campbell, it is through experiences of heart biculturalism that Pākehā have positive encounters with te ao Māori, implying that decolonisation occurs when Pākehā become open to learning about te ao Māori, and open to having compassion towards events or issues that marginalised Māori over past decades. These events and issues include government acts/laws that eradicated aspects of Māori reo, tikanga, culture, the failure of Pākehā education institutions to recognise the importance of Māori language for Māori studying in education settings (Bishop, 1999; Smith, 1999; Walker, 1990) and grievances suffered because the responsibilities of the Crown as outlined in the Te Tiriti o Waitangi were not honoured by subsequent New Zealand governments (Orange, 1987; Consedine & Consedine, 2005). Thus, Campbell’s (2005) study implied that in order for Pākehā to decolonise, they need to develop awareness of Pākehā hegemony in various institutions.

Both studies suggest that Pākehā involvement in te ao Māori helps Pākehā decolonise, because such involvement connects meanings of being Pākehā with different aspects of te ao Māori, (i.e., whakapapa, whānau, tikanga) (Campbell, 2005; Jellie, 2001). However, both studies generally focused on the term Pākehā and the meaning this term had for those Pākehā involved in particular settings. Although both studies offered Pākehā experiences of te ao Māori, these occurrences have been analysed in relation to the term Pākehā, rather than analysed as actual events that Pākehā experience when they engage with te ao Māori.

Another study addressed what it meant to be Pākehā for Pākehā “who had engaged with Māori cultural learning contexts” (Mitalcfe, 2008, p. 104). Mitalcfe’s aim was to find out what kinds of experiences occurred for Pākehā in formal Māori learning environments and what these experiences “brought to being Pākehā” (p. 104). Her qualitative method involved semi-structured interviews with six Pākehā

participants. Her findings demonstrated that Pākehā involvement in Māori learning contexts can lead to those Pākehā emerging as “border crossers . . . and bridge makers between Pākehā and Māori worlds” (p. 107). Mitcalfe’s suggestion here is that such Pākehā bridge gaps that occur between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā because they learn to develop a more sophisticated and nuanced perspective toward Māori issues, interconnectedness between two worldviews and towards issues of biculturalism. Mitcalfe wrote:

Involvement in the Māori cultural learning context brought participants greater awareness of contemporary Māori issues, an acute sense of Māori difference, and opportunities for reflection about their own identity as Pākehā. As participants move between both worlds, the Pākehā and the Māori, difficulties and possibilities exist for them. Some of the difficulties for participants are negotiating the attitudes of and positioning by other Pākehā towards them; noticing how their connected-to Māori ways of being Pākehā are not represented in the media: and struggling to find a place to belong in the discursive environment that so clearly separates Pākehā off from Māori. The participants’ difficulties and possibilities resonate with some articulations by Māori of living a bicultural identity. (p. 107)

Mitcalfe’s (2008) research clearly identified with the ethos of *Te Hui Pumaomao* (2002) workshop and with Jellie’s (2001) and Campbell’s (2005) studies, in that elements of each point to Pākehā becoming postcolonial in their thinking through awareness of the connection between the coloniser and the colonised. It is this connection that has potential to develop into what Bell (2004b) called “cultural exchange” (p. 129). Pākehā learn to develop awareness, insights, and enriched understandings of Māori culture, as well as of their own culture, through cultural exchange. And, the significance here is important; that cultural exchange can occur for a dominant group member (Pākehā) in a colonial setting where the coloniser remains dominant. Furthermore, a member of a dominant group can engage in a process of decolonisation that is not tokenistic, nor in favour of the dominant group.

Culture exchange and sharing of ideas and knowledges in pursuit of new social constructions between peoples was evident in the investigation of Huygens (2007) into the ways in which Tiriti educators articulated their understanding of

processes of change that occurred for Pākehā involved in Tiriti workshops and Tiriti organisation settings. Essentially, Huygens found that:

the theorising of Pākehā change in response to the Treaty of Waitangi has constituted a sustained counter-hegemonic discourse over the past 30 years in New Zealand, which . . . enables a dialogue between the Maori and Pakeha approaches to colonisation. (p. 234)

A key goal for Huygens (2007) was to establish an understanding of the kinds of change processes that occur for Pākehā Tiriti educators, as well as for the Pākehā who attend Tiriti workshops. She wanted to find out how and why these Pākehā were able to become postcolonial in their thinking, in that they were able to “work actively and collectively to become less ‘blind’ and deaf” (p. 73) to the politics and societal influences that surround Tiriti discussions. What she found was that Pākehā involvement in Tiriti issues/discussions/forums, whether as an educator or a participant, involves an educational process of change that has the collective potential to transform the “social consensus” (p. 76) of all Pākehā, and thus, extend or advance their ability to develop “new social constructions” (p. 76) for New Zealand society. In other words, these Pākehā have potential to become organic intellectuals because they educate themselves and other Pākehā on the basis of their third space experiences. It is this Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy that connects with Freire’s (1975) concept of conscientisation, in that, third space Pākehā – the organic intellectuals, become conscientised by the “socio-cultural reality” (p. 27) of Māori and thus, become motivated to educate other likeminded individuals. Therefore, Pākehā participation in Tiriti groups or workshops is a transformative process that helps Pākehā extend their postcolonial way of thinking about Tiriti issues from their individual experiences to the societal experience through education among like-minded Pākehā. Huygens (2007) understands this educational practice as transformative praxis when she describes the positioning of Pākehā educators, or Pākehā involved in Tiriti workshops, as “translators” (p. 89) to other Pākehā. Thus, for Huygens, Pākehā Tiriti educators have the potential to be “constructors of a new

relationship with Māori . . . to be potential articulators of theorising on how our dominant cultural group changes” (p. 90):

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 radicals’ position to other Pakeha, for instance through community and workplace education, by writing and supporting Maori actions. (Huygens, 2007, p. 89)

Huygens’ (2007) study is a clear example of a location, or site (i.e., Te Tiriti educational institutions) where the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy has a positive effect. However, it is important to point out that Huygens’ study was not specifically geared towards an exploration into the lived experiences of Pākehā as they engage with te ao Māori. Huygens participants were “10 groups of activist educators who were members or associates of the national organisation for tauwiwi Treaty workers” (p. 149). Most of these participants identified as Pākehā, but some identified as “Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Antiguan and other cultural heritages” (p. 149). Nevertheless, a significant finding of Huygens’ study which relates to my own research lies in the notion that there are a number of steps that apply to the “journey” (p. 184) Pākehā go through when they take part in Tiriti workshops. Essentially, these steps have been identified within the experiences of the Tiriti educators in Huygens’ study and are represented as a stage model. Conceptually, this stage model can be applied to Pākehā in general population, in that Pākehā may be in an “unawakened stage” (p. 183), “learning stage” (p. 183), or “action stage” (p. 184) in relation to their involvement with te ao Māori. Huygens suggests 11 such steps:

1. Progressing from ignorance to action
2. Awakenings through information, de-centring, and empathy
3. Progressing from individualised ignorance to a sense of connected destiny
4. Becoming part of a group that is changing
5. Searching for a different relationship with Māori, a different way of being

6. Preparing ourselves emotionally to understand our place in colonisation
7. Spiralling journeys of individual and collective inspiration
8. Establishing relationships between Māori and Pākehā activists
9. Working with each other as educators
10. Relating to assertions of tino rangatiratanga
11. Supporting each other in Pākehā institutions (Huygens, 2007).

Huygens's (2007) 11 steps about decolonisation have informed my thinking in that, a scheme for thinking about decolonisation for Pākehā in group settings clearly has potential to help change collective Pākehā views. But, she does appear to imply that in order for decolonisation to be sustainable Pākehā should engage in dialogue about decolonisation with like-minded individuals. For example, Huygens (2007) pointed out that Tiriti educators found that it was “an appreciation of themselves as a cultural collective group” (p. 185) that helped them move through the “emotional cycles of blame, guilt and denial” (p. 185). Huygens suggests that a possible reason for this is that collectivity “allows people to learn and reflect without feeling guilty, since they no longer blame themselves as individuals” (p. 185). Hence, an underlining ethos of Huygens' model is driven by collective responsibility, in that, there is “collective (rather than individual) responsibility for the direction of Pākehā/dominant group culture in the future” (p. 185). Nonetheless, her research does clearly show that understanding the coloniser/colonised relation remains as an important element of decolonisation and an important part of the journey Pākehā take to become postcolonial in their thinking.

The workshop *Te Hui Pumaomao* (2002) and the studies by Jellie (2001), Campbell (2005), Mitcalfe (2008) and Huygens (2007), contribute to our understanding of the direction a Pākehā decolonisation model should follow. I interpret this direction as involving four essential components. They are:

1. Pākehā need to first acknowledge that New Zealand is a colonised nation

2. Pākehā should choose to enter into a process of decolonisation where they do not judge either Pākehā or Māori ways of doing things as better
3. Pākehā need to develop an understanding of the impact and implications of colonisation
4. Pākehā need to begin to understand why Te Tiriti o Waitangi is relevant for future Māori and Pākehā relations.

These four elements are not too dissimilar from the message Laenui (2002) imparts with his model of five phases of decolonisation. Conceptually, the five phases of “rediscovery and recovery”, “mourning”, “dreaming”, “commitment” and “action” (p. 153-160) connect the experiences of Māori with those of Pākehā through ongoing interaction, cultural exchange and education. Also, these experiences can occur at multiple times and in multiple settings, “at the same time or in various combinations” (p. 152). When applied to the New Zealand context, Pākehā involved in decolonisation go back and forth between te ao Pākehā and te ao Māori. For Huygens (2004) a possible reason why this occurs is because Pākehā involved in a process of change, go “backwards after each shift in worldview to what is known” (p. 17). I argue that what is “known” for Pākehā is generally informed by their experiences at home, at work, in education institutions, among friends and/or among whānau. Therefore, when Pākehā experience te ao Māori at various times in their lives, in various locations and in various contexts, they learn from their cumulative experiences and thus, become more postcolonial in their thinking about them. However, some Pākehā feel threatened, or concerned, or unsure of any movement by Pākehā toward te ao Māori and about the reasons why Pākehā would do this. Negativity occurs because movement by Pākehā toward te ao Māori disrupts popular Pākehā understandings of Pākehāness, boundaries between Pākehā and Māori, and stereotypes of both. These things can lead to antagonistic discussions resulting in Othering of some Pākehā, in the effort to maintain conceptual distance and to sustain the beliefs that popular Pākehā ways of being are normal and dominant. In this the theoretical component to my study I have demonstrated that movement by an individual of one group toward another is best understood in the vocabulary of third

space experiences. These experiences are fluid and individual and do not represent an occupied position or a fixed hybrid identity or an individual type. In the New Zealand context, third space experiences help Pākehā become more enriched, deeper, and insightful about themselves, helping them become postcolonial in their thinking. Postcolonial thinking occurs when Pākehā become open to critiquing themselves at the individual level, critiquing the relationship they share with Māori. As a pathway to change, encountering third space experiences are effective because they help Pākehā develop an understanding of what it means to be Pākehā, coexisting with Māori. I now move to the “nuts and bolts” of this study and demonstrate how I apply the theory discussed in this section to the lived experiences of the 13 participants.

CHAPTER THREE / Te wāhanga tuatoru:

Methodology

“Te tāpaepae o te rangi. See ther e, to the place where the sky reaches down. Strive to attain the utmost. Look to the furthest horizon. (Trad.)” (Grace & Grace, 2003, p. 52)

Introduction

Searching for an appropriate method for this study proved to be a long process. In the first few months I struggled to find a method suitable for examining the kinds of personal experiences that I wanted to explore. As suggested in the tradition that starts this section, I then looked to the furthest horizon in search of appropriate methods. This led me to employ a multifaceted approach to this study.

I begin this chapter with a brief description of my approach to qualitative research and then move to an in-depth discussion about the methodological framework employed. Here I introduce grounded theory as my method for qualitative inquiry, and in-depth interviewing as my method for collecting qualitative data. I then explain how coding and theorising helped shape my conceptualisation, facilitation and theorising of the information I collected. In part two, I discuss how I implemented the methodology including participant recruitment, participant involvement, ethical considerations, interview collection procedures and methods for analysing and theorising participant experiences.

Research design

Ragin (1994) states, “The design of an investigation touches almost all aspects of the research, from the minute details of data collection to the selection of techniques of data analysis” (p. 191). With this in mind, developing a good research

design is an important first step when undertaking research, whether qualitative or quantitative. My research design followed a grounded theory approach and drew on participant experiences to develop theory about those experiences. This is an approach that is in line with Morse's (1991) suggestion that developing theory about phenomena under investigation is a significant part of qualitative research design.

The design approach I employ in this study is multifaceted; that is, it is not limited to grounded theory. About multifaceted designs, Schram (2006) wrote:

It can appear difficult to identify studies that are an exclusive or "pure" expression of a particular research tradition or approach. It is often easier (and more accurate) to claim that studies are only relatively more oriented toward this or that approach. (p. 112)

Hence, my design is best described as "oriented toward" the following two research approaches:

1. Grounded theory, and
2. Whakawhanaungatanga (Bishop, 1996).

While grounded theory will be discussed more explicitly later in this chapter, whakawhanaungatanga as an approach to research underpins my overall research design because it is an approach that explores the experiences of participants in a "culturally safe" manner (Powick, 2002, p. 12). Bishop (1996) considers that the ethos of this approach embodies three interconnected elements: 1) establishing and maintaining relationships, 2) participant-driven approaches to power and control over the content and the approach to research, and 3) awareness that the researcher is physically, ethically, morally and spiritually involved in the research process (Bishop, 1996). Incorporating a whakawhanaungatanga approach to this research was helpful because it highlighted for me that whakawhanaungatanga (relationship building) between the participants and me as the researcher was an integral part of my interactions with the participants (Bishop, 1996; Powick, 2002). Also, a

whakawhanaungatanga approach connected my own experiences (a Pākehā involved in te ao Māori) with those of the participants (Bishop, 1996).

Methodological approach

Predominantly, the method of this study has been informed by grounded theory. To offer a brief background to the theory, I refer to the sociological work of Glaser and Strauss and their pioneering book *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (1967). For Glaser and Strauss (1967) the origins of grounded theory came out of a rationale to develop a theory that involved interplay between data collection and theory development. My use of grounded theory is informed by the second tract of grounded theory which Strauss and Corbin (1998a, 1998b) developed in the mid-to late 1990s. In brief, Strauss and Corbin (1998b) extended the understanding of grounded theory methodology to include an emphasis on “richness of concept development” (p. 161). For Strauss and Corbin, this approach meant that emphasis should be placed on the overall conceptualisation of events that occur within the phenomenon under investigation, and that conceptualisation should involve an investigation into relationships between concepts and actors with the overall intent being to uncover “properties” such as behaviours, contexts, and experiences that emerge from these (p. 169). My approach is oriented toward the conceptualisation element of grounded theory, because I am interested in the overall conceptual understanding of Pākehā involvement in te ao Māori. This element of grounded theory was helpful because it provided a method for “*thinking about and conceptualizing data*” (p. 163, italics in original).

A grounded theory method involves the three key stages of: 1) data collection, in this case through interviews, 2) conceptual ordering or coding, and 3) the analysis stage of theorising (Straus & Corbin, 1998a). I now discuss each stage and identify how each was incorporated into my methods.

Stage one: Data collection

This first stage involves capturing “description” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998a, p. 16) of the phenomenon under investigation. For Strauss and Corbin, this involves conducting one or more interviews with participants to uncover ways in which people describe, convey ideas about, and articulate their understanding and experience of a phenomenon. Johnson (2002) considers that the number of interviews required depends on the knowledge obtained by the interviewer from the interviewee:

The number of interviews needed to explore a given research question depends on the nature of that question and the kind or type of knowledge the interviewer seeks. To those students who have asked me how many interviews they need, I have often responded, “Enough.” By this I mean that enough interviews must be conducted so that the interviewer feels he or she has learned all there is to learn from the interviews and has checked out those understandings by reinterviewing the most trusted and most knowledgeable informants. (p. 113)

When the researchers are effective in their method of interviewing, saturation point (Strauss & Corbin 1998a) is reached; that is, no new information is offered. This point indicates the time when ‘enough’ interviews have taken place. When interviews have been conducted in an effective manner, the participants’ life stories unfold. Roberts (2002) suggests that the life story represents the lived experiences of people which are retold when the researcher engages in an interactive relationship with his or her participants. Roberts (2002) argues that life story is:

The account someone gives of his or her life to another. It is usually quite a full account across the length of life but may refer to a period or aspect of the life experience. When related by interview to the researcher it is the result of an interactive relationship. (p. 177)

Life stories, or lived experiences, are generally retold by research participants in rich detail (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1998a). Coffey and Atkinson (1996) consider that narrative inquiry is an effective method for capturing rich description because people “produce, represent, and contextualise experience and personal knowledge through narratives” (p. 54). Schram (2006) reiterated this idea,

pointing out that through narratives people “make sense of events and actions in their lives” (p. 104). Roberts (2002) believes that the narrative is “a fundamental aspect of social action” because “we experience life through conceptions of the past, present and future” (p. 177), and that “narratives provide the organization for our actions and experiences” (p. 177). Narratives also reveal the complexities and diversity of experiences. For example, Bishop (1996) observed that complexities are revealed because narratives uncover “the many experiences and ‘voice’ of the participants” (p. 24).

To capture detailed narratives, I followed an in-depth interviewing method, which follows a conversation approach to interviewing (Johnson, 2002). I felt that a conversation format would be the best way for me to establish a relationship with the participants so that their stories would unfold freely during the course of the interview and without any prior prompting. Hokowhitu (2004), notes that intimacy helps both parties feel “comfortable expressing their opinions” (p. 12). Thus, in-depth interviewing is a participant-driven approach (Bishop, 1996; Hokowhitu, 2004). Bishop (1996) argues that this approach allows the control of the narrative to remain “in the domain of the research participant” because participants “reflect on stories within their own cultural context and language rather than in the cultural context and language chosen by the researcher” (p. 24). In other words, should the participant choose to retell a story in Māori or English, it is their choice.

Stage two: Conceptual ordering, coding

Stage two involves conceptualising the content gained from in-depth interviews into ordered concepts and subcategories. For Strauss and Corbin (1998a), this process or stage involves reducing data into manageable “chunks” (p. 12). Conceptualising and reducing are often referred to as coding (Becker, 1970; Charmaz, 1983, 2002; Huberman & Miles, 1994; Lofland, 1971). Coding involves identifying, naming, and describing captured data, then cross-referencing that data across participants. For Strauss and Corbin (1998b), coding is an effective method

for the conceptual ordering of data because it involves “constant comparison, theoretical questioning, theoretical sampling [and] concept development” (p. 173). The process of coding involves the three key phases of: 1) open coding or conceptualising, 2) axial coding, and 3) selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998a). The first phase of conceptualising involves grouping then naming concepts. Strauss and Corbin (1998a) state:

Conceptualizing is the process of grouping similar items according to some defined properties and giving the items a name that stands for that common link. In conceptualizing, we reduce large amounts of data to smaller, more manageable pieces of data. (p. 121)

The second phase, axial coding, relates concepts to events that lead to or influence them. These events are named as “subcategories” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998a, p. 123). A significant part of axial coding is identifying complexities between concepts and subcategories and the different ways in which these relate. The third phase is represented as the point of “theoretical saturation” (p. 143); that is, the point where no new concepts are revealed. For Strauss and Corbin (1998a), this third and final phase involves the interrelationship of concepts and subcategories to “*form a theoretical framework that explains some relevant social . . . phenomenon*” (p. 22, italics in original). This final phase engages the researcher in a reflective process about the phenomenon under investigation. For Tesch (1990), this phase involves a process of “de-contextualisation” and “re-contextualisation” (p. 97). In other words, the researcher must decontextualise in order to ‘re-contextualise’ his or her understanding of the phenomenon by developing theory from participant experiences and relating this to past and present literature about the phenomenon. Strauss and Corbin, (1998a) regard the third phase is important because it involves the researcher’s “literature sensitivity” (p. 49) which considers a researcher’s own experiences (i.e., academic, personal, cultural) and how these might impact on theorising phenomenon. Literature sensitivity also applies to what concepts the researcher might derive from research literature as a source for “making comparisons to data” (p. 49). By having literature sensitivity, the researcher is more equipped to

develop what Tesch (1990) refers to as “a higher level of theorising” (p. 97), because the researcher becomes sensitive to differences, commonalities and/or complexities within concepts which lead to a higher level of theorising about the conditions/settings in which they occur. Literature sensitivity encourages a higher level of theorising by connecting a study with past and present research, to contribute to future literature. This understanding was observed by Marshall and Rossman (1989) who wrote, “[literature sensitivity] relates a study to the larger, ongoing dialogue in the literature about a topic, filling in the gaps and extending prior studies” (as cited in Creswell, 1994, pp. 20-21).

Storylines

Once all three stages of grounded theory method are completed, they are then integrated into findings. One method for facilitating findings is through the use of storylines (Strauss & Corbin, 1998a). Strauss and Corbin (1998a) advocate the employment of storylines as a useful method to facilitate a researcher’s findings because storylines give “voice” to the participants’ experiences. As grounded theorists themselves, Strauss and Corbin (1998b) also point out that “[we] have obligations to the actors we have studied: obligations to ‘tell their stories’ . . . to give them voice – albeit in the context of their own interpretations” (p. 174). For Strauss and Corbin (1990) then, storylines are the “conceptualization of the story” (p. 116) and emerge from the researcher’s “gut sense of what the research is all about” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 148). Atkinson (2002) demonstrates why stories are a useful form for retelling our lives:

Telling the stories of our lives is so basic to nature that we are largely unaware of its importance. We think in story form, speak in story form, and bring meaning to our lives through stories. People everywhere are telling stories about some pieces of their lives to friends and strangers alike . . . Our lives consist of a series of events and circumstances that are drawn from a well of archetypical experiences common to all other human beings. (p. 121)

Strauss and Corbin (1998) suggest questions that researchers might ask themselves to get to such a “gut sense” (p. 148). For example, “What seems to be going on here? What is the main issue or problem with which these people seem to be grappling? What keeps striking me over and over? What comes through, although it may not be said directly?” These questions lead the researcher to a “general sense” (p. 148) of the raw information that has been collected in the interviews. Once the researcher has a grasp of his/her/the central idea, concepts and subcategories are related to that idea and are presented through storylines. Therefore, storylines highlight ways in which relationships between concepts and participants’ experiences are interrelated with the researcher’s central idea(s). My reasons to facilitate and theorise my findings through the use of storylines are threefold:

1. Storylines are drawn from meaningful stories participants reveal about their experiences.
2. Storylines are an effective method for revealing similarities between participant experiences and overall concepts.
3. Storylines are a good way to show how participant experiences are complex and unique, yet still connected with overall concepts.

Biographical introductions

Biographical research: Research undertaken on individual lives employing autobiographical documents, interviews or other sources and presenting accounts in various forms (e.g. in terms of editing, written, visual or oral presentation, and degree of researcher’s narration and reflexivity). (Roberts, 2002, p. 176)

It is important to introduce individual background information to accompany the participants’ storylines. This introduction should outline the participants’ history, engagement, and context in which their stories unfold. Biographical introductions are a useful way of introducing participants involved in a study (Denzin, 1989a, 1989b; Roberts, 2002; Smith, 1993, 1998; Titon, 2006) and are a method widely employed in kaupapa Māori research (Bishop, 1999; Hingangaroa Smith, 1997;

Hokowhitu, 2004; Smith, 1999) and qualitative research designs that employ a whakawhanaungatanga approach (Bishop, 1996). Roberts (2002) sees biographical research, as a method to explore past and present participant experiences, that is effective and relevant within various qualitative research approaches because biographical research links participants' personal experiences with wider social and political practices:

While life stories may be collected in different ways and for specific research purposes, biographical research is part of a movement to reveal and understand the 'personal' and its interlinking with the immediate and wider social context and political practices. Biographical research has been used to understand numerous fields and issues, for instance the development of careers, as in teaching; the experience of and responses to ageing or ill-health; neglected aspects of social history, to give voice to those who are largely unheard; and to trace the effects of migration and other social upheavals. Biographical research is therefore used for a variety of empirical and theoretical purposes and applicable to both historical research and contemporary social issues. Roberts, 2002, p. 31)

A biography represents the written history of a person's lived experiences, informed through the "interactional relationship" (Roberts, 2002, p. 177) formed between the researcher and the participant, and retold in a manner which is respectful to the participants involved. Biographies are therefore a collection of "personal-life documents, stories, and narratives which describe turning-point moments in individuals' lives", (Denzin, 1989a, p. 13).

Storylines: Constructivist approach

My approach to grounded theory and storylines is constructivist, because I have chosen to let the voices of participants reflect the reality of their experiences, rather than let the experiences be over dramatised (Charmaz, 2002, 2003a, 2003b). In other words, the participants articulate their experiences in their own words, and in their own time and I, as the researcher, respect their experiences as part of their ongoing lived experiences. This allows the participants and me to share experiences, without me over dramatising any individual experience they might have. About this, Charmaz (2002) writes:

The constructivist approach places priority on the phenomena of study and sees both data and analysis as created from shared experiences of researcher and participants and the researcher's relationship with participants. Constructivists study how participants construct meanings and actions, and they do so from as close to the inside of the experience as they can get. Constructivists also view data analysis as a construction that not only locates the data in time, place, culture, and context, but also reflects the researcher's thinking. (p. 677)

Charmaz (2003a) considers that the constructivist approach “stresses the analytic and theoretical features of the study processes” by retelling “a collective story, not an individual tale told in a single interview” (p. 327). A constructivist approach to the presentation of findings through storylines is effective because it allows for the “integration of categories into a theoretical framework that specifies causes, conditions, and consequences of the studied processes” (p. 313). Also, it affords the researcher the ability to piece together “a theoretical narrative that has explanatory and predictive power” (p. 327) because participants “cast their stories in their terms” (p. 275). It is this approach that has its foundations embedded in reciprocity between researcher and participant; a whakawhanaungatanga approach which adds depth to the overall rigour of the researcher's findings.

Method

In this section I detail the specific procedures I followed from participant recruitment through to analysis of their stories.

Participants

There was no predetermined demographic for selecting the participants. The only requirement was that participants would be Pākehā who felt comfortable sharing with me their experiences of te ao Māori with me. Predominantly, participants involved were recruited through existing relationship networks. Most of these networks were formed during my years studying at university, where I was fortunate

to have been taught by both Māori and Pākehā academics within the School of Māori, Pacific and Indigenous Studies.

Recruitment

Once I had received ethical approval from the University of Waikato (30th October 2006), I began participant recruitment. Initial contact was made with seven Pākehā whom I already knew. Rather than contact them by phone, I felt it better to follow a plan for recruitment that I could replicate with other Pākehā whom I did not know as well. The first stage of recruitment was to e-mail each of the seven recruits an *Introduction Letter and Information Sheet* (see Appendix 3), a *Referral Form* (see Appendix 4), and a *Consent Form* (see Appendix 5). The *Introduction Letter and Information Sheet* highlighted the intent of my study, what was required of participants, the procedures in which they would be involved, and their time commitment. The *Referral Form* was provided so that the recruit might offer the names and contact details of other Pākehā who he or she thought might wish to take part in my study. This method is known as a snowball technique (Flick, 2006) which proved very helpful. The *Consent Form* was attached so that the participant could complete it and return it to me on the day of the interview. All seven of the people I initially contacted agreed to take part. Five of the seven provided contact details for a further five people. Three of those five people referred to me were available to be contacted immediately. I sent these three people an *Introduction Letter and Information Sheet* via email. All three agreed to take part. This was a rewarding outcome because it meant that the Pākehā I approached were clearly eager to talk about their experiences, and if at any time I needed to access more people for my study, I knew that my method of recruitment was successful.

Because I wanted to ensure geographic, demographic, and social diversity among the participants in my study, I extended my recruitment by contacting three more people; a Pākehā within the television industry, a Pākehā journalist and author, and a Pākehā involved in the music industry. Although I did not personally know

these people, they were people who shared similar characteristics with the other people I had already recruited. All three agreed to take part. I now had 13 participants in total. I did not have a pre-determined limited number of participants, because I felt it more important to ensure Pākehā diversity. This desire was a reason why I placed more emphasis on contacting Pākehā of varied ages, from varied locations, and social backgrounds. Because of the positive response I had with recruitment, I was mindful that I could recruit more people later during my fieldwork if I needed to.

Of the original 13 participants, two had to withdraw a few days after they agreed to take part because of other personal commitments. This withdrawal occurred before any time-frames for interviews had been arranged so it did not have any real impact on the study. Both people sent an email to me expressing their disappointment, pointing out that they had been looking forward to being involved. I then made contact with the remaining two referrals and both agreed to take part, which meant that I once again had 13 participants. The success rate for recruitment was more than satisfactory. At this stage of my research I had not identified participants under pseudonyms. It was not until much later that I decided to do this (I discuss my reasons in sections that follow). Instead, numbers were allocated to participants and although there are 13 involved in this study, the numbers allocated range from (P1) to (P15). This is because when (P5) and (P7) pulled out, I chose to retain the existing numbers rather than renumber all remaining participants.

Location

The 13 participants range in age from 20 to 90 years. They come from varied locations across New Zealand including one each from Te Awamutu, Whakatane, Palmerston North, and Wellington; four from Dunedin, and five from Auckland. The varied locations meant that I had to travel long distances conduct interviews. For example, when I first began my research I was living in Hamilton. However, the first four participants I contacted were located in Dunedin. Because my wife was also

undertaking her PhD research, we made the decision to move to Dunedin for six months to conduct interviews and to do further research. While in Dunedin I interviewed the participants who were located there and transcribed their interviews. After the six months, we returned to Hamilton. On my travel back to Hamilton, I arranged to interview the participants who were located in Wellington and Palmerston North. When I arrived in Hamilton, I then made further arrangements to meet and interview the participants from Te Awamutu, Whakatane, and Auckland.

Demographic

As well as the age, the academic, social, and educational backgrounds of the 13 participants also varied. Although most were middle aged, age range is described as: young 20-40 years (2), middle aged 40-60 years (8), and older 60+ years (3). The five males and eight females who took part included:

- An older male fluent in te reo (Māori language) who is actively involved in Māori language development
- A young male involved in promoting and working with Māori musicians in the New Zealand music industry
- A middle-aged female fluent in te reo who has worked extensively with Māori in a research capacity
- A middle-aged female member of the NZ Air Force for many years, who is now involved in the rehabilitation and manaakitanga of Māori
- A middle-aged male comedian involved in the presentation and production of television documentaries about New Zealand
- A middle-aged female involved in Māori research and training within Te Whare Wānanga o Aotearoa (the University of New Zealand)
- A middle-aged male involved in Māori academia
- A young female fluent in te reo and active in the Māori television industry

- A middle-aged female, involved in Māori initiatives at governmental level, who was whāngai'd (fostered) to a Māori family in her teenage years
- An older female who is married to an influential Māori academic
- An older male who has been active in a Māori church for more than 50 years
- A middle-aged female involved in the Waitangi Tribunal
- A middle-aged female involved in reporting current affairs through television, radio and print and who has published a number of influential books and articles concerning Māori.

Anonymity

The *Introduction Letter and Information Sheet* sent out to participants informed them that their interviews would be recorded in video and audio formats. The *Introductory Letter* also informed them that they could chose to remain anonymous. At the beginning of each interview and prior to any recording, I asked participants if they would like to be named or if they preferred to remain anonymous. I reminded them that their audio and video recordings would not be used for any purpose other than to facilitate the accurate transcription of interview discussions. If a participant decided that he/she wanted to remain anonymous, I offered the following options to conceal that person's identity:

- The option to have the video camera pointed away from his or her face and body
- The option of a using pseudonym in the interview transcript.

One of the difficulties I had with concealing identity was related to the ongoing relationships a participant had with his or her friends, whānau, and/or work colleagues because many were either well-known public figures, or had a connection through marriage, whānau, friends or work colleagues that could reveal their identity. Ten decided they did not mind if their identity was revealed. One chose

not to reveal her face on the video camera. She said this was because she was whakamā (shy), rather than because she wanted to conceal her identity. For this interview I pointed the camera toward the ground so that I still had two recording formats available (digital audio was also used). The two remaining participants had minor concerns about content discussed in the interview and how this content might lead to their identity being known. I found the best way to address this issue was to ask them what parts of their experiences might lead to their identity being revealed. For one participant, concern was with the involvement he had with a Māori individual and, more specifically the ways in which this involvement had a negative impact on him. His concern was more about the feelings he had about that person, rather than about any specific element of his overall engagement with te ao Māori. This concern was a significant point to consider, because I found that three other participants also raised similar issues about the same person. It also became clear that experiences involving this person did not add significantly to the participants' overall understanding of te ao Māori. For this reason, I chose to remove any reference to that person from the four transcripts.

The concern of the remaining participant was more obvious. This person is a well-known individual in New Zealand media. After discussions, we decided that identity concealment was going to be difficult. Therefore, the best option was to use commonsense. This meant that any parts of the transcript that did not specifically relate to her general experiences of te ao Māori would be removed, with more focus being placed on concepts and subcategories inherent in her experiences and the relationship these had with her overall experiences of te ao Māori. As a result, people referred to were no longer the central focus. The focus was redirected toward how the overall experience in general related to her understanding of te ao Māori. This was an additional breakthrough point in my study, because it helped me focus on conceptualising ideas, rather than spending time trying to conceal identities. And because other people were no longer a focal point of participant experiences, I began to realise that each time participants referred to events with

people, their experiences generally related to an already known subcategory or wider concept.

Biographies

Another difficulty I had with concealment became apparent when I started to compile each participant's biography. Each biography identified experiences that clearly could lead to the participant's identity being revealed. In most cases this was unavoidable. Therefore, dealing with issues of confidentiality for this study was more about using commonsense: that is, the commonsense to know that confidentiality may at times be compromised. Hence, for purposes of confidentiality, commonsense, and uniformity, pseudonyms have been used to identify the 13 primary participants, and references to specific individuals have, in many cases, been removed from transcripts.

Ethical considerations

Acknowledging that different participants might be comfortable with different forms of communication required me to offer multiple ways in which the participant and I would engage in communication about the study (i.e., in person, through email, post or phone). Thus, it was important that I had some flexibility when communicating with them. Also, I made my supervisory team aware that if any tikanga, manaakitanga or cultural issues arose through the course of the study, these would be discussed with the team in the first instance. If further consideration were required, this would then be addressed at an additional meeting with the team and with any appropriate departments or individuals. No such issues arose in the course of this study, however.

Data collection

Consent and interview procedures

Participants were required to conduct one in-depth interview with me. At the time they agreed to take part in the study, they were invited to email and confirm a suitable time and location to conduct the interview. Once the time and location had been confirmed, I reminded them to complete the Consent Form and have it with them so that I could collect it at the time of the interview.

Research data were collected from one in-depth interview undertaken with each of the 13 participants. To revisit Hokowhitu's (2004) comments discussed in an earlier section, in-depth interviewing is built on a foundation of intimacy and rapport maintained between the researcher and the participant, thus allowing both parties to express their opinions in a comfortable, respectful, and reciprocal manner. To create intimacy in the environment in which the interview would be conducted, I encouraged participants to have the interview at their homes, or at a place where they felt comfortable to talk about their experiences. All participants agreed to conduct the interview either at their home or place of work.

Recording interviews

Interviews were individually recorded. This approach was in line with Johnson's (2002) recommendation that "it is essential that interviewers tape-record in-depth interviews to obtain verbatim records of those interviews" (p. 111). The interviews were recorded in two formats - digital video and digital audio. I used two formats for recording because, through past experience with interviewing participants for my Master of Indigenous Studies research, I found that when only one format was available, there was the possibility that the recorded material may be corrupted due to faulty equipment, inadequate recording conditions, or incompatible recording equipment. Therefore, by using two formats, a back-up copy of each

interview was still available if one of the formats failed. The process for handling the recorded interviews had three parts: 1) after each interview, the digital video recording was captured in *Windows Media Player 11*© and the digital audio recording was captured in *Olympus DSS Player Version 6.3*©, 2) each participant's digital video recording was burnt onto 2 DVD-Rs and stored as a back-up copy. The file was then deleted from the *Windows Media Player 11*© file. Each participant's digital audio recording was burnt onto 2 CD-RWs for later transcription. The file was then deleted from the *Olympus DSS Player Version 6.3*© file, 3) the DVD-Rs and CD-RWs were stored in two locations.

Interview process

My overall vision for the interview process was to establish a trusting relationship with each participant so that his or her experiences would be retold freely. I also wanted to establish a mutual understanding with each so that rapport would follow (Trevithick, 2000). For example, on my arrival at the interview location - before the interview commenced - I was presented with an opportunity to talk freely with each participant about various general topics. Sometimes our pre interview conversations would last only half an hour, at other times a few hours. This was a time of story-telling, a time when the participant and I would share information about whānau, friends, interests, and personal experiences. I reflected on this engagement at a later stage of my research and came to realise that these interactions helped our relationships become more enriched, open, and reciprocal, because we were developing rapport *kanohi ki te kanohi* (face to face).

Before I began the formalities of getting the digital video and audio equipment ready for recording, I would ask the participants if they had any unanswered questions about the study. If they had, I would address them at that time. I then collected the signed *Consent Form* and began the interview process. Each interview began with an open-ended question. For Trevithick (2000), “open ended questions . . . form a major part of an initial interview” (p. 87), because open-

ended questions allow the participants to discuss their experiences in their own words. I did not want to influence the participant's re-telling of his/her experiences, so I began each interview with a non specific, open-ended question, such as: What would you like to tell me about your involvement with te ao Māori? As a back-up, in the event the open-ended questions did not encourage the participant to open discussion, I had a set of *Interview Guideline Questions* (see Appendix 6) that I took to each interview. I found that after the first interview, I did not need to refer to these questions because, when prompting was required, I simply asked participants to articulate any characteristics or values they felt best described their experiences of te ao Māori. On reflection, this approach helped with my analysis and theorising of their experiences, because all participants retold stories to describe their encounters. Sometimes these stories were retold in chronological order - from childhood through to adulthood - while at other times they began from adulthood and returned to childhood experiences. Generally, I found that stories would unfold and develop into further stories. It is significant to point out that when the participants told their stories, they would often ask me whether I had had similar experiences. I found this reflexivity rewarding because we would then engage in open discussions, uncovering more insights into their experiences. This process provided plentiful examples of thick description (Geertz, 1973).

Although the length of each interview ranged from 30 minutes to 3 hours, all ended in the same way, either when the participant or I decided to end the interview, or at the point of theoretical saturation (Strauss & Corbin 1998a); that is, when no new information was offered. At the end of each interview, all 13 participants commented that they enjoyed the experience, some calling it therapeutic, others commenting that they enjoyed talking with a person who had had similar experiences.

Monitoring my actions: Reflexivity

After each interview I made a point of evaluating my actions. Gambrill (1997) advised: "our actions influence how others perceive us" (p. 298). The strategy

I employed was to record field notes in a journal at the end of each interview, noting how the interview went, and identifying any areas of the interview process I felt could be improved. I monitored my techniques during interviews by constantly evaluating my communication, listening, and responding skills (Trevithick, 2000). This process proved to be helpful. For example, in the first interview it became clearly apparent to me that my voice was more prominent than the participant's. By changing my approach to act more as the listener in subsequent interviews, my voice became less prominent. The benefits of this modification were twofold. Firstly, there was less material to transcribe. Secondly, the participant's voice became a central part of the recording. My journal notes also recorded the content of each interview and noted the different kinds of experiences each participant referred to. I recorded commonalities and connections across participants' experiences and made a note of any obvious properties (i.e., behaviours, contexts and/or experiences in which events occurred). As I followed this strategy, concepts began to emerge which revealed further complexities. I discuss these in a later section of this chapter.

Transcription

It took me 12 months to conduct, record, and transcribe all 13 interviews. The first interview was the most difficult, because I had not refined my recording method. Also, the content of the interview was not as clear as I would have liked because both the audio and video device were placed in an unsuitable area which resulted in outside noise interference and muted recordings. I transcribed each interview verbatim - including stories that did not specifically appear to relate to my study. I did so after I realised that the more I listened to the participant's voice, the easier it was for me to understand the kinds of language they would use to describe their experiences, thus making it easier to transcribe the very long recordings (sometimes 2 hours of audio/video was recorded) because I had a better understanding of the words and sentence structures each participant regularly employed. When I could not understand a phrase, or word that had been recorded in audio format, I would refer to the video format. This technique was helpful because I could then see and hear the

participant talking, which made it easier to determine. On the rare occasion that both formats proved unhelpful, I made contact with the participant via email and attached a brief description of the conversation that I had trouble deciphering. Participants then replied, clarifying context and meaning. Most often this lack of understanding occurred when Māori names or locations were referred to. After each interview was successfully transcribed, I went through and removed from the transcript any parts that did not specifically relate to Pākehā involvement in te ao Māori. However, in performing this task, I found that most of the content was relevant. When all interviews had been transcribed and edited, I began the process of analysis.

Analysis

One of the issues I had with analysing and theorising was the sheer volume of transcribed words. In total, the 13 participant transcripts amounted to more than 200,000 words. This section will discuss how I edited the transcripts down into defined concepts and subcategories.

Stage one: Conceptualising concepts

My interview techniques improved as I interviewed more participants. By interview two, I found my listening skills had become more effective, which meant that I was more aware of emergent concepts and subcategories. By interview four, I was firmly in the practice of reviewing all my journal notes before and after interviews. By interview five, I had identified six overall properties that continued to emerge in subsequent participant experiences. As Strauss and Corbin (1998b) demonstrate, properties are the behaviours, contexts and experiences that frequent across participants. I wrote a description of these in a journal entry after interview five:

(Friday March 2nd 2007): Properties

1. *Each participant appears to experience a kind of epiphany, a time when he or she become more aware that he or she is frequently exposed to aspects of te ao Māori. These experiences are identified by a point in time when a participant changes his or her view, understanding or opinion of te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā.*
2. *Each participant becomes more aware that his or her understanding of Pākehā identity is 'different' in some way from that of other Pākehā. Differences are described in multiple ways and reflect the ways in which a participant begins to understand his or her own view of Pākehā identity.*
3. *Each participant appears to understand his or her identity as 'outside' of a majority/mainstream Pākehā view of Pākehā identity, and 'outside' of Māori identity. These experiences are identified when there is movement between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā.*
4. *Movement between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā leads to a participant becoming more aware of attitudes Pākehā have about this movement. These attitudes resemble elements of Othering.*
5. *Each participant refers to ways in which the values he or she learned from te ao Māori add to, or are different from, the participant's own Pākehā values. Values learned from te ao Māori do not appear to be at the expense of Pākehā values.*
6. *At this stage of his or her involvement in te ao Māori, each participant appears to become confrontational when he or she encountered negative stereotypes Pākehā might have of Māori or te ao Māori. Over time this confrontational approach develops into other more passive forms of getting the point across.*

At the conclusion of all 13 interviews, I went back through my journal entries and related the six properties to the behaviours, contexts, and experiences that presented frequently across all participants. I did so by following a process of inductive and deductive thinking that is consistent with axial coding. It involved identifying causal relationships between participants' behaviours, contexts, and

experiences, and putting them into a basic framework of generic relationships (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Strauss and Corbin (1990), call this process, “The Paradigm Model” (p. 99). The Paradigm Model links “subcategories to categories in a set of relationships denoting causal conditions, phenomenon, context, intervening conditions, action/interaction strategies, and consequences” (p. 99). In Table 1 below, from Borgatti (2008, p. x) succinctly demonstrates these six sets of relationships, as set out by Strauss and Corbin (1990, pp. 99-107):

Table 1: Generic relationship between subcategories and categories

Element	Description
Phenomenon	This is what in schema theory might be called, the name of the schema or frame. It is the concept that holds the bits together. In grounded theory it is sometimes the outcome of interest, or it can be the subject.
Causal Conditions	These are the events or variables that lead to the occurrence or development of the phenomenon. It is a set of causes and their properties.
Context	Hard to distinguish from the causal conditions. It is the specific locations (values) of background variables. A set of conditions influencing the action/strategy. Researchers often make a quaint distinction between active variables (causes) and background variables (context). It has more to do with what the researcher finds interesting (causes) and less interesting (context) than with distinctions out in nature.
Intervening conditions	Similar to context. If we like, we can identify context with <i>moderating</i> variables and intervening conditions with <i>mediating</i> variables. But it is not clear that grounded theorists clearly distinguish between these two.
Action strategies	The purposeful, goal-oriented activities that agents perform in response to the phenomenon and intervening conditions.
Consequences	These are the consequences of the action strategies, intended and unintended.

Source: Borgatti (2008).

Because the phenomenon under investigation was Pākehā experiences of te ao Māori, the causal conditions, context, intervening conditions, action strategies and consequences that emerged from the participants' experiences revealed five overall concepts. I wrote a description of these in a journal entry:

(Wednesday May 7th 2008): Five concepts

1. Encounters with te ao Māori
2. Ngā wairua o te ao Māori' (spiritual values of te ao Māori)
3. Othering
4. Equality
5. Pākehā educating Pākehā.

All five concepts are significant because each one emerged from subcategories (participant experiences) that either led to the concept being revealed, or added to my overall understanding of the concept. Also, each concept emerged from complex and often varied participant experiences. For example, in one case encounters with te ao Māori was revealed by the participant's ongoing encounters with Pākehā. Because she had many experiences of confrontation with Pākehā about te ao Māori, she became more exposed to the negative views Pākehā might have of te ao Māori. In contrast, another participant encountered te ao Māori through the short-term interaction she had with a Māori woman. These and other examples are discussed in detail in the storyline chapters of this thesis.

Stage two: Subcategories

To establish a connection between concepts, subcategories and the transcripts themselves, I revisited my journal entries and the notes that I had made after each interview. I was specifically looking for behaviours, contexts, or experiences across participants that might connect one or more of the five concepts. This search led me to establish 28 subcategories. I labelled each of these with a short description and numbered them from 1-28:

(Wednesday July 17th 2008): Subcategories

1. *First experience of te ao Māori.*
2. *A metaphoric 'gate' is opened enabling entry into te ao Māori.*
3. *Epiphany moment occurs when the participant becomes more insightful about aspects of te ao Māori.*
4. *A change in view, understanding and/or opinion of te ao Māori occurs.*
5. *A change in view, understanding and/or opinion of te ao Pākehā occurs.*
6. *Participant ascribes values to te ao Māori.*
7. *Participant comments that no value is removed from te ao Pākehā.*
8. *Other Pākehā do not understand why the participant has chosen to learn and/or develop an understanding of/or educate themselves about te ao Māori.*
9. *The participant is Othered by Pākehā.*
10. *The participant is Othered by Māori.*
11. *Anger prevails when the participant confronts and/or debates a Māori issue with Pākehā.*
12. *Passivity prevails in terms of the ways in which the participant confronts and/or debates his or her positioning in relation to te ao Māori with Pākehā, and/or a Māori issue with Pākehā.*
13. *The participant educates Pākehā about te ao Māori.*
14. *There is an expectation by Pākehā and Māori that the participant should know everything about te ao Māori.*
15. *The participant becomes a spokesperson for Māori or on behalf of Māori.*
16. *There is resentment toward the participant from young Māori who do not agree with the participant's involvement in te ao Māori.*
17. *There is resentment toward the participant from older Māori who do not agree with the participant's involvement in te ao Māori.*
18. *Māori view the participant's involvement in te ao Māori as a threat to te ao Māori.*

19. *The participant expresses disappointment when Māori do not support the participant's endeavours to learn, develop an understanding of, and/or engage with te ao Māori.*
20. *The participant develops an ability to navigate between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā without disrespecting either world.*
21. *The participant's position in society/work environment and/or family engagement appears to present as 'between' te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā.*
22. *The participant describes his or her positioning as 'outside' of te ao Pākehā and 'outside' of te ao Māori.*
23. *The participant has an effect on the negative and/or ill-informed opinion and/or viewpoint Pākehā have toward te ao Māori.*
24. *The participant has the expectation that he or she must uphold knowledge gained from te ao Māori in a respectful manner.*
25. *The participant describes his or her involvement in te ao Māori as a positive experience.*
26. *The participant finds that majority Pākehā think they know what Māori want.*
27. *The participant's knowledge of te ao Māori is valued by Pākehā.*
28. *Māori offer positive comments about the participant's involvement in te ao Māori.*

I then went through each participant's transcript individually to determine the frequency of occurrence of each subcategory. I did so by recording the number of times a participant commented about or made reference to the behaviours, contexts, or experiences of each subcategory (see Appendix 7). I then created a table showing the frequency of occurrence of each subcategory across all participants. See Table 2:

Table 2: Frequency of occurrence for all participants

	Lisa	Francis	Susan	Simon	Helen	Glen	David	Brenda	Cindy	Jack	Alice	Betty	Joseph	TOTAL
subcategory	frequency													
1 First experience of te ao Māori	1	5	-	4	2	2	6	2	5	3	4	1	3	38
2 A metaphoric 'gate' is opened enabling entry into te ao Māori	1	4	-	4	1	1	2	2	2	-	2	-	3	22
3 Epiphany moment occurs when the participant becomes more insightful about aspects of te ao Māori	1	7	-	1	3	-	3	-	1	-	2	-	1	19
4 A change in view, understanding and/or opinion of te ao Māori occurs	-	2	-	6	2	-	8	2	1	5	3	1	-	30
5 A change in view, understanding and/or opinion of te ao Pākehā occurs	-	4	4	1	7	2	11	1	-	5	5	3	1	44
6 Participant ascribes values of te ao Māori	1	5	8	10	13	4	13	9	10	-	6	6	11	96
7 Participant comments that no value is removed from te ao Pākehā	1	4	-	-	4	2	2	1	1	-	2	2	-	19
8 Other Pākehā do not understand why the participant has chosen to learn and/or develop an understanding of/ educate themselves about te ao Māori	10	2	5	2	5	3	11	2	4	-	6	9	2	61
9 The participant is Othered by Pākehā	6	11	6	4	-	10	18	1	2	1	3	10	3	75
10 The participant is Othered by Māori	2	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	8
11 Anger prevails when the participant confronts and/or debates a Māori issue with Pākehā	3	3	5	1	7	2	-	3	7	-	-	1	-	32
12 Passivity prevails in terms of the ways in which the participant confronts and/or debates their positioning in relation to te ao Māori with Pākehā, and/or a Māori issue with Pākehā	2	1	7	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	15
13 The participant educates Pākehā about te ao Māori	9	8	4	10	11	3	15	6	5	13	7	1	1	93
14 There is an expectation by Pākehā and Māori that the participant should know everything about te ao Māori	-	-	8	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
15 The participant becomes a spokesperson for Māori or on behalf of Māori	-	-	5	4	5	1	4	1	6	1	3	1	-	31
16 There is resentment toward the participant from young Māori who do not agree with the participants involvement in te ao Māori	5	2	4	1	-	-	8	-	-	1	-	-	-	21
17 There is resentment toward the participant from older Māori who do not agree with the participants involvement in te ao Māori	4	2	4	2	-	-	1	-	2	6	-	-	-	21
18 Māori view the participant's involvement in te ao Māori as a threat to te ao Māori	5	2	4	-	-	-	1	-	2	8	-	4	-	26
19 The participant expresses disappointment when Māori do not support the participant's endeavours to learn, develop an understanding of, and/or engage with te ao Māori	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	5
20 The participant develops an ability to navigate between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā without disrespecting either world	12	10	7	12	5	17	27	2	20	16	24	19	33	204
21 the participant's position in society/work environment and/or family engagement appears to present as 'between' te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā	12	11	7	11	6	17	27	2	21	15	24	19	33	205
22 The participant describes their positioning as 'outside' of te ao Pākehā and 'outside' of te ao Māori	2	-	4	1	-	10	17	1	12	4	9	2	1	63
23 The participant has an effect on the negative and/or ill-informed opinion and/or viewpoint Pākehā have toward te ao Māori	3	3	4	2	6	4	2	5	7	-	-	1	-	37
24 The participant has the expectation that he or she must uphold knowledge gained from te ao Māori in a respectful manner	4	1	4	2	2	0	1	0	1	1	4	0	1	21
25 The participant describes his or her involvement in te ao Māori as a positive experience	1	2	0	0	3	0	8	1	1	3	5	0	2	26
26 The participant finds that Majority Pākehā think they know what Māori want	5	4	1	0	2	0	3	1	1	0	1	1	0	19
27 The participant's knowledge of te ao Māori is valued by Pākehā	3	4	1	0	0	4	5	0	3	1	1	0	1	23
28 Māori offer positive comments about the participant's involvement in te ao Māori	1	1	2	2	5	1	8	1	1	2	4	0	3	31
TOTAL	94	101	95	80	90	84	205	44	116	88	115	83	99	1294

I found that there was a varied level of occurrence across subcategories. For example, subcategories 20 - *The participant develops an ability to navigate between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā without disrespecting either world* - and 21 - *The participant's position in society/work environment and/or family engagement appears to present as 'between' te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā* - were clearly significant. This significance was highlighted in the frequency of individual, and across participant, occurrences. This frequency indicated to me that emphasis for my analysis should be on high frequency subcategories. I then related the 28 subcategories back to the five concepts and developed a table showing how each concept connected with the subcategories. Table 3 follows below.

In my final analysis, I did not relate each subcategory to one specific concept. Instead, I focused more on the ways in which the behaviours and contexts of participant experiences help to confirm the concepts through my employment of a constructivist approach to the storylines, as discussed earlier. Also, storylines are an appropriate method for my analysis because they have emerged from the five stages of grounded theory method. This involved

1. Reducing transcribed material to six properties
2. Defining these six properties into five key concepts
3. Identifying 28 subcategories which related to the concepts
4. Identifying the frequency of subcategories across participants
5. Relating subcategories back to concepts through storylines.

By following this method of grounded theory, a saturation point was reached where no new concepts were revealed. Also, my employment of a grounded theory approach to my analysis and findings led me to be better able to offer a higher level of theorising because the concepts emerged directly from the participants' voices (Tesch, 1990). As a qualitative researcher, it is my obligation to respect these participant voices and integrate them into my findings as interpretations, because it is

the participants' interpretations of the phenomenon that help to explain the phenomenon investigated (Strauss & Corbin, 1998a, 1998b).

Table 3: Connection between concepts and subcategories

Concepts (1-5)	Subcategory (1-28)
Encounters with te ao Māori	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) First experience of te ao Māori. 2) A metaphoric ‘gate’ is enabling entry into te ao Māori. 3) Epiphany moment occurs when the participant becomes more insightful about aspects of te ao Māori.
Ngā wairua o te ao Māori	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) A change in view, understanding and/or opinion of te ao Māori occurs. 5) A change in view, understanding and/or opinion of te ao Pākehā occurs. 6) Participant ascribes values to te ao Māori. 7) Participant comments that no value is removed from te ao Pākehā. 8) Other Pākehā do not understand why the participant has chosen to learn and/or develop an understanding of/or educate themselves about te ao Māori.
Othering	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9) The participant is Othered by Pākehā. 10) The participant is Othered by Māori. 11) Anger prevails when the participant confronts and/or debates a Māori issue with Pākehā. 12) Passiveness prevails in terms of the ways in which the participant confronts and/or debates their positioning in relation to te ao Māori with Pākehā, and/or a Māori issue with Pākehā. 13) The participant educates Pākehā about te ao Māori. 14) There is an expectation that the participant should know everything about te ao Māori. 15) The participant becomes a spokesperson for Māori, or on behalf of Māori. 16) There is resentment toward the participant from young Māori who do not agree with the participant’s involvement in te ao Māori. 17) There is resentment toward the participant from older Māori who do not agree with the participant’s involvement in te ao Māori. 18) Māori view the participant’s involvement in te ao Māori as a threat to te ao Māori. 19) The participant expresses disappointment when Māori do not support the participant’s endeavour to learn, develop an understanding of, and/or engage with te ao Māori.
Equality	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 20) The participant develops an ability to navigate between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā without disrespecting either world. 21) The participant’s position in society/work environment, and/or family engagement appears to present as ‘between’ te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā. 22) The participant intimates his or her positioning as ‘outside’ of te ao Pākehā and ‘outside’ of te ao Māori.
Pākehā educating Pākehā	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 23) The participant has an effect on the negative and/or ill-informed opinion and/or viewpoint Pākehā have toward te ao Māori. 24) There is an expectation to uphold knowledge gained from te ao Māori. 25) A positive experience for being involved in te ao Māori. 26) The participant finds that Majority Pākehā think they know what Māori want. 27) The participant’s knowledge of te ao Māori is valued by Pākehā. 28) Māori offer a positive comment toward the participant’s involvement in te ao Māori.

Stage three: Storylines

There are five storylines. Each represents one of the five concepts:

1. Storyline One: *Encounters with te ao Māori*
2. Storyline Two: *Ngā wairua o te ao Māori*
3. Storyline Three: *Othering*
4. Storyline Four: *Equality*
5. Storyline Five: *Pākehā educating Pākehā.*

The storylines are presented in five chapters of findings, one chapter for each storyline. Analysis and theorising of the concepts discussed in each storyline will draw on theory and literature previously discussed. However, before presenting the five storylines, I first introduce the participants in their own voices through an edited biography of their experiences.

CHAPTER FOUR / Te wāhanga tuawhā: The people in the study

“Hupane, kaupane whiti te rā. A new sunrise, A new day... One can emerge from difficult situations to seek new opportunities (Trad.)” (Grace & Grace, 2003, p. 34)

Introduction

The stories that are retold here have emerged from the participants’ varied and often difficult situations. Nonetheless, they represent their lived experiences that have led to new and rewarding opportunities. In other words, they are part of the participants’ life story. About the life story, Titon (2006) writes:

A life story is, simply, a person’s story of his or her life, or of what he or she thinks is a significant part of that life. It is therefore a personal narrative, a story of personal experience, and, as it emerges from conversation, its ontological status is the spoken word, even if the story is transcribed and edited for the printed page. The storyteller trusts the listener(s) and the listener respects the storyteller, not interrupting the train of thought until the story is finished. That is not to say the listener is passive as a doorknob; he nods assent, interposes a comment, frames relevant question; indeed, his presence and reactions are essential to the story . . . his role is mainly that of a sympathetic friend. (p. 132)

In this chapter I introduce the participants as they were at the start of the study. They are introduced under the pseudonyms used to identify them whenever they are quoted in the storylines that follow. I begin with a brief description of the participant’s gender, age, and interest in te ao Māori. What follows is a biographical portrait of each participant’s involvement with te ao Māori. The participants’ experiences offered in their biographies and in the chapters that follow have been edited where necessary to improve readability but nothing has been removed or changed that would affect meaning or alter the context of what was said. The biographies vary in length. Some events are introduced in the participant’s biography, while other events may not appear until the later chapters. In addition,

encounters introduced in the biographies may be revisited in their entirety, or in part, or not at all in the storyline chapters.

Lisa

Lisa is an older Pākehā woman who is fluent in te reo Māori. She worked at Women's Refuge where she helped to establish and implement a bicultural unit. She is currently employed at a New Zealand university where she helps develop Māori education and training programmes.

Tana kōrero (her story)

My father came from a very poor farming family. He started work at age 12. By the time I was born he was working for New Zealand Railways. We always lived in small towns and moved around from town to town every couple of years. All the communities we lived in were predominantly Māori. Dad was fascinated with the Māori people and their culture. He often spoke his version of Māori with the guys on the railway gangs. Dad gave me heaps of encouragement to learn Māori. But it took me until I was in my early 20s until I finally decided that I better start learning something about the culture for myself. I have three brothers. One of them supported my decision to learn about te ao Māori, the other two thought I was nuts. Mum didn't really understand either. She died fairly recently, maybe 10 years ago and my father remarried. His second wife had grown up with Māori so she was also interested in learning about their culture and she had been to teachers college and had done some Māori courses. I studied Māori at university. In my third year, I was one of only two Pākehā. I had trouble with Māori students from time to time and I found that difficult. I could understand where they were coming from, but it was a hurtful experience and there were some tearful moments. In 1990 I took up a job at a Māori Studies department. It started off all very fine and there was a general respect for the knowledge that I had of te ao Māori. But my partner was offered a job in another town, so we moved. I got a job at Rape Crisis and helped to establish a

bicultural development group. I was the only Pākehā in the group and that was difficult. There was a lot of cattiness and backstabbing that went on. The Pākehā women were very vindictive at times. I stayed there for a couple of years. We moved once again back to the same town we had left 2 years earlier. I started working at the Māori department again. It went very well for a couple of years, but then the wheels started falling off. It became racial. It started to look that way to me. Memos and emails started to filter through saying things like “Pākehā are privileged to be working in the Māori department”. I began to feel like a second class citizen in the department. Whenever I am challenged by Pākehā, I find that easier to handle than any challenge from Māori. So that was a difficult time for me. I think the Māori academics in the department may have seen me as a threat in some way. I have never really got that feeling myself, but other people have told me that was the case. The role I am in now is one of educating Pākehā about te ao Māori. I run a couple of workshops teaching just basic Māori things - nothing real in-depth. At the end of the workshops I often get a lot of positive feedback from the Pākehā who attend. But generally, these days, I am not as bicultural at family gatherings as I might be at work. I’m still a lot whiter than brown if you like. But I do find myself code switching in my speech now and again because te reo is so engrained in me that it doesn’t matter where I am, I’ll always throw in a Māori word if it works better for me than an English word. So now, the occasions where I am completely monocultural are few. In the early days I had two very different personas, but they are melding into one now.

Francis

Francis is an older Pākehā woman who is a leading New Zealand author, television personality, interviewer, and documentary producer.

Tana kōrero

My parents split up when I was three or four. At that time it was considered to be really terrible that a divorce would happen. The kids in the neighbourhood were not allowed to play with us because of this. So I knew what it was like to be different on the outside, at a very early age. When my grandfather retired he decided he was going to learn about Māori language and carving. He lived in Otaki and would go to the local marae in Ruatoria to practise spoken Māori and to learn how to carve. He met a little girl at the marae and he made me write to her as a pen-pal. That gave me the idea that it was perfectly normal and acceptable to be interested in Māori. As a teenager I went to Wellington Girls' College. I can't remember any Māori being there. But in those days it was very common to teach a few Māori songs in schools so I became familiar with waiata. I then went on to university and I worked part-time as a cadet for the New Zealand Broadcasting Corporation. During that time I met a lot of influential kaumātua and began to take an interest in Māori stories. After university – in 1975, I moved to Auckland. I began working at a broadcasting firm and covered a lot more Māori stories. I reported on Bastion Point, the Haka Party incidents, the 1981 Springbok tour, the Māori Loans Affair; I went over to America and Canada to look at fishing rights and land rights during the mid-eighties, during the time of the Fisheries Claim and I covered the Kahui twins story. These were all good stories. I always had lots of Māori stories to report on, so we would end up having more Māori stories than the broadcasting firm thought were worthy for a news bulletin that went out to a Pākehā audience. After a while it got difficult for me at work because my colleagues said that I was biased, pro-Māori. So it became known in the firm that I wanted to report on more Māori stories. Once I did a story about the pronunciation of Māori words. We ended up with hundreds of complaints from Pākehā. I felt I was under siege. It may sound ridiculous but I was. I was such a righteous bitch though, that I would say "I am not going to back down on this". I suppose it is who I am, my whole being. I am a one in society - I am not separate, I don't feel separate and Māori are my friends and my contacts. I have lost my cool in an interview with Pākehā about issues relating to Māori though. I mean, usually

when I interviewed racist Pākehā it never bothered me, I never got emotional about it because I was very good at just staying outside of the situation. But I think that interview was difficult because it was such a painful time and it reminded me of the 1981 Springbok tour, which was also a painful time for me as a reporter. It was a bit like déjà vu, because I thought New Zealand had moved on - but we hadn't. I was very upset about this. But I did feel sorry for the Pākehā I interviewed because he didn't really know how to relate to Māori at all. And even though we conducted the interview in good manners, we were getting hotter and hotter under the collar. But over the years it has often been unpleasant to go anywhere because I have had to try and avoid conversations about Māori topics. My husband would get really upset about it, especially when people kept asking me about Māori news stories. Often my friends will ask me genuine questions about what I think about certain Māori things so they could get an alternative Pākehā perspective. They would listen to me and try and take that on board. But, still, Pākehā can be very hostile toward me. I remember attending a yoga class with predominantly middle-class Pākehā, none of them with any knowledge of te ao Māori. They would say really hostile things to me. We were having a cup of coffee, and they said "Remember when we were children and they had to tear out that Māori village, it is such a relief to have a car park there now". I had to make an excuse to leave because I felt there was no point engaging with those kinds of people. But I am Pākehā and I identify as Pākehā. I like being Pākehā and I don't want to be Taiwi. I am a fifth generation New Zealander. All my family have lived in this country. One of my relatives was even in the Constabulary (settler volunteer units who fought in south Taranaki between 1868 and 1869 against Taranaki Maori). So they have all been in some relationship with Māori over the generations. Therefore, my Pākehāness comes from my relationship with Māori. That is who I am. I have a dual New Zealand identity that includes elements of te ao Māori. When I read Michael King's Being Pākehā, I knew the context in which he wrote it. I felt he was a bit upset with Māori and that came out in his work. But I couldn't identify with that, because it wasn't my experience. Even though I felt for him and what he was going through, I thought he had crossed the line by writing about Māori histories. I also wrote a book on Māori and Pākehā relationships. But I

did all the interviews. I wrote all the stories. I changed them quite dramatically in places for coherency. So at times you could not recognise the original interview. But I got consent from the people involved, so that made it ok. It has been read by a large number of people. It is in all the university libraries and it is a recommended reading in many courses. I authored another book about Māori sovereignty and tino rangatiratanga 10 years earlier which has also been referenced widely. I met with a good Māori academic friend of mine recently and he said that both these works were wonderful. So that was nice. But as far as social history goes, I think Pākehā views about te ao Māori will end up being very important because they represent many different streams of Pākehā thinking. At the moment I have been commissioned to write a book for journalists. It is about advising journalists when it is appropriate to employ the term Pākehā in their writing. It is very important because a lot of journalists use non-Māori. I don't believe that you can call Pākehā that because it is antagonistic. In the past, my husband and I would argue about Māori things like that. He did not have any of the background knowledge that I had, so he didn't really understand why it was such a contentious topic among Pākehā. But now that he has completed his social work training, and has worked with Māori organisations, he understands more about the terms employed by Pākehā and Māori and their significance. But up until that point, we couldn't talk about Māori topics without arguing. He was caught, got caught up, in the idea that Māori were dishonest, caught up in that media crap. When he began to encounter more of te ao Māori, he began to understand where I was coming from. Now he is very passionate with his advocacy for te ao Māori. It has taken him a bit longer, but he is catching up to me. In my personal life I made a commitment to always try to pronounce Māori words correctly. I see that as a mark of respect, as my way of honouring the language and the people. So I suppose I am bicultural in that I know a lot about Māori current affairs and Māori institutions and I understand a lot of the concepts; I care about how Māori do as part of our whole society, as much as I do about Pākehā. So I guess my Pākehā identity comes from my relationship with Māori. That's how I would put it.

Susan

Susan is a middle-aged Pākehā woman. She spent many years working for the Waitangi Tribunal and is currently employed at a New Zealand university where she is involved in teaching a Te Tiriti o Waitangi politics course.

Tana kōrero

I have had two quite different experiences of working in te ao Maori. The first was when I was working at the Waitangi Tribunal, the second while working at a New Zealand university. When I worked at the Tribunal, I had something in common with the other Pākehā there because we were in the same circumstances. So the encounters I had with Pākehā there were quite different to the encounters I had with Pākehā and Māori at university. It is hard to say in any brevity, but I guess some of the defining characteristics of how I see Pākehā working in a Māori organisation is that other Pākehā generally feel more comfortable communicating with Pākehā about Māori issues. That is the dynamic I noticed the most; that, by default, Pākehā may often be the first port of call to ask for advice. I guess the flipside of that is that I often encounter Pākehā saying some pretty horrendous things about Māori. So it's a peculiar kind of dynamic. Also, when I told Pākehā that I had worked at the Tribunal, they often would assume that I had a familiarity with Māori language and culture beyond that which I had. So it can go either way. Pākehā may either treat you with great suspicion or they would assume that you were incredibly knowledgeable about te ao Māori. Here at university, my Pākehā colleagues are often perplexed by my ongoing commitment to Treaty issues. I wouldn't assume to know what motivates them, but there does appear to be some kind of suspiciousness going on. I think it comes from simply a lack of understanding. But I don't know, more than that I couldn't say. I think it is really complicated. Sometimes it's professionally motivated, sometimes personally. I guess the way that I try to negotiate my way through a lot of those fairly complicated encounters is to try and be diplomatic and respectful to Pākehā regardless of what they think about my

commitment to Māori. I think that in some ways that perplexes them even more. But I try not to be hostile and antagonistic. I try not to get exasperated or confrontational with Pākehā. But I do think there is definitely a place to voice one's opinion. I admire a lot of Pākehā who are very strong in their convictions, who are not concerned about isolating colleagues or alienating people that they confront. I think there is a definite need for that. But I don't play that role well myself. I tend to take the more conciliatory approach. It's tiring to be strong in your convictions. I have seen people do it. But I think it's not people in general as much as it is particular occasions where people choose to play that particular role. I think in some ways I would hope that the approach I take is to make the message more implicit, more leading by example. But then you don't often notice the progress that you make. And so much of it is about your gut feeling at the time. What is overwhelming for me is when Pākehā attack te ao Māori. In those encounters I intuitively think to myself whether any response I give would be well representing Māori, or whether I am best to shut up. I know some Pākehā defend Māori with great passion. But I would not do that without giving it considerable consideration. I have seen situations where those Pākehā will let things go and I would most certainly follow that lead. But I would assume that they are humble in terms of what they would feel they could confidently respond to, as opposed to Māori who may have had a wider range of encounters to draw from. I certainly have seen Pākehā speak effectively and passionately in defence of awful assumptions in racism from other Pākehā. But I don't pretend to know all things about Māori. I just like the interface between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā. So I think that's why I remain a bit of an enigma, because I am Pākehā. But that has its advantages too. But generally, I now feel more comfortable setting my limitations for what I will talk about and what I feel I am able to say confidently as a Pākehā woman talking about Māori issues. As a Pākehā in a position of authority, I have to be explicitly aware of what I am doing and acknowledge the limitations of what I am able to contribute, and I should listen to any criticism. But I am much more tolerant of criticism that comes from Māori, and mindful of it. The closest thing I have experienced to culture shock was coming to work at the university from the Tribunal because the Tribunal was an environment

where I engaged with Pākehā over details of issues, as opposed to debates about whether the Treaty was important or not. Here at the university, I found myself back 50 years thinking, “Oh my God, we are right back defending if the Treaty meant anything at all” as opposed to the details of what that document implies and means today. So that was a tremendous shock which has never really worn off. So I feel tired on behalf of everybody who is engaged in that debate. I find myself constantly having to get right back to the basic assumptions about the Treaty as opposed to dealing with what I think are some really fascinating politics and debates. I like differences of opinions at that more sophisticated level, where people argue points from different approaches and have got past the general acceptance that people are equal members in society. I think the attitudes thing is definitely generational and it alarms me how much sway the increasingly smaller and older proportion of university staff and faculty still hold. Just a few senior people on campus can have a tremendous effect on the dynamics of a much wider group of people who wouldn't normally tolerate or engage in some of their outdated ideals. That's problematic. I would hope that in years to come, committee discussions would be less threatening so that an environment could exist where people can be honest about their feelings. I mean, I would feel quite comfortable advocating gender equality issues on a committee of men and I think those men would see that as my responsibility to do so. As a woman it is relatively easy to have huge impact very quickly on a decision that you can see as having some kind of dodgy gender issue about it. If somebody's about to make a reference to whether or not this person we are considering for employment might get pregnant and might not stay for terribly long, a woman can have a really effective crack at something like that. So I would hope that the same will happen with Māori issues. Generally though, my involvement working at the Tribunal and at university has been an overall positive experience and one of the most important experiences in my life. But I do think that when Pākehā become involved in te ao Māori there is always going to be antagonisms, because it is a kind of power game. But it would be nice to see discussions and interactions become more sophisticated, or to become developed to the point where differences between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā are more evenly fought, that you are not necessarily disadvantaging yourself

by showing alliances or allegiances with any particular group. But that is just not the case at the moment. It is pretty sad.

Simon

Simon is a middle-aged Pākehā man who is a comedian, television personality, and television documentary director. He has been involved in many projects dedicated to exploration into the history of Pākehā/Māori relations in New Zealand. He has worked with Ngāi Tahu (a tribal group from much of the South Island), Māori Television Services, and Television New Zealand. He is currently working on a television documentary for Ngāi Tahu.

Tana kōrero

I didn't come from a background where I had a lot of encounters with te ao Māori. I was brought up on a farm in the middle of nowhere. I went to a little boarding school and there wasn't a lot of involvement with te ao Māori in those early years. But I remember at high school the Māori kids played softball and I wanted to, but I failed miserably. I stayed at the school hostel and the hostel group hung out together. We didn't really hang out with day-boys - we just did our own thing. We were quite happy just to hang out with ourselves. I went to university and I did a philosophy and drama degree. I was staying at the college hostel. That was the time I encountered my first practical experience of haka. Performing the haka was a big deal between these long established colleges. It was taught to us by the All-Black captain Taine Randell, and he didn't want a slap-stick haka. It was amazing. There were a whole lot of guys doing it against a whole lot of other guys. It was fantastic. After university I got into performing comedy. I then got to meet Mike King (a Māori comedian). We started doing the New Zealand history show which looked at the history of Māori and Pākehā relations. I would go around to his house and ask him questions that I had about Māori. I then became more interested in Māori history, battles and that kind of thing. I felt it was relevant because it happened here in New

Zealand. I guess I wanted to find out why people were thinking about things the way they were, and whether there was any validity in their belief structures. I also began exploring tino rangatiratanga which is a Māori concept I still can't get my head around. I didn't really know that many Māori in those early years. I say that in the same way that I didn't know many blue collar workers. It was just not my kind of social circle. I wasn't into sports, so I don't go to sports clubrooms. I don't have children, so I didn't go to kindergarten or preschool groups. So in a way I was kind of ostracised from all of those different kinds of things. I mean, if I had dated a Māori girl earlier, she may have been the gate that opened into te ao Māori. But as it was, it took me until my early twenties to find that gate. It wasn't that I wasn't looking for it, and it wasn't that I was looking for it, it just kind of happened. When I do comedy these days, I hope the things I say people actually get. I hope they go "Oh that is a really interesting point". It has happened like that. So to me, it is interesting being involved in comedy and being mystifying in the way I execute my comedy routine. I allow Pākehā the chance to laugh about their identity. I guess initially when I first started doing a mihi at the start of a performance it was just comedy, but now I see it as something more because I am a big believer that Pākehā are part of the land. So I like to throw in 'ahi ka' – you know, keep the home fires burning (a metaphor for land ownership and its connection with genealogy across generations), all that stuff and that often annoys Pākehā. But generally, my encounters with te ao Māori come from asking questions, from being allowed to enter te ao Māori. In all situations I have found myself, there is always a certain amount of Māori knowledge to draw upon. So if I need to know, why that has happened, why do they do that, why is this person angry at me about that? I had someone to ask.

Helen

Helen is a young Pākehā female who is married to a Māori man. She has a blended family with bicultural children. She is currently employed at Te Wānanga o Aotearoa.

Tana kōrero

When I did my certificate in Social Work, I encountered an alternative Pākehā perspective of Pākehā identity. I had a Pākehā tutor, she changed my life. She would ask the class different types of questions about Pākehā and Māori identity. She would challenge us on stuff that we had been taught at school. That made me start to challenge my own views of Pākehāness. From that, I found more information out about Māori history and Māori and Pākehā relations. Out of the 25 Pākehā in the class, three of us all felt the same, while the rest stuck to their guns and chose not to be challenged on their views. Most of them dropped out of the course. I completed the course and began work in a corporate law firm. But I never really let go of how I felt about te ao Māori, how I enjoyed learning about te ao Māori. I worked in corporate law firms for about 16 years and I encountered a lot of institutional racism. I was actually quite sickened by it. I mean, if the partners of the firm wanted to make a buck out of a certain race in the community, they would quite happily employ someone so that they could communicate with that particular clientele. Sometime toward the end of my time working at that firm, I met my partner. Then all of a sudden, by surprise, we ended up with custody of his two children. I was working very long hours and my partner needed to get back working so that we could support the children. They are both part Māori and their environment they came from wasn't a safe environment. They had been neglected. So we needed to spend a lot of time blending our whole family, because I had a daughter from a previous relationship. I left the law firm and took a part-time job to settle the family. Then an opportunity came up for a position at Te Wānanga. My partner and I decided I should go for it and I have never looked back. Working for 16 years at the law firm was difficult and I had a lot of stress. Working at Te Wānanga, there is no chance of that ever happening. It is not because the work doesn't get done or because everybody sits around and doesn't do anything. It's just that there is an overwhelming feeling of support and love for one another here. If you don't agree with somebody about something, you have a discussion with them and there is no anxiety or anything. You just sit down and talk. You say what you think and they say

what they think. There is so much respect and love here. When I was interviewed for the position, it didn't matter that I was Pākehā. Being Pākehā only came into it when the interviewers wanted to know my views on working for a Māori organisation, and they weren't intrusive with their questions. So I felt really safe and I was able to express how I felt in a respectful manner. In contrast, at the law firm, I had to fight to represent myself in a male-dominated environment. I had to prove my worth every day. At Te Wānanga, five percent of the workforce is Pākehā. There are some that work here because it is just a job. But they are not as passionate as I am about it being the welcoming organisation that it is. So they don't stay long. I am here because I believe in what the organisation is trying to achieve and I want to be part of that. There is a saying that goes with this place, "Those that leave do come back and nobody leaves for long". But there are some people that do leave and never come back, but they were never part of it in the first place. Te Wānanga has great values of tikanga and respect and love for one another. There is a commonality of morals and beliefs, that kind of thing. Everything just gets put out on the table and talked about. You might set your watch for a 15 minute hui and you may still be there 5 hours later. If it is an important issue, then everybody involved is treated with the same respect. I feel very honoured and privileged to work here and to have this experience. I don't feel like I have to cover up who I am anymore. I can just come to work and be me, it's incredible. I am really proud to be who I am, I am proud of being Pākehā. But I can't say that I am proud of the way some Pākehā perform in society. I actually think that they have got a lot to be ashamed of. They are ignorant. It comes back to what they have been taught and where they have been taught that from. Their views have been informed by what society has taught them and what their parents or grandparents have taught them. Last year I walked around the Wellington museum with my partner and kids. We looked at the Treaty of Waitangi room, at the artefacts that were in it. There were little labels under each piece telling a story about the item. But I felt that some of the descriptions or versions of history were incorrect because I had found a more accurate history from doing my own reading and research. My whole life encountering Pākehā opinions from friends and family, I was only being taught one side of history – the Pākehā side. I was fed a

Pākehā perception of events that never rang true for me. It just never felt right. So I began to become more aware of situations where I felt I was right, and what I had been taught was wrong. Now that I have experienced the culture first hand, the people first hand, I know that Pākehā perception about Māori is wrong. My partner is Pākehā with his little finger being Ngāi Tahu, and the biological mother of my partner's children is Māori. When my partner's son cut his hand badly last year, he ran around the house saying "Look, I'm not Māori, my blood is red!" We had to sit him down and explain that everybody's blood was red because, at first, he didn't want to identify as Māori because of the negative encounters he had with te ao Māori. Now he has more positive encounters because he has a stable home which is safe for him to acknowledge his Māori side. So my encounters with te ao Māori have given me, my partner's children, and my partner a lot. And it is my knowledge of te ao Māori that has helped my partner feel more confident and safe about his Māori identity. But in my wider family, my father continues to make racist comments. But there is a certain amount of respect that needs to be given there because he is my father. I remember when I got the job at Te Wānanga. My father said that I should still apply for jobs elsewhere. That was his attitude toward te ao Māori – he didn't think much of it. In the future I would love to be a mediator between Pākehā and Māori. I would love to do that. I would love to get a programme into primary schools educating Pākehā about te ao Māori, to show Pākehā that Māori culture is the culture and ways of our country. I think it is incredibly important to challenge Pākehā now and again so that they embrace Māori culture and embrace New Zealand as a bicultural society so that we can begin to heal some of the wounds of the past. We do attempt to do that in our primary schools, but from my experience it is a token gesture because there is no real depth to it.

Glen

Glen is a young Pākehā male who has been involved in the New Zealand hip-hop and rap music industry all of his life.

Tana kōrero

I went to Edmund Hillary Primary School in Papakura. The class was predominantly Māori and Polynesian and that demographic remained the same for most of my years at primary school. I lived in a single parent household during that time. My folks split when I was 8 years old. Both of them were white European. My dad is third generation Kiwi from an English background, and my mum was actually born in Australia, but both her parents were from England, so it's like she is a first generation Kiwi. My neighbourhood was predominantly brown kids. My side of the tracks was the brown side, and the other side was the white side. That shaped my social interaction and the way I communicated with other kids, because I was hanging out with kids from different cultural backgrounds. So I learned to communicate with them in a very normal way. That became a natural part of my life later on. In my youth I didn't really come across any overtly negative racial problems. Pākehā would say to me, "You want to be a Māori", but you get that kind of attitude from young kids. I didn't really understand why that kind of view offended me at the time, because I was a little kid, but I do remember saying "No I am not trying to be Māori. This is me and this is where I am from and these are my friends and this is how I present myself to the world". But that kind of thing stopped by the time I was 15. When I was 16, I started keeping my hair really short. I shaved it down to a number one. At that time, that look was associated with skinheads. Romper Stomper [movie following the lives of a group of racist skinheads in Melbourne] was out and I remember being called a skinhead. I thought that was the funniest thing, because it was in complete contrast to what I was about. It hurt though and it made me think that I shouldn't wear my hair like that because people might associate a skinny, pasty, bald white kid with a racist skinhead culture and, in a place like Papakura, I really didn't want to be identified that way, because that element did exist. The skinheads wore Doc Martin boots, tight jeans and had shaved heads, whereas I wore baggy pants with a T-shirt and exuded a kind of hip-hop angle. Hip-hop music and culture was something that I latched onto from a young age. The Māori and Pacific kids at my school were into rap music and that is where I

first picked it up. At that time, groups like Public Enemy and Run DMC had a DJ in the group as a band member who did scratches in the songs. I was attracted to that whole side of it. So I was just consumed by hip-hop culture during my teenage years. But at that time, rap and hip-hop was left field, a bit weird. Attitudes from Pākehā were that it was not white people's music and there weren't any major white dudes involved in the industry. When Third Bass [a rap group consisting of two Jewish white guys from New York] came out they became a really credible white rap group. Then in the mid-1990s the term Wigger became popular. It was an American-generated term. It came from white Jewish kids who wanted to be down with the hip-hop culture, but didn't know how. They would see other white kids embracing and enjoying the culture and they got jealous and labelled them Wigger, which is a pretty horrible term. The term wasn't employed much in New Zealand, because our hip-hop community was so small. But from the mid-1990s on, more Pākehā kids started getting into hip-hop. Then sometime around 1999, it got commercial and more accessible to masses of white kids globally. Eminem came out and made it totally socially acceptable to be a white kid and be interested in hip-hop. So as I got older, I started to realise that it was not just a black thing, there were many crossovers. It was ok for people to like different things. In fact, I became very encouraging of that, welcoming Pākehā kids into the industry. So in a way, I am a mediator for Pākehā to get into the hip-hop industry, I open doors for them and that changes the cultural aspect of the music, because the fans are coming from different experiences, different lifestyles, different backgrounds and different thoughts about things. Their priorities are different, their opportunities in society and life are different, so the music is different. I think that's when hip-hop becomes a powerful cultural and political vehicle, when it is being generated by those with an alternative perspective. That is when the music begins to contribute truthful things. And that seems to be my recipe for success.

David

David is a middle-aged Pākehā male who has spent most of his academic life exploring Pākehā and Māori history, Māori tikanga, and Māori language.

Tana kōrero

I studied Māori language at high school in Auckland from 1973 to 1975. Then I went on to study Māori at tertiary level. The first day that I went to the Māori class at high school it was a day of high anxiety because I really wondered what on earth I had got myself into. The class was mostly Māori with a very small number of Pākehā. I recall thinking “My God, a lot of these Māori guys seem much larger than me”. I decided I must be very small in stature. But these Māori guys had a reputation for being very tough guys who chewed up little white fellas like me. Thinking back, the irony is that it was my most enjoyable class, probably because it was a predominantly Māori-dominated class that operated in a kind of Māori cultural way. At that same time I was also learning French. But I quickly became aware that when I moved from my French class to the Māori class, it was like moving from one planet to another. Even though these classes were at the same standard, coed school, it really struck me as a strange experience. I mean, I am not a very sociable fellow and I would have been even less sociable in those days. So I didn’t interact with a wide range of people, just the odd person in class. But when I went into the Māori class it was as if I moved through a door into this whole new world of exciting encounters and insights. So I became aware that I was moving through more than just a literal door and it became an educational process as well as a puzzling process, because at times I became aware that I was in between two very different worlds. I don’t think at that age I articulated it like that, but I was aware that I was crossing some quite significant boundary because the two classes were just so contrasted. The Māori students who knew me at high school treated me differently to the Maori students who didn’t know me – who might accidentally on purpose knock me into the mud with their school bag as they walked by because, to them, I was just another white ‘honky’.

But I wasn't treated like that by the Māori that knew me. They had moved beyond thinking of me as just another white face because they had got to know me. But I always felt that the Māori class was more of a positive and pleasant place than the French class. So I couldn't see why Pākehā were demonising Māori all the time. Māori were always pleasant to me and I was always treated very well by them. Te reo was challenging to learn though, because it is not an Indo-European language and unless there is a transliteration, understanding the meaning of the word can prove difficult. My father grew up in working class Newtown, in Wellington, white population, mostly Irish Catholic. He had openness toward cultures and had a lot to do with Pacific communities. He worked in the Scouts and travelled to the Cook Islands to set up Scout groups there and always established a good rapport with those communities. My father is an honest, truthful and sincere man and those communities sensed that. He was the one who encouraged me to take Māori classes at high school. I have brothers and sisters and none of them really got into Māori to the same degree I did. My younger siblings attended Catholic schools in the 1970s and 1980s and those schools didn't really have Māori as part of their curriculum. At the end of high school I went to university, fresh, young and innocent. I found the tertiary courses to be quite different to the encounters of te ao Māori I had at school. At school the classes were smaller, the teachers were involved with students more and a bond was developed between the students and the teacher. At university I didn't really develop that same connection. I was at university during the 1980s, a time of "ethnic cleansing" in New Zealand. So there was a lot of pressure put on Pākehā postgrad students and Pākehā staff in Māori departments. A lot of them moved away from Māori studies because students wanted to be in a Māori space, being taught by Māori scholars. So there was a lot of hostility expressed towards Pākehā in those departments in various ways. Hence, I moved to Australia and began studying Pacific history. That was quite a conscious move on my part to absent myself from those hostilities. Intellectually though, my frame of thinking in scholarship remained very much informed by what I had learned through my encounters with te ao Māori in terms of thinking of language as the core element for looking at history. I found that my Māori work colleagues and the Māori students I

taught had qualities about them that were more than just academic. They appealed to me as people far more than Pākehā did. So when I had a choice, I kept going with Māori. But I was always aware of tensions that would arise because I was Pākehā. And even though at university I had many encounters with te ao Māori that were affirming experiences because I had excellent Māori teachers, beautiful speakers of the reo, I still struggled at times with the politics that went on during my time as a student and as a lecturer. In those days when I began lecturing, I thought that I was some hotshot intellectual or scholar. I would pose provocative ideas about missionaries and say things in ways that were perhaps barbed, sarcastic, even provocative. The students would walk out of history class because of this and the academic staff became really incensed by that. The same kind of thing happened in my social life. I remember going to dinner with a friend and this woman, and all through dinner the woman kept looking at me. Then she said to me “I know who you are. You’re that man that said all of those things about the missionaries”. She became very angry and just emoted. She began to let out something that she had wanted to say to me for some years. So I knew my alternative view of missionaries did have an impact on Pākehā students and teachers. The tutors of the papers I was lecturing even complained. But all I was trying to say was that there are alternative points of view to history. So in those days, Pākehā staff and students found me problematic, they kind of jumped up and down and had minor revolts in class about my method of education. And I suppose some Pākehā students were looking for an authentic Māori experience. They probably felt short-changed when a Pākehā face popped up to lecture to them. But with those students, it wasn’t “Oh we don’t like your white face”, it was more “We want a Māori, we want indigenous authenticity”. I found that very surreal. So then in the 1990s, I lost some of my shock value and I don’t know if I should have been worried about that, but things did get easier. I felt like I could talk about the issues rather than having these almost extraneous structural things getting in the way. Maybe during that time I was marked as being quite stuffy, considered rather dull and boring, slightly conservative at least. So, therefore, nothing I said was going to be particularly radical. These days I don’t get Pākehā students thinking if they are getting a good deal or not. Or at least, they

don't say that to me anymore. There is not this issue of authenticity. But looking back, educationally I usually was at the bottom of the Māori language classes struggling. I have always had a really low opinion of my capacity in that regard. But perhaps that's overly critical and maybe there is a certain anxiety in there. In my personal life, I often say that I don't have Māori friends, which is a bit harsh. I am sure some of my Māori colleagues might get a bit upset about that because they may see themselves as having a kind of emotional and personal relationship with me. But my life now is reading books and writing articles, being a professional scholar. I am not comfortable going to marae. I never stay over at marae. I just kind of come up with some excuse to leave, then turn up in the morning again. Colleagues know I have a neurotic aversion to things like that. I am useless with waiata, I don't sing. I am sure there is a Geneva Convention against my singing because it imposes cruel and unusual punishment on the audience's ears. So there are a lot of activities that people might classify as being part of the Māori domain that I don't do. I operate as a middle-class, middle-aged Pākehā scholar who is passionate about Māori and Pacific languages, historical texts, traditions, and narratives. I mean, I am just an average Pākehā person who has a hidden side. I might watch Marae or Waka Huia on television to see if I still understand it as a kind of exercise partly professional, partly personal. So I suppose that might be quirky from a Pākehā perspective. But I am, and always have been, a Pākehā boy who comes from an Irish Catholic background, who grew up in West Auckland and who likes to be an academic. It is all inertia that means I am still here among Māori studies, rather than anywhere else. Someone plonked me here and I just haven't really had any gumption to go off and do anything else.

Brenda

Brenda is a middle-aged Pākehā female. She was involved with the New Zealand Army for many years during which she formed many close friendships with Māori. She is currently working as a budget advisor for Presbyterian Support.

Tana kōrero

I had a few Māori friends at primary school, but my main Māori friendships were formed at secondary school in Invercargill. One of my Māori friends at school helped depoliticise the way I thought about Māori. We would talk about politics when we were at school together and she opened my eyes up towards many different things in the world. I remember when we had this conversation about South Africa and apartheid. She was so passionate about equality, and helping people. She would talk about how cruel some people were in different societies. I felt obligated to ring up our local radio talk show and comment about it. But she was always very generous imparting her knowledge. I remember spending time at her family's house where I was always made to feel like one of her family. I spent many weekends at that house. They had a big family, and it was great. There was manaakitanga, a value that was important to me, probably because of my Irish background you made people feel welcome. After secondary school, some of my Māori friends and I talked about joining the military. I joined and was posted to Ohakea air force base. All my Māori friends were posted to the base at Te Rapa. I did a three way exchange with somebody so that I could end up with them, and it was fantastic. It was like we were one big whānau group again. In the weekends we would move our mattresses into the lounge and it was like a big marae atmosphere. We would sleep there the whole weekend. But there weren't many of us at Te Rapa, so we all had to mix together and that was just great. When I left Te Rapa I moved to Shelly Bay air force base, then on to the base at Wigram. But at that stage it didn't matter which base I was posted to because there were always Māori girls at the bases in later years. But as far as my Māori friends go, they have had a big impact on my life and it still continues today. Māori are my true friends.

Cindy

Cindy is a young Pākehā female who is fluent in te reo. She has been employed as an English subtitler for Māori television and is currently employed as an Assistant Director for a drama series produced by Television New Zealand.

Tana kōrero

I grew up in the 1980s and 1990s. During those years I pretty much had no contact with Māori. My parents had come out from England just before I was born, so they didn't know anyone in New Zealand. They thought they were coming to this great bicultural place. We lived in Warrington, a small rural town just outside of Dunedin in the South Island. As a kid that's where I grew up – and it wasn't a bicultural area, it was quite a redneck place. At school there were hardly any Māori parents on the board of trustees. My dad didn't really agree with that, so he went to a local kaumātua to talk to him about getting more Māori on the board and more Māori subjects into the curriculum. But most of the Pākehā parents on the committee disagreed with that idea. They wouldn't let the kaumātua into the school to even talk to the principal. That was the kind of attitude that I grew up around. But my parents didn't agree with those kinds of racist attitudes. My dad had lived in Brixton during the Brixton riots in 1981, so he was very much against institutionalised racism. When I went to intermediate school, I took lessons in Māori language and culture, but they weren't normal lessons, they were separate lessons that were taught outside of school hours. I didn't agree with that so one of the reasons why I enrolled in the lessons was because I didn't like the way te ao Māori was being sidelined. The course was taught by a student's father and the class mainly consisted of Māori kids. So that was the time I really got hooked into te ao Māori. I continued with reo lessons right through intermediate. Then when I went to enrol in high school, my two top priorities were a school with a good Māori teacher, and a good drama department. After high school I went to university and did drama, theatre studies, and Māori studies papers. I then decided to do honours in Māori studies. That was a

big decision for me because drama was a big part of my life. But I didn't quite feel that I had got all that I wanted to get out of the Māori language papers I had taken in my undergraduate years. The first and second year papers were very much just revision for me. Then the third year was a huge leap. All of a sudden it was total immersion. In my honours year there were two Māori, one Samoan and two Pākehā. I had quite an interesting mix of friends at university. I ended up doing my dissertation on how language affects culture and the intrinsic connection that exists between the two. As far as friends go, I had my friends from school that I had known for years, as well as new friends I had met while at university. Some of my university friends were right wing law students and I often encountered rather inappropriate comments from them about my interest in te ao Māori. But mostly my friends were supportive. I would hang out with the other Pākehā honours student and we would practise for our reo class. We would only talk in te reo. So we had quite a lot of interesting encounters from Pākehā who would hear us speaking in te reo. I help my family with te reo. My dad comes to me quite often and asks me to help him with various Māori words or with his mihi. Quite recently he wrote a sensitive letter to somebody who was quite well known in Māori education. My father wanted to say some stuff that he didn't quite feel comfortable saying in English. He really wanted to phrase it in a nice way. So he asked me to help him find a more appropriate Māori translation. When mum studied psychology and did a basic Māori language course, I helped her with any questions she had about te reo. My brother did Māori through his first 3 years at high school and I taught him his mihi as well as some haka. But I think it is easier for Pākehā to come to Pākehā with a question about te ao Māori than it is for them to go to a Māori person. And I know I can help them. But I would only help them if I felt that I was not crossing a line or disrespecting Māori in any way. I was taught te reo by a Pākehā, so I know that learning about te ao Māori from Pākehā is an effective method. This person was taught by top Māori academics and speakers of reo. But he is a Pākehā who entered into te ao Māori and became fully immersed in it. So I think there is a lot to be said for immersion. But I learnt te reo through Pākehā educational institutions, so I appreciate the call for Pākehā to educate Pākehā about te ao Māori. I do know of a Pākehā girl whose parents sent

her to kōhanga. But the problem for her was that she thought she was Māori right up until the age of nine. Because her parents had Māori friends, they decided that kōhanga was the way to go. Then when the Pākehā girl found out that she was Pākehā and not Māori, she got very upset, devastated in fact. But I do think if you have grown up being fully immersed in something then you are as close to that something as you ever can be. When I left university I got a job as a subtitler for Māori Television Services (MTS). I had come out of full immersion reo, having just finished my dissertation, so I was really on the ball with my knowledge of te reo and the connection it had with my Pākehā identity. It was a real advantage being Pākehā, having grown up in a Pākehā environment and having gone through a Pākehā school system, because it made me a better translator of Māori language into English. In comparison, some of the Māori subtitlers had gone through kura kaupapa and hadn't had to write essays in English at all. So I would help them with their translations into English. I worked with one guy who was fluent in reo, but didn't have the background in English that I had. He would get me to translate, or check things for him quite frequently. On the odd occasion, I also had to correct my presenter's pronunciation of English words, as well as his pronunciation of te reo. Although at MTS we were meant to have a Māori language advisor at each shoot, we often got stuck and couldn't have one. So I went instead. But the Māori at MTS were mostly supportive. After a while at MTS I decided that it was time for me to leave. I wanted to be involved in television drama so I went into the Shortland Street studios [Television New Zealand drama series] and asked if I could observe for a day or two. They let me come in and do that, then a full-time position became available which I accepted. Even here at Shortland Street, I still feel like it's my job to stick up for Māori who can't be there to stick up for themselves. And I guess Pākehā say things to me that they wouldn't say to Māori. I mean, I encounter Pākehā opinions that Māori wouldn't necessarily hear. So I stick up for Māori because that bothers me. I grew up Pākehā. I hardly ever stay on marae and I haven't really been fully immersed in Māori culture. So te ao Māori has always been something quite outside of me, in that I have always had a Pākehā base and structure to the way I do things. But strangely enough, at times, I do still dream in te reo. So I am very aware of the

influence te ao Māori, and especially the reo has had on me. I mean, if somebody at work had to do something that went against Māori protocol, I would say “You are not allowed to do that. If you really need to do that, go check it and if Māori approve it, then that’s their call. It is not my call, it is their call”. So I do feel like I am a back-stop. And although I may not have the authority to make the decisions, I have enough awareness to know that things need to be done in a respectful manner. To be honest, there are probably times where I am a bit too careful. But I would rather be too careful than not careful enough. But, ultimately, there is definitely something very spiritual about my interest and involvement in te ao Māori and even though I may not be working somewhere where I am using te reo, the influences of te ao Māori are very much a part of my life.

Jack

Jack is a middle-aged Pākehā male who describes himself as competent in te reo. He has been involved in teaching and training Māori language, culture, and tikanga at a number of educational institutions in New Zealand. He is currently employed as a lecturer/researcher in a Māori studies department at a New Zealand university.

Tana kōrero

All the primary, intermediate, and high schools I went to had a high ratio of Māori. After high school, I moved to Dunedin and got a job working at New Zealand Railways. That was in the 1970s. I carried on in the railways and didn’t leave until I was about 36. I then married, had kids, and started to take up Māori studies as an adult student. I began learning te reo out of a book called He Whakamarama. I did School Certificate through night class, then Bursary through correspondence school. Then my marriage broke up and I had custody of the kids, so I had to go on the Domestic Purposes Benefit. That was the time I decided I should go to university. I took up Māori studies because I had already gained some knowledge of te ao Māori

and I thought I may as well extend that. While at university, my son was at high school and he became involved in kapa haka. The kapa haka group was run out of the university so I helped on the committee that managed it. At university I went straight into stage two of the te reo course, then onto stage three, Te Kākano and Te Whanake. My degree was a double major in History and Māori Studies. But I was really interested in learning te reo. So I did a fourth year reo paper. In my fourth year I was asked to help one of the researchers in the Māori Studies Department with a research project. He was looking at Māori newspapers and doing linguistic research on transliterations. Later that year a staff member left and the department needed someone to teach the Māori 110 paper. So I took the position and started working there. During that time I encountered many occasions when I was put in my place for being Pākehā. I started to learn how to be very careful with what I would say and who I would talk to. When I finished working at the department I still hadn't quite finished my PhD and I didn't have any money, so I had to get another job, so I got a position as a Māori language teacher at a polytechnic. That was an interesting time because the polytechnic didn't have the same high profile that the university had and, therefore, it was difficult to attract students. But I learnt so much during my time there. The polytechnic closed down and I then got a job at a Māori language and culture training outpost in Dunedin for a short time. I left there to look for another job, but found it quite difficult to find one. I applied twice at a university and missed out and I applied at another university and missed out. I thought "Well is this it? Is this because I am Pākehā?" Then I applied for a job at a third university. When I went for the interview there were four people on the interview panel, including one Māori representative. The Māori representative got up to mihi me and I replied in reo, which was good because it meant that I could talk directly to him. I said to him "Look, you know I am Pākehā and you can take that how you like. If you don't like it, then that is hard luck". I explained to him that I had spent a lot of time with Māori. He didn't say anything. Then later on in the interview he said "How are you going to be able to teach Māori who may not want to be taught by a Pākehā?" I explained to him that I could do it because I was such a nice guy and that people would look past my being Pākehā, which eventually they do. But I have never been

overly ambitious. I want to be a good academic and I want to be successful as an academic, but in terms of chasing positions, I am not really worried about that. But I do think there is resistance to having a Pākehā as Head of a Māori Studies department. I guess it is a tino rangatiratanga thing; maybe you need to have a Māori person fronting a Māori department. I did finally get to finish my PhD though. I wrote it in English and Māori - two versions. When I need to, I refer to the English one, because English is my first language. That is why I don't like saying that I am fluent in Māori, because to be really fluent in Māori you would think that a person would be approaching the kind of fluency that you would have in English. I am not at that level. But I do hope to improve. Until then, I prefer to use the word "competent" . . . I think that would be a more honest description.

Alice

Alice is a middle-aged Pākehā female who was whāngai'd (fostered) to a Māori family. She is currently working for the Ministry of Social Development where she is involved in the implementation and instruction of key policies applicable to Māori welfare services.

Tana kōrero

I probably need to start before I was born. Some of that whakapapa is actually relevant to who I am now and how I was raised. Ko Aoraki te maunga, ko Scottish, me Danish, me Maltese, me Chinese, me Koori o tangata whenua in Australia, kāo kuri whoof, whoof... Koori o te tangata whenua! (Alice's mihi greeting translates as, Mt Aoraki is my mountain and my genealogy is Scottish, Danish, Koori which is a part of Australia and not kuri! [Kuri is the Māori name for dog and sounds similar when spoken to the word Koori]). I was whāngai'd in my early twenties. In my whānau I am known as 'sis', or 'auntie' and all that go with that in terms of reciprocity and obligations of whakawhanaungatanga. Later in life, in my early thirties, I was also whāngai'd into a Samoan aiga. I mostly think and dream in

English but I can hold conversations in reo. On my Danish side there are Andersons. Johannes Anderson was one of the founders of the National Library. He was a fluent speaker of Māori. He fell out with Apīrana Ngata in the late 1930s and early 1940s when Johannes was getting old and dodderly. Although he got an order of merit from Denmark, he has not been covered very sympathetically in the historical record about New Zealand because in the last 10 years of his life he was quite racist toward Māori. But I do have some of his early monographs about Tanaka weaving. He was trying to document that aspect of te ao Māori. He was also involved with the Burton brothers who took him on one of their trips up the Whanganui River. He accompanied them as a translator. Johannes' nephew was my Danish-speaking grandfather. My grandfather learned English at school and then married my grandmother who was of Maltese/Chinese mix. My mother had major mental health problems, so I went to live with my grandparents in Temuka at a very early age. At that time, Temuka was a small town, mainly populated by Māori. I began to form a close relationship with the Arowhenua Marae. My aunt taught Sunday school there and I would get taken over there a lot. But there was all of this racial shit going on within my immediate family. I would often get told off for going over to the marae, or for playing and swimming with Māori. But I did have a lot of Māori friends at that time. When I went to university I couldn't stand it. The Pākehā students there were all wandering around with pieces of smelly fish under their nose, it was dreadful. So I dropped out in my second year. I flagged university away and I went to Wellington to see a couple of people I knew. After a while, I got quite bored with life and decided to reenrol at university. I didn't know what course to do, or papers to take so I just closed my eyes, stuck a pin in the university calendar and it landed on Anthropology. It was 1972. I hadn't pre-enrolled, so I went to do the round of interviews and that when I met Dame Joan Metge. I told her a bit of my history and she said "Oh I think that you would be ideal for Anthropology". I enrolled, fell in love with the subjects, scored A's, took it through to Honours and then did an advanced Māori Society Culture option. Whaimutu Dewes and Hemi Pohatu were in the same class. After university I got a job in the public service. I got involved setting up and establishing Wellington Women's Refuge as well as their National

Collective. I was National Chair. Then the challenge of the Treaty and its application in the public and private sector came about in the early 1980s. This led us to invent Parallel Development. We were seen as radical feminists at the time, so we had to take a bit of shit from Pākehā women who didn't agree with equality of services for Māori. At that time I was also attending night classes in te reo as well as working for the Ministry of Social Development setting up family violence programmes. The Ministry wanted somebody who had public service experience, Māori knowledge, an academic qualification, and street-cred to set up their family violence prevention base. We had to get funding from the then National Government so we did a targeted push to get it and we achieved that six months prior to the 1984 election. Then in 1986 under the Labour government, I helped the Ministry set up a coordinating committee. Men's programmes were established as well as the Rape Crisis Te Kākano o te Whānau Māori Women's Refuge. However, it did take 3 years before the secretariat of the Family Violence Protection Coordinating Committee appointed a Māori and Pacific colleague on the committee. So my involvement in te ao Māori is not done as an individual. It is a task that I have been given and Māori sit behind me to make sure that I do it correctly. I have seen Pākehā walk in and assume that they know what Māori want, but they just get sliced up by Māori, and quite rightly so. Those Pākehā have just assumed, and they come at the problem from a colonial stance. For me, I come from an alternative Pākehā point of view, so there is a clear paradigm difference.

Betty

Betty is an older Pākehā woman and is married to a respected Māori academic.

Tana kōrero

When I got engaged to my husband, the headmaster at the school I was teaching at said to me, "Make sure all of his relatives don't come in and move in on you". He

was just one of many Pākehā who had that kind of attitude toward Māori. You see, my husband is Māori and a Catholic, and some people thought that you shouldn't marry a Māori, and other people thought that you shouldn't marry a Catholic, but there was nobody who thought you shouldn't marry both, which is what I did. On another occasion, my mother came across the deputy principal of the Teacher's College where I had trained. He said that he was very worried about me. He didn't think that it was a very good idea for me to be going out with a Māori, because you never know what it might lead to. Those kinds of encounters with Pākehā happened quite frequently. In my family, there were two kinds of people that my father didn't like. One was Catholics, the other Māori. In my husband, I had both, which I thought was rather funny. But my father never really said anything negative about that. He tried very hard to be nice, but the effort was clearly uncomfortable for him. Apart from my father, there were no real barriers in my family about me marrying my husband. My mother, sister, and brothers were all ok with it. I remember my grandmother asking my mother what sort of people Māori were. My mother said some were Catholics just like Pākehā. My grandmother was Catholic, so she was fine with that. But my aunty had a rather negative view of Māori, and my uncle cut my name out of the family bible for marrying a Māori. After we were married, a Pākehā person said to me that my husband was very dark. They asked if he was French or Italian. When we had our children, Pākehā people would often say how beautiful and brown they were, until they found out that they were part Māori. That's when their attitude would change. I remember when I was teaching, we were in a staff meeting and we were expecting a speaker and he was late. One of the group said that he must have been on Māori time. I quipped back, "My husband is Māori and he is never late!" But I don't really bother with those kinds of encounters too much. I don't waste any breath over it. They generally involve stupid people, so why get angry over stupid people? But sometimes I do feel that I should explain, or at least vaguely educate Pākehā when I encounter those kinds of negative opinions. But the people my husband and I generally mix with, our friends are all totally supportive so it doesn't happen to me that often these days. I don't speak the Māori language, for all sorts of reasons. For all of those years when my husband and I were younger, while

my husband was studying at university, he never learned the language. He spoke it a little when he was a kid, but only renewed it when he became more actively involved in Māori causes later on in life. But he never really had time to teach me, and I didn't have the opportunity to learn because I was working as well. I have tried to learn later in life, but it is hard. Our granddaughter has just come to live with us and she is thinking of going into total immersion. I thought maybe I should learn with her so we could practise together. But I think that total immersion is the way to go. I am certainly not bicultural to that extent because I don't understand the language. But then I am not offended if Māori speak te reo in front of me. I don't feel that they are talking about me. Recently I started working at the Red Cross shop. Some days there I encounter negative views Pākehā have about Māori and I might try and set them right, or give them an opinion. But generally I don't get many bad vibes from Pākehā. Mostly they are just too ignorant. All my children and grandchildren say they are Māori. They have just picked it up themselves and decided that is what they want to be. But I think that society has something to do with that, because society labels our kids because they are brown. They get labelled as Māori so they just presume that is what they are. But we never told them they were or weren't. Our children and grandchildren are an extraordinary mixture now and although they don't say that they are not Pākehā, they all quite strongly identify as Māori, even though some of them may not look it. The second to last one is a total blonde; you'd think he came from Sweden. But I think I understand why Māori do the things they do. I understand their protesting and I totally support it. But I don't think that it has made any difference to me. I have always been the same and because my husband and I have been together for so long, everybody knows us and that makes a difference to the ways in which Pākehā might treat me. But as my husband says, there are some good Pākehā, some of them are alright, and they too are God's children.

Joseph

Joseph is an older Pākehā male who has been involved in te ao Māori for more than six decades. He is a Reverend in the Māori Presbyterian church and is married to a Māori woman who is a direct descendant of Rua, the Prophet.

Tana kōrero

When I lived in England I was a bricklayer and bricklayers at that time were earning five pounds ten shillings a week and that was pretty good money. Astonishingly, I can't to this day say why I decided to go to New Zealand. However, I did come to think of it as a call from God. At that time I was an Anglican, not a Presbyterian, and I wasn't a very good Anglican. But I applied to come to New Zealand and was accepted. I was set to sail in July 1949. A couple of weeks before I departed, I was walking down the promenade with my mate. It was a beautiful day, mid-summer. Some other mates were coming the other way towards us. We stopped and we got chatting. One of them said "I hear you are going to that God-forsaken hole New Zealand, why the hell are you going there?" and I said "Well I can't get a woman here. I am going to get one of them Māori woman". And at that time, I didn't know anything about Māori, other than what I saw in the painting of the four kuia which hung on the wall of my parent's house in England. I arrived in New Zealand on the 12th of September 1949. I stayed with my uncle in Auckland and worked at various jobs in the Auckland region. Six months later, I decided I wanted to see a bit more of New Zealand, so I applied for a job as a bricklayer in Tauranga. I got the job and lo and behold the boss was a Pom. I worked there for 6 months then moved to Rotorua. There was only one other bricklayer in Rotorua at that time and he was heading for retirement. So I started to work on my own. I formed a relationship with another Pommie bricklayer and we started a partnership. I was a boozier at that time, going into pubs where there were a lot of Māori, so I got to know quite a few of them. One of them asked me to do a job at Kawaha Point for the old Bishop that was living there. The Māori Affairs Department funded the building project and I was asked to

build the fireplace. Through that job I got to know quite a few more Māori, Tupara Morrison, an uncle of Sir Howard Morrison, was one of them. We did a lot of boozing together and would often go to the local hot baths. Then I got to know John Taiapa, he was a master carver, well known throughout New Zealand. I began to build up quite a relationship with Māori at that time. So I guess my focus was changing towards Māori. I mean, I was never a racist in England, although there weren't a lot of black people there at that time. But at Middlesborough, the big port from near to where I lived, we used to see black people occasionally and I often boozed with them in the pubs. But I took to the Māori people and they seemed to take to me. While I was living and working in Rotorua, a chap from the Labour Department told me about a job available at the Whakatane board mill. I took the job which lasted 3 months. I stayed at the local pub as a permanent guest. I got to know all the mainly Māori staff there, one in particular, a waitress. We got chummy and eventually as time went by, we got married. That was my first wife. My first wife was adopted when she was a week old and taken from the Urewera down to Kutarere between Whakatane and Opotiki. She was adopted into a family called the Hape. When I met her, her name was Tira Kahurangi Tatu. We were married in November 1952. We had a family of six children in Rotorua and I vowed that that would be the last, but we ended up with seven, the last one was born in Whakatane when I was in training for the Ministry. We went back to Rotorua to find a place to live. But that proved difficult and we had to stay at a camping ground for some time until we got a flat in Ngongataha. Then a Māori social worker called on us and asked if we wanted to own our own home. He said that the government would give us a loan to build our own home. So we built our own house. I then met this old chap, the Very Reverend John Laughton. He had been a moderator for the Presbyterian Church in New Zealand. He was the first Moderator, the first leader of it and the first theological teacher of Māori at Whakatane. He was asked by Te Hinota Māori in his retirement if he would start a congregation in Rotorua. But first John had to encourage Tuhoe Māori living in Whakatane and Rotorua to join the congregation. John Rangihau was one of the most prominent ones back then. Then eventually, John Laughton managed to lasso my wife into the congregation. My wife would go with John when

they were having karakia in Rotorua. John kept asking me to go until eventually I said yes. My memory of that time was driving John's great big green Chevrolet around town, picking up all these Māori to take them to church. Then eventually things started to happen to me, which I couldn't quite understand. I started thinking more about Church. After a while I was accepted to do a year's training in Te Wānanga a Rangi, the theological college down at Whakatane. I studied philosophy of religion and Māori there. At the end of the year I was sent down to Dunedin for more training. I was there for 3 years and enjoyed it thoroughly. I was the only one in the theological department that had anything to do with Māori. One of the students there came to me and said he was due to complete his training at the end of the year. He said he was worried that he might be placed somewhere where there were Māori and he wouldn't have a clue what to do. So I approached the Senatus, Pieter de Bres, and suggested to him that he get a tutor to help students with similar issues. Pieter agreed to do it himself, and came in once a week to take lessons on the philosophy of Māori. Then one day the principal of the college, Lloyd Geering, came to me and said that he had a phone call from the Dunedin's Women's Prison. They desperately needed a prison chaplain who was familiar with Māori. I agreed to take on the role and I had a great time. After Dunedin, I was placed at Waimana. Waimana was my first parish. Because I had been attending Māori meetings at the Ohope meeting house, I became known to Māori in that area. But at that time I was the only Pākehā in the parish. There had been a lot of Pākehā before me, missionaries, but in recent times I was the only one. I was ordained on the 4th of January 1970. My second wife and her first husband were the Ministers then. But they moved out of the parish house and went into a share-milker's cottage to make room for us. Four days after I was ordained, they left the town altogether. So the parish was left with just three Māori elders, two men, one woman, and me. My first wife died of cancer and sometime later I married my second wife, who at that time was ministering in Auckland. She had been a deaconess. We got married in the end of 1980. Then in 1986, I was transferred to Auckland. Bruce Hucker and Purewa Biddle were the ministers at the church I was transferred to. My wife and I worked together until I got to know Auckland, then I went to the Mangere area while she

worked in the Mt Wellington area. In mid-1986 the Māori Synod, which was funded by the Pākehā church, had a drastic funding cut. I had just turned 60 that year so I offered to retire, but would stay on working full-time. After a while, my wife and I moved to Wellington to begin building a church marae. We had to get funding and friends from the Pākehā church helped us raise money. We found a place in Moera, Lower Hutt but it was very expensive, so we needed a lot more money than was initially raised. I got in touch with the Minister at that time, Ian McCallum. We got talking and I unashamedly laid the Treaty of Waitangi on him. I said "give us back our land". He said "I can't do anything about it myself but I'll take it back to my elders". It was on the market for \$80,000. He rang me up a week later and he said that he had a meeting with the elders and they had decided to take it off the market. Three months later the elders met with us to officially hand over the deeds to that property. Just like that, the whole lock stock and barrel. Mind you it took us \$260,000 to do it all up to a church marae! To pay for the fix-up, we had an inaugural appeal dinner at the Pipitea Marae in Wellington. We got an appeal committee together to raise money, some from the Pākehā side, but mostly members from our side. We had the inaugural dinner to launch the appeal and then someone came up with the idea of having a ball at Government House. I spoke with the Governor General - a friend of mine. He gave us the use of the ballroom at Government House, the military band, the drinks, and food, and waitress services - all for free. It was a smashing ball. We raised all of the money we needed and opened the church marae 2 weeks later. We officially opened on Boxing Day, 1989. It was absolutely crowded with people. Groups of people come from all over the place. Inside the church we had two main carvings, one of Rua the Prophet, the other of John Laughton. On the day of the opening we welcomed members from the Ringatū church. They arrived very early in the morning at four o'clock. But the main service began at ten o'clock that day. After that the church marae got very well known. So it was absolutely tremendous. I kept working there until the end of 1995 when I retired once again. But over the years, my encounters with te ao Māori have led me to meet many dignitaries. I have met three Prime Ministers, Cabinet Ministers, and even the Moderator of the Church of Scotland, and many more

encounters have happened along the way, too many for me to remember. Now, while in my third retirement, I have 21 grandchildren and five great grandchildren and my wife has 15 grandchildren, no greats yet. So there we are. Māori has been my life for the last 44 years, I know no other.

Storylines

The biographies above demonstrate the lived experiences of what I am calling “Pākehā decolonisation experiences”, in that these experiences reveal the decolonisation process. It is important to point out here that these experiences are not provided in support of any interpretation or generalisation about the concept of decolonisation beyond the participants’ experiences. Rather, they are offered in this thesis in support of the kinds of events that occur when Pākehā enter into te ao Māori, and, as an outcome, lead them to engage in some part with processes of decolonisation. Also, it is important to point out that although the participants had experiences with te ao Māori that were sometimes contentious, or even contradictory, generally these encounters helped them learn more about te ao Māori and become informed about differences between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā as well as possible connections between the two worlds. Also, ongoing encounters helped to keep the participants involved in seeking, or furthering opportunities for new information about te ao Māori to be accessed. It is these experiences that can lead to the process of Pākehā decolonisation because in order for Pākehā to begin to decolonise, they must first encounter te ao Māori.

The five storylines, one in each of the chapters that follow, demonstrate ways in which ongoing experiences with te ao Māori help Pākehā decolonise and become more third space in their thinking. Here, I demonstrate my interpretation of Pākehā decolonisation as five occurrences that form the framework of a Pākehā decolonisation model. I relate these occurrences, as five separate storylines, to the behaviours, contexts, and experiences that occur when Pākehā become interested in te ao Māori:

1. Storyline One: *Encounters with te ao Māori*
2. Storyline Two: *Ngā wairua o te ao Māori*
3. Storyline Three: *Othering*
4. Storyline Four: *Equality*
5. Storyline Five: *Pākehā educating Pākehā.*

It is important to point out that as Laenui (2000) suggests, decolonisation is a process involves encounters and experiences that “can be experienced at the same time or in various combinations” because there are no “clear demarcations from one [experience] to the next” (p. 152). For the purposes of the thesis and analysis, I separate the storylines in order to demonstrate ways in which decolonisation, as a process, is experienced by the participants.

CHAPTER FIVE / Te wāhanga tuarima:

Storyline One: *Encounters with te ao Māori*

“Te ara kura o Tāne. Glittering pathway of the setting sun. A potential leader sets out on a pathway to success (Trad.)” (Grace & Grace, 2003, p. 50)

Introduction

When I interviewed participants for this study, I was interested in knowing what kinds of experiences occurred that encouraged them to want to find out more about te ao Māori and to have more rewarding and successful interactions with Māori. I found that their interests as well as successful interactions within te ao Māori increased because they were frequently exposed to different kinds of encounters with te ao Māori. For example, their encounters occurred at work, school, through social interaction with other Māori or Pākehā, and in intimate relationships. It became clear that these encounters were complex, and that there was no single way in which they occurred. What emerged as significant across participants was that, collectively, these encounters helped participants develop insights into te ao Māori.

In this storyline I demonstrate the multiple ways in which these encounters occur. For example, sometimes they are metaphorically described in spatial terms as a structure that requires moving around or over (David), or as an accidental encounter (Simon), or an epiphany (Francis), or as something that was always there to encounter, as in, “The Māori culture is right here at our doorstep, it belongs in our country, it’s native to our country” (Helen). A consistent element within these experiences was that, when they occurred, participants often discovered as well as recovered information about what it means being Māori and being Pākehā. Also, the participants’ reactions to these experiences within te ao Māori changed or evolved from childhood to adulthood. The complexity of participants’ encounters is revealed in the different timeframes, contexts and settings in which they occurred (i.e., at

home, in education settings, at work) and through the different actors involved (i.e., Māori, Pākehā, members of whānau, friends, spouse, or partner). It became clear that early encounters occurred when participants discovered that their positioning as Pākehā was connected with social order.

Encounters with te ao Māori

I reiterate here that Pākehā do come from a different starting point to decolonisation from that of indigenous peoples. Nonetheless, encounters occur when decolonising peoples chose to become more aware of discussions about past and present social injustices, grievances, problems and issues that continue *us/them* relations between two peoples. These discussions awaken Pākehā from an unaware state to engaging in a process of learning and action toward change. This process of awaking from a state of unawareness was theorised by Mezirow (1990) as experiencing “disorientating dilemmas” (p. 5) in that awareness to oppressive practices, grievances, and societal issues that promote distance between groups, led group members to question their own view of self and its location in relation to another group. Thus, group members may experience emotions of anger, frustration, and disappointment and/or mourning as they question the multiple reasons why they were not aware of this earlier in their lives, i.e., “why wasn’t I told about this?” (p. 5).

In the New Zealand context postcolonial thinking lends its hand to discussions about Māori grievances which draw out Pākehā awakenings about past and present Māori/Pākehā relations including both productive aspects of this relationship as well as discriminatory or oppressive practices. These discussions uncover events, views and opinions that reveal *us/them* ways of thinking. Within these kinds of discussions popular Pākehā assumptions about being Pākehā are revealed because the relationality of the colonial relationship is revisited where Pākehā are portrayed as superior to Māori. Thus, awakenings for Pākehā lead Pākehā to what Gramsci (1971) referred to as the commonsense understanding held by a majority in a society. Through a “series of negotiations” (Gramsci, cited in Adamson, 1980, p. 151),

Pākehā engaging in third space experiences attempt to disrupt the prevailing commonsense of the general Pākehā group. However, as Flores and Moon (2002) argue, any discussions about relations between different groups of people “are often rendered invisible by identity politics” (p. 201). In other words, because formalised models of decolonisation at the individual level are not always readily available or accessible, the politics of being Pākehā come to the surface and are associated with dominance and are sustained as such by popular Pākehā opinion. When questions are raised about the *us/them* relation by a member of the more dominant group, this member begins to find out that the group they belong to (Pākehā) is seen as having some power over their subordinate (Māori), something Māori already know and are constantly overwhelmingly reminded of. Also, these Pākehā begin to rediscover New Zealand history - Pākehā and Māori history from a third space perspective because they begin to relate then integrate their own Pākehā ways of being with Māori culture, Māori language and Māori ways of being. As demonstrated in a previous chapter, an all-encompassing Pākehā perspective of Pākehā ways of being, decolonisation and colonisation is difficult to ascertain because some Pākehā New Zealanders continue to believe in the standard story of New Zealand history (Fish, 1980; Nairn & McCreanor, 1991) and in the notion that Pākehā do not need to change their view of the Māori/Pākehā relation because it is Māori that should change theirs (McCreanor, 2005, 2009).

For Pākehā engaged in third space experiences any continuation of *us/them* thinking is counter-productive to future discussions about the Māori/Pākehā relation. Although there is some diversity here, generally, discussions third space Pākehā have with other Pākehā tend to reveal essentialisms generated from *us/them* ways of thinking and are discussions that do not respect that Māori and Pākehā ways of being are relational in that they impact on each other. These kinds of discussions are generally around issues involving injustices, grievances and questions Pākehā have about Māori sovereignty, (Archie, 1995; Melbourne, 1995) or Pākehā place (Bell, 2004a, 2004b; Bell & Mathewman, 2004). During early encounters with te ao Māori or on reflection of these encounters, participants begin to understand their perspective

of te ao Māori as different from that of Māori and many other Pākehā. This realisation helps them become third space in their thinking in that they adopt a decolonised perspective toward Māori and Pākehā relations. Also, they become more motivated to reflect on experiences where *us/them* thinking by Pākehā is revealed. These ongoing encounters highlight that Pākehā positioning is heir to the benefits of status, wealth and education (Bell, 2004b; Frankenberg, 1997) as well as the status of Whiteness (Feagin et al., 2001). It is these encounters that can also lead to deeper understandings. For example, Helen felt that Pākehā superiority infiltrated ways in which history was taught at her school:

What we were actually taught as children back in primary and high school was very much one version. If you are going to be taught history, shouldn't you be taught two sides and then be left as an individual to make up your own mind? An example is the Treaty of Waitangi and land claims. My whole life through school I had only been told a snippet. Pākehā would say "Why can't they just leave things in the past? Why do they need their land back? They are just going to waste it on drugs and alcohol anyway". I was only being fed one sort of perception and it was the common perception throughout most of Pākehā society. But it never rang true with me. Māori culture is the culture and ways of our country. That's just how it is. So before people can actually judge them as a people, on their ways and how they do things, they should know about it first and about why they have their culture and why they do things a certain way, then they can make judgement. To me it is such a beautiful culture and it stands for so much of what society and the world is searching for. It's right here on our doorstep. It belongs in our country. It's native to our country and yet Pākehā just walk past it and don't pick up on it. Because I have experienced the culture first hand and the people first hand, I now know that Pākehā perception is so wrong.

Another strand in which the participants experience Pākehā dominance involves judgements made about Māori or negative stereotypes of Māori as being Other and inferior to Pākehā. For example, Betty's husband is a prominent Māori academic, prolific author and political spokesperson for Māori and has been for more than five decades. Because he is well known, Betty was aware of many experiences where Pākehā expressed disdain toward her husband. The most recent occurrence in 2008 was evidence to Betty that *us/them* thinking still existed in New Zealand today:

I took a Māori certificate to get it framed at a chemist shop. The certificate had a kōwhaiwhai [painted scroll ornamentation] on it. It was clearly a Māori kind of thing. The shop assistant said to me “What’s your name?” and I said “[name]” “Oh” he said “Not Mrs [name]?” I said, “Lucky, aren’t I?” “Oh no” he said, “Oh no, you are not. He is twisted and he is bitter and he is this and he is that and he doesn’t like Pākehās” and so I said “Oh, well he thinks that I am alright”. But he didn’t believe it. I don’t think that he believed it. I said to him “You are just judging him by what you see on the television and what you read in the paper”.

The participants’ experiences of stereotypical views of Māori also demonstrate that for some Pākehā, Māori are considered their inferior. Betty and her wider whānau encountered these kinds of negative stereotypes often:

My mother came across the deputy principal of the Teachers’ College and he said that he was very worried about me. He didn’t think that it was a very good idea me going out with my husband because you never know what it might lead to . . . My sister is married to a Pākehā in Hamilton and her husband was a bit of a big cheese down there. When she was younger, they always used to go on about my husband this and my husband that, and my sister would say “Well that is my brother-in-law”. Because of my husband, she got interested in Māori politics. But she has some terrible run-ins with her friends. One of her friends’ parents was murdered by one of these gang things and of course her friend was terribly bitter about Māori and her friend blames the whole lot for it . . . My grandson had a big argument with his teacher because the teacher said he wasn’t Māori. He was doing a test and he had to put his ethnicity on it and he put Māori. The teacher said “No you are not Maori”, and my grandson said “Yes I am”. The teacher said “No you are not. You put down European”. So he said “My mother is Māori” and so she said “Yes, but she is less than half, so you are not at all”.

I said something to this politician about our children calling themselves Māori and he said to me, “Oh you have failed haven’t you?” That interested me because my husband and I never pushed it either way. The children and grandchildren have just picked it up themselves and decided that that is what they wanted to be.

For Betty, negative stereotyping of Māori meant negative experiences for her children. In contrast, for Helen negative stereotyping of Māori led to her creating positive experiences for her Pākehā partner’s children who had a whakapapa connection to Māori:

he mother of my partner's children is Māori and she is mixed up with the Mongrel Mob and the children never really had any knowledge of te ao Māori or whakapapa. Then one day the kids came home with a story book from the library and it was the legend of Te Arawa and Hinemoa [creation story of Māori mythology] and that is their iwi. I sat them down at the table and was reading the story to them explaining some of the language that was used and they just loved it. They thought that it was great. It was just so amazing to see these two kids who never even knew or acknowledged that they were Māori to start embracing it. Another time my partner's son cut his hand badly and he was running around saying to everybody "Look, look, I'm not Māori, my blood is red!" So I had to sit him down and explain to him that everybody's blood was red. He has now really started to embrace who he is and where he comes from . . . I don't like to take credit for it, but I think my husband and the children feel safe now to be able to say that they are Māori. Before, the only Māori side of things they had been exposed to was quite an abusive environment, neglect, drugs, and alcohol and they didn't want to associate themselves with that environment. Whereas now they are in a really stable home and they are exposed to positive aspects of te ao Māori and they can now actually see that it is safe for them to acknowledge their Māori side.

Encounters of this kind suggest that boundaries (Giroux, 1992) between Pākehā and Māori do exist in New Zealand today and although boundaries might be reinterpreted or reordered, they appear to maintain nineteenth century stereotypes (Goldberg, 1993) associated with the colonial relationality (Bell, 2004b) of Pākehā and Māori because as a nation we are generally not decolonised or postcolonial in our thinking. When negative stereotyping of Māori by Pākehā occurs, Māori are negatively Othered because Māori are considered to be unlike Pākehā or "unlike the dominant group" (Pincus, 2006, p. 17). For example, Francis was exposed to this kind of stereotyping when she interviewed a prominent Pākehā politician:

I think when I interviewed him it was such a painful time because it reminded me of the 1981 Springbok Tour. It was a bit of déjà vu and I thought we had moved on a bit . . . as a country. I was very upset about this and I guess that was part of it . . . the whole country thing. When I interviewed him, I got really upset, I was really emotional. It was probably one of the only times in my whole life where I have been emotionally involved in a story or an interview. But it was so painful that Pākehā could believe all that crap about Māori, all those myths. There was hardly any truth in any of it and to think that Māori were[seen as] advantaged, I mean honestly, when we have totally disadvantaged them in every possible way through racism and government

policies and theft and you know... greed... and then to turn around and blame them. That hurt, that hurt Māori . . . God it was terrible. During the interview, we had a hell of a row. We had to cut the whole middle section out of the interview. I have never been angry with an interviewee before or since . . . never . . . I was very, very angry and he was so calculated about what he thought about Māori. It was so politically motivated and I was thinking about the impact that it was going to have on people. He was being so crudely political and manipulative with the population and people's emotions . . . their nastier sides . . . the nasty side of people. I thought how dare he bring up all these issues about Māori without having any reading or any understanding about what he was talking about? How dare he? He only knew what was said at the financial dinner party circuit . . . that was his total knowledge. He got really angry and upset with me. I think we both lost our cool. He was really surprised with himself losing his cool and it was because we were talking past each other. It wasn't because we were rude to each other. I said to him "How come a Māori man who has got a heart condition ends up dying and doesn't get a bypass operation or anything else and the equivalent Pākehā man will get health care and so on?" and he was saying "Oh well, with black people in America it has been shown that if you give special consideration it is counterproductive", all of that sort of crap, and I said to him, "No, no, hold on a minute, let's just talk about this man, this Māori man. He has got a heart condition, so how come he is not getting the same care as all of these other people?" and he said "But that is not the issue" and I said "But yeah it is. How are you going to give him the same care as Pākehā?" he said something like "Well I can't help if he is a country bumpkin". He could not see that it was about a person with an illness who deserved the same care as somebody else and who might need some special thing to make sure that he got it. "No" and he kept on saying to me "What do you mean?" and I was going "Can't you see?" We just had completely different opinions. I think he saw people as numbers. He didn't know any Māori. He couldn't see them as people. They were numbers, they were statistics. I mean . . . he just completely couldn't relate. He said to me, "You're really very interested in Māori culture aren't you? As a Pākehā why are you like that?" He said "Don't you find them very primitive and very animalistic?" But I was mindful that he had been manipulated by his public relations guy who would have said to him, "Hey we have done a focus group and these sorts of comments will get you noticed".

For David, it was summer holidays spent in Bulls that revealed negative stereotypes of Māori:

When I was a boy we used to go on summer holidays to my grandmother's in Bulls, which is an interesting town. It is quite a segregated town if you actually wander around it. There is a marae in quite a separate physical space and then there is this sort of white town . . . and it was, at that time, a

very white sort of town. I remember it as quite a segregating place and I remember the family that lived next door in the street were Māori. We used to hang out with them and play. My parents didn't seem particularly perturbed about that. But my grandmother did find that perturbing because I think she found that they were dirty, or not really the right kind of children for her grandchildren, which could be a natural grandmother kind of response, that no-one is quite good enough for their grandchildren. But you sort of felt that there was another element to it going on there. On my mother's side of the family . . . they had been in Bulls since the 1880s and while there was an Irish side to it, their original forebears were English, so they were from that kind of stock . . . or maybe it was because they were living in a town that was quite segregated . . . they did have a slightly more negatively coloured attitude to Māori as being somewhere kind of over some fence. Even though on a one-to-one basis they might interact perfectly pleasantly with any particular Māori person, you got a feeling that there was more of a division and that we were here . . . they were there.

Susan and Brenda each reported that members of their own whānau also negatively Othered Māori:

I have a fairly solid redneck branch of the family and one of them said to my mum when I left the Waitangi Tribunal, "Thank God she's getting out of all that Treaty business". There was quite a bit of that kind of attitude. I have an uncle who is particularly keen on ribbing me about my involvement in Treaty issues also, and the thing that I keep coming back to is that he is a very larger-than-life individual who just has some awful Central Otago opinions about a number of things. The thing that makes me constantly sad when we have our kind of pretend fights about Māori is that the qualities that I most admire in the Māori colleagues I see working very hard for a very admirable cause are exactly the qualities that I admire in my uncle. It's just that I can't understand in my great naivety in the human race, why he can't get past those negative opinions he has about Māori. (Susan)

I have relations who have been brought up in an area of New Zealand where they didn't have much contact with Māori and I began to notice that they would say some derogatory things about Māori. I decided that they didn't really know what Māori were like because they were stereotyping each person and individual. I took some of my Māori friends around to meet them one day and they just welcomed them in and adored them. So I think that I dispelled some of those stereotypes. Sometimes people have those kinds of stereotypes and they are not aware of it because they haven't had any exposure to people of other cultures. (Brenda)

Clearly, the participants were aware also of frequent experiences where Māori were negatively Othered by Pākehā in ways which were hierarchical (Goldberg, 1993). For example, Alice was well aware of between iwi Othering by Pākehā and she intimated that outcomes of this process remained the same; that Māori, regardless of iwi hierarchical order, were inferior to Pākehā:

As I got older I discovered quite a lot about the wrong side of the tracks stuff. There would be comments like, “The only decent Māori are from the East Coast” and “Māori are very nice people, but you don’t want to let your daughter marry one”. There was all of this kind of racial shit that would go on.

Encounters in which Pākehā Other Māori helped participants become more familiar with ways in which Māori are Othered and how Māori experiences are clearly different from the experiences of Pākehā. For example:

We went to the Auckland Museum one day, to the war memorial. We were going on a class trip. Nothing seemed particularly odd about that. We went to look at Māori objects there. I remember that something must have gone missing while we were visiting the museum. There are always hundreds of people in that museum. But when we were back at school they must have contacted us as if it must have been that bunch of Māori wandering around the museum that filched this thing. I remember thinking, “Well there were a lot of other people there, how come they haven’t been accused?” I then became more aware in the classroom in terms of the way Māori people react to those kinds of accusations. It’s like this is what happens, it is like, “Oh well here we go again”. The Māori guys in the class would say, “Well the cops were around our house again the other night because something happened in West Auckland and they naturally always come to our house” and I was thinking “Well they don’t do that to my house”. So I was exposed to these strange experiences because I thought that these were really nice people and I really liked them, more than most other people in the school, and yet listening to these narratives it seemed like a lot of Pākehā had quite a different attitude toward them. Whereas I thought, “Oh you know they are rough diamonds, some of them like a good scrap, but they are individuals”. They treated me right and I couldn’t see why the police would want to go visit them all the time and why they were being accused of theft when there were so many other people in the museum . . . most of whom were white. So it was a learning curve for me. I was learning lots more than just the language.

There were cultural things and all sorts of stuff going on. Those kinds of experiences made me very aware about conscientisation. (David)

As demonstrated in a previous chapter, negative stereotypes of Māori perpetuate sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth century stereotypes of indigenous peoples as inferior to European/Pākehā peoples. This stereotyping occurs when Whiteness or Pākehāness is seen to be the measure of civilisation, of racial hierarchical order and of all human truths (Appleby, 1994; Battiste, 1996; Goldberg, 1993). Participants' experiences with Othering show that the existing hierarchical order is continuing because some Pākehā refuse to accept that te ao Māori has anything positive to offer te ao Pākehā. For Goldberg (1993), "refusal to acknowledge the influence of other cultures" (p. 33) is a continuation of Enlightenment philosophy. Participants' experiences with Pākehā that revealed te ao Māori to be irrelevant, unimportant, or undervalued occurred in varied settings such as within their own families, at work, at school, or among friends. For example:

In my family, my mother and stepfather . . . my stepfather in particular . . . thought that I was doing something that was perhaps... a bit unnecessary. They weren't racist but they did say things like "Why are you doing that?", that kind of thing. (Francis)

All of my family think I am mad . . . I don't think my mum really understood. My two older brothers thought that I was nuts . . . Their wives thought I was nuts and I think that some of them still think that I am nuts. They couldn't see the point. Mostly it was like, "What the hell are you going to do with it?[learning Māori] You are never going to get a job", those types of things. (Lisa)

When I first started working at Te Wānanga, Pākehā would say to me things like, "You won't last long" and "Are you sure that you are going to have a job? Do they need you there to keep them on the straight and narrow? What are you doing that for? You are not Māori" and "Oh great, you are one of them now", all those sorts of comments. I was just floored, but I did kind of expect it. (Helen)

Thinking back, there could have been a perception by some of the white teachers that "Why are we teaching Māori? What is the point of it? Should we

not be giving our students other types of skills, technical skills? Being West Auckland where everybody is going to end up being some kind of worker in a factory, why are we not giving them metal work? Why are we mucking around with the Māori language?” (David)

A lot of my Pākehā friends were law students and I would quite often get comments from them like . . . “Why are you studying Māori and theatre studies? Why don’t you do an academic subject? Why don’t you do a real subject? Why don’t you do a real degree?” (Cindy)

Although participants were frequently exposed to negative opinions about te ao Māori they did appear to employ a third space perspective toward these encounters because they also reflected on their positive past experiences with Māori. For example, for more than five decades Francis had encountered many negative opinions Pākehā had about te ao Māori. She described these experiences as epiphanies because they helped her realise that some Pākehā viewed Māori in a negative manner. In Denzin’s words, epiphanies are significant because they reveal experiences that “cut to the inner core of the person’s life and leave indelible marks in them” (Denzin, 1989b, p. 39). Francis described this sentiment:

When I first became involved in journalism I took a passing interest in the odd Māori story. Then when I moved up to Auckland in 1975 the Dawn Raids occurred and boom . . . an epiphany. I thought to myself, “I have to do more stories in this area. This is social injustice . . . I am a journalist!”

Francis’ epiphany revealed an “interactional moment” (Denzin, 1989a, p. 70), or a “point of difficulty” (Roberts, 2002, p. 176) in her life which challenged her understanding of her own life and brought about “significant subsequent effects” (p. 176) which led Francis to question why Māori and Pacific peoples were represented negatively by Pākehā in mass media (Wall, 1997). To counter this, Francis employed a more accurate and focused portrayal of te ao Māori in journalism. In doing so, she uncovered a new element of her experiences and interest in te ao Māori. She found that her interest in covering Māori stories was not something that her work colleagues felt would advance her career prospects:

At meetings at work I always had two or three Māori stories. Some of them were good and some of them were probably not so good and I think partly because I was a good story creative person that other reporters would resent it. Anyway, at meetings we would end up having more Māori stories than the broadcasting firm thought were worthy of reporting because “We, the broadcasting firm, don’t really do Māori stories . . . that isn’t our function . . . this is a Pākehā organisation”. So the broadcasting firm said to me that I was suggesting too many Māori stories. I would always say to them, “That is ridiculous. I am doing a round here and I am giving you all of the suggestions and you want to punish me because I am coming up with too much Māori stories”. I then got this annual report and it said that I was putting too much of my energies into Māori and that it was affecting my career and that it was not in the best interests for my future as a journalist. It was tough to handle and at times I felt that I was under siege . . . it may sound ridiculous . . . but I was. It was only because I was righteous and because I felt that I was right that I would say “I am not going to back down on this, I am not going to”. I was bloody angry. So I wrote this letter and I copied in the Director General . . . the Minister. In the letter I asked to do another round because I thought that somebody else should do the Māori and Pacific round for a while because it was getting difficult. I would have still done some stories but I didn’t want to be identified as biased because it was counterproductive. Anyway, I told the broadcasting firm that I had written to the Director General and had asked for another round and the broadcasting firm said “Oh you haven’t sent it have you?” and I said “No not yet, but I intend to” and they said “Well we will rewrite the report” and they did. I am not absolutely sure whether it was competition, or professional jealousy, or whether it was totally racially based. Whatever it was, the broadcasting firm did realise how dangerous it was.

This is just one example of the kinds of experiences Francis was frequently exposed to. Similar experiences led her to become more proactive in her response to injustices that occurred for Māori but also led to her being characterised by her Pākehā work colleagues as “pro-Māori”:

We get to Bastion Point which I covered quite a lot before and during the occupation. I wasn’t allowed on the day because the broadcasting firm said I would be biased. They said that I would be too biased because I had come to know the people there. After Bastion Point, I reported on the Haka party incident and quite a few other odds and sods. My work colleagues then started to say that I was pro-Māori and they said that you couldn’t send a reporter to cover a Māori story who is biased. So I was often told by other reporters that I was biased. Sometimes it was used just for an edge, like they are very competitive in the television broadcasting industry, and sometimes it

was because that was how they perceived it... that I was pro-Māori. It was a really, really painful time because I was mixing with Māori and I was working with Māori on a daily basis . . . it hurt . . .

Therefore, participants encountered situations, events and experiences where their support for te ao Māori was seen negatively by other Pākehā, as being biased toward Māori. One possible reason for this negativity is that for some Pākehā advocacy for Māori by another Pākehā might seem detrimental to Pākehā society in general. Advocacy for te ao Māori could be perceived as favouring te ao Māori over te ao Pākehā, a view which reflects hierarchical ordering of identities because some Pākehā do not accept that te ao Māori has anything of value to offer te ao Pākehā. This perspective was clearly evident in the interview Francis had with a prominent Pākehā politician, part of which has already been presented above:

It made me realise that there is in him a sincerity that he honestly believes that Māori don't have value . . . that their culture is crap . . . that the only way they are going to be able to succeed is to become Pākehā . . . That is what he believes . . .

Pākehā hostility toward or dismissal of Māori does exist. Although the nature of this hostility has arguably changed quite dramatically over time from a focus on *us/them* issues of past decades to what Francis identifies as an unsubstantiated belief that Māori get preferential treatment. Hostility by Pākehā toward Māori occurs in many different settings. For example, for Cindy and Jack school was a location that revealed the hostile attitudes that some Pākehā had towards Māori as well as racial divisions between Pākehā and Māori:

I remember being on my school bus as a kid and having the bus driver call any Māori kids that got on "Niggers" and telling them "You little niggers better not cause any trouble". Those kinds of comments were passed around as normal. (Cindy)

I grew up in Whakatane and the primary school I went to had quite a high ratio of Māori. I also lived in a street where they pepper-potted it with Māori housing . . . sort of dispersed amongst Pākehā families. But by the time I got

to high school . . . which was in the early seventies . . . there were quite rigid racial divisions. Very few Pākehā kids played rugby. Most played soccer, hockey or cricket. Very few Pākehā went into the cadets; nearly all that went were Māori. So even though at a primary level I had a lot of contact with Māori kids, at secondary level that had pretty much dried up . . . at high school there was a certain amount of racial antagonism between Māori and Pākehā and essentially the Pākehā hung out together. (Jack)

For these participants, experiences with negative Pākehā opinion toward te ao Māori lead them to the realisation that their view of te ao Māori was different from that of many Pākehā. This difference was highlighted in the assumptions David's fellow Pākehā schoolmates made about his interest in Māori subjects:

When I was at school, a lot of Pākehā at times found it very odd or bemusing for me to be doing Māori. I do remember them asking me, "What are you studying it for? It can't be a very complicated language because I presume native people aren't meant to be very bright and so how can their language be?" I used to try and assure them that it was far harder than French, but that didn't wash. But there was a lot of bewilderment and puzzlement. I think that they thought that I was somewhat decidedly eccentric for doing it. There wasn't hostility, but there was puzzlement, bemusement, and questions as to "Why are you doing it?" or "Why are you still doing it? What do you find about it that really keeps you going?"

However, such experiences of negative Pākehā opinion toward te ao Māori led some participants to see their involvement in te ao Māori as generally rewarding and positive experiences whether they were experiences that occurred at work, in education, with whānau, in friendships and/or marriage. For example, for most participants work was a location where many positive experiences occurred:

Wiremu Parker [a Māori man] was doing the Māori news and we used to save anything that looked Māori in the news for him. He was a lovely man, a very special man. He had that lovely gentle demeanour that kaumātua often do have. He used to help people with their Māori pronunciation and he did a lot of training in broadcasting. Derek Fox [another Māori man], who was somebody that I worked with many times quite closely. These people had a big influence on me . . . Harry Dansey was the Race Relations Conciliator and he is an ex journalist and he realised that there would be people in broadcasting that he could target and get to do more stories about race

relations and issues. I was one of the ones that he saw that could do that. He gave me stories and got me introductions to really important Māori people. (Francis)

Encounters at work also led to understanding of tikanga or a Māori way of doing things. In addition, encounters at work revealed hierarchical differences between Māori and Pākehā which had potential to lead to further investigation into te ao Māori. For example:

I met Uncle Tom . . . he was a Ministry of Works man. He was one of the elders of Tainui [iwi of the Waikato, King Country and Tauranga areas]. He became like my second father. He was wonderful. In the day he taught me some Māori words. We did lots of things together like have hāngī [food together cooked from a traditional Māori earth oven]. (Brenda)

I got a job in the railways and the thing that amazed me there was that all the workers were Pākehā . . . only our foreman was Māori . . . he was the only Māori in the whole thing, which is like the complete reversal of what it is likely to be in the North Island. During that time the railways was still one of the few places that Māori could move around and get jobs and get promoted. (Jack)

We began working together doing stand-up comedy around New Zealand. Because of [the influence of a Māori man], certain things opened up. They may have opened up anyway, but they probably opened up faster because of [him]. I called myself [his] “white monkey”. Working with [him] helped lead on to doing more stuff in Māori, then suddenly I was doing stuff for Māori Television Services and I was doing stuff for Ngāi Tāhu and more stuff has come from that. So in a way, [he] was that gate and it was through [him] and through the fact that his wife was very staunch on Māori issues that [he] and I started doing the New Zealand history show where we looked at various kinds of Māori and Pākehā history. I would go around to [his] house and ask him about stuff and he would say “Well actually, it is to do with this, or it is to do with that”. Because of that interaction, the gates then started to open up more through my own study of history. I looked at battles and that kind of thing and I would say, “Well why do they do this?” and “What is the motive behind that?” and “Why do they say this when I’m assuming it may mean something else”. (Simon)

Participants’ openness to “grabbing hold” of these encounters marks them as significant experiences because participants were receptive to te ao Māori and its

influences. For example, Simon intimated that being receptive to te ao Māori meant being open to experiences with te ao Māori whether those encounters were frequent or infrequent:

If I had dated a Māori girl earlier in my life she may have been the gate. But as it was, it took all of that time until my early twenties before I found the gate. It wasn't that I wasn't looking for it and it wasn't that I was looking for it, it just kind of happened. Before I knew anything about te ao Māori I was perfectly happy going about my business in my little white-bread unemployed comedian world.

Participants' stories suggest that work encounters with Māori may be infrequent because not all places of work employ Māori or have any connection to te ao Māori. One context where encounters do happen more frequently is in education. For example, for Alice who spent much of her early childhood at Arowhenua Marae (pp. 168-171):

When I started learning Māori as an adult I discovered that there was already quite a lot that I knew. Most of the waiata that the Māori people started singing in the class, I suddenly realised I knew . . . I knew the tune and I was able to join in. It has been quite a process of discovery into how much I had absorbed earlier in my life when I was between the ages of two and five. (Alice)

Primary, intermediate, high school and higher education settings such as polytechnic or university are all locations where exposure to te ao Māori or Māori people occurs. For some participants, work and education settings were interconnected (i.e., they are employed as teachers, tutors, or lecturers). For Francis, primary school was significant because she learned about waiata and because she began to realise that there might exist potential difficulties for being Māori in a Pākehā setting:

My Māori teacher was just the loveliest teacher and he taught us Māori songs and games and all that sort of thing . . . I was conscious that life was difficult for him . . . in that school . . . as a Māori teacher with Pākehā kids . . . he had a bit of a struggle and I always felt that I wanted to support him.

During these kinds of experiences with te ao Māori participants began to reflect back on earlier encounters and became more aware that they had been around situations where Pākehā prejudice towards Māori existed. For example:

At school there was some kind of other agenda or other issues going on, like race or prejudice that made me aware about conscientisation. I was becoming more conscious that there was more than just a language . . . that there were issues and politics about Māori and Pākehā worlds . . . about how Māori perceived them and how Pākehā perceived them. It seemed like a lot of Pākehā people had quite a different attitude toward Māori. (David)

It appeared helpful for participants to recall these earlier experiences because they highlight that their encounters with te ao Māori were generally positive. For example, David recalled his experiences at school and although he suggested awkwardness about being the only Pākehā in his reo/tikanga Māori class, more importantly he felt: “It was probably my most enjoyable class because it was a predominantly Māori-dominated class. They operated in a kind of Māori cultural way” (David). For Simon, recalling his experiences at university also helped him to make positive associations with te ao Māori:

When I was at College we did the swimming sports against [another] College. We did a haka... it was a big deal between these long established colleges. The haka was taught to us by [a former New Zealand All Black captain]. It wasn't explained a great deal, but there was a sense that it was to be done correctly, that you did it for certain reasons and that you would do it right... they didn't want a slap-stick haka. It was the college haka, so you were taught to do it properly and there was a sense of pride in that... it was amazing.

Whether encounters with te ao Māori occurred at work or in education settings, for these participants they generally were recalled as positive experiences. This positivity often occurred when these Pākehā made a choice to become involved in te ao Māori. However, there were times when *location* proved to be more significant than the choice Pākehā made to encounter te ao Māori. For example, for

Glen, David, Joseph and Alice, their being positioned as a minority emerged as a significant element of their early encounters with te ao Māori:

I went to primary school in Papakura. My classroom was a predominantly Māori and Polynesian classroom and that remained the same for most of my years through primary school. My neighbourhood and community were more brown kids in the places that I was living. There were more white kids in other parts of town. At Papakura at the time, my side of the tracks was like the brown side and the other side of the track was the white side . . . I lived on the brown side. (Glen)

I went to live with my grandmother and grandfather when I was around two in Temuka. At that time I was part of a very small Catholic minority in Temuka. Most of that community were Māori. Because of that, I developed a very close relationship with the Māori people from the Arowhenua Marae. I used to get taken over to the marae to learn poi [the movement of a light ball with a short string which is swung or twirled rhythmically to the accompaniment of a song] and waiata . . . that is where I learnt to do long and short poi. (Alice)

As a Pākehā working in a Māori context there is always a feeling that you're like a long term guest, highly regarded and accorded many privileges in the house, but still a guest nonetheless, as opposed to the person who owns the house . . . if I can put it like that. That's kind of how I would describe it. So there is still awareness of being a minority. (David)

I was accepted to do a year's training in Te Wānanga a Rangi . . . the theological college. I spent a year there. There were two of us that went in at the same time . . . one Māori person and me. I was there to study philosophy of religion and Māori. I was the only Pākehā that had ever been through the Te Wānanga a Rangi college since its inception. (Joseph)

Furthermore it is the positive insights gained from these experiences that helped participants shape the ways in which they later recall and interpret their involvement in te ao Māori. When they rediscover that *us/them* thinking exists in Pākehā society they then begin to make inroads into a third space perspective about Māori minority positioning and the impact this positioning has on Māori and how this thinking or relation might be interpreted by Pākehā.

Alice's, encounters with te ao Māori were spiritual because they involved the wairua of whakapapa. She felt that her earliest encounters occurred "before I was born" while Helen felt that an initial encounter she had with te ao Māori revealed a "missing link that I have always felt was missing for me as a person". The connection between wairua and whakapapa is an important and significant element of te ao Māori, in that wairua helps bind whakapapa with iwi, hapū and whānau (Walker, 1990). It is whānau links that helped participants become more aware of connections in their own family and how these might have potential to lead to more positive experiences with te ao Māori. For example:

When my grandfather retired he decided that he was going to learn Māori and Māori carving. He was living in Otaki at the time. He would go to the local marae . . . to Ruatoria . . . so he could practice spoken Māori and learn to carve. One time when he went to Ruatoria he met this little Māori girl. He made me write to her as a pen-pal. He would help me write letters using words like "Kia ora" and little greetings in Māori. That is what gave me the idea that it was perfectly normal and acceptable to be interested in Māori. That was why it didn't seem to me that to be interested in Māori language or Māori people was in any way unusual, because it was there in my family. (Francis)

My father came from a very poor farming family. He started working at the age of twelve. By the time I was born he was working for New Zealand railways, so we moved around a lot and always lived in little wee towns all around the place. All of the communities we lived in were predominantly Māori. Dad was fascinated with the Māori people and the Māori culture. He learnt a little bit of pidgin-Māori and he used to speak his version of Māori with the guys on the railway gangs. There was heaps of encouragement from him because I was one of the only children that really pursued an interest in Māori at that time. My father always supported me. But it took me until I was in my twenties until I finally decided "Shit I better start learning something about Māori!" I had wandered off and I had learnt about French and I'd dabbled in Japanese . . . so it was sort of like, "Hang on a minute, I should start learning Māori". (Lisa)

At the end of my third form year at high school in 1972, I thought that I was going to take French or German because I was hopeless at commerce and I couldn't really do anything with tools and in those days men didn't do cooking. So technical subjects and commerce and other things were areas that I really didn't have any competence in. That meant that I had to become

a linguist. I suppose it was a natural thing that I thought that French and German would be good languages to learn. But when my parents went to a night at the school to confirm these arrangements, they were told that the school were thinking of forming an experimental class in Māori language for the fourth form year. They were asking every parent "Do you think your child would be interested in taking a class?" My father and my mother . . . particularly my father . . . said "Yes he would be". So they came home and said "Well you are not doing French or German, you are doing Māori" and I thought well that wasn't what I wanted to do, but I didn't really have any argument that I could see in my mind that actually could justify saying why I shouldn't be doing Māori. I think my father's motivation came from a nationalist culture and growing up in the thirties and the forties. The way he put it to me was, "If you are going to be a New Zealander you should know Māori". That was in his mind and I think he thought that the opportunity shouldn't be overlooked. (David)

Growing up I pretty much had no contact with Māori. My parents are English and came out from England just before I was born. So it was just my mum, my dad, my brother and me. My grandparents followed them out after they came here. So they had no-one here . . . didn't know anyone here. They thought that they were coming to this great bicultural place and they had heard a lot about Māori and about New Zealand. They came to Warrington which is very much a rural, New Zealand farmer kind of area. That is where I grew up and it wasn't a bicultural area. At my school my parents told me that there were hardly any Māori parents on the board of trustees. My dad didn't really agree with that. He was trying to get more Māori curriculum into the school and he tried to get the kaumātua to come in and meet with the principal. When they tried to do that, the majority of parents disagreed. They ringed the school gates and wouldn't let the kaumātua into the school to even talk to the principal. That was the kind of attitude that I grew up around. It wasn't until later on, when I was ten, that I had my first real contact with Māori. It was my mother's friend. She lived up the hill from us. She was a Māori lady. This was one of the first times that I ever really got involved with te ao Māori. I used to write a lot of poetry as a kid. I was writing a poem about the ocean which I lived by and it just didn't feel right. I needed a different word and I felt like maybe I needed a Māori word because I had heard a little bit of Māori at school through the songs and stuff. So I went and talked to my mum's friend. She taught me the Māori word for sea, te moana nui a kiwa [the great Pacific ocean], and I just thought it was so beautiful . . . I just really loved it. So I wrote that in my poem. So that was my first inkling I guess . . . of another world that was out there . . . so my parents really encouraged that. (Cindy)

However for Alice, whānau was not *always* a place where positive encounters occurred:

When I was four, I asked my grandmother if we were Māori . . . I asked her because she had black eyes and black hair and I was the light one with blonde hair. On my dad's side of the family they are all Scottish . . . and I am the dark one in the family. I asked my grandmother, "Are we Māori?" and I will always remember her reaction . . . she was horrified . . . shocked . . . she said "What the hell is going on?" She didn't speak to me for about three weeks after that . . . It was very clear to me that there was obviously something very deep there.

Based on the experiences of these participants, it seems that many Pākehā may be open to and/or make a choice to enter into te ao Māori, in doing so, they begin to develop friendships with Māori. Friendships were significant because they helped the participants find out about te ao Māori from within a Māori perspective. Friendships with Māori also led to more connections with te ao Māori and in turn, more experiences of te ao Māori. For example:

I got to know these Māori chaps quite well. My Māori friends and I used to do quite a lot of boozing together. Through them I got to know a master carver who was well known throughout New Zealand. I used to go to his house at Kawaha Point. From then on I began to build up quite a relationship with the Māori. I guess my focus was changing towards Māori. I mean, I was never ever a racist, even in England. There weren't a lot of black people there at the time . . . but you know . . . Middlesborough . . . the big port from near to where I lived... we used to see black people occasionally . . . off the boats . . . and boozed with them in the pubs. But it never bothered me whether they were black, white or brindle. So as I say . . . I took to the Māori people and they seemed to take to me, otherwise they would have never have invited me to places . . . I couldn't have just walked into them by myself. (Joseph)

A clear outcome of friendships with Māori is that they provide opportunities for more experiences with te ao Māori and additional exposure to the influences of te ao Māori. For example, Joseph's ongoing relationship with his Māori friends led him to the Māori Presbyterian Church. Although he was initially confused about the relationship he had with the church, the experience led to an epiphany whereby he realised he had become more familiar with te ao Māori than te ao Pākehā:

I had to go to the old man in his study and say “Koro [term for an elderly man], what is going on? What is wrong with me?” He said, “What do you think it is?” I said, “Well God is talking to me somehow”. Koro said, “What do you think he is saying?” I said, “I think he is calling me into ministry” Koro said, “What Ministry?” I said, “The Presbyterian Church” Koro said, “What part of the Presbyterian Church?” I said, “The Māori Presbyterian Church . . . the only one that I know!”

A significant element of this epiphany is that Joseph’s Māori friend helped him uncover the connection he had with te ao Māori, a connection that became more evident during the interview when Joseph continued to refer to the Māori Presbyterian Church as *his* church, and the Pākehā Presbyterian Church as the *other church*. This revelation - that Joseph felt he belonged to the Māori Presbyterian Church - was significant for Joseph because of the longevity of his experiences with Māori through marriage and the Māori Presbyterian Church over six decades. It was through marriage to his first wife, and after her death, to his second wife that his relationship among Māori was confirmed in whakapapa. This was clearly an advantage that allowed him to experience te ao Māori more intimately:

I went to a Māori person’s house and I knocked at the door. I said “You are wondering who I am”. I told him my wife’s name, and as soon as they knew who my wife was it made all the difference in the world. I was welcomed anywhere at any time. You see my first wife’s grandfather was Rua, the Prophet, so I guess what I am saying is that I am connected . . . very well connected in that sense . . . and I am accepted . . . it makes a difference . . . all the difference in the world.

Joseph’s experiences are not referred to here as the general experience of Pākehā when they continue to become more involved in te ao Māori. Out of the 13 participants, Joseph was the only one who felt that he belonged among Māori *more* than he belonged among Pākehā. However, he did make it clear that he was Pākehā and, therefore, did not identify as Māori. What was significant across all participants was that Māori friends, whether long-term or short-term, helped the participants view te ao Māori through an alternative lens. For example:

I had Māori friends at primary school, but my main Māori friend was when I went to secondary school. I met her when we moved from Levin down to Invercargill. I was on the school bus and I was talking to a Pākehā girl about living in Levin and she said to me “There are too many Māori in Levin” and I said, “So? They are actually good people” and then the Pākehā girl started bullying me on the bus. The girl and her Pākehā friends started to throw orange peels at me. Then my Māori friend got up and told them off more or less. She told me to go and sit with the Māori girls down the back of the bus, which is what I did. From that day on we have been best friends. I asked her later on why she stepped in on my behalf, because she didn’t at that time really even know me. She said it was because she knows what it is like to be the underdog. So I will always remember that. She made me feel good. What she did for me was depoliticised me. We used to talk about politics and she opened my eyes up towards things in the world. It was also her generosity. At her house I was made to feel like one of the family. I spent many weekends at her house . . . it was great. So as far as my Māori friends go, they have had a big impact on my life and it still continues today. The Māori friends I have are my true friends . . . they make me feel really welcome . . . that is what I have always found. (Brenda)

The ability for Māori friends to help participants view te ao Māori from this alternative perspective i.e., to depoliticise their thinking, to decolonise, to create awareness of the power difference evident in *us/them* thinking - helped participants challenge the ways in which Pākehā may think. This challenge or possibility occurs because Māori friends helped participants develop their interest in te ao Māori and facilitated their movement between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā, which in turn, uncovered a third space perspective, a more informed and more “critical perspective” (Meredith, 1998, p. 1) of New Zealand and Pākehā/Māori relations. Glen articulated this perspective as his inbetween positioning when relating his role as a producer for a New Zealand rap group:

There is a friend of mine . . . he is a Māori guy from the East Coast, from Tolaga Bay. We were on tour and we had a van for the night and there was this four piece band . . . two Māori guys and two Samoan guys . . . and then there is me . . . kind of like the inbetween guy. My friend brought it up in the van . . . he was saying “Hey dude, you don’t realise how unusual you are”. I didn’t know what he meant, but he said it because when I recorded my first album with [rap group], out of all the guys that I was working with, there was only one white rapper among a dozen dudes. All these dudes were from different backgrounds, a lot of them quite street . . . the types of people that

maybe the old man across the street might be scared of. But they are not bad guys, they are just regular people. I was the producer and I would conduct what was going on. I was telling everybody what to do and my friend couldn't believe how this skinny white dude could be telling him . . . a Māori dude . . . how to read his verses in rap. In no uncertain terms I would say "No, that is not good enough, do it again" and that was seen as really unusual. It was probably the first time I really looked at it from that perspective . . . from outside of myself. I guess I can't really name anybody else like me . . . with my high profile . . . doing the same kind of job.

Participants' friendships with Māori emerge as reciprocal relationships because they have a focus on trust and loyalty. For example:

I always spent the school holidays at Temuka in Arowhenua, so I grew up with the Māori kids. I have stayed at a lot of my Māori women friends' houses and I am the only Pākehā who has ever slept in them. We are fast friends for life because we went through a lot of fire together and we just made really lifelong friendships . . . they were really deep trust ones . . . we would just watch each others' backs . . . because we had to . . . to survive. (Alice)

As a journalist I have made connections with many Māori people. They become really close to you because you are talking to them on a regular basis and they become really like quite close friends. I might not see them very much socially but they regard me and I regard them as friends. There is great trust there. They are really quite generous with me. Whenever I need help or anything they are just amazingly helpful and they will support me. (Francis)

For these participants, friendships with Māori are reciprocal, trusting, close, and supportive. Also, they *chose* to enter into these friendships. Based on the experiences of these participants, when knowledge of te ao Māori has been obtained through ongoing experiences with te ao Māori Pākehā may become more inclined to understand differences that exist between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā from a third space perspective.

Encountering criticism from Māori

Entering into te ao Māori was not always a totally positive experience for the participants because sometimes participants received criticism from Māori. For example:

I find the challenge from the Pākehā world is easier for me to handle than the challenge from the Māori world because it's like I am trying to give back some of what I have been lucky enough to learn and it's all getting thrown back in my face by Māori. It's a lot harder to take than say Pākehā saying "Why are you siding with those Māori?" (Lisa)

In another example, Susan's employment in academia meant that she was exposed to situations where her knowledge of te ao Māori brought criticism from Māori. However, she felt the criticism was justified because of her willingness to challenge academic views from within the academy:

I am much more tolerant of criticism that comes from the Māori community and mindful of it and think seriously about it and decide which bits of it I would stomach and which bits I really feel I should respond to. There have been many times when what I have done has been challenged by Māori. In those moments afterward of self-examination, I think to myself "Well that was awful". But I also think that it was kind of predictable that Māori would say something. I am not going to change what I am trying to do, but I do need to accept that I am going to get it in the neck every now and then. I mean, that's what being part of the academic community is about really and I think if you are not getting it in the neck every now and then from any corner of the Pākehā or Māori community, then you are not saying stuff that is important enough really, or challenging enough.

Accepting that Pākehā demonstrating knowledge of te ao Māori may provoke criticism from Māori is, therefore, another element of the experiences participants had with te ao Māori. Simon articulated his movement into te ao Māori as being on the "outside coming in". Simon was also well aware that because he became interested in and gained knowledge of te ao Māori, Māori were "going to be the group of people who are judging [him]". Hence, criticisms received from Māori were generally

tolerated and responded to in a respectful manner by the participants because they had respect for te ao Māori. For example:

I went over to America and Canada which was a plum job . . . to look at fishing rights and land rights in view of the Waitangi Tribunal during the mid-eighties. It was when the Fisheries Claim had come out. I went just to look at Indigenous peoples' rights in other countries and how they compared and what the claims were over there. I thought it was totally valid for me to go because I was working for a current affairs programme. I was in television network news covering those stories on a daily basis over some years, so it was a logical thing for me to go. But I had to think about it first. I had to think if it was appropriate for me to go. The only thing that I could think of was that if another reporter had gone then it should have been a Māori reporter so that they could do half of the stories from a Māori perspective. But there were some Māori in the Māori department who thought that it should have been a Māori that went. When I got over there, I did realise that the Indigenous people would have preferred a Māori person also. But they understood where I was coming from and we certainly all got on well, because I related well to Māori things and to Indigenous things. I think the ideal thing there would have been for two people to go. I don't think that it had to be a Māori. I never tried to get in where Māori should go and I would back off and say "No" and say "That's for Māori to go". But that was a plum job and everybody would have wanted to go to Navajo land in Washington State and Canada and right up to near Alaska . . . it was a fabulous trip. (Francis)

A guy in a bar in Whanganui at three o'clock in the morning said that I was offensive to all Māoridom. Another time, a picture of me dressed as a ninety-year-old kuia with a moko [tattoo on chin] smoking a pipe appeared on the front of a magazine and a Māori woman emailed me and she said "You are offensive to all Māoridom". My email to her was "I'll get back to you once I have finished filming the programme for Māori Television. I will then come and explain to you why I don't believe I am offensive to all Māori". (Simon)

However, although the occurrence of criticism from Māori was low across participants' experiences, generally these events helped them find out more about their own limitations. For example:

During my 300 level in my BA at university I was one of two Pākehā. All the other students were Māori. I was the only Pākehā in the Master's year also. I had trouble with the young Māori students at university from time to time . .

. you know . . . the sort of resentment that Pākehā had come so far learning te reo and that Pākehā had studied waiata and mōteatea [traditional chants] and those things with these wonderful Māori teachers. The young Māori students just coming out of school were quite resentful about that, especially when I got put in the position of a teacher. It was like, "Who the hell are you?" I found that difficult. I could understand where they were coming from, but I did find it hurtful. I found it difficult to cope with because I felt that I had earned the respect from my Māori teachers and I'd spent a lot of time within the Māori community in the Waikato and had always had nothing but support from the older Māori people on the marae, even when I badgered them with my half-pie Māori. There had been nothing but support from Māori in other sections of the community as well. So I found that quite difficult to cope with . . . being challenged by the young Māori students. There were some tearful moments. (Lisa)

I wasn't planning to tutor a Māori language class, but I was asked to do it by the school of Māori Studies. I finished my MA and a couple of the Māori academics had fallen ill and so the department said to me "Look, we are in this bit of a crisis and you are a recent graduate and one of the first MA's, can you help?" and I just thought well that is a natural and decent thing to do. But the Māori students didn't know who I was and so their reaction without that knowledge was a more negative one. I think for them, I was just a white face. To them, I was just another white honky. When you are in that context tutoring Māori students who don't know you and you are white, then any issue they might have with that . . . about being taught their own language by a honky . . . they would find difficult. But to be honest, if the head of the department called me into his office and said that he had complaints about me and that I was an abominable teacher, then I wouldn't have been surprised . . . because I had had no training and I was thrown in the deep end doing something that I really wasn't comfortable with . . . teaching the reo . . . because I didn't think that I was that flash a speaker or anything. But it was sort of like the department was in a lurch and I thought after all these years that they had put into me, I should put something back. But the Māori students in the class did complain about being taught by a white person. I sort of struggled to understand what it was that the Māori students were saying, especially when I had not been given a right of reply, or anything like that. It hurt a lot and that intensified the shock because it was based on my being a Pākehā, rather than me being an incompetent teacher. (David)

I applied for a job as a Māori teacher at Polytech which I got. The students that I had there were a real mixture. A lot of them were young and they hadn't done well at school and this was sort of like a second chance for them to move on, or they wanted to go to university but their school grades weren't good enough. So doing this diploma at Polytech would actually give them something to go to university with. Then I had a few older people, I had some

people with real health problems, as well as people with mental and physical issues. So there was a lot of pastoral care. Most of the students were Māori and it was more like a school situation in some respects. It was really nice but there was still raruraru [problems]. There was one particular Māori student who didn't think that I had the wairua to teach Māori. So my boss . . . a Māori woman . . . got the staff together and they backed me to the hilt. It was just really quite gratifying that they did that. (Jack)

Summary

Based on the experiences of these participants encounters with te ao Māori may occur at work, school, home, or when among whānau or friends. Because these participants chose to experience te ao Māori they began to explore a third space perspective toward te ao Māori; a perspective that led to the discovery that processes of colonisation have centred on the relationship of Pākehā and their subordinate. This meant that participants then became postcolonial in their thinking about Māori and Pākehā relations. This stance occurred because they were willing to explore what Deloria and Lytle (1984) and Young (2001) referred to as the power imbalance between coloniser and colonised. Based on the experiences of participants discussed in this first storyline it appears that they “redress current imbalances of power . . . in . . . pursuit of more just and equitable societies” (Young, 2001, p. 66) because they become more aware that processes of colonisation have been counter-productive for Māori. This realisation unfolds because participants explored the effects of colonisation more thoroughly and become more aware of Māori initiatives such as kaupapa Māori and why these initiatives were of benefit to Māori. The participants also became more aware of Othering processes and ways in which these processes had been informed and maintained through the maintaining of stereotypes. As a result, participants adopted a more robust and sophisticated third space perspective of Pākehāness and the colonial relationality and history Māori and Pākehā share. In this storyline I have demonstrated that work, education and whānau are all sites where encounters with te ao Māori may occur and lead to a process of decolonisation for Pākehā. I also demonstrated that Māori friends helped the participants access more experiences with te ao Māori. Thus, there were many opportunities for the

participants to learn about te ao Māori and to rediscover/recover aspects of their own Pākehā way of being. What does emerge as a highly significant element of their experiences is that overall each participant was willing to enter into te ao Māori, to learn about tikanga and reo and to learn about te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā from a third space perspective. This process of engagement with Māori helped each participant view their own Pākehāness differently.

CHAPTER SIX / Te wāhanga tuaono: Storyline

Two: *Ngā wairua o te ao Māori*

“Ka whaimata te tapuae o Tangaroa. Tangaroa. Ka haruru. He strides to and fro, Tangaroa. Hear him roar . . . Unwelcome events create a strong reaction (Trad.)”
(Grace & Grace, 2003, p. 66)

Introduction

In this chapter I argue that when the participants mourned the loss of Māori history, culture and place, they also mourned the loss of their own Pākehā history, culture and place in New Zealand. This led them to begin to think about colonisation processes that disenfranchised and displaced Māori culture, tikanga, and values, and the effect this has on them individually as Pākehā, and on the whole country. As demonstrated in a previous chapter, processes of colonisation marginalised many aspects of Māori culture through the implementation of new systems of power (i.e., new settler governments, franchise based on individual ownership, churches and missionary schools, colonial health delivery systems, and new legal institutions). Participants’ experiences of uncovering, or gaining awareness of values of te ao Māori, centred on the failure of Pākehā to appreciate the destructive impact of colonisation and its effects of the marginalisation of Māori language, beliefs, values and practices.

As suggested in the previous chapter, participants’ ongoing experiences with te ao Māori, often lead to strong reactions these Pākehā have in their interaction with other Pākehā. This is especially the case when the participants were exposed to elements of tikanga associated with Māori events such as tangi, haka, waiata, and karakia. Through participation in these activities, the participants began to develop a more robust understanding of tikanga and its application in various Māori settings. For example, Alice gained insight into tangi this way: “You intellectually know that

water will lift the tapu around the tūpāpaku [corpse] . . . but until you go on a marae in that situation, you don't actually know it . . . *really* know it". Simon also gained a deeper understanding of haka through taking part in it, "You certainly get a different aspect of what the haka is all about by actually participating in one". These kinds of experiences occurred for these participants when they took part in a Māori event, or chose to engage with te ao Māori, and become familiar with values and practices such as mihi, reo, tikanga, whānau, whanaungatanga, manaakitanga waiata, tangi and karakia, which are implicit elements of Māori life (Walker, 1990).

Cindy described mihi, reo, and tikanga as significant Māori values she had learned while at school, university, and work. Alice articulated karakia and tikanga as values implicit in processes associated with the removal of tapu. Brenda referred to the values of manaakitanga within whānau, and Francis described the value of manaakitanga among her friends. When values of te ao Māori were encountered by these participants during their experiences, insights gained from these events became an important part of their overall experiences of te ao Māori. Participants also came to realise that other Pākehā do not always appreciate the relevance of tikanga for Māori.

Ngā wairua o te ao Māori

When the participants learned about values of te ao Māori, they began to see that "a Māori way of doing things" may be a better way forward for Pākehā society. Cindy felt that Māori tikanga should take precedence over the 'Pākehā way of doing things' in certain contexts. She spent many years working within Māori environments and became familiar with the tikanga of hui and waiata. In this following example, she had not realised that she had come so far in decolonising herself that she mourned the loss of waiata at the end of a meeting. She articulated this experience as culture shock:

When I first started working at Shortland Street it really surprised me how used to working in a Māori environment I had become. I didn't realise it at the time, but the whole time that I was working at Māori Television, I didn't feel like I fit in. Even when I was getting on really well with everyone . . . which was most of the time . . . I still felt like I am the little white girl on the outside. Then when I got to Shortland Street it was a huge culture shock because I felt out of place all over again in a place that I thought I would fit in. I went to the first team meeting and at the end of it everyone started to leave and I was just standing there waiting for a waiata. When I realised it wasn't going to happen, I felt like someone had just hit me . . . it was like . . . "Where is the waiata, where is the karakia? [Prayer to close a meeting] What do you mean you are going to just clap your hands and everybody is going to walk off? We need some closure to this meeting". It was really weird. It really threw me because I was just so used to a certain way that things went and I hadn't realised how used to it I had become . . . it was very strange.

This idea that there might be a better way of doing things gains traction as the participants gain deeper insight into Māori values. Like Cindy, Simon also felt that the tikanga associated with te ao Māori was a better way of doing things; "I like the concept of the tangi. I think that maybe it could be a little bit better than the way that we do things in the kind of European world". For Simon, tangi was implied as a better way of doing things because tangi, or tangihanga, is a process that allows whānau to grieve in the presence of the tūpāpaku (the deceased) over a period of time (Walker, 1990). Simon also referred to another context in which he felt te ao Māori offered a better way of doing things. He referred to an incident that occurred in the late 1990s that involved discussions between the Ministry of Transport and a local iwi about a section of motorway between Auckland and Hamilton. The discussions became sensationalised in the media at the time and the tikanga associated with the removal of tapu by the action of water dispersion emerged as a contentious topic between Pākehā and Māori. What Simon's description of this experience reveals is his willingness to accept cultural difference and a Māori world view:

The truck driving down the highway squirting water on the road in the Waikato . . . there was some reason where I thought that seemed like quite a good idea. I don't believe it, but if it brings a sense of something to it, then what's the big deal? A truck and fifty bucks worth of diesel, the reasons that

the people gave for it . . . when you look at the motivations behind it, they were very valid. (Simon)

Simon shows further evidence of his growing empathy with the motivations behind tikanga and the relevance of tikanga in various contexts. For example:

Tama Iti [a Māori activist] shot the gun and spat on the flag. People took this as just offensive and I said “Well it is around the kind of practice of theatre and the grand gesture and all of this”. I thought it was really fantastic. I am really glad that the bigger thing we in this country get angry about is that a guy spat at something or at someone. Great . . . no-one is going to die from it . . . The karakia . . . I think it is fascinating. The deeper you go into it the more you find out that women have a very specific role . . . that they set the agenda and it is not until you actually become associated with people that are doing it that they can then explain, “Well this is not religious, it is to do with something else”. (Simon)

Frustration was a significant emotion which occurred when these participants were exposed to negative or dismissive Pākehā opinion about Māori values. For example, Susan felt frustrated that some Pākehā do not always see the value of te ao Māori:

It frustrates me that Pākehā let things get in the way of seeing the value that can be gained from understanding more about other people. I can't see how it can be anything but a positive experience, to understand your own circumstances better by seeing a world as well as you are ever able to through the position of somebody who knows it completely differently than you do.

For Cindy, frustration led to her arguing for the protection of Māori values. For example, she felt that she was *obliged* to protect values learned from te ao Māori and, therefore, the mana of Māori:

I feel that because I have seen so much of the Māori world and because I have been part of that world, I feel like I need to protect it because, while it is not mine, I have seen and I have got something that most of Pākehā haven't got. I see that as something that is just a great opportunity that I have had and that Pākehā haven't had and that is why I kind of feel like it is my job to stick up for Māori who can't be there to stick up for themselves. Pākehā say things to me that they wouldn't say to a Māori person and so therefore I hear stuff that

Māori wouldn't hear. So I stick up for Māori because that bothers me. I guess that is one of the differences between being Pākehā and being Māori. If I was Māori, my friends would never say that stuff around me because they would know that if I was Māori I would take it personally. But because I am Pākehā, they think that it is not me that they are attacking . . . Here at Shortland Street they are very big on rules. If we are on a marae then the marae protocol is printed on the call sheet. Everyone is informed of what that protocol is before the day starts. For example, people are told "Don't walk across this area". Working on the marae is just like working around a gas leak or a cliff. You have certain sets of protocol that you have to observe. That's kind of how it is treated. If somebody did something that went against that protocol, I would say "You are not allowed to do that. If you really need to do it, go check it and if the people of the Marae approve it then that's their call but, no, you can't do it without checking". I don't have the authority to make the decisions but I have enough of a view that I feel like I can pipe up in order to check that it is ok. To be honest, there are probably times where I am a bit too careful because I would rather be careful and then have somebody else go "It's ok, we will let that be ok" than if I was to let something happen and for people to turn around and go "What are you doing? That's not alright". For me to be sitting there knowing that it wasn't alright and that I hadn't said anything . . . to me that would be not only standing on the mana of the people who were then put out by it happening, but also it would be standing on the mana of everything that I had been taught, by letting something like that slide. I have been privileged enough to learn these kinds of things and if I am not going to use that knowledge then to me that is disrespectful to the Māori people who have taught me . . . If you don't have the reo and even if you do, you see it as being quite tapu, like it's something that you don't mess with, it is something that has its own value, it is kind of sacred. I like to think that I am tied into it, but I know that it is nothing in comparison to how a Māori person would be. I would never ever try and cross the line. I know that this is te ao Māori and I am over there [gesticulates towards a direction away from the Māori world]. I might be able to see through a little of the glass but I am still over there. I would never try to say that I am in here. So from somebody out here to go in here to get something to pull back out . . . is quite . . . I think . . . a hard step to make. It feels like you have crossed a barrier. It is kind of a bit like, "Can I have something of yours for me?" is how some people would see it. So I think that a lot of Pākehā are quite cautious of that because even if that is how they are not meaning it, there is a fear that that is how it will be taken by Māori, as kind of "Give us some of your language, I just want to chuck this in", even if the person is trying to use it in the most respectful way and with the best intentions possible.

For these participants, values learned are treated in a respectful manner because they generally have been encountered at Māori events (e.g., haka, tangi,

karakia, waiata) or in a Māori learning context (e.g., in a tuakana/teina reciprocal interaction with older Māori). For David, this tuakana/teina interaction occurred at university with older Māori who were “embracing of anyone who wanted to learn Māori”, and for Francis, the tuakana/teina method was helpful for her and her Pākehā friends. Throughout her career in journalism, Francis had frequent tuakana/teina experiences with Māori. These events helped her to learn more about tikanga and Māori values. Francis replicated this reciprocal exchange of knowledge when she helped a Pākehā friend understand the significance of Māori values in a work context:

A really good friend of mine never quite understood about Māori values. She is a nurse and I would call her my closest friend, a Pākehā woman, a lovely lady. She had to do some cultural safety stuff at work and she said to me “What exactly is it that I have to grasp about Māori?” and I said to her “Imagine if your family was more integral to your being than anything else, what would the message be in that?” and she said “Oh I understand, I understand” and it was wonderful for me, because for the first time I had a connection with her about Māori.

Exchange of knowledge between Māori and Pākehā is a reflection of the welcoming ways in which many Māori allow Pākehā to enter into te ao Māori. Helen articulated this welcoming and positive experience as whānau: “I have got a huge whānau here at work and I just feel like I have the strength of a million warriors on my back for the support I have received for being Pākehā and working here at Te Wānanga”. This positive interaction between Pākehā and Māori speaks volumes Pākehā being able to access te ao Māori and learn more about it without having to justify their reasoning to Māori or Pākehā for doing so. When participants became open to these experiences, they began to realise that te ao Māori had something very important to offer te ao Pākehā, thus disrupting the influence of colonial thinking (i.e., the refusal of Pākehā to accept the “influences of other cultures” (Goldberg, 1993, p. 33).

When experiences that participants had with te ao Māori led to insights into values or tikanga, participants generally became more aware of contextual differences

between Māori and Pākehā values. For example, Helen compared her current Māori work environment with a previous Pākehā work environment:

I feel very honoured and privileged being able to work here and to have this experience and I have probably humbled a lot. We have great values in this organisation, which comes back to tikanga. There is always respect and love for one another. There's abiding by the laws of that commonality about why you are all there and abiding by your morals and beliefs and that kind of thing. Everything just gets put out on the table and talked about. You might set your watch for a fifteen minute hui and you might still be there five hours later. That is just how it goes because if it is important, that everybody and everything is treated with the same respect. It is like being able to come into work each day with my extended family because everybody cares for one another and everybody is supportive. If you don't agree with somebody about something and you have to have a discussion with somebody about something, then there is no anxiety or anything. You just sit down and talk and one person will say what they think and the other person will say what they think. There is just so much respect and love and there is such good strong values embedded into the Māori culture and their ways that it is such an amazing place to work. Here I am heard, I am listened to, I am respected, and I am valued. When I was working in the Pākehā corporate sector I was quite arrogant. It hardened me, it really did. I used to come home in my high heels and suits and my partner would say "Can you go and get changed, you are scaring me". You had to dress like that because you weren't taken seriously if you didn't look the part. So I used to wear make-up every day to work and my hair was pristine and I used to spend four or five dollars on a cup of coffee three or four times a day. Now I hardly ever wear make-up. I am always tidy, but I don't wear any make-up. I don't feel like I have to cover up who I am anymore. I can just come to work and be me, it's incredible. I still wear make-up if I am going to go out . . . it's a girly thing . . . but I don't have to power play anymore.

For Helen, then, manaakitanga was an implicit element of a Māori work environment while for Jack, wairua was important:

I was teaching a Wānanga Aotearoa course as a night class and on some weekends as well. Most of the students were Māori and I got on really well with them. They were mature, most in their thirties or older. They were a really great group. I quite enjoyed the work there and I thought that the place did have a good wairua. They had a carving school there, they had a music school, they had a raranga [weaving] school and we had a great time in the

evenings singing and doing little skits and playing tricks on people and things . . . so that was a good time.

Experiences that revealed Māori values were significant for participants because they were positive experiences that helped them find more opportunities to learn about te ao Māori. Also, participants began to appreciate that their knowledge of te ao Māori had been unselfishly passed down to them by Māori. This revelation revealed a new complexity. As participants developed their individual knowledge of te ao Māori, they become more effective in imparting that knowledge to others. However, this generated anew and challenging concern, because some Māori prefer to learn about te ao Māori from Māori. It was only when the participants knew that they had been sanctioned by kaumātua, kuia, or other senior Māori to learn, educate themselves then impart their knowledge, that they felt more comfortable accepting the rewards that learning more about te ao Māori brought to them. For example, David articulated this as an affirming experience:

When I was at high school my teacher was a Māori woman, quite a well known Māori woman to Māori. I used to work really hard in her class at the Māori language and at the end of the year I got the prize for best achievement in a Māori language course. No-one in the class ever felt or showed any resentment about a Pākehā receiving that award, because I think they watched and saw that I worked really hard and, I mean, I put a lot of effort in to understand it because I found the Māori language really hard to learn. I didn't feel that Māori thought I was somehow subordinating them or conducting some kind of colonialist activity upon them or disempowering them from their education. It didn't feel that it was something that the white establishment were giving me at the expense of Māori. I mean, there was recognition from my Māori teacher that I had done well in the class. It was always one of my favourite awards really. That recognition was quite an important one to me. It still lurks away in my mind. For me it was an affirming experience personally. That was the reason why I stayed on to the seventh form. I think I might have got a merit award every year actually. In the last year I might have got some kind of prize for a special contribution to Māori over the years. (David)

The realisation that learning, educating, then imparting knowledge of te ao Māori results in a rewarding and affirming experience, helped other participants to feel more comfortable about imparting their knowledge to Māori. For example:

I would like to think as a supervisor of many of my Māori colleagues here that I am adding something to the national quota of scholars. I like to think that I am getting all these Māori people to a point of confidence where they all blossom and get into their own research projects. It is really nice to see young Māori scholars who have come in thinking that they are not very good and are quite negative about their abilities intellectually, to see them really blossom through those years of postgrad supervision, to see them subtly thinking that they have a brain, that they have a voice, that they have ideas and that they are as good as anyone else. To see them get stroppy with people in an academic context and not feeling like they have to be deferential. I enjoy watching that, even though I say that it is all too stroppy for me now. I get a real secret pleasure out of how amazing they are in this academic world. I am aware that some of the students got really excited about Māori things and did work and felt they could because I was there to encourage them and I get great pleasure out of thinking that there are Māori scholars who now feel more confident about their abilities and can foot it with anybody. I think that I have made a wee bit of a contribution there and thinking back, in some way I think I could have been of value in Māori studies. (David)

Imparting knowledge was significant for Susan because she wanted to recreate her positive affirming experiences of te ao Māori for her own children. However, because her children were Pākehā, she felt that they may not have access to the kinds of experiences she had had. She was concerned that that her boys may encounter more Pākehā institutions, schools and work environments:

I find myself often thinking these days about the kind of world that my kids will grow up in . . . in Dunedin in particular and being mindful of how it's possible to recreate that kind of experience for them so that they never take for granted that richness of culture . . . so that they are equally able to understand Māori communities. That is one of those things that I am kind of grappling with as a parent. It has been such a valuable thing for me that it would make me tremendously sad to think that my kids were too white . . . which they are likely to be as Dunedin boys.

When participants became involved in te ao Māori, it was generally understood as a rewarding and affirming experience. However, a strong reaction

occurs for them when they encounter other Pākehā who do not see the rewards that can be gained from experiencing te ao Māori. This reaction occurred for the participants because they understood that values of manaakitanga, whakapapa, whānau, whakawhanaungatanga, and tikanga had become interconnected with their own Pākehā values. For these participants the interrelationship between Māori and Pākehā values emerges as a significant element of their experiences that helped them become more connected to te ao Māori, without feeling that they were moving away from their own understandings of being Pākehā. In other words, they begin to talk about how they and their wider whānau have been enriched through their relationship with Māori. For example:

Manaakitanga . . . the qualities of manaakitanga are important to me and that is probably because of my Irish background. Manaakitanga is about making sure that people feel welcome. At traditional things like hāngī there was always lots of food and hospitality, trust and loyalty with friends. That is what I remember about manaakitanga and that is what I hold on to. Those things are what are important to me and those are the things that I see in my family . . . they are exactly the same. If you go to my mother's place, you always get well fed and are made to feel welcome. (Brenda)

When I went to intermediate in Dunedin they had Māori lessons outside of school. The school were treating these lessons as if they were not proper subjects. I didn't agree with that so I decided to take the course, not just because I wanted to, but also because I didn't like the way they were kind of sidelining Māori subjects. So I thought "I am going to study Māori and I am going to try and get lots of other people to do it because I think that everybody should be able to do it". So I decided to take the course and it was taught by a girl's father from the school and there were a few Pākehā students in it but not many . . . it was mainly Māori kids. I remember the first lesson so clearly. The teacher was talking to us about your mihi and how part of your mihi is your name and your tūrangawaewae, your place to stand. She talked about how through your mihi you kind of tie in everything. She said that your mihi ties you to the land and to your family and to your place. I remember at the time, and I still kind of feel like this, that I never had that because my parents had come from England and I had no family here. I also remember how when I was growing up I always got teased for using all of the English words like flannel for facecloth and kettle . . . you know . . . I always said all the wrong words. So I never felt like I had something that tied me to this place and that is why when I started to learn about mihi, I just locked onto it and I really felt a connection to it. (Cindy)

There is something to be said for finding your roots . . . there really is. I know how much of a change finding my whakapapa made in my life. Because of whakapapa I have now found out more about my grandfather and I have learnt more about where I had come from. I was learning about my roots. I would hate for somebody else to grow up and not have that. It took me until I was an adult to know and appreciate it. I know now that I can pass that down to my daughter without a problem and I do that. I have got these two Māori children who I love just as equally as my daughter and they now have an opportunity to learn about their whakapapa. I know some information about where they come from and their roots and I can give some of that knowledge to them . . . while they are children, rather than them having to wait to find out when they are adults. (Helen)

Summary

Through their exposure and openness to explore te ao Māori values, these participants learned about, and become more familiar with, values such as whānau, whakapapa, whanaungatanga, and manaakitanga. When encountering te ao Māori values, participants began to see these experiences as significant because they revealed a connection between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā values. Based on the experiences of these participants, it appears that through ongoing exposure to te ao Māori, decolonising Pākehā may begin to see why particular values are important and relevant for Māori, and, they may also begin to connect these values more strongly with the values in their own lives. However once this connection is made, these Pākehā participants may begin to mourn the marginalisation of te ao Māori values. They may mourn for two main reasons. The first is because they become aware of more contexts in which te ao Māori values have been marginalised by Pākehā institutions (for example, education contexts) or by the imposition of Pākehā way of doing things (as can occur in employment, among friends, with family). The second is because they discover that te ao Māori values associated with whānau, whanaungatanga, manaakitanga, and certain tikanga (i.e., hui, karakia) are either missing, or are not as evident within their own Pākehā lives. By continuing to connect te ao Māori values with their own Pākehā values, participants began to see clear similarities between the two worldviews. This understanding helped the to advocate for Māori values passionately when among other Pākehā, because it is

through ongoing exposure to te ao Māori values that they developed a deeper insight into a Māori way of doing things. This deeper insight enabled them to appreciate why a Māori way of doing things may be a better, or more appropriate way of doing things, than a Pākehā way, and may also result in a more vocal or direct response to events when they encounter negative opinions Pākehā might have of te ao Māori. What is also clear is that when participants discover and reflect upon values of te ao Māori they learned that Māori people were mostly willing to accept Pākehā into their world. This, in turn, is one reason why some participants felt obliged to confront other Pākehā when events of Othering occurred. Participants attempted, but did not always succeed, in engaging in conversations with Pākehā about te ao Māori in a manner which is respectful to both te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā. Participants found that in advocating for te ao Māori they do not take anything away from te ao Pākehā. They also came to understand at a deeper level how *us/them* thinking has been part of New Zealand's history and how their vision of connectedness and equality between the two worlds can be achieved.

CHAPTER SEVEN / Te wāhanga tuawhitu:

Storyline Three: *Othering*

“Kia whakapapa pounamu te moana kia teretere te kārohirohi e. May the days ignite - as sunlight on greenstone waters. Greenstone, or pounamu, is New Zealand jade. Here it is used descriptively for shining seas, which in turn express a wish for bright futures (Trad.)” (Grace & Grace, 2003, p. 30)

Introduction

To be able to weave in and out of both te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā, to me that is what it is all about, to be able to see a different world and being able to have at least a glimpse of an understanding of that world and therefore be able to work with it better and work with people who come from that world better, that is really important to me. (Cindy)

The two previous storylines demonstrated that participants frequently encountered negative views of te ao Māori from other Pākehā as well as from some Māori. Generally negative views are accompanied by negative stereotypes. When the participants outwardly express a positive view of te ao Māori, they are sometimes Othered by Pākehā. In general, Othering experiences of this kind were a shock to the participants because they led them to see that many Pākehā appear to promote a Pākehā self serving story is often evident that in government policy, in educational institutions, in the media and among whānau and friends. I interpret these occurrences as Othering events, because they occur within same Pākehā identities.

Othering

Because Pākehā interest in te ao Māori might be seen by other Pākehā as strange, or unusual, it may even be viewed by some as extreme and challenging behaviour. For example, Francis was Othered by her Pākehā work colleagues as “a traitor” to Pākehā. This is a strategy employed by Pākehā that continues the ways in which Pākehā Māori were Othered by Pākehā during the nineteenth and early

twentieth centuries (Bentley, 1999, 2007). These participants' experiences explore how these methods can also reveal elements of fetishism (Said, 1978, 2007). Fetishism, as a process of Othering, is employed in the effort to understand reasons why an individual from one group might choose to become part of, advocate for, or pursue an interest in another group. For example:

There was a guy in our office and he was quite right wing and quite outrageous. He sort of played on the fact that he was a bit outrageous and he would say outrageous things about Māori. He started saying that I had a fetish about Māori men. That was very, very, very hurtful because it was just such crap. I told my husband and he was fiercely defensive of me and he was very, very, very angry about it. At work, that type of thing started to develop even more. Why they did it, I am not absolutely sure, but I think there were a whole lot of things behind it. I think that one of the reasons is that they believe a Pākehā who is interested in Māori is a traitor to her own people and if they are interested in what Māori men have to say, then they are letting the side down somehow. It kind of almost seems to be connected with male virility or some bloody thing, you know. It is very hard to understand as a woman . . . where they are coming from . . . because none of my interest in Māori was sexual. That would be the last bloody thing that I would be interested in. I was happily married. So it was completely inconceivable where that was coming from. (Francis)

As discussed in previous chapters, for some of the participants, experiences of Othering reveal essentialised views, stereotypes, and cultural boundaries. Othering experiences emerge as significant, because these experiences appear to be a stimulus to participants dreaming of a better way forward for Māori and Pākehā relations.

Racism (institutional)

As the participants became aware that political, social, economic, and educational processes in New Zealand often promote a Pākehā way of thinking they recognised a link between Pākehā ideologies and what Feagin et al. (2001) referred to as a white-centred-society way of thinking. Some Pākehā-centred institutions, such as government departments and education settings, promote Pākehā ideology as forward thinking, although it has the potential to (and often does) lead to institutional

racism. Helen referred to occasions when she had experienced institutional racism in the law firms she had worked in. Participants often saw institutional racism which led them to explore better outcomes for Māori. For example, Susan explored Te Tiriti o Waitangi policies within Pākehā university departments and in her korero, implied that institutional racism was evident in this setting because tino rangatiratanga, an implicit element of Tiriti o Waitangi, was ignored in favour of Pākehā ideology.

When some participants began to see institutional racism, confrontational exchanges with other Pākehā occurred. These occurred because participants were seen as rejecting Pākehā-centred ways of thinking. For example, Brenda opposed the approach of Government institutions to include words such as whare paku on toilets in public areas, because she felt that it was “tokenism” and did not address deeper issues or power imbalances. In rejecting Pākehā-centred views, participants were often Othered by Pākehā. For example, Lisa was Othered as “pro-Māori” by a Pākehā woman who attended the bicultural development group at Rape Crisis where Brenda worked. The group dealt with issues associated with biculturalism and decolonisation:

I worked at Rape Crisis for a while and got involved in their bicultural development group. The bicultural development group was made up of Pākehā and Māori women. The Pākehā women that were involved were being brought face to face with Others' pain for the first time in their lives. They were also dealing with rape, but they were exposed to that sort of cultural pain if you like . . . as opposed to personal pain. It was the first time they had been brought face to face with that and so they were really resentful of me inflicting that on them. There was a fair amount of flak flying around. I came across a lot of it. It's not something that I have come across anywhere else actually and it quite sours me. The Pākehā women were very vindictive at times. I think it was because they saw it as me siding with the opposition. It was very much an 'us-and-them' thing.

Thus, being Othered as pro-Māori, biased toward Māori, a traitor, or even anti-Pākehā was a common occurrence for these participants.

Participants were Othered in complex ways. Generally, when the participants reflected on these experiences, they learned from them. For example, Glen was Othered through the employment of Othering stereotypes. He referred to the term ‘Wigger’ being associated with a white person who was involved in a black American industry and learned a lot more about his own third space, “in between” positioning:

The first white rapper that I saw was Vanilla Ice and he sucked. But funnily enough, I didn't think that he sucked until I saw his music video and I think anybody didn't think he sucked until they saw that video and then they were like "He just looks stupid". Vanilla Ice was corny and some of the lyrics he said just didn't make sense. When I saw the video I thought "No something is a bit off here". What it turned out to be was that he was manufactured by a record company and you could smell a rat. He was manufactured as a Wigger. Wigger was a word that I hated. It came out in the nineties. Vanilla Ice was manufactured as a Wigger in the same way that Kid Rock [another white American rapper] was earlier in his career. When Kid Rock came out, he was a stereotypical Wigger because he had his hair pushed into a high top fade and he would wear all hip-hop clothes. Vanilla Ice was manufactured in the same way. It must have been as far back as 1994 or 1995, probably more like 1994 that the term Wigger started to pop up. It was an American thing. It was not a locally generated thing. It was the media that were writing it. I don't know the ethnicity of the writers that were using the term, but it could quite well have been other white Jewish kids writing it who felt that they wanted to be down with this culture but they didn't know how to. They saw these other white kids being part of it and embracing it and enjoying it and they were jealous. So they labelled them Wigger, which is a pretty horrible term. Wigger was a term used to describe white people who wanted to be down with hip-hop who weren't really down. It wasn't until Eminem came out and made it totally socially acceptable to be a white kid in hip-hop that the term Wigger was no longer used . . . that term didn't exist anymore because they became just rap fans, or they were just regular kids who liked hip-hop. Hip-hop then started to cross over into the mainstream and that crossover changed the whole hip-hop and rap music industry.

This experience helped Glen become more aware of his inbetween positioning. Also, because Glen had grown up in an environment where there were many Māori influences, he had developed a “brown understanding” of Māori that helped him see through the stereotypes that associated Māori with violence. For example:

Previous to 2000, I think there were actually quite a few white kids that weren't into hip-hop. The white kids thought that it was not safe to go to a hip-hop club, or go to a rap gig. They were scared that it was a violent thing. They were scared because the hip-hop industry was painted as a brown thing.

Glen began to see negative stereotypes of Māori employed by Pākehā, as Pākehā judgements about Māori. Sometimes when Pākehā made such judgements, Glen felt he was Othered in a kind of extreme manner, associated with overt or violent white racism. For example:

When I was sixteen I started keeping my hair really short. I shaved it down to what I think was a number one or a number two. At that time, that look was still associated with skinheads. Romper Stomper [Australian film about racist skinheads] was out at the time and I remember being called a skinhead by some Pākehā. I thought being called a skinhead was the funniest thing that I had heard in my life. I just thought that was such the most opposite thing to what I was about. But I was a bit hurt by it. I thought "Oh, maybe I shouldn't wear my hair like this because people associate this look . . . skinny, pasty, bald white kid . . . as textbook skinhead". I was like "That is so not me". In a place like Papakura, I really didn't want to be identified like that because that element did exist. They were a very small element and I didn't take them seriously . . . I don't think anyone really did... but there were kids who wore Doc Martin boots and tight jeans and shaved their heads and I was like, "No I am not that man. Look I have got the baggy pants and I have the t-shirt". I thought that everything I did kind of exuded a little bit of a hip-hop angle. That is what I was hoping for because I was so obsessed with hip-hop music and hip-hop culture at the time. I told my dad about it. I said "Hey dad, a guy just called me a skinhead" and dad didn't really have much to say. It was like "That is not a big deal" and I was like "Yeah I guess it is nothing to be really worried about". But I didn't want to be called that, I just thought that was the most opposite thing to what I was about.

Glen's experience points towards elements of hybridity, in that his appearance, or behaviour, signalled to other Pākehā that he presented as a certain kind of Pākehā, which was in stark contrast to what he actually felt he was. Cindy also had experiences where she was described in a hybrid manner. For example, Cindy referred to an article that the *Otago Daily Times* newspaper ran about her involvement in Māori Television where "they called me the Blackest white Chick at Māori Television". The term "blackest white chick" is a hybrid interpretation which

reflects what Brah and Coombes (2000) referred to as conceptual “mixing” (p. i). However Cindy was clearly not an individual of mixed descent (Brah & Coombes, 2000), she had simply become more aware of her positioning as a Pākehā who frequently engaged with te ao Māori.

Generally, when the participants began to understand their encounters of te ao Māori as Othering experiences, they began to develop a third space perspective toward Māori and Pākehā engagement. However, their engaging with an alternative perspective often leads to more Othering experiences. While at university, David encountered these kinds of experiences when he offered a third space perspective of the history of New Zealand missionaries:

When I came to the university it was a joint appointment between history and Māori studies. But for the first few years, I was physically located in the history department and that did create some issues because they got me to teach New Zealand history subjects as well as Māori topics and my kind of point of view was probably a little controversial, a little more provocative. People would say that missionaries were really good and nice-intentioned and I quoted the old proverb, “Kindness kills” and that just really got to the students. I was trying to say “Well there are other points of view”. For a lot of Māori, if you said that missionaries destroyed their culture and engaged in genocide, a lot of Māori would say “Yes, what’s new?” I mean there is another point of view to argue there. So you can’t really shock a Māori group of students about what Pākehā might say, even the most redneck kind of comments won’t really faze them because they have heard it all. Whereas for Pākehā students it is like, “Oh my God. No-one has had the cheek to talk to me as a middle-class person in that way, or confronted me with that worldview before”. But I always thought that by provoking people you gained more thought and so I used to pose provocative ideas about missionaries and all sorts of things and say things in some ways that were perhaps barbed or sarcastic or provocative and there was a lot of negative reaction from the Pākehā students in the class because of that. It was like shock, horror, “You can’t say things like that. You can’t say things about my ancestors like that. I am going to complain”. It caused amazing shock. I used to have students walk out of history class. So obviously, I did stimulate them about the subject of history, rather than it being so grey and dull and full of facts, which is what some people think. But the department couldn’t handle it. They had complaints and so they actually stopped me teaching these topics. It was like they couldn’t take it and instead of thinking “Well this is something that we have to wrestle with intellectually”, there was a real hostility to me having

dared to question any pious white ancestor of the New Zealand colony. I always thought that university life was about the life of the mind and an expression of freedom of thought and so I felt like saying to them "Get a life!"

Susan and Alice also encountered experiences which revealed elements of suspicion, a concept implicit in Othering processes (Said, 1978), because their involvement in te ao Māori was perceived by some Pākehā in an unfavourable manner. For example:

Pākehā colleagues that I have at work are perplexed by my ongoing commitment to Treaty issues. I wouldn't assume to know what motivates them but I think when I see the same dynamics occurring again and again that it seems to be something to do with the feeling that there is some advantage being gained that isn't due to a particular group. Pākehā would either treat you with great suspicion or they would kind of go the other way and assume that you were really peculiar. So there's that kind of suspicion that comes simply from a lack of understanding of what is actually going on. (Susan)

I got a job in the public services and I got involved in setting up and establishing Wellington Refuge and then the National Collective. I was National Chairperson. Then the challenge came on in the early eighties about the Treaty and so because we had invented Parallel Development in Women's Refuge, we were seen as radical feminists. So I wore a bit of shit from the Pākehā women at that time. They would say things like "Why are you always hanging out with the Māori women?" (Alice)

For other participants, Othering experiences also occurred simply through their association with Māori individuals. For example with Joseph, because he was married to a Māori woman:

When we went to live in Rotorua we couldn't get a place to live. I was friendly with the owner of the local petrol station. I used to go to parties at his place and I would baby-sit for him. He had an empty flat and I asked him for it and he said "You are getting married to a Māori. No thanks, I don't want a Māori in my flat."

When Joseph asked a second friend - the local doctor, if he could stay in the flat next to the doctor's surgery, his friend said, "No thanks. I don't want a Māori in my flat". Thus, these participants experienced similar kinds of prejudices Māori suffer. Also,

they encountered stereotypical assumptions Pākehā have of Māori that continue the hierarchical order (Dyer, 1997; Appleby, 1994). For example,

After we were married a Pākehā woman said to me “Oh your husband is very dark isn’t he? Is he French, or is he Italian?” and I said “No, he is Māori”, “Oh” she said, “You are lucky he doesn’t look like one. (Betty)

Betty’s children were also Othered in a similar way to her husband. The complexity here is that Betty’s children are of mixed descent (Brah & Coombes, 2000). However, this experience does appear to reflect aesthetic hierarchical order:

When our children were little, Pākehā people used to say, “Oh they are so beautifully brown, aren’t they lovely?” And I would say “They are part Māori” and they would say “Oh are they?”, then their tone would change.

Othering by Māori

In a previous chapter, I discussed negative reactions by Māori toward the participants’ involvement in te ao Māori. Here I interpret these encounters as experiences that made the participants feel different, strange or inferior to Māori. I point out here that the experiences participants had of being Othered by Māori, are clearly different from those experiences Māori might have of being Othered by Pākehā. Simply put, this is because the participants are Pākehā and all that this represents in their *us/them* relationship with Māori. As discussed in the theoretical section of this thesis, the starting point for Othering between these two groups is clearly different. Nonetheless, the Othering of Pākehā by Māori does suggest that there is diversity to what Flores and Moon (2002) referred to as the “implications of us/them thinking” (p. 201). For example, to show this, I refer once more to Lisa’s experiences at Rape Crisis and the bicultural development group that she was involved with. This example conceptually relates to feminism and specifically, to hooks’ (1994a) argument that Othering process occur in feminism because an *us/them* relation exists:

When I first got involved in the bicultural development group at Rape Crisis it was a very difficult experience because I was the only Pākehā in the group. You know Rape Crisis . . . feminist organisation . . . supposed to be all open and loving . . . not even! There was a lot of cattiness and backstabbing and things that went on and I think that was probably the one place that I encountered the most of . . . you know... “What do you think you are talking about? You are a Pākehā” . . . sort of attitude. There was certainly a very high representation of Māori within Rape Crisis and they weren’t a small minority by any means. The Māori side of the organisation was very strong. I worked in a working group team that housed the bicultural development part of the organisation. I stayed there for a couple of years I guess and by that time there was another Pākehā woman in the group and we did things like organise decolonisation hui. We contracted in a group that ran the hui and it was very much a psych dramatic sort of awareness-raising exercise. Quite a number of the Māori women were quite upset because it brought stuff to the surface for them that they had to deal with and so they were feeling very raw, thinking “What are these Pākehā doing here putting this on us?” So it was like being re-colonised for them. In hindsight, after we had all calmed down a few months later, we thought “You know, that was probably a sign that it was a really, really good workshop”. But at the time it was very harrowing and quite difficult.

Lisa referred to more Othering experiences from Māori when she worked in a university Māori department. This encounter suggests that *us/them* thinking is dependent upon which group is doing the Othering, and which group is being Othered (i.e., Māori (us) Othering Pākehā (them)):

Things started filtering in like memos and emails saying things like “Pākehā are privileged to be working in the department” . . . that sort of stuff . . . that “You are just a second class citizen in here” . . . sort of thing. (Lisa)

Based on the experiences of these participants third space Pākehā certainly do have the potential to be Othered by Māori. Thus, the Othering of Pākehā by Māori disrupts the *us/them* relation because Pākehā may be conceptualised as belonging to different “us” or “them” groups, depending on what group is doing the Othering. For Jack, conceptualisations of *us/them* were disrupted when he was misunderstood by some of his Māori classmates at university, because one of his Māori classmates thought he was Māori. This encounter revealed processes of suspicion implicit in Othering, i.e., because these Māori were suspicious of a Pākehā:

Because I am brownish skinned . . . well . . . maybe not in the middle of winter . . . but you know . . . and because I am teaching Māori, people often assume that I am Māori. I had one Māori guy who was a student at university when I was a student, he came up to me and he was going on about some of the Pākehā staff at Māori Studies and he said “Oh, you know you just can’t trust these Pākehā” and it was quite a shock to him when I said, “Oh, well I am actually one”.

It was their knowledge of te ao Māori that helped participants through their experiences of being Othered by Māori. For example, for two participants, knowledge of te ao Māori was considered more important than any concerns they might have about being Othered by Māori. The more knowledge participants gained from te ao Māori, the less likely Othering experiences affected them. It was more likely that their knowledge of te ao Māori would help to alleviate any concerns Māori might have about a Pākehā person being involved, or having an interest in te ao Māori. For example:

When I was working at Māori Television Services, Māori would come to me for help with te reo. There was a guy who I worked with who would get me to translate all of his stuff for him, or he would come to me to check things. I would have quite a few people who would do that with me. We had a language advisor that went along to each shoot, but if we got stuck and the language advisor couldn’t go then I went. I remember my first day when I walked in to Māori Television Services and a Māori woman went “Man, all I knew was that we were getting some great language speaker from Kai Tahu [a tribal group from much of the South Island], from Otago, I thought that you were going to be Kai Tahu, but you’re white!” . . . She said “That’s awesome, that’s really cool, that makes me want to go and learn te reo better because man, if you can do it then why the hell haven’t I done it?” I had quite a lot of reactions like that, like “That is really cool and that is really motivating and because you are doing that - that makes me want to get myself into the reo”.
(Cindy)

I have worked in Māori organisations and often I have just done my job because I had to just do my job. But I have always tried to support Māori. There are a lot of young Māori journalists around that will say I helped them. I look for opportunities to bring them on and help them. I find it rewarding to teach Māori journalists because quite a lot of them are not very politicised and it is quite nice to politicise them because in most Māori mainstream organisations or other media organisations, no-one is going to politicise them. They are going to be quite the reverse. So I make Māori more aware of

institutional racism and all that sort of thing, so when it happens they can cope with it a lot better. (Francis)

Moving toward a third space perspective

Through their experiences of Othering, participants began to further their understanding of biculturalism and inbetweenness (Hoogvelt, 1997; Meredith 1998); to move further towards a third space way of thinking about Pākehāness. However, in no way does this movement negate being Pākehā in favour of Māori. For example, Cindy took offence to being called Māori:

I remember this Māori girl saying something to me that really offended me. She meant it as a compliment, but it really offended me. It was when I was at high school. She said to me “Oh you are not Pākehā you are practically Māori”. I found it quite offensive because I was like “No, I actually have my whole own identity over here thanks”.

Thus, the participants moved closer to what Giroux (1992) referred to as ‘border-crossers’, because they negotiated “boundaries of knowledge that claim the status of master narratives, fixed identities, and an objective representation of reality” (p. 26). When the participants border-cross, they disrupt what Giroux referred to as “relations of power” (p. 26) between Māori and Pākehā. Simon, spoke of border-crossing as movement into a “different cultural status”. This robust understanding of movement may be a reason why he employed impassioned outbursts. For example:

If a Pākehā comes up to me and says something about Māori and I think that it is ridiculous, I am more likely to say something like “I think that is just fuck’n absurd! That is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard, I mean if you want to continue to believe that, I think that is all well and good, but I think it is just ridiculous”. (Simon)

Impassioned responses generally were an outcome of two types of encounters: 1) when participants were exposed to Pākehā who express their ill-informed views of te ao Māori to the participant, 2) when participants were exposed to Pākehā institutions that marginalised Māori. When these challenges arose, participants

employed methods to address them in a manner which was respectful to te ao Māori.

For example:

When we invented Parallel Development in Women's Refuge in the very early eighties we were the first incorporated society in the social sector to change our rules from a corporation to give that meaning, so that the leadership for example . . . four Māori . . . four non-Māori . . . were elected to make a governing group of eight, so that Māori caucus have the veto over non-Māori and so that non-Māori, who weren't in keeping with that kaupapa [topic, plan], could not get elected and destroy it. (Alice)

Summary

These participants embraced their experiences of being Othered by Pākehā, despite some of these experiences being hurtful to them. By doing so they began to develop insights into the ways in which they might respectfully communicate with Pākehā about te ao Māori when Othering events occur. Because the participants had been exposed to many frequent Othering occurrences, they learned to develop a deeper third space perspective. This development occurred because the participants first encountered, then become more widely exposed to many different Pākehā opinions about what it means to be Pākehā in relation to Māori, and so developed a more enriched understanding of what being Pākehā might mean for different Pākehā. Engendered by Othering experiences, the participants' third space perspective involves the negotiation of contestable relations of power between Pākehā and Māori through disrupting generalised representations of Pākehā interest in te ao Māori. By disrupting what some Pākehā may view as a pointless or an unnecessary endeavour (Pākehā interest in te ao Māori), the participants were seeking a better way forward for Māori and Pākehā relations that does not continue to promote boundaries between the two. Also, because the participants dream of helping Pākehā bridge gaps that emerge as differences between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā, they uncover better ways in which movement can help Pākehā understand more about Māori and about what being Pākehā means. And, because the participants dream that a third space perspective of past and present conceptualisations of being Pākehā, being Māori and

biculturalism can actually exist, they also dream of more practical solutions to Māori and Pākehā differences. In other words, the participants investigate more explicitly new ways for Pākehā and Māori to engage, interact, and co-exist together in a respectful manner. It is this vision of practical and productive solutions for Māori and Pākehā relations that the participants seek to build on when they dream of better Pākehā/Māori relations in New Zealand, as I explore in the next chapter.

CHAPTER EIGHT / Te wāhanga tuawaru:

Storyline Four: *Equality*

“Tuia te rangi e tū iho nei, Tuia te papa e takoto nei. Join sky above to earth below, just as people join together. As sky joins earth, so people join together. People depend on one another (Trad.)” (Grace & Grace, 2003, p. 88)

Introduction

When Pākehā find themselves in situations which make decolonisation more likely, or more possible, connections between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā are discovered. Pākehā and Māori join together in their lives in love, at work, with friends, and this leads to better relationships between the two groups. For this coming together to occur, Pākehā must depend on Māori allowing access into te ao Māori, while Māori must depend on Pākehā not to abuse the privilege of entering into te ao Māori. This reciprocal respect, trust and appreciation has potential to transform future relations between Māori and Pākehā.

Equality

Collectively, the participants’ experiences pointed towards a clear statement of intent, that is, to promote equality. Promoting, or advocating for equality between Pākehā and Māori, emerged as an important element in their decolonising experiences. In this storyline I demonstrate how the participants were open and willing to use their knowledge of te ao Māori to promote equality as a “better” way forward for Māori and Pākehā relations.

When the participants advocate for equality, they typically connect their experiences of te ao Māori with their own understanding of Pākehāness and Pākehā institutions. Brenda connected her experiences of te ao Māori with her experiences of

Pākehā-centred institutions to demonstrate how the New Zealand education system disadvantaged Māori. According to Brenda, this was an effective approach to help other Pākehā think about equality for Māori and Pākehā:

I still have Pākehā saying to me some rather uninformed things about the Treaty. I say back to them “Well, how would you like it if all your land was confiscated and how would you like it if you were disadvantaged by the education system which had initially set Māori up for failure and had relegated them to the working class?” I see Māori being disadvantaged by the education system as a big thing and as a result, many Māori have been displaced and are now on a benefit. Māori get blamed for that when it is not their fault. (Brenda)

It is these kinds of connections that helped participants’ think about how equality might come about between Māori and Pākehā. For Helen, having commitment to find new ways to encourage Pākehā to see the value of te ao Māori is significant because Māori as a culture represents “so much of what society and the world is searching for” (Helen).

In previous storylines I demonstrated that ongoing experiences with te ao Māori helped the participants establish a more informed and sophisticated view of Māori and Pākehā relations [and of biculturalism]. However, in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, New Zealand’s demographic changed – moving from a bicultural toward a multicultural society (Spoonley, Macpherson & Pearson, 2004). As demonstrated in a previous chapter, in the New Zealand context, multiculturalism is counter-productive for Māori, and for Māori- Pākehā relations, because it is counter intuitive to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Participants found that multiculturalism does not help discussions about “better” relations between Māori and Pākehā. For example:

Pākehā just walk past it [te ao Māori] and don’t pick up on it and yet it could solve so many things. Pākehā are scared that if they do open up about biculturalism then what are people going to think about them. We have gone from being a very Pākehā-driven country to being a very multicultural country. But we are excluding our founding culture and I actually believe

that we need to go back and be a bicultural society, as in everybody should have to learn Māori culture, not just the language, but the ways of the people and the ways of the land. Pākehā perception is so wrong now and I believe our primary schools should start teaching tikanga, not just the token parts of te reo. I want them to teach the cultural side of it in our primary schools. It is part of what makes our country the way it is. I would love to be able to get a te ao Māori programme into primary schools teaching people about the culture. Māori culture is the culture and ways of our country, that's just how it is, so before Pākehā can actually judge Māori on their ways and how they do things, they should first find out about it firsthand. They should find out about why they have their culture and why they do things a certain way. They would then have that understanding and they could then make judgement. One of the things that annoys me a lot . . . is these advertisements that come on TV . . . these banks and institutions, they go; "We now have multicultural call operators. We can now answer your inquires in Samoan, Tongan, Japanese and Mandarin" and they rattle off a few others. They don't advertise that they can answer a query in Māori and that's the culture of New Zealand. (Helen)

This kind of insight held by Helen reflects her desire to move her decolonising experiences from the individual to the societal. I am not suggesting here that for Pākehā to decolonise they must disagree with multiculturalism but, rather, that the participants' experiences suggest there is some value in pursuing interconnectedness between Māori and Pākehā. For the participants, it is their individual desire to promote awareness of te ao Māori to Pākehā, as well as their desire to show that a connection may exist between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā, that helped them address with more confidence questions Pākehā had about te ao Māori. They were more confident because they had learned that some Pākehā found it difficult to ask Māori about te ao Māori. In other words, the participants learned cultural sensitivity (Powick, 2002; Tolich, 2001), they learned how to respectfully interact with Māori, te ao Māori, and with Pākehā who have questions about te ao Māori. For example:

When I was at university I worked at Critic, the student newspaper there, as the kaiwhakapaoho. When I was working there I was like the go-to-girl for Radio One, Critic and all of the Otago Students Association. That was fine with me because I would rather they came to me than they went to no one. They came to me because they knew me and I was more approachable than maybe going to somebody in the Māori department. Because going to the

Māori department was kind of like crossing the boundary. So they would ask “Hey we need some translations for this, could you come help us out?” or “Hey we have got this thing going on and we are not quite sure what to do”, or “Hey we need to teach our radio DJs to pronounce things properly, can you come and teach them a course?” So it was a lot easier for them to come to me than it was for them to go to the Māori department. (Cindy)

Because Cindy was familiar with cultural sensitivity, she learnt to set her own limitations, or as Alice articulated it, you learn where to “draw the line” (Alice), and participants will not cross that line because they do not want to discredit or disrespect Māori. In the event that the participants should, Some, not all, participants will speak on behalf of Māori, but will do so only when prior approval from Māori has been given. David articulated this approach as being “sanctioned” by Māori: “whenever I have had to do that kind of leadership thing, it has only been because I have been sanctioned or supported by Māori colleagues”. This respect for Māori, combined with a willingness to advocate equality between Māori and Pākehā is both a desire and a commitment taken on by participants that has potential to move their combined experiences toward finding a societal strategy for better Maori and Pākehā relations in New Zealand.

By drawing on their third space experiences, participants are able to help advance discussions about what Bell (2004b) referred to as Pākehā identity, because the pursuit of equality breaks down barriers to interconnectedness between groups. Because the participants become effective navigators of boundaries between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā, they cross borders and see possibilities for interconnectedness between Māori and Pākehā. It is this intent to find a connection that emerged as particularly significant for Glen. For example:

When you are a teenager you get so intensely consumed by things. When you are into something, whether it is a music thing, or a sport, you are just so into it, you are so passionate about it that you will protect it till the end. That is your shit and that is how you define yourself and that is everything. So if somebody else is coming in and they are not that serious or committed to it, then it is like, “You are not allowed access to where I am at and I won’t allow you to listen to my favourite album because you don’t deserve it, you won’t

understand it. You won't respect it. You can go listen to Britney Spears [an American pop singer]. You can do that. That is for you. You go and listen to Guns N' Roses hard rock band because that is your redneck shit that you are in to. You are not supposed to be here, you are not into this". But as you get older and do more and more social interaction you start to realise that it is not black and white, that there are many crossovers. You start to realise that it is OK for people to like different things. I now think that it should be encouraged actually. I am very welcoming now. I developed that attitude not long after being so intense, not long after I started playing and performing and DJ'ing live. I realised it was all about having as many different types of people involved as possible. (Glen)

In an earlier chapter I demonstrated how white sympathizers and pro-feminist men negotiated differences to help them advocate for equality. I also discussed how Pākehā Māori helped form relationships with Māori to secure trade, advance Māori and Pākehā relations, which led profitable and rewarding engagement between the two groups (Bentley, 1999, 2007). The experiences of Pākehā Māori show that third space experiences have potential to change the way society views its groups. The participants' commitment to change the way Pākehā view Māori, is clear. It is this commitment to promote equality between Māori and Pākehā that drives renegotiating past antagonisms between the two groups. Because they have been exposed to essentialist views Pākehā may have about Māori, learn how to engage in conversations with other Pākehā that have potential to transform what Hoogvelt (1997) referred to as "...the embeddedness of past antagonisms" (p. 4). This Decolonising Pākehā openly challenged stereotypes that continue nineteenth century *us/them* characteristics of Pākehā and Māori (Bentley, 2007). Conceptually then, the participants' experiences are similar to those of white sympathizers and pro-feminist men, because they also seek to promote equality between groups. By promoting equality as a better way forward for Māori and Pākehā relationships, Glen found that the experience revealed a learning process:

As a kid, I was hanging out with kids from different cultural backgrounds so I learnt to communicate with them in a very normal way. It was just natural and it became a part of my life. But Pākehā would say to me "You want to be a Māori". You get that kind of attitude from young children. Or you know, they would say "You just want to be black or something" and I was like

“What?” and that would offend me, even though I might not have really understood why at the time, because I was a little kid. But I didn’t like it and I would say “No I am not trying to be anything. This is me and this is where I am from and these are my friends and this is how I present myself to the world”. So yeah, I definitely got that from time to time. But that kind of thing stops by the time you get to about fourteen or fifteen I guess. Later on when I was a teenager, Pākehā kids were sometimes surprised that I was into rap music because the number one thing at the time was a pop thing, as it has been in recent years, and rap wasn’t a pop thing. It was quite a sub-culture. Rap and hip-hop was left field and a bit weird and only if you knew all about it could you actually be a part of it and understand it, so all types of people would go “Oh, are you into rap? I hate rap . . . rap sucks”. I guess that was the attitude at the time. We are talking about when I was thirteen and fourteen and at the time the attitudes were like “That is not white people’s music” because there weren’t any major white dudes involved in the music, none of the high profile people. (Glen)

Negative experiences did not negatively impact on participants’ intent to advocate for equality. For example, as described earlier, Francis and Betty were frequently exposed to negative Othering of Māori by Pākehā. These events did not have a negative impact on their advocacy for equality. For example; “I have interviewed masses of racist Pākehā and it has never bothered me” (Francis), and Betty:

I am retired now and I don’t get to meet that many new people. I have just started working up at the Red Cross shop here in Auckland. The Pākehā who come into the shop often say negative comments about Māori and I try and set them right, or give them an opinion or something . . . I try to explain things to them . . . but I mean mostly people they are just ignorant. (Betty)

When the participants in this study encountered Othering, it often led them to employ more diverse strategies for challenging these events. For example, in his comedy routine Simon would make jokes about Māori or Pākehā because he felt comedy made it easier for him to shed light on barriers that emerge when Pākehā are faced with different aspects of te ao Māori, for example, tikanga:

Am I racist towards Pākehā? Certainly I am racist towards Pākehā in terms of certain subjects and people’s attitudes. I am more than happy to mock

them in history. Events that have happened in history and that kind of thing, I am willing to portray them as being absurd, ridiculous, foolish, racist . . . yeah. I started doing a mihi as an introduction to my stand up set and I still do it now. I love doing it at conferences and stuff like that. When I do it Pākehā think “Oh God here we go again” and it’s right on PC, you know . . . Auckland liberal . . . but then when the comedy translation comes through, you can hear the laughter, especially when you are going around the country and hearing where the laughter in that routine comes from. In places like Gisborne you hear the laughter through the Māori bit. You’ve got people who understand the language laughing and then you get the sense that Pākehā feel they are being excluded from something, that there is a gag that they don’t understand . . . “What is it? Is he saying something funny? Why are the Māori laughing?” Then they get the translation. It is interesting in that way. It is interesting from my point of view, being involved in comedy and being mystifying in a way and in a sense with the use of greetings. Pākehā realise that they are allowed to laugh and that there is a Pākehā person up there saying that it is ok to laugh. As a comedian I am giving Pākehā the opportunity to laugh. There is a lot of hostility and anger out there amongst Pākehā about some of the topics I have dealt with over the years in the industry. But by making jokes out of them, I think Pākehā go “Oh, oh that’s ok”. It’s good medicine. But the Pākehā response is honestly something that I have never cared about. I have never cared if they have gone “He is some kind of liberal, learning Māori, working with Māori Television.”

Summary

These participants found strategies to engage in discussions that had potential to help some Pākehā decolonise. Generally the strategies they employed involved relating particular elements of te ao Māori with te ao Pākehā, to ‘get their point across’. By connecting history, culture, values, and protocols, these participants became more willing to accept cultural diversity, to accept that certain aspects of Māori culture may connect with Pākehā history. Potentially, it is the recognition that there exists a connection between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā, that may lead to a better way forward for Pākehā and Māori relationships. Importantly, the participants also realised that this process does not involve the homogenisation of differences, but rather adds rigour and sophistication to discussions with other Pākehā and Māori, about ways of being Pākehā, of being Māori and biculturalism. By exploring connectedness between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā, these participants learned to

become more involved in their advocacy for te ao Māori in a manner which was respectful to Pākehā and Māori. In other words, they promoted interconnectedness and equality between Māori and Pākehā ahead of any aspect of separatism, and in doing so, emerged as effective facilitators of equality between Māori and Pākehā, or as Papastergiadis (1997) might put it, they serve as a “lubricant between cultures”. The ability of the participants to “straddle two cultures” (Meredith, 1999, p. 24) and become “transitional” (Bell, 2004b, p. 129) in their thinking, clearly points towards advocacy for equality as the statement of intent for decolonising Pākehā, the application of which becomes even more apparent through their employment of the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy, which I discuss in the following chapter.

CHAPTER NINE / Te wāhanga tuaiwa:

Storyline Five: *Pākehā educating Pākehā*

“E hī ake ana te atakura. He tio, he huka, he hauhunga. The red dawn comes with a sharpened air, a touch of frost, the promise of a glorious day. A wish that challenges will be met and that futures will be bright (Trad.)” (Grace & Grace, 2003, p. 82)

Introduction

I think my Pākehā colleagues feel comfortable communicating with me about Māori or Treaty issues because they know me. That is the dynamic that I notice the most really. That by default, often the first port of call is to ask advice from me, or to ask me to be sort of a conduit of some kind, or a connection if some communication has to be made about Māori or Treaty issues, or if Pākehā are wanting to sound something out. So I am surprised when colleagues contact me about Treaty things because people would assume that if you said that you were working at the Tribunal, that you had either a familiarity with Māori culture beyond that which you had, or a capacity with Māori language that you didn't have. I don't pretend to know things about Māori society and the community. I just like the interface bit of it. So I think that's why I remain a bit of an enigma, because I am white. But that has its advantages too. What I find I regularly engage in as a Pākehā working in the field of teaching Treaty politics is other discussions with other Pākehā about whether they feel they belong in what they are doing and how they can deal with, or respond to, challenges that come from Māori communities about what they are doing. But it does annoy me when Pākehā in the department I work in assume that I speak for all Māori. I have sometimes suddenly thought “Oh my God, they are expecting me to represent all Māori” when they don't even know who they are expecting me to represent. Then I suddenly realise that this positioning is awful and is wrong. So I say from the start that the only person I am representing here is my own department. So that kind of thing is just outrageous. It sometimes moves me to tears when I think the flicker of that kind of thing that I experience and it's nothing like the kind of thing you experience as gender issues. That's nothing compared to the kind of marginalising that goes on. So combine the fact that I understand as a woman what it is like to be excluded from something, with the tiniest insights I get into what hard work it would be to actually be a Māori representative on those committees, I just don't know where to begin in terms of taking my hat off to the hard slog that goes on really, which is confronting that kind of thing time after time after time. That is what a lot of

Pākehā don't understand. They think that it is easy. They think that Māori are getting an easy road. I couldn't think of a tougher one really. (Susan)

When the participants dream of equality between Māori and Pākehā, and are committed to challenge essentialised views Pākehā have of te ao Māori, and to promote better relations between Māori and Pākehā, the future for Maori and Pākehā relations looks bright. These participants are proactive and take action to make these relationships better. For the participants, 'action' is represented by the strategies they employ to promote awareness of te ao Maori. The previous storylines demonstrated that strategies do not always reflect the message of equality. For example, when participants discovered, or reflected upon values, a time when feelings of anger and frustration are expressed, some of these participants were emotional, impassioned, and reacted outwardly toward events, policies, social commentary, and Pākehā viewpoints all of which normalised and legitimised Pākehā ways of being over Māori. The commitment to improving relationships between Māori and Pākehā preceded that of advocating for equality. For example, four of the participants reported feeling emotional or acting emotionally: Brenda, in response to tokenism; Helen to negative comments about te ao Māori from Pākehā at work, with friends and with whānau; and Francis and Cindy in response to opinions Pākehā had that presented te ao Māori in an unfavourable manner.

In contrast, strategies generated when Othering experiences occur are more about finding ways to confront and educate Pākehā. For example, the participants begin to address their encounters with stereotypes in more diverse ways. For example, Simon's approach was to over-emphasise Pākehā stereotypes through comedy:

You become the über-racist in order to destroy the notion of what is racist and to make the über-racist look ridiculous . . . I said, "Ladies and gentleman just because he is Māori doesn't mean he kills his kids". Some people in the audience think 'Whoa', but you know other people get it.

Generally, strategies employed during the process of decolonisation ultimately become an ongoing part of the journey Pākehā take to decolonise. For example:

I say to myself, “If I am going to be in this for a longish haul, how do I pace myself in order to do more good in the long term than not?” So I guess that’s one of the things you think about. You think about it as a very long journey and you don’t expect things to be changing immediately. I try not to be hostile and antagonistic and I try not to get exasperated or be confrontational with Pākehā about the issues in the hope that Pākehā can see that it is not a threatening issue. I tend to take the more conciliatory approach to it. It is the approach that I see other colleagues take who also try and fight the good fight . . . to make the message more implicit and more leading by example than trying to kind of shout at people from the roof tops. (Susan)

The Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy

The Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy promotes equality and interconnectedness as a way of addressing antagonisms between Pākehā and Māori. The strategy supports participants to enact justice and empathy, put changed views into practice at work, in relationships with friends and whānau, to take a stand in support of Māori, to join in specific action on behalf of Māori and, engage with Pākehā about te ao Māori in a manner which is respectful to Māori. As Huygens (2004) suggested, engagement with Māori by Pākehā helps Pākehā to establish “feelings of empathy, passion or hope” (p. 15) that future relationships between Māori and Pākehā may become better relationships. Huygens (2007), believes that it is this feeling of empathy that generates “motivating factors for Pākehā” (p. 187) to engage with other Pākehā about various aspects of te ao Māori. Thus, although the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy evolves from experience to experience, it is a strategy with many different approaches. For example, when exposed to Pākehā opinion that ill-represented Māori, or te ao Māori, Lisa, Helen, Brenda and Cindy all started off with impassioned responses – challenging Pākehā:

I don't handle it very well it has to be said. I usually end up fighting and shouting. I lose the argument because I lose control rather than them losing control. There are some things that I just find very difficult to be passive about . . . Some of the letters to the editor at the Otago Daily Times just get me so boiling. (Lisa)

I would challenge Pākehā to get them to try and justify where they are coming from and just try and talk to them about it. I would challenge them on their statement and I would turn the TV off and I would say "So why do you say that?" I would just keep challenging them until they couldn't get themselves out of it anymore and they had to admit that they are actually being racist . . . I can't say that I am proud of the way some Pākehā perform in society. I actually think that they have got a lot to be ashamed of. They are ignorant and it comes back to what they have been taught and where they have been taught that from. I worked in Pākehā corporate law firms for many years and it is amazing how much racism there is in those law firms. I was actually quite sickened by it. Things would happen, like when we would be going through interviews, or CV's, to look at candidates to become a lawyer in the firm, comments would be made by the partners . . . "On no, we don't really want Māori working here". (Helen)

One thing that does get me annoyed is the Māori signs on doors like whare paku [toilet]. I think that is tokenism and I think that the Māori language has been fragmented. What I would really like to see in accordance with the Treaty is that everyone in New Zealand is speaking Māori. It should be a right and people shouldn't have to pay for it, because it is something that was stolen from the people . . . from the Māori people. Because the Māori language is one of my passions, I get quite aggressive about it and that is why I believe that whare paku on the odd toilet is just tokenism. (Brenda)

I do get fired up. I mean even with my partner. He likes to joke a lot and a lot of my friends are like that. There is very much a culture nowadays of making fun of aspects of Māori culture . . . you know . . . like when people say "Oh cheer bro" . . . people are always doing that. People do it at my work here at Shortland Street. They go "Cheer, cheer bro" you know . . . just being stupid. But if that gets taken to the next step I find it really hard to sit there and not say anything. I normally do say something because it really bothers me to see things sidelined, especially by people who don't really understand. That's what gets me . . . people who never made the effort, don't know anything about the reo, don't know anything about te ao Māori, they just sit there and think that all Māori are on Police 10-7 [Television New Zealand crime programme] and that's the only kind of Māori that are out there. (Cindy)

Their impassioned responses, however, led to more educational responses that helped Pākehā find out more about te ao Māori. For example:

I had a lot of rather large discussions or arguments with my friends who were right wing law students. I remember one of them was telling me he was going for a job or an internship that required knowledge of te ao Māori and how he put on his application form that he had knowledge about te ao Māori. He said to me that he didn't think that he needed to do any kind of Māori protocol course or anything like that because he knew the basics. I had this huge argument with him about how if he was going to be a lawyer then there was the possibility that he would be dealing Māori. He said "No I don't need to know anything". That was his argument: "I don't need to do any course, I know the basics, I know like the head is tapu". He was just so adamant that he didn't need to know anything about Māori culture and I was just so adamant that he did and that the job was working with people and he needed to understand them and help them. I said to him, "How can you help Māori if you don't know where they are coming from?" (Cindy)

I remember I had a big argument with a Member of Parliament on the plane. I was sitting next to him flying from Dunedin back up to Auckland and we were talking about our jobs and he said "I am an MP" and I said "You don't want to know what I do". He said "Oh what do you do?" I said "I work for Māori TV". We were discussing a kura kaupapa event he attended and the tikanga behind why you shouldn't clap at the end of a waiata. I said to him, "If you actually understood the culture, you would realise that clapping is really inappropriate in a kura kaupapa situation when someone has done a waiata, because clapping is very much a Pākehā thing that you do after someone sings. Some kura kaupapa are incredibly strict, and you are not even allowed to speak a word of English while you are at that school. So to react by doing an English thing in a Māori situation . . . that is really out of place. Imagine if you went to a normal school environment and you did a speech and at the end of the speech one of the kids stood up and started singing . . . what do you think would happen? They would get told off because it is inappropriate for that cultural situation". (Cindy)

Although these strategies might appear aggressive or confrontational, their overall intent is to educate Pākehā about te ao Māori. Lisa, Helen, Jack, Francis, and Simon all intimated that the Pākehā educating Pākehā approach is one that Pākehā should grab hold of:

What I do do well and I do whenever I can is just gentle education with Pākehā, just letting Pākehā know that if somebody says something like “Oh, I don’t understand why so many Māori get upset when you sit on a table” or something like that, then I will explain why it is not appropriate to sit on a table . . . I have always strongly believed that it is the role of Pākehā to educate other Pākehā as much as you can. We are never going to be able to explain everything, but you know . . . it is a Pākehā’s job to take it on board and up-skill other Pākehā. It should not all be left to Māori to do that and people like Wharehuia who imparted their knowledge to me, they didn’t expect me to just hold onto it. (Lisa)

A Pākehā tutor . . . I have never forgotten her name . . . she changed my life. In her class we did the module called Being Pākehā. As part of our assignment we had to go into our own Pākehā community and challenge the views of our fellow Pākehā. She said that we need to get out there with our young people and teach them the right things. She said “It is not up to us to tell Māori how it is, it is up to us to tell Pākehā how it is because they are our people and that’s all we can do to change the racism that is out there”. I took that onboard wholly and really set about making some waves with friends and family. (Helen)

I have heard from some Māori that in terms of educating other Pākehā, Pākehā will take stuff from Pākehā better than they do from Māori. Like if Māori were running a Treaty workshop then a lot of Pākehā will have their backs up. Whereas if a Pākehā is taking it, then that is less likely to happen because they are more conducive to listening to a Pākehā person. (Jack)

I still think Pākehā need a Pākehā to tell them what is going on. Sometimes it is kind of sad that Pākehā will listen to another Pākehā saying things about an injustice or something more than they will a Māori. (Francis)

I think that the main problem is that Pākehā don’t have someone to ask, or if there is someone to ask, they don’t know the questions they want to ask, or they are too worried to ask in case they offend Māori. (Simon)

The Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy is a helpful tool employed by participants when they engage with Pākehā about issues that relate to te ao Māori. It is this strategy that helps the participants become better communicators of te ao Māori to other Pākehā, because it engages other Pākehā in discussions about te ao Māori topics, that may seem contentious to some Pākehā. Thus, the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy may help other Pākehā emerge as Pākehā practitioners of

Pākehā decolonisation, because when it is employed by Pākehā, it offers a third space perspective about te ao Māori that may appear more appealing to other Pākehā, especially those Pākehā who question the relevance of te ao Māori for Pākehā.

The Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy is effective because it is an educational strategy that reflects a kaupapa Māori perspective for Pākehā. For example, the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy employs elements of whakawhanaungatanga and whakapapa to help Pākehā understand that connections exist through whānau for Pākehā that are similar to those for Māori. For Māori, whakawhanaungatanga, whakapapa, and whānau are concepts that help Māori understand their own ways of being. For Powick (2002), a reason for this is because these concepts are connected with te ao Māori and therefore offer a “high degree of cultural consciousness and understanding . . . that an ‘outsider’ . . . is unable to fully appreciate” (p. 20). When the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy is employed, a more sophisticated third space perspective on te ao Māori is offered because Pākehā cultural consciousness is addressed – especially when questions about Pākehāness extend to antagonisms, or issues that might be sensitive to Māori. Thus, awareness that sensitivity exists when the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy is employed reflects cultural sensitivity (Powick, 2002; Tolich, 2001).

The Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy takes on many different forms (i.e., from saying nothing, to more intense confrontation). Although Francis felt it best not to say anything when confronted with Pākehā who held hostile opinions toward Māori, she did suggest that at other times she would become more confrontational. For Susan, creating awareness was a more productive approach:

I go to a yoga class. They are all middle-class rich Pākehā people who have never had any contact with Māori. They often say really hostile things to me. We were around the corner having a cup of coffee one day after a yoga class and they said “Remember when we were children and that dump at Okawa Bay was there and they had to tear down that Māori village? It is such a relief to have a car park complex there now”. I think they were saying it to annoy me and they said things like “You probably wouldn’t agree with us”

and I would say “Look I have got an appointment”. So I left because there is no point in engaging with those kinds of people . . . I still get people coming up to me telling me their opinion about Māori, like “That thing that is going on in the news at the moment, you should know this!” The old finger pointing thing, I often get it. Just recently I went to a party and this guy came up to me and did that. He knew that I had Māori connections and he started saying something negative about what was happening. I mean, I do like to occasionally go to a party and not have people giving me their crap about what they think about Māori issues. I mean, I just want to enjoy myself. Over the years it has been very unpleasant to go to most dinner parties or go anywhere. People would ask questions about Māori. Although quite a lot of my friends will ask me genuinely what I think about Māori things so that they could get another perspective, I do get the odd person at parties who say negative things about Māori. So I actually now have got more strategies for dealing with negative comments Pākehā make about Māori. I will say things like “It’s not the 1970s is it?” or I might say to them “Look, if you want to have that conversation then have it with somebody else, I just don’t want to go there. If we are going to take it somewhere really positive because I understand this better than you do, then that is fine, but I don’t want to talk to you at this level”. Other times I am really rude . . . you know. It was funny . . . I went to a party and there was a Pākehā woman saying “You know it is quite horrible how these students with only a tiny bit of Māori blood can go in and get this and this” and I said “No I don’t agree with you, sorry, and you are not going to get me to agree with you so you are wasting your time” and she said “That’s the trouble with Pākehā like you; you don’t want to know what Māori are really getting up to!” It was really funny and several of my friends were there and they were roaring with laughter and they were saying “Do you know who that is? She knows a lot more about it than you do!” (Francis)

What I sometimes do is try to startle a dynamic that I can see emerging of assuming that it is ok to be racist publicly just because you assume the faces that are around you, around the table, are white that there is some kind of implicit consent about it, that it is ok to be racist. On occasion I have found that it is quite useful to say something like “It’s interesting that you point that out, because when I was at a Māori staff meeting last week I just didn’t have the impression that that was the approach that they were taking”. What this does is get people, particularly greying white-suited men, a bit startled and it’s like “Ok boys, I think we need to stop chatting about this, we clearly have got an interloper in the ranks”. Other times I don’t say anything because I think to myself there are way too many people that out rank me here and it’s just not worth it. During these times I think back to the Māori people who gave me some good advice. They said “Don’t put your arse on the line. Just let it go, it’s part of a much bigger thing that is going on”. (Susan)

A further significant element of the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy is that when employed, the strategy should recognise and respect te ao Māori. For example, for Susan, this meant that she must first be confident that her knowledge of te ao Māori was sound:

For me it is definitely the knowledge. If I am completely confident that I've got my facts straight about the information that I need to take the issue on, then I would certainly do it. But I would only do it if I knew that it wouldn't be doing Māori a disservice. That's what helps inform me where I feel comfortable setting my limitations for what I will teach about and what I feel I am able to say confidently as a Pākehā woman talking about Treaty relationships. I often intuitively think to myself whether I feel like I would be well representing Māori to say anything at all, or whether I am best to shut up, listen to what is going on and just inform people about the kind of discussion that was had. I know for other Pākehā scholars who don't necessarily draw those lines, who do find themselves moving into the area of commenting specifically about Māori issues, that they question really quickly what their right is to do it. I don't think they do have a right to do it. Well, no, that's not true. I think that when you are in that position you have to be explicitly aware of what you are doing and acknowledge the limitations of what you are able to contribute. I would not do that without giving it considerable consideration. It can cause problems where they would otherwise have just disappeared. I mean, sometimes it can just make matters worse. I think it is so important that the people who the detractors are attacking actually should represent themselves. I couldn't do the cause justice. But it would be nice to see discussions become more sophisticated, or to become developed to the point that it is more evenly fought, so that you are not necessarily disadvantaging yourself by showing alliances or allegiances with any particular group. But that is just not the case at the moment. It is pretty sad. (Susan)

Te Tiriti o Waitangi

In the New Zealand context, we are fortunate to have a document that provides a foundation for equal Māori and Pākehā relations – the intent of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. It is Te Tiriti that outlines the basic foundations for working together. Therefore, Te Tiriti o Waitangi is a starting point for dialogue to take place between Māori and Pākehā. However, as demonstrated in previous chapters, from a Pākehā perspective, discussions about Te Tiriti o Waitangi, tino rangatiratanga or Māori

sovereignty often reflect a Pākehā-centred view rather than a third space perspective. Employment of the Pākehā educating Pākehā is an approach to these discussions that may help Pākehā with knowledge of te ao Māori to become far better equipped, and more informed, than other Pākehā without this knowledge when they respectfully pass their knowledge of te ao Māori on to Pākehā. However, employment of the strategy does involve significant thought. For example, Simon referred to the analogy of two farmers talking about a cow to show this:

It is like two farmers arguing about the health of a cow. Would I be more likely to step in between two farmers arguing about the health of a cow, as opposed to two guys in a café in Auckland arguing about a cow? The chances are I am more likely to step in to the two guys in the café arguing about a cow because they probably don't know too much about cows. Whereas two farmers, you are going to assume that they have more knowledge about the cow than I do.

Thus, the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy must be employed in different forms, depending on the setting and context. For example Alice helped alleviate concerns Pākehā had about te ao Māori at work, Cindy helped whānau members with aspects of te ao Māori, and Lisa helped educate Pākehā about te ao Māori in education settings. It is in their diverse execution of the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy that its breadth of application is revealed. For example:

I get asked for advice like, "I have got this hui to go to, what should I wear?" and I would say, "Wear a long dress or trousers and take a scarf so you can cover up the te whare tangata [groin area] when you are sitting cross-legged", or "If you are going to sit in a chair make sure that you are not in a micro-mini where everybody will get distracted by it" and basics like that. (Alice)

My father works in education and he comes to me quite often and asks me things. I have written both my father and mother a mihi so that when they go to their courses they always have a mihi to say. My dad comes to me if he has got an important address to make at work. He is a union representative and he does a lot of work where he is speaking to large groups of people. He will come to me quite often and ask for both a start to his speech and a way of ending it. My brother did Māori through his first three years at high school

and prior to that when he went to England to visit our relatives I taught him his mihi and I taught him a haka . . . that sort of thing. (Cindy)

I have run a couple of workshops within the library of just basic things like “Why do Māori hug and kiss when they meet?” and “Why do Māori not sit on tables?” just some basic stuff and it was really well received. But it was just real basic stuff, nothing real in-depth. Pākehā might know the taboos, they know the forbidden, but they don’t understand the reason and it is so much easier to comply with something when you understand the reason behind it and that is the premise I came from when I designed these workshops. I thought that there was no point just saying “Don’t go sitting on the tables” unless I am going to tell them why it is not appropriate in Māori culture to sit on tables. At the end of the workshops I got a lot of feedback from Pākehā saying that it was easier for them to learn about te ao Māori from a Pākehā because they could have confidence that I had a fair idea what I was talking about and that they could ask the stupid questions without feeling embarrassed, or being afraid of giving offence or anything. So they appreciated that. They found it easier that I was Pākehā and I think that I found it easier as a Pākehā relating to them, in that I didn’t find the stupid questions offensive. So it works both ways. So for me, it is easier to answer things that for a Māori might seem like a real dumb question, you know . . . like Māori might think “Why do I have to answer so many dumb questions from Pākehā?” whereas for me, I come from having to ask the questions and so it’s not so hard. Although I do get fed up sometimes with the same old dumb questions. (Lisa)

Overall, the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy helps Pākehā find better ways of interacting with Māori. For Alice, the strategy proved effective when helping Pākehā organisations, “not to put their foot in it and bugger it up when they are working with Māori”. For Francis, the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy helped encourage Pākehā to ask more questions about te ao Māori. This approach was demonstrated in two of her published works and a paper she developed for journalists about Pākehā engagement with te ao Māori:

The two versions of Māori Sovereignty are often referred to. At the time they were published, sovereignty and tino rangatiratanga were dirty words and I think that they are less dirty words now because Pākehā are prepared to ask questions. (Francis)

I am advising journalists how they should use Māori information, how to engage with Māori and Pākehā, and how to engage with Māori and Pākehā opinions in newspapers and in broadcasting. It is very, very important for

New Zealand. That is why I was agonising over it, because a lot of people are starting to use this 'non-Māori' term. I am saying that you must not use non-Māori. You can't say to Pākehā that they are non-Māori, you can't. That is antagonistic and dreadful. The paper I am developing has got all the stuff about how to establish contacts, knowing who to speak to and the correct spokesperson, because those issues are always an issue for journalists. They never know who to talk to and why. So it is all that stuff and there is a chapter on the Treaty and why it is important to journalists. There is a little bit about the history of New Zealand. There is some information on reporting on Māori occasions and how to behave on the marae and what to do and what a whakatau is, what the position of women is on the marae, what to do with a koha [gift] and that sort of stuff. There is a chapter about reporting with local knowledge and advises journalists to start in their own community. That they must first understand and respect the people in their local area before they go out and learn about other Māori organisations. Then there is a chapter on good practice which analyses what it is that people do when they stereotype and all those kinds of things. It looks at the ways in which people demonise Māori . . . it is a very long chapter . . . and how they can avoid it and how they can take stock of what they are writing. There is also a chapter on Māori media and a chapter on the history of Māori media and how people and practitioners in Māori media differ and what they do differently from Pākehā. There is a chapter on doing rounds and how, if you understand the history of your round, the Māori history, and the New Zealand history, how you will approach things differently and how you will see patterns developing and so on. Then there is a reo chapter and all the rules about things like the first syllable and the first diphthong, you know all that kind of stuff. Key words that are now used in New Zealand English. There is a few waiata and hymns and things like that and I put the Māori version of the national anthem in it. Then there is a final chapter on the future of Māori journalism in New Zealand and where I think it should be going. (Francis)

Although the intent of the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy is to educate Pākehā about te ao Māori, there is potential for the strategy indirectly to help some Māori become more educated in aspects of te ao Māori that they may not have been familiar with - such as connections with whakapapa. For example:

A classic example is the story we did in our show. This group of elderly white folk came up and they said "We are from Taranaki and we are farmers and we live on that disputed land and we never heard that story told like that and we would like to thank you for opening our eyes" . . . then a young Māori guy came up and he said "That story is about my whakapapa it is about my ancestry and I would like to thank you for bringing that story up". So I had Māori and Pākehā coming up to me and that was a real moment. (Simon)

However, the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy did have limitations for at least one participant. For Simon, because he “pushed the boundaries” of Pākehā/Māori relations in New Zealand through his comedy work, found that not all Pākehā were prepared for his view of Māori and Pākehā relations. For example:

With the knowledge that I have gained over the years I now feel as if I have a little bit more ability to represent Māori and Pākehā relations more credibly and more interestingly. I can now push the boundaries more inside and I get away with more stuff now. I can be more outrageous and that comes from having inside knowledge . . . I didn't make very many friends when I came down to the Ngāi Tāhu symposium to get this kind of arts project together. There were all kinds of Māori and Pākehā artists and there was a big talk about assimilation and how dreadful that was and I actually said something along the lines of “Well I think there should be more of it and we should all be assimilated a little bit more. There will be things that you want to keep as yours, but you need to open the gates so that we can all share this because no one is going anywhere”. It was an old cliché, but it is kind of true and the more that you can open the gate to show Pākehā why you believe things the better. It doesn't have to be enforced like “Well this is what I believe”. That is as stupid as anyone else going “Oh well I believe in something else”. That is like being a fundamentalist and just stating that this is why things happen and it doesn't go into explaining it. So that is going to be difficult for anyone to cope with.

Another implication of the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy is that it may lead to the exploitation of Pākehā with knowledge of te ao Māori. For example, Jack was one of the only people in the university department where he worked who had any knowledge of te ao Māori:

When you are working in a place like this, you are the only person with any sort of expertise in Māori things, so people come and talk to you and it is like you are meant to be the expert on everything. One time I had to do a whaikōrero [official speech] for the mihi whakatau [official welcome] and it went down okay. But being the kaiako [teacher] and being the most fluent male here it landed on my shoulders quite a bit. (Jack)

Susan felt that she was expected to be a “conduit” for Pākehā:

By default, often the first port of call is to ask advice from me, or to ask me to be a sort of conduit of some kind or a connection if some communication has to be made about Māori or Treaty issues or if Pākehā within the department are wanting to sound something out. (Susan)

For the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy to be employed in a respectful manner, the context in which it is employed must be appropriate. Also, it may be a long-term strategy, in that it takes time to educate Pākehā. For Betty, this was a clear implication, “I don’t always have enough time to change people’s opinion. You are not going to do it overnight. You are not going to do it in one sentence”. Generally, however, when the Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy is employed, it is done so in the knowledge that Pākehā have the responsibility to impart knowledge of te ao Māori onward. For example:

My involvement in te ao Māori is a responsibility that is not done as an individual. It is a task that I have been given and Māori sit behind me to make sure that I do it. It is not something that I just walked into and assumed. I had to earn the right to do it. You only earn the right to exercise that responsibility if you have been through the journey. I have seen Pākehā walk in and assume that they can do it and they just get sliced up and quite rightly so, because they have just assumed. They are coming at it from a colonial stance and there is a clear paradigm difference. (Alice)

I think that I understand why Māori do the things they do. I understand the protesting and all of those sorts of things and I totally support it. But I don’t think that it has made any difference to me. I have always been the same. Because my husband and I have been together since we were young everybody knows us . . . you know . . . everybody we know has known us forever and it makes a difference. In fact sometimes my husband will ask me something like . . . if the newspaper rings up . . . he will say “What do you think of that so the newspaper reporter can report on it?” He asks me because I have read the papers and he hasn’t. Sometimes Māori Television will ring up and they will say “Can we speak to him?” and I will say “No he is out, what do you want to talk to him about?” and they would tell me and I would say “Well I will tell you what he thinks if you like”. (Betty)

Summary

The Pākehā educating Pākehā strategy is the action these participants choose to take as they make their way through their journey of decolonisation. It is a strategy that is informed by experiences with te ao Māori, and experiences of decolonisation. And it is a strategy which challenges boundaries of knowledge that exist between Māori and Pākehā. When decolonising Pākehā employ this strategy, in its many different forms, the strategy's effectiveness to confront, educate, and help Pākehā understand te ao Māori emerges as a new and enriched strategy for addressing Pākehā and Māori differences, that has not been fully considered in other Pākehā decolonisation initiatives (e.g. Campbell, 2005; Jellie, 2001; Huygens, 2007; Mitcalfe, 2008; *Te Hui Pumaomao*, 2002). Thus, decolonising Pākehā experiences should be celebrated, because they are experiences that “avoid the perpetuation of antagonistic binarisms” (Meredith, 1998, p. 5) promote equality and cultural sensitivity between Māori and Pākehā.

Conclusion: *Pākehā with third space experiences: Practitioners of Pākehā change*

“He rangai maomao ka taka ki tua o Nukutaurua e kore ā muri e hokia”

Translation: *“Once a shoal of maomao pass Nukutaurua, they never return”*

Tamatea-pokai-whenua was much like his grandfather Tamatea-ariki, captain of the Takitimu. When he attained adulthood, he carved a new canoe and named it Takitimu. It was on this waka that he and his companions travelled around the country exploring the land. It was from these deeds that he was given the name ‘land traveller’. Finally, they settled at Rangaunu near Kaitaia. He married his three wives here and it was here his son, Kahungunu, was born to Iwipupu (his second wife). As time passed, the people of the North saw that the influence of Tamatea was growing and being envious and anxious for their own authority in the region planned to expel him before he grew too powerful lest they lose their own land. Not only that but they were also annoyed at his ability to acquire the best of the food resources for his people. They began to build fortresses and Tamatea, seeing this, realised it was time that he moved on. Before leaving, he devised a plan to flood the crop lands but because of the size of the task could not achieve this. Consequently, he turned his attention to carving a canoe. Upon completion, they went to Te Aurere and it was here that he was entreated to stay by one of the local inhabitants whereby he replied, ‘A shoal of maomao that passes Nukutaurua will never return by this way’. Nukutaurua is a rock that can be seen in the waters of Mangonui Bay. He likened his group to a shoal of maomao that, once past this rock, would not return. He was saying that he would never return. Thus, they travelled to Heretaunga before again settling... *There is only one clear meaning to what this proverb means. Such is one’s commitment to a task that they eventually reach a point from which there is no return. Therefore, you must continue onward with positivity and vigour.* (McGrath, 2003, p. 13, italics in original)

The journey continues

It is time now to bring this thesis to an end. But how does one end the beginning of something? There is no simple answer and no simple way to end a five year research project that has raised as many questions as it has answered about Pākehā decolonisation and the Pākehā/Māori relation.

My research explored how Pākehā and Māori histories have been intertwined and have impacted on each other in New Zealand's history of colonial and postcolonial Pākehā and Māori power relations. I explored Pākehā experiences of movement by Pākehā toward te ao Māori and the ways in which these experiences have been documented as different or alternative experiences. From the experiences of Pākehā Māori (Bentley, 1999, 2007) in the early years of New Zealand's colonial history, to the experiences of the 13 Pākehā participants in this study, movement toward te ao Māori by Pākehā is clearly still very much misinterpreted and misunderstood by many Pākehā. The stories of my participants strongly suggest that there is value and importance in Pākehā undertaking individual journeys that explore what being Pākehā means in terms of Pākehā relations with Māori. The experience of talking with my participants has led me to understand more fully how necessary it is for Pākehā to interact with Māori with much more positivity and vigour so that Pākehā might arrive at a third space examination of themselves. My participants' experiences demonstrated to me that change for Pākehā does not have to be actively imposed; change can just occur because many Māori are willing to share their world with us, that is, if we as Pākehā don't choose to resist it at the first challenge. And, although some of us might have different views of our history with Māori and although we cannot predict what our future will be like with Māori, what remains as the unquestionable in the *us/them* relation that binds Pākehā and Māori to New Zealand as its founding peoples, is that Pākehā may always be viewed by Māori as the coloniser. Nevertheless, Māori still continue to invite us into their world.

Pākehā who have third space experiences are Pākehā who choose to listen, to learn, to hear the stories of the Māori experience, to look deeper into their own way of thinking, to learn to understand how rewarding it can be to form a third space perspective of past, present and future relationships Pākehā and Māori share. The stories of my participants strongly demonstrate how these Pākehā have all learned from their lived experiences, how they have developed new and enriched more sophisticated perspectives of themselves as Treaty partners because of their

experiences with te ao Māori. Their stories clearly show that Pākehā can learn to respectfully interrelate te ao Pākehā with te ao Māori, to navigate these two worlds with respect, compassion, empathy and a commitment to equality. These are the Pākehā who have chosen to enter into unfamiliar territory, culturally, intellectually and emotionally, to move outside their comfort zones so that they may critically assess their emotional reactions to what is known and what is not known.

Although in general, I have theorised Pākehā decolonisation as a psychological and sociological model of change that starts with the individual (Pākehā) rather than at the societal level (Pākehā as a group), the stories of my participants do indicate that the individual experience will have some impact in society. This occurs because a connection between the individual and the societal experience will always exist (Barnes, 2002; Campbell, 2005; Fanon, 1963; Freire, 1975; Gramsci, 1971, Huygens, 2007; Jellie, 2001; Mitcalfe, 2008). My findings suggest that third space experiences have the potential to shape the psychological, sociological, political and ideological ways in which Pākehā view themselves. This is the case because a greater sharing among Pākehā of third space experiences does play an important role in advancing the cause of moving New Zealand towards a postcolonial society.

If continuing postcolonial discussions about what being Pākehā might mean in the twenty-first century are to be productive and helpful, these discussions must surely focus on third space experiences and how these experiences serve to enrich the ongoing relationship of Pākehā with Māori. My findings suggest that within these discussions there should remain a focus on foregrounding the many reasons why the Pākehā/Māori relationship should be valued and respected by Pākehā, so that the outdated notion of “we are all one people” can be challenged more openly by Pākehā, so that in challenging this notion Pākehā engage more fully in a process of change that incorporates being an individual Pākehā within their wider Pākehā community.

In New Zealand today we already have sufficient opportunities for Pākehā to encounter then experience and learn about te ao Māori, should they choose to. And we have sufficient formalised settings (i.e., government settings, educational environments and/or work places) in which decolonisation models and Tiriti programmes do provide the setting for Pākehā to encounter the wrongs that have occurred for Māori. Within these formal settings Pākehā have the opportunity to address the disfigurement of dominance that Pākehā are heir to because of our colonial history. And, the role of these forums is deliberate - to decolonise New Zealand society by giving the people the necessary historical knowledge and personal skills to operate in more culturally sensitive and respectful ways. These are important and necessary activities because, from the point of view of Māori, they can't just wait around in a second-class position until individual Pākehā choose to change themselves. And, in a world that has several decades of postcolonial critique it is unacceptable for a country like New Zealand *not* to be taking deliberate steps in this regard.

My participants' stories strongly suggest that more informal exchanges and interactions that are not so much about redressing past and present grievances of the formerly colonised, but about showing Pākehā there are actually advantages to Pākehā of accepting invitations to learn more about te ao Māori, should be encouraged. My findings suggest that in doing this, the Pākehā/Māori relation is revisited in a way which offers a more empowering third space perspective for Pākehā, one which is primarily about enriching twenty-first century understandings of Pākehāness, both for the individual and for society, so that *our* place in history is not limited to an *us/them* account of events.

It is my view that this thesis will add to the broader literature on Pākehā genealogy and what "being Pākehā" means today because I present an argument that suggests an alternative way for Pākehā to find themselves and their place in New Zealand among Māori. By engaging in third space experiences Pākehā show Māori

that we (individual Pākehā) are willing and interested in learning and experiencing te ao Māori regardless of the collective political processes that may or may not be at play at any given time. My participants' experiences clearly show that by taking "baby steps" into deeper engagement with te ao Māori, Pākehā begin to claim their past and present involvement with te ao Māori as part of their own individual history, part of the essential element they lay claim to when they describe their place in New Zealand today. And, it is in their stories that the suggestion is made that Pākehā *are* interested in finding their place in New Zealand alongside Māori, that when Pākehā experience te ao Māori, they *are* supported by Māori to find out more about the history of Pākehā privilege, to find out more about the ways in which Pākehā have naturalised and normalised their own economic, political and educational processes at the expense of Māori. My participants' individual accounts clearly show that ongoing encounters with te ao Māori help Pākehā come to appreciate how and why we have reinterpreted Te Tiriti to our advantage, to appreciate how and why we might often tacitly let the *status quo* view expressed by our Pākehā colleagues and friends pass unchallenged. Also, it is in my participants' accounts of Pākehā/Māori engagement that we are reminded that as a nation New Zealand is changing in small but arguably significant ways - we *are* moving towards a postcolonial way of thinking - slowly. Simply put, this is evident in the ways in which many Pākehā employ "kia ora" as their form of address when greeting people. And, although it is difficult to predict how things will change/evolve in New Zealand society in coming decades, it is worth conceptualising progress through both formal and informal action and through commitment to Te Tiriti that includes encouraging greater appreciation of the value of third space experiences.

The lived experiences of the Pākehā participants involved in this study clearly point to two powerful ways in which Pākehā learn to acquire a more critical and searching understanding of Pākehā place in New Zealand today: 1) by discovering how Pākehā and Māori history in this country is intertwined and has impacted on each other, 2) by appreciating that successful engagement in te ao Māori by Pākehā is

helpful, in that it enriches the future of both Pākehā and Māori. Thus, if Pākehā are to move forward, we must surely seek out, reflect on and share in third space experiences, to view these experiences as the “new natural”, the “new ordinary” so that we might construct an alternative discourse that renders postcolonial or decolonising positions as the unexceptional way of “being Pākehā”. In doing this, we make the conscious choice to free ourselves from the imposition of dominant thinking and we become “fully Pākehā”.

People, events, concepts / Ngā kupu me ngā tikanga

People and Concepts

Dame Joan Metge: social anthropologist, educator, lecturer and writer

Derek Fox: Māori broadcaster, commentator, publisher

Don Brash: former New Zealand National Party leader

John Rangihau: Māori leader of the Tuhoe iwi (Rangihau, 1992)

John Taiapa: wood carver from Ngāti Porou

Lloyd Geering: Zealand commentator on theological issues

Mike King: Māori New Zealand comedian/presenter

Rua the Prophet: pacifist, separatist leader of Tuhoe Maori in the Urewera region in the early 1900's

Sir Apīrana Ngata: Māori politician

Sir Howard Morrison: one of New Zealand's leading stage personalities

Sir Ranginui Walker: Māori academic, Professor and Head of Māori Studies at the University of Auckland

Tama Iti: Māori male of Tuhoe often portrayed in media as an activist/radical

Wiremu Parker: New Zealand's first Māori broadcaster

Pākehā/Pākehāness: this study acknowledges the complexities associated with the term Pākehā. For the purposes of this study the terms Pākehā and Pākehāness refer to a Pākehā/New Zealander whose perspective and/or viewpoint has been informed/constructed and/or reconstructed as conforming to Pākehā cultural values and behaviours which were/are “primarily formed from the experience of being a member of the dominant group of New Zealand” (Spoonley, Pearson & MacPherson, 1996, p. 147).

Whakawhanaungatanga: the term whakawhanaungatanga is used in a metaphoric sense, in that metaphorically, whakawhanaungatanga “reorders the relationship of the researcher/researched from one which focuses on researcher as ‘self’ and on the researched as the ‘Other’, to one of collaborative research participants” (Bishop, 1996, p. 239).

New Zealand events

1981 Springbok Tour: controversial tour of New Zealand by the South African national rugby team (Shears & Gidley, 1981)

Bastion Point: in 1977-1978 the Orakei Māori Action Committee organised an illegal but peaceful occupation of the land located at Bastian Point that lasted for 507 days. The occupation ended on the 25th of May 1978 at which time 222 protesters were arrested. Bastion Point later became a major landmark in the history of Māori protest movements (Hawke, 1998)

Dawn Raids: the Dawn Raids began in 1974 and took place at the homes of alleged Pacific Islander 'overstayers' (De Bres & Campbell, 1976; Kightley, 1997)

Fisheries Claim: Maori fisheries rights issue where the claimants were Māori (Boast, 2000; Cheyne., O'Brian., & Belgrave., 1997)

Haka party: in 1979 students at the Auckland Engineering School parodying the haka in a culturally offensive manner were confronted by Māori (Walker, 1990)

Kahui Twins: a 2006 murder case that highlighted that Māori children were twice as likely to die as a result of child abuse than non-Māori children (Chris Kahui: exclusive interview, 2008)

Māori Loans Affair: 1986 scandal of Maori incompetence and corruption

Orewa Speech: on 27 January 2004 the leader of the New Zealand National Party made a controversial speech to the Orewa Rotary Club at Orewa that addressed the theme of race relations in New Zealand and particularly the special status of Māori (Brash, 2004).

List of Appendices

Appendix 1: Timeline of Māori and Pākehā actions and responses

This timeline of Māori and Pākehā actions and responses has been taken from (Belich, 1986; Scott, 1975; Huygens, 2007; Network Waitangi Taranaki, 2000; Walker, 1983, 1990; Williams, 1999) and the following works, which all take a critical approach to the standard story of British colonisation:

Māori actions & responses	Pākehā actions & responses
<p>Māori society flourishing under hapū, rangatiratanga and tikanga, covering all of Aotearoa, New Zealand</p> <p>Māori Population 100,000 – 200,000 or substantially more.</p> <p>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 hapū who are behaving in an uncivilised manner</p> <p>1834: Flag chosen by northern Māori who issued warrants to trading ships to fly the flag and so avoid being confiscated.</p> <p>1835: <i>He Wakaputanga o Te Rangatiratanga - Declaration of Independence</i> signed at Waitangi on October 28 and later to clarify that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All sovereign power and authority - “tino rangatiratanga” rested with Māori. • Māori would meet each year to make laws for “justice, peace, order and trade”. • No "legislative authority" other than this would be recognised. <p>Both the flag and the Declaration of Independence were formally recognised by the British Crown.</p>	<p>Early 1800s: European ships began visiting from Australia & America to trade for natural resources.</p> <p>Pākehā missionaries began arriving to establish mission stations, often on gifted land.</p> <p>Pākehā sealers and traders began to live in coastal settlements, mostly abiding by Māori laws apart from in the north where whalers on leave ashore were drunk and disorderly at Kororareka, the ‘hellhole’ of the Pacific.</p> <p>1833: James Busby arrived as Kaiwhakakite (intermediary) or British Resident - facilitated choice of a national flag and encouraged the Declaration of Independence.</p> <p>1839: British Colonial Office dispatched Captain Hobson with instructions to annex New Zealand, i.e. to have Māori cede their sovereignty to the British. Resident missionaries translated Hobson’s English draft into <i>Te Tiriti o Waitangi</i>; retaining key concepts such as ‘tino rangatiratanga’ from the Declaration of Independence because they knew Māori would never cede sovereignty.</p> <p>Pākehā population 2,000</p>

February 1840 *Te Tiriti o Waitangi*:- Māori text of Treaty of Waitangi – signed on Feb 6 at Waitangi and later by over 500 leaders:

- Gave British a lesser right of government - “kāwanatanga”.
- Guaranteed Māori retention of “tino rangatiratanga” over all aspects of property and culture. They could sell land they wished to sell.
- Guaranteed Māori equal rights with the British.
- Spoken guarantee of spiritual freedom for all, including Māori custom –

Many iwi and hapū did not sign, e.g. Te Wherowhero, who later became the first Māori 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 Kororaraka (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 Pākehā law failed, and he faced armed settlers.

1848: Fifty-three Māori owned vessels of over 14 tonnes registered at Auckland. Coastal shipping largely controlled by Māori

Mid-1850s: Māori were producing half the colony’s exports. In the Waikato there were 18 tribally owned flour mills, supplying Auckland settlers. Māori 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 Māori 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 Māori control of Māori affairs in Taranaki. Their people began ploughing confiscated land and constructed fences across roads built through their cultivations. Hundreds imprisoned without trial.

March, 1840: a Treaty copy written in English by Hobson was signed by 39 Māori. Māori 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 Māori 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 Pākehā land-owning men.

1845: British troops called from Sydney to quell Heke. British army no match for Māori strategy and fortifications, but Governor Grey announced victory and made peace.

1840 – 1865: Large tracts of land purchased by Government land agents. Hapū 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 Māori owning communal land ineligible to vote. Section 71 allowed Māori control of Māori areas.

1856: Depression in agricultural prices seriously affected Māori commercial enterprise. Settlers’ wheat farms also affected so they turned to sheep farming by squatting on large areas of Māori land and pushing for ownership.

1858: First population census Māori 56, 049 Pākehā 59,413

Governor Gore Brown waived Kingi’s right of chieftainship. His nephew sold 600 acres resulting in Taranaki land wars.

Governor Gore Brown invited Māori leaders to Kohimarama, promising to respect mana Māori to avoid other iwi joining the Taranaki war. The Government saw this conference as a Māori 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.

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 Māori. This effectively created a separate Māori sphere that was recognised by Māori and non-Māori alike. The aukati remained until 1879 when Rewi Maniapoto negotiated for a railway through the King Country.

1870 – 80: Māori 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 Māori seats. All sought to put in place new systems of land administration to give Māori 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 Puhī and it was decided to begin regular meetings at Waitangi.

1880s: Major depression affected tribes whose land had been alienated far worse than Pākehā. 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. Māori received little medical aid other than periodic inoculations. 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 Māori Parliament.

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 Māori hands by substituting individual ownership for the rangatiratanga of hapu control. Fragmentation of succession meant that the land remaining in Māori hands became unmanageable.

1866 Oyster Fisheries Act Prevented oyster fishing by Māori, and leased Māori oyster beds to non-Māori commercial interests. (*prevented Māori selling seafood?*)

1867: Māori Representation Act

This created four Māori seats for which all Māori 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: Māori schools receive curriculum taught in English and focused on 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 Pākehā behaviour, but had a harassing effect on Māori communities.

1883: Dr Alfred Newman said New Zealand the healthiest country in the world, disregarding Māori health, after stating “the disappearance of the [Māori] 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 Māori Council to administer Māori rights under the Treaty of Waitangi.

1890: Liberal Government bought over 5 million acres of Māori land in North Island at 5 shillings per acre (market price 30 pounds) for intensive dairy farms for settlers.

1891: Influenza pandemic Māori died at 4 times the rate of Europeans.

1891: Rees-Carroll Commission reported “intolerable difficulty” for settlers in acquiring land from Māori.

1881 King Tawhiao Petitions the Queen of England

King Tawhiao and four other leaders travelled to England to petition Queen Victoria about Māori 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, Māori political autonomy, roading and mineral rights, and land confiscation.

1892 – 1902: Māori Parliament Leaders of the Kotahitanga set up a Māori Parliament, meeting over a decade in 11 districts. They sought a limited sovereignty for mana Māori to control Māori affairs. Bills passed by the Māori 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 Parliament as spokesman for the Kotahitanga. Put forward the Federated Assembly Empowering Bill to have a Māori Parliament with power to govern Māori, with:

- an Upper House composed of Chiefs
 - a Lower House elected by Iwi
- The Assembly was to appoint committees of Local Government for Māori Districts.

1897: Young Māori Party A group of young Māori men educated in Pākehā academic institutions formed the Young Māori Party to take up the work of the Kotahitanga. Apirana Ngata, Peter Buck and Maui Pomare aimed to improve Māori health through modern sanitation, better housing conditions, access to health care and to revive Māori morale and prosperity through halting land loss.

1900: Māori Councils Act

Put forward by Māori MP, James Carroll, it gave Māori 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 Māori.

1893: Votes for Women: Women were allowed to vote for the first time. The same Act also abolished the provision that allowed Māori 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 of Māori land suitable for (Pākehā) settlement.

1894: When Hone Heke's bill was eventually presented as the Native Rights Bill, Pākehā MPs left the Debating Chamber to prevent it being debated.

1896: Māori population census at its lowest: Māori 42, 113; Pākehā 703,360

1898: Old Age pension Act for 'deserving persons'. Māori seldom qualified because of 'shares' in ancestral land, although these provided no income. Asians ineligible. Pākehā complained that the Māori Councils' leasing policies were unfair to Pākehā. The Councils were replaced by Land Boards, with Pākehā 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 (Pākehā) 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 Māori health, but had effect of hounding Māori prophetic leaders, especially Rua Kenana.

1909: Native Lands Act Allowed for Māori land to be used for roads and railways with no compensation paid.

1918: Influenza pandemic Again kills Māori at 4 times the rate of Pākehā .

1918: Pākehā soldiers returning from World War I are allocated farm land, but Māori soldiers ineligible.

1930s: Unemployment relief for single Pākehā males 15/- per week, single Māori males 7/6d if they were living "in the same manner as Europeans". Usually Māori 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 Māori (and Asians) but ignored tribal basis of Māori society.

1915: Kauhanganui decision not to enlist for WWI

As a result of the Kingitanga decision not to volunteer for WWI, many Waikato Māori were arrested or imprisoned for refusing to report for duty.

1921: Ratana political movement and religion founded

Māori 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 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 Māori War Effort Committee, Rt Hon. Paieka established 365 tribal committees to regulate education, welfare, housing, training, land use and development, and grievances. Paieka's dream was to convert these re-established tribal networks into a statutory Ministry of Māori Welfare.

1949: Kingitanga efforts to keep King Country dry King Koroki and Te Puea led a deputation of 600 Waikato Māori to Parliament in a vain attempt to keep alcohol out of the King Country, as promised by the Colonial Government in the 1870s.

1951: Māori Women's Welfare League set up as pan-tribal organisation with major thrust to improve Māori 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 Māori 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 Māori land sold by individuals began to dry up. Māori now owned merely 3% of New Zealand, and were hamstrung from developing it. Government owned 50%, and 47% freehold under European title.

1939: Deputation to request that Māori be taught in schools received response from the Director of Education that "the natural abandonment of the native tongue involves no loss on the Māori"

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 : Māori Social and Economic Development Act stripped the tribal committees of their autonomy and any responsibility for land. Māori wardens given welfare functions and required to be largely voluntary.

1940s and 1950s: a period of Pākehā complacency about race relations. Policy of assimilation now informed legislation.

1950s: Māori people encouraged to migrate to the cities. In 1936, 10% of Māori population was urban, but by 1961, this had increased to 40%, and by 1986 to 80.7%.

1951: Policy of "peppercotting" Māori families among Pākehā families to assist assimilation. Undermined cultural cohesion.

1953: Māori Affairs Act allowed government to compulsorily purchase Māori Land if deemed "uneconomic" and thus "waste land". Also stated "No marriage in accordance with Māori custom...shall be regarded as a valid marriage."

1953: Town and Country Planning Act prevented Māori from building on their land through zoning restriction. This forced many Māori to move from rural areas to cities.

1959/60: No Māoris No Tour protests included leadership from Pākehā activists.

1960: Hunn report gave thorough statistical report of Māori trailing behind Pākehā 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 Māori and Pākehā members, focused on racism at home. In response to Hunn report, set up homework centres to support Māori school children.

1966: Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Racial Discrimination Signed by New Zealand government.

1962 Māori Council formed by government to act as an advisory body on Māori policy. Regional Māori councils followed. Māori Councils developed considerable skill in monitoring Parliament, scrutinising legislation and making submissions to ministers and select committees. The 1967 Māori Affairs Amendment Act seen by Māori as the ‘last land grab’ by Pākehā . It triggered the Māori land rights movement in the next decade.

1967: Revival of Kotahitanga Movement Meeting at Otiria Marae, Kawakawa, to revive the Kotahitanga movement. Discussions included Māori self-determination, ratification of the Treaty of Waitangi and a symbolic unity under the Māori Queen.

1968: Te Hokioi newsletter published by a radical Māori group in Wellington as a “taiaha of truth” about the role of the Māori trustee in disposing of Māori resources.

1968; Māori Organisation on Human Rights (MOOHR) formed in Wellington. They opposed discrimination in housing, employment, sport and politics. Advocated recovering control of Māori reserved lands under perpetual leases to Pākehā .

1970: Young Māori Leaders Conference convened by the Māori Council at Auckland University established **Nga Tamatoa** ‘the young warriors’. They initiated legal aid, an employment office and a nationwide programme for full recognition of the Māori language in education. Began protests at Waitangi to challenge Pākehā and 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: Māori Land March Te Matakite o Aotearoa welded localised grievances over land loss into a cohesive Māori 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 Pākehā .

1977: Occupation of Bastion Point begun by Orakei Action Committee to expose the dealings of past governments over the 700 acres of Māori land at Orakei declared “inalienable” by the Native Land Court in 1873. Supported by some Pākehā .

1977: Occupation of Raglan Golf Course taken under the Public Works/Defence Act.

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

1967: Māori Affairs Amendment Act opened up membership of Māori land corporations to non-owners (i.e. Pākehā) and forced land owned by fewer than four people under one title into conversion from Māori to European land.

1967: Rating Act subjected land to rates even though not producing income with Māori away in cities. Local bodies able to lease or sell Māori land to recover rates.

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.

1970s: Race Relations Office established

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 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 Māori 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 Pākehā who were then challenged by Māori to address homegrown racism and their responsibilities under the Treaty of Waitangi. A separation between Māori and Pākehā activism from here on.

1982: Programme on Racism established by the Conference of Churches Aotearoa New Zealand. 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. Pākehā involved at Waitangi from here on.

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 Māori, resigned from Labour Party, and formed a new Māori party called Mana Motuhake, ending the exclusive Labour/Ratana alliance.

1982: First Kōhanga Reo at Wainuiomata to teach pre-school Māori children the Māori language and culture. By 1998, the number of Kōhanga Reo had risen to 300.

1984: Hikoi ki Waitangi organised by Waitangi Action Committee and People Opposed to Waitangi (non-Māori) to highlight the dishonouring of the Treaty

1984: Ngaruwahia Conference Sponsored by Te Runanga Whakawhanaunga and the NZ Māori Council, the conference considered constitutional questions relating to the Treaty, followed by the Conference at Waitangi. These conferences asked that Pākehā educate themselves about the Treaty of Waitangi, in preparation for dialogue with Māori in 1990, the 150th anniversary of the Treaty signing.

1984: Hui held throughout country in preparation for 150th anniversary of Treaty signing “to bring together collective opinions from Māori people to talk about and seek points of healing and reconciliation, in regard to the Treaty of Waitangi”.

1985; Te Runanga Whakawhanaunga at Waitangi brought these hui together. Prime Minister David Lange visited hui saying “the Māori discussion opened the way for the dialogue between Māori and Pākehā to begin. Before Māori and Pākehā develop the dialogue, we Pākehā need to debate our actions and responsibilities as cosignatories to the Treaty of Waitangi.” Attended by Pākehā church leaders and groups

1988: Māori nurses initiate cultural safety education and hospital protocols to help all New Zealand nurses deliver culturally appropriate care to Māori.

1990: National Māori Congress formed with the aim of whakakotahitanga. Backed by Sir Hepi te Heuheu, the Māori Queen and Mrs Reo Hura, leader of the Ratana Church. Support by iwi gradually declined, particularly after the Sealord’s deal. Radical Māori groups acted as monitors to Project Waitangi educators to ensure that a Māori view of the Treaty and experience of colonisation was upheld.

1984: Anglican General Synod established a Bicultural Commission.

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

1984: Neo-liberal economic and social policy adopted by Labour government. Māori 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: Ministerial Committee on a Māori 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 Māori people.

1985: Waitangi Tribunal legislation amended to hear historic claims dating back to 1840.

1986: Project Waitangi - Pākehā Debate the Treaty campaign formed by Bob Scott of Programme on Racism, YWCA and trade unions to prepare Pākehā for dialogue. Produced educational material for communities and lobbied Parliament.

1986: National Collective of Independent Women’s Refuges adopted policy of parallel development for Māori and non-Māori women’s refuges.

1986: Constitution Act removed the provision in Section 71 of the 1852 Constitution Act that allowed for Māori districts to be set up under Māori control.

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.

1989: Māori Fisheries Bill Limited Māori 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 Māori participation. Became Literacy Aotearoa, a new organisation based on tino rangatiratanga and guided by manaaki tangata principles.

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, Māori groups including Tino Rangatiratanga and the Māori Congress, asserted that constitutional change was what Māori needed, not electoral reform.

Māori 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 Māori attended Hirangi Marae near Turangi, called by Ngati Tuwharetoa Paramount Chief, Hēpi Te Heu Heu, to debate issues of Māori 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 Māori parties contested the election including: Mana Motuhake, as part of the Alliance, Mana Māori and Te Tawharau (linked to the Ringatū church). 15 Māori candidates elected.

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 Māori (not only " half castes") to choose their roll. Māori seats now represented the same number of people as a General seat.

1991: Finance Act Benefits reduced, family benefit abolished. Twenty per cent of Māori unemployed compared to 8.5% of non –Māori.

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 Māori self-determination.

1992: Appeals against cultural safety in nursing requirement lodged and widely broadcast by public media.

1994: Kāwanatanga 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 tauwi to sign who supported a constitution based on *He Wakaputanga, 1835* and *Te Tiriti, 1840*.

Appendix 2: Key Government Acts

- 1852: Constitution Act: This Act saw the establishment of Provincial Government and that only males over the age of 21, who had individual title to property of a certain value, were entitled to vote
- 1862: Native Lands Act: Designed to break down Māori communal ownership of land. A land court was set up to individualise title
- 1863: Suppression of Rebellion Act: Rebelling against the Crown resulted in no right to trial before imprisonment
- 1864: Native Reserves Act: Land reserved for Māori was put under settler control
- 1864: Public Works Land Act: The Government could take land from Māori and only had to compensate 'loyal natives'
- 1865: Native Land Act: Māori owners had to have their land cases heard in Court. However, the many months waiting in town to have cases heard resulted in Māori accumulating huge debts and having to sell their land to pay for these
- 1866: Oyster Fisheries Act: Prevented Māori from fishing commercially
- 1867: Māori Representation Act: Four seats in Parliament established, a response to Pākehā fear that because Māori had a majority under the property qualification clause of the 1852 Constitution Act in a number of electorates, Māori could gain a majority in Government
- 1867: Native Schools Act: to assist in the process of assimilation
- 1871: Government stipulated that instruction in Native Schools had to be in English
- 1880: West Coast Settlement Act: Any Māori in Taranaki could be arrested without a warrant and jailed for two years if they hindered in any way the surveying of property
- 1881: The Native Reserves Act: The control of Māori reserves is taken over by the Public trustee

- 1887: Native Land Act: Bastion Point in Auckland is appropriated for defence purposes
- 1893: Native Land Purchase and Acquisition Act: The Governor could take any land they wanted for settlement, whether the owners wanted to sell it or not
- 1894: Advances Settlers Act: Low interest loans made available to settlers to buy land from the Government
- 1894: Māori Land Settlement Act: Māori land was put under the control of Land Councils
- 1905-8: Amendment to Native Land Act: forced further sales of Māori land
- 1908: Tohunga Suppression Act: Penalties were imposed on tohunga
- 1909: Native Health Act: Māori could no longer use the whāngai system for adopting, and Māori women could no longer breastfeed their children
- 1918: Rehabilitation Scheme: Māori servicemen who returned after WWI were not eligible for the benefits of the Rehabilitation Scheme. The scheme was only available to Pākehā
- 1932: Ratana M. P.'s present a petition with 30,000 signatures calling for the ratification of the Treaty. It was ignored.
- 1953: Māori Affairs Act: If land was not occupied or used it was declared waste land and taken by the Government
- 1953: Town and Country Planning Act: Prevented Māori from building on their land
- 1960: The Hunn Report: Recommended a steeping-up of the assimilation process, i.e. Pepper-potting – relocating Māori around various locations in urban areas, e.g. Pukekohe
- 1986: The Crown introduced a fisheries quota system
- 1990-1992: Māori Fisheries Act: Māori are granted 10% of the fishing quota. The Government redefined 'full' - which in Article Two guarantees Māori 'full exclusive possession of Lands and Estates, Forest, Fisheries' - to 10%.

Appendix 3: Introduction Letter and Information Sheet

Title: Experiences of Pākehā working with Māori

Contact details of the researcher

Micheal W. Brown BCApSc MIndS (dist) (PhD candidate)
Department of Human Development and Counselling
School of Education
Waikato University
Private Bag 3105
Phone:
Email: mwbrown07@yahoo.co.nz

Name and contact details of the chief supervisor

Associate Professor Monica Payne
Department of Human Development and Counselling
School of Education
Waikato University
Private Bag 3105
Phone 07 838 4466
Email: monicap@waikato.ac.nz

Date
Dear

I would like to invite you to take part in my PhD study into Pākehā identities that I am conducting within the School of Education at Waikato University. The School of Education Ethics Committee has approved the study.

I have contacted you because I believe that you can offer important insight toward the experiences associated with being a Pākehā working with Māori communities/ individuals/initiatives. Your help with my study will open up important and exciting areas of research. Your insight will be shared with other Pākehā in similar settings and will help tremendously towards creating an awareness and understanding of the themes that occur when Pākehā become involved in Māori initiatives.

Please find attached an information sheet and a *Consent Form* for your perusal. Prior to taking part in my study, I will be seeking your consent. If you choose to take part in my study, would you please hold onto the consent form so that at our first meeting we may go through it together.

If you have any questions please feel free to email me at any time. I would also like to invite you to offer the contact details of any person(s) that you know of that may be interested in taking part in my study on the attached *Referral Form*.

I thank you for taking the time to have a look at the information provided and look forward very much to the possibility of speaking with you further about my study.

Thank you

Nāku noa, nā

Micheal W. Brown BCApSc MIndS (dist) (PhD candidate)

Information sheet

Research topic

Experiences of Pākehā working with Māori

Aim of the research

The overarching research questions that guide the research explore how self-identified bicultural Pākehā experience and understand their identity within contemporary New Zealand society

Procedures in which you will be involved

During an initial in-depth interview, you will be given the opportunity to talk about your own experiences. The interview will be recorded. You will then have the opportunity to make changes or amendments to the interview.

Recording our discussions

Digital video and audio formats will be used to record the interview. The reasons for using both video and audio formats are:

- It provides backup in case of any recording problems
- It facilitates the ease and accuracy of transcribing

The digital technology of the video recording system used offers the option for you to have your image concealed. If you choose to have your image concealed through the captured video, you have the choice to have the video camera pointed away from your face and body

Procedures in which the information gained from your final confirmed transcript may be published or used in presentations or used for research purposes during the course of the PhD study and on completion of the PhD study

Your final transcript will be used for the purposes of thematic analysis and therefore parts of your transcript may be published, used in presentations and used for research purposes during the course of the study and/or on completion of the PhD study

Confidentiality

If you choose to keep your name, background information and location of work confidential, you have the right to do so. You have the option to be a named participant or you may wish to be referred to by your own choice of pseudonym.

Informed Consent

- If you choose to take part in my study, would you please email and let me know so that we can arrange a time for an interview
- If you choose not to take part in my study, I thank you for your time.

Appendix 5: Consent Form

I have understood the requirements of participation in this PhD study

I agree to the procedures that I will be involved in throughout the study as outlined in the introductory letter that I have read

I agree to the procedures in which the content of the interviews will be recorded (i.e., in video and audio formats) as outlined in the introductory letter that I have read

I acknowledge that the video and audio materials will only be used for transcribing the interviews and will not be made public in anyway

I understand I may decline to answer any questions/issues raised by the researcher during interview sessions

I understand I may withdraw entirely from the project at any point during the period of interviews and transcription checking

I also acknowledge that my accurate final transcript will be used within the PhD for the purposes of thematic analysis and that part of the PhD study may be published and used in research presentations and research articles

I agree to take part in the study

Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____

I wish for my name to be known in the study Yes No (please circle)

I wish to be referred to by a pseudonym of my choice in the study. My chosen pseudonym will be

Would you please complete and hold onto this form so that I may collect it from you at the time of our initial interview

Thank you,

Micheal W. Brown

Appendix 6: Interview Question Guide

The interview guide sets out the experiences that I am interested in and when required, will guide the interview to ensure that these key areas are covered. The questions are in no particular order and will only be used if required.

1. Can you describe what it is like to be a Pākehā involved with te ao Māori?
2. How has your life changed as a result of being involved with te ao Māori?
3. How did you first become involved in te ao Māori? Was it by accident, or was it by active choice?
4. Can you describe some of the positive and negative experiences of your involvement with te ao Māori?
5. How accepting have your family, friends, acquaintances and/or co-workers been of your involvement with te ao Māori?
6. Are there parts of your life when you move between te ao Pākehā and te ao Māori?
7. How do other Pākehā respond to your involvement with te ao Māori?
8. How do Māori respond to your involvement with te ao Māori?
9. Have Pākehā and Māori responses to your involvement in te ao Māori changed over time?
10. What was it like when you first got involved with te ao Māori?

If required I will prompt specific participant experiences in search of disconfirming evidence. Examples of possible prompts may include:

- Is this representative of what it is usually like?
- Can you describe any experiences that are different from this?
- Can you think of any person who has reacted differently?

Appendix 7: Subcategories: frequency of occurrence

(Template showing frequency of occurrence of the participant's experiences)

1. First experience of te ao Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

2. A metaphoric 'gate' is opened enabling entry into te ao Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

3. Epiphany moment occurs when the participant becomes more insightful about aspects of te ao Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

4. A change in view, understanding and/or opinion of te ao Māori occurs

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

5. A change in view, understanding and/or opinion of te ao Pākehā occurs

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

6. Participant ascribes values to te ao Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

7. Participant comments that no value is removed from te ao Pākehā

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

8. Other Pākehā do not understand why the participant has chosen to learn and/or develop an understanding of/or educate themselves in te ao Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

9. The participant is Othered by Pākehā

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

10. The participant is Othered by Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

11. Anger prevails when the participant confronts and/or debates a Māori issue with Pākehā

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

12. Passivity prevails in terms of the ways in which the participant confronts and/or debates their positioning in relation to te ao Māori with Pākehā, and/or a Māori issue with Pākehā

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

13. The participant educates other Pākehā about te ao Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

14. There is an expectation by Pākehā and Māori that the participant should know everything about te ao Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

15. The participant becomes a spokesperson for Māori, or on behalf of Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

16. There is resentment toward the participant from young Māori who do not agree with the participant's involvement in te ao Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

17. There is resentment toward the participant from older Māori who do not agree with the participant's involvement in te ao Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

18. Māori view the participant's involvement in te ao Māori as a threat to te ao Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

19. The participant expresses disappointment when Māori do not support the participant's endeavour to learn, develop an understanding of, and/or engage with te ao Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

20. The participant develops an ability to navigate between te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā without disrespecting either world

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

21. The participant's position in society/work environment, and/or family engagement appears to present as 'between' te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

22. The participant describes their positioning as 'outside' of te ao Pākehā and 'outside' of te ao Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

23. The participant has an effect on the negative and/or ill-informed opinion and/or viewpoint Pākehā have toward te ao Māori

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

24. The participant has the expectation that they must uphold knowledge gained from te ao Māori in a respectful manner

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

25. The participant describes their involvement in te ao Māori as a positive experience

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

26. The participant finds that majority Pākehā think they know what Māori want

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

27. The participant's knowledge of te ao Māori is valued by Pākehā

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

28. Māori offer positive comments about the participant's involvement in te ao Māori.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40

Appendix 8: Participant exemplars

Participant exemplars showing possible connections between decolonisation and the accessible settings of whānau, friends (both Māori and Pākehā), education settings and work settings:

At first reading, my presentation of each exemplar might appear brief. This is because decolonisation for Pākehā involves complex, diverse, contradictory, and sometimes unrelated, or even generalised experiences. Collectively, the exemplars offered here are not intended to be prescriptive, nor are they offered in support of any generalisation about the overall process of decolonisation beyond that of the participants' lived experiences already discussed in this thesis. Instead, my intent is to show that because involvement in te ao Māori may be experienced differently across participants (i.e., because the actors involved in the experience(s), and the timeframe, context, and setting in which those experiences occurred are complex and diverse), interpretations about this involvement can be conceptualised with decolonisation as a process in multiple ways. What follows then, are 13 brief exemplars (1 for each participant), which show possible ways in which a participant's lived experience may be interpreted as connected with one or more elements of decolonisation. I point out here that generally, all participants had experiences with whānau, friends, education, and work settings. Therefore, each exemplar offered is one interpretation of possible connections between these four settings, and one or more of the five occurrences of Pākehā decolonisation.

The exemplars show that the process of decolonisation varied across participants. Furthermore, individual occurrences of decolonisation may be experienced frequently or infrequently, or not at all by participants, depending on the participant's gender, age, geographic location, marital status, friendships, work environments, and availability to access te ao Māori. What is significant is that whānau, friends (both Māori and Pākehā), education and work settings are all

accessible settings where Pākehā have potential to encounter, and experience te ao Māori. Therefore, most Pākehā have the potential to engage in a process of decolonisation. Also, because decolonisation for Pākehā promotes interconnectedness and equality over any aspect of separatism, Pākehā entering into a process of decolonisation may learn to become effective facilitators of decolonisation for others. The outcome being action strategies, that challenge boundaries of knowledge that exist between Māori and Pākehā; strategies which help Pākehā confront, educate, and find more possibilities to view te ao Māori from a new and more enriched Pākehā perspective.

Lisa

ENCOUNTERS WITH TE AO MĀORI: WHANĀU: *All of the communities we lived in were predominantly Māori. Dad was fascinated with the Māori people and the Māori culture. I was one of the only children that really pursued an interest in Māori at that time. My father always supported me. All of my family think I am mad.* EDUCATION: *During my 300 level in my BA at university I was one of two Pākehā. I was the only Pākehā in the Masters year also.* WORK: *I find the challenge from the Pākehā world is easier for me to handle than the challenge from the Māori world.* OTHERING: WORK: *I worked at Rape Crisis. Pākehā and Māori women were being brought face to face with Others' pain for the first time. The Pākehā women were very vindictive at times. I think it was because they saw it as me siding with the opposition. Quite a number of the Māori women were quite upset because it brought stuff to the surface for them.* PĀKEHĀ EDUCATING PĀKEHĀ: WORK: *I have run a couple of workshops within the library. At the end of the workshops I got a lot of feedback from Pākehā saying that it was easier for them to learn about te ao Māori from a Pākehā. I do get fed up sometimes with the same old dumb questions. I have always strongly believed that it is the role of Pākehā to educate other Pākehā.*

Francis

ENCOUNTERS WITH TE AO MĀORI: WHANĀU: *My grandfather would go to the local Marae so he could practice spoken Māori and learn to carve. He would help me write letters using words and little greetings in Māori. That is what gave me the idea that it was perfectly normal and acceptable to be interested in Māori. That was why it didn't seem to me that to be interested in Māori language or Māori people was in any way unusual, because it was there in my family.* EDUCATION: *My Māori teacher taught us Māori songs and games.* WHANĀU: *My family weren't racist but they did say things like "Why are you doing that?"* FRIENDS: *As a journalist I have made connections with many Māori people. They*

regard me and I regard them as friends. There is great trust there. **WORK:** When I first became involved in journalism I took a passing interest in the odd Māori story. My work colleagues started to say that I was pro-Māori and I was often told that I was biased. **NGĀ WAIRUA O TE AO MĀORI: FRIENDS:** A really good friend of mine never quite understood about Māori values. It was wonderful for me, because for the first time I had a connection with her about Māori. **OTHERING: WORK:** I have worked in Māori organisations and have always tried to support Māori. There was a guy in our office and he started saying that I had a fetish about Māori men. At work, that type of thing started to develop even more. **EQUALITY: WORK:** I have interviewed masses of racist Pākehā and it has never bothered me. **PĀKEHĀ EDUCATING PĀKEHĀ: WORK:** The two versions of Māori sovereignty are often referred to. The paper I am developing has got all the stuff about how to establish contacts, knowing who to speak to and the correct spokesperson. **FRIENDS:** Over the years it has been very unpleasant to go to most dinner parties or go anywhere. Although quite a lot of my friends will ask me genuinely what I think about Māori things so that they could get another perspective, I do get the odd person at parties who say negative things about Māori. I now have got more strategies for dealing with negative comments.

Susan

ENCOUNTERS WITH TE AO MĀORI: WHANĀU: I have a fairly solid redneck branch of the family... My uncle... I can't understand why he can't get past those negative opinions he has about Māori. **WORK:** There have been many times when what I have done has been challenged by Māori. I am much more tolerant of criticism that comes from the Māori community. I think if you are not getting it in the neck every now and then from any corner of the Pākehā or Māori community, then you are not saying stuff that is challenging enough. **NGĀ WAIRUA O TE AO MĀORI: WORK:** I can't see how it can be anything but a positive experience, to understand your own circumstances better by seeing a world as well as you are ever able to through the position of somebody who knows it completely differently than you do. **WHANĀU:** I find myself often thinking these days about the kind of world that my kids will grow up in . . . and being mindful of how it's possible to recreate that kind of experience for them so that they are equally able to understand Māori communities. **OTHERING: WORK:** Pākehā colleagues that I have at work are perplexed by my ongoing commitment to Treaty issues. There's that kind of suspicion that comes simply from a lack of understanding of what is actually going on. **PĀKEHĀ EDUCATING PĀKEHĀ: WORK:** By default, often the first port of call is to ask advice from me. I don't pretend to know things about Māori society and the community. I just like the interface bit of it. It does annoy me when Pākehā in the department I work in assume that I speak for all Māori. If I am completely confident that I've got my facts straight about the information that I need to take the issue on, then I would certainly do it. But I would only do it if I knew that it wouldn't be doing Māori a disservice.

Simon

ENCOUNTERS WITH TE AO MĀORI: FRIENDS: *A gate is opened and you are allowed to come in.* **EDUCATION:** *At Selwyn Collage we did a haka... there was a sense that it was to be done correctly, so you were taught to do it properly and there was a sense of pride in that.* **WORK:** *Working with Mike helped lead on to doing more stuff in Māori. Because of that interaction, the gates then started to open up more through my own study of history.* **NGĀ WAIRUA O TE AO MĀORI: WORK:** *I like the concept of the tangi. The karakia... I think it is fascinating. The truck driving down the highway squirting water on the road in the Waikato... there was some reason where I thought that seemed like quite a good idea. Tama Iti shot the gun and spat on the flag. I thought it was really fantastic.* **OTHERING: WORK** *[I am aware that I move into] a different cultural status.* **EQUALITY: WORK:** *I am racist towards Pākehā in terms of certain subjects and people's attitudes. I mock them in history. From my point of view, being involved in comedy and being mystifying in a way and in a sense with the use of greetings [makes] Pākehā realise that they are allowed to laugh. As a comedian I am giving Pākehā the opportunity to laugh.* **PĀKEHĀ EDUCATING PĀKEHĀ: WORK:** *You become the über-racist in order to destroy the notion of what is racist and to make the über-racist look ridiculous. The main problem is that Pākehā don't have someone to ask.*

Helen

ENCOUNTERS WITH TE AO MĀORI: EDUCATION: *What we were taught in primary and high school was very much one version. My whole life through school I was only being fed one sort of perception and it was the common perception throughout most of Pākehā society. Māori culture is the culture and ways of our country. That's just how it is. To me it is such a beautiful culture and it stands for so much of what society and the world is searching for.* **WHANĀU:** *My partner's son has now really started to embrace who he is and where he comes from... now they are exposed to positive aspects of te ao Māori.* **WORK:** *When I first started working at Te Wānanga, Pākehā would say to me thinks like, "You won't last long", "Are you sure that you are going to have a job? Do they need you there to keep them on the straight and narrow? What are you doing that for? You are not Māori" and "Oh great, you are one of them now".* **NGĀ WAIRUA O TE AO MĀORI: WHANĀU:** *There is something to be said for finding your roots. I know how much of a change finding my whakapapa made in my life.* **WORK:** *I have got a huge whānau here at work and I just feel like I have the strength of a million warriors on my back. I feel very honoured and privileged being able to work here.* **EQUALITY: EDUCATION:** *The Māori culture is right here at our doorstep . . . it belongs in our country . . . its native to our country. We have gone from being a very Pākehā driven country to being a very multicultural country. But we are excluding our founding culture and I actually believe that we need to go back and be a bicultural society.* **PĀKEHĀ EDUCATING PĀKEHĀ: EDUCATION:** *A Pākehā Tutor she changed my life. She said "It is not up to us to tell Māori how it*

is, it is up to us to tell Pākehā how it is because they are our people and that's all we can do to change the racism that is out there". **WORK:** I would challenge Pākehā on their statement. I would keep challenging them until they had to admit that they are actually being racist.

Glen

ENCOUNTERS WITH TE AO MĀORI: **EDUCATION:** My classroom was a predominantly Māori and Polynesian classroom... that remained the same for most of my years through primary school. My neighbourhood and community were like the brown side. **WORK:** Me . . . kind of like the inbetween guy. My friend couldn't believe how this skinny white dude could be telling him . . . a Māori dude . . . how to read his verses in rap . . . that was seen as really unusual. It was probably the first time I really looked at it from that perspective . . . from outside of myself. **OTHERING:** **WORK:** The first white rapper that I saw was Vanilla Ice. He was manufactured by a record company as a Wigger. Previous to 2000 there were quite a few white kids that weren't into hip-hop. The white kids thought that it was not safe. They were scared because the hip-hop industry was painted as a brown thing. **EQUALITY:** **FRIENDS:** When you are a teenager you get so intensely consumed by things. Whether it is music, or sport, you are just so into it, you are so passionate about it that you will protect it till the end. That is your shit and that is how you define yourself. But as you get older you start to realise that there are many crossovers. It is OK for people to like different things. I am very welcoming now.

David

ENCOUNTERS WITH TE AO MĀORI: **WHANĀU:** When I was a boy we used to go on summer holidays to my grandmother's in Bulls. I remember it as quite a segregating place and I remember the family that lived next door in the street were Māori. We used to hang out with them and play. **EDUCATION:** "If you are going to be a New Zealander you should know Māori". That was in his mind. When I was at school, a lot of Pākehā found it very odd for me to be doing Māori. There was a lot of bewilderment and puzzlement. I became more aware in the classroom in terms of the way Māori people react to accusations. So it was a learning curve for me. I was learning lots more than just the language. There were cultural things and all sorts of stuff going on. **WORK:** When you are tutoring Māori students who don't know you and you are white, then any issue they might have with that... about being taught their own language by a honky... they would find difficult. The Māori students in the class did complain about being taught by a white person. As a Pākehā working in a Māori context there is always a feeling that you're like a long term guest. There is awareness of being a minority. **NGĀ WAIRUA O TE AO MĀORI:** **EDUCATION:** I always thought that the Māori world was more of a positive and pleasant place than the Pākehā world. [Older Māori were] embracing of anyone who wanted to learn Māori. **WORK:** I get a real secret pleasure out of how amazing [Māori] are in this academic world. I think that I have made a wee bit of a contribution there and in some way I think I have been of value in Māori

studies. **OTHERING: WORK:** *I used to have students walk out of history class. The department couldn't handle it. They had complaints and stopped me teaching these topics.* **EQUALITY: WORK:** *Whenever I have had to do that kind of leadership thing, it has only been because I have been sanctioned or supported by Māori.*

Brenda

ENCOUNTERS WITH TE AO MĀORI: FRIENDS: *I had Māori friends at primary school. [my Māori friend] depoliticised me... she opened my eyes up towards things in the world. The Māori friends I have are my true friends.* **WORK:** *I met Uncle Tom... he became like my second father. He taught me some Māori words.* **WHANĀU:** *I have relations who have been brought up in an area of New Zealand where they didn't have much contact with Māori.* **NGĀ WAIRUA O TE AO MĀORI: WHANĀU:** *The qualities of manaakitanga are important to me because those are the things that I see in my family... they are exactly the same.* **EQUALITY: FRIENDS:** *I still have Pākehā saying to me some rather uninformed things.* **EDUCATION:** *I see Māori being disadvantaged by the education system as a big thing. Many Māori are now on a benefit. Māori get blamed for that when it is not their fault.* **PĀKEHĀ EDUCATING PĀKEHĀ: EDUCATION:** *What I would really like to see in accordance with the Treaty is that everyone in New Zealand is speaking Māori. I believe that whare paku on the odd toilet is just tokenism.*

Cindy

ENCOUNTERS WITH TE AO MĀORI: WHANĀU: *Growing up I pretty much had no contact with Māori.* **EDUCATION:** *I remember being on my school bus as a kid and having the bus driver call any Māori kids that got on "Niggers". Those kinds of comments were passed around as normal. That was the kind of attitude that I grew up around.* **WHANĀU:** *It wasn't until later on when I was ten, that I had my first real contact with Māori.* **FRIENDS:** *A lot of my Pākehā friends were law students and I would quite often get comments from them like . . . "Why are you studying Māori and theatre studies? Why don't you do an academic subject? Why don't you do a real subject? Why don't you do a real degree?"* **NGĀ WAIRUA O TE AO MĀORI: EDUCATION:** *When I went to intermediate in Dunedin I thought "I am going to study Māori". I remember the first lesson so clearly. The teacher was talking to us about your mihi. When I started to learn about mihi, I just locked onto it and I really felt a connection to it.* **WORK:** *Working at Shortland Street it was a huge culture shock. It really threw me because I was just so used to a certain way that things went.* **OTHERING: EDUCATION:** *To be able to weave in and out of both te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā, to me that is what it is all about.* **WORK:** *I remember my first day when I walked into Māori Television Services and a Māori woman went "Man, all I knew was that we were getting some great language speaker from Kai Tahu, I thought that you were going to be Kai Tahu, but you're white!" . . . She said "That's awesome, that's really cool, that makes me*

want to go and learn te reo better". I had quite a lot of reactions like that. **EQUALITY: EDUCATION:** When I was at University I was the go-to-girl for Radio One, Critic and all of the Otago Students Association. **PĀKEHĀ EDUCATING PĀKEHĀ: FRIENDS:** I do get fired up. There is very much a culture nowadays of making fun of aspects of Māori culture. If that gets taken to the next step I find it really hard to sit there and not say anything. **WORK:** I remember I had a big argument with a Member of Parliament on the plane. **WHANĀU:** I have written both my father and mother a mihi. I taught [my brother] his mihi and I taught him a haka.

Jack

ENCOUNTERS WITH TE AO MĀORI: EDUCATION: The primary school I went to had quite a high ratio of Māori. By the time I got to high school... there were quite rigid racial divisions. Essentially the Pākehā hung out together. **WORK:** I got a job in the Railways... the railways was still one of the few places that Māori could move around and get jobs and get promoted. **WORK:** I applied for a job as a Māori teacher at Polytech which I got. Most of the students were Māori. One Māori student didn't think that I had the wairua to teach Māori. The staff backed me to the hilt. It was just really quite gratifying that they did that. **NGĀ WAIRUA O TE AO MĀORI: WORK:** I was teaching a Wānanga Aotearoa course. Most of the students were Māori. The place did have a good wairua. **OTHERING: EDUCATION:** Because I am teaching Māori, people often assume that I am Māori. **PĀKEHĀ EDUCATING PĀKEHĀ: WORK:** When you are the only person with any sort of expertise in Māori it is like you are meant to be the expert on everything. **EDUCATION:** Pākehā will take stuff from Pākehā better than they do from Māori because they are more conducive to listening to a Pākehā person.

Alice

ENCOUNTERS WITH TE AO MĀORI: WHANĀU: In Temuka . . . I developed a very close relationship with the Māori people. I always spent the school holidays in Arowhenua, so I grew up with the Māori kids. When I was four, I asked my grandmother if we were Māori . . . she was horrified. As I got older I discovered quite a lot about the wrong side of the tracks stuff. There was all of this kind of racial shit that would go on. **EDUCATION:** When I started learning Māori as an adult I discovered that there was already quite a lot that I knew. **FRIENDS:** I have stayed at a lot of my Māori women friends' houses . . . we are fast friends for life. **NGĀ WAIRUA O TE AO MĀORI: EDUCATION:** You intellectually know that water will lift the tapu around the tūpāpaku... but until you go on a Marae in that situation, you don't actually really know it. **OTHERING: WORK:** I got a job in the public services . . . we were seen as radical feminists. I wore a bit of shit from the Pākehā women at that time. **PĀKEHĀ EDUCATING PĀKEHĀ: WORK:** My involvement in te ao Māori is a responsibility that is not done as an individual. It is a task that I have been given and Māori sit behind me to make sure that I do it.

Betty

ENCOUNTERS WITH TE AO MĀORI: EDUCATION: *The deputy principal of the Teachers' College said that he didn't think that it was a very good idea me going out with my husband.* WHANĀU: *My sister is married to a Pākehā. When she was younger, they always used to go on about my husband. My grandson had a big argument with his teacher because the teacher said he wasn't Māori.* WHANĀU: *I said something to this politician about our children calling themselves' Māori. He said, "Oh you have failed haven't you?"* **OTHERING:** WHANĀU: *After we were married, a Pākehā woman said to me "Oh your husband is very dark". When our children were little, Pākehā people used to say, "Oh they are so beautifully brown. Aren't they lovely?"* **EQUALITY: WORK:** *I started working up at the Red Cross in Auckland. The Pākehā who come into the shop often say negative comments about Māori and I try to explain things to them . . . but I mean mostly people they are just ignorant.* **PĀKEHĀ EDUCATING PĀKEHĀ:** WHANĀU: *I understand why Māori do the things they do. Because my husband and I have been together since we were young everybody knows us.*

Joseph

ENCOUNTERS WITH TE AO MĀORI: FRIENDS: *I got to know these Māori chaps quite well. From then on I began to build up quite a relationship with the Māori. My focus was changing towards Māori. I took to the Māori people and they seemed to take to me.* WHANĀU: *I went to a Māori person's house and I told him my wife's name, and as soon as they knew who my wife was it made all the difference in the world.* EDUCATION: *I was the only Pākehā that had ever been through the Te Wānanga a Rangi college since its inception.* **OTHERING:** FRIENDS: *When we went to live in Rotorua we couldn't get a place to live. I was friendly with the owner. He had an empty flat. I asked him for it and he said "You are getting married to a Māori. No thanks, I don't want a Māori in my flat".*

References / Whakapuakanga

- Adamson, W. L. (1980). *Hegemony and revolution: A study of Antonio Gramsci's political and cultural theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. New York: Doubleday.
- Amin, S. (1989). *Eurocentrism*. (Russell Moore, Trans.). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Appleby, J. (1994). *Telling the truth about history*. New York: Norton.
- Archie, C. (1995). *Maori sovereignty: The Pakeha perspective*. Auckland, New Zealand: Hodder Moa Beckett.
- Archie, C. (2005). *Skin to skin: Intimate, true stories of Maori-Pakeha relationships*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Group.
- Arsenault, R. (2006). *Freedom Riders: 1961 and the struggle for racial justice*. Oxford: University Press.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (Eds.). (1995). *The postcolonial studies reader*. London: Routledge.
- Atkinson, R. (2002). The life story interview. In J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method*. (pp. 121-140). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Awatere, D. (1984). *Maori sovereignty*. Auckland: Broadsheet Magazine Ltd.
- Ballara, A. (1986). *Proud to be white*. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann.
- Banks, O. (1987). *Becoming a feminist: The social origins of "first wave" feminism*. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press.
- Barclay, K., & Liu, J. H. (2003). Who gets voice? (Re)presentation of bicultural relations in New Zealand print media. *New Journal of Psychology* 32(1), 3-12.
- Barnes, A. (2002). A Pakeha (non-Maori) perspective of decolonisation in Aotearoa. In J. Hutchings, *Decolonisation and Aotearoa: A pathway to right livelihood*. Retrieved November 1, 2008, from Swaraj Foundation web site: http://www.swaraj.org/shikshantar/ls3_jessica.html
- Barnes, A. (2006). *Taku ara, taku mahara: Pākehā family experiences of kaupapa Māori and bilingual education*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Battiste, M. (1996). Indigenous knowledge and research: Enabling the Autumn seed. *Indigenous theory and method course readings book*. University of Otago (Week 8, April 28 2004, pp. 223-238)

- Beatson, P., & Shannon P. (1990). History, In P. Beatson (Ed.), *New Zealand society*. (pp. 137-191). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Department of Sociology, Massey University.
- Becker, H. S. (1970). *Sociological work: Method and substance*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Belich, J. (1986). *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian interpretation of racial conflict*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Belich, J. (1996). *Making peoples: A history of New Zealanders from Polynesian settlement to the end of the nineteenth century*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Bell, A. (1996a). *Inventing New Zealand: Everyday myths of Pākehā identity*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Bell, A. (1996b). We're just New Zealanders: Pākehā identity politics. In P. Spoonley (Ed.), *Nga patai: racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. (pp. 144-158). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Bell, A. (2004a). *Relating Māori and Pākehā: The politics of indigenous and settler identities*. Unpublished PhD thesis: Massey University.
- Bell, A. (2004b). 'Half-castes' and 'white natives': The politics of Māori-Pākehā identities. In C. Bell & S. Mathewman (Eds.), *Cultural studies in Aotearoa New Zealand: Identity, space and place*. (pp. 121-138). South Melbourne Victoria, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, C., & Mathewman S. (Eds.). (2004). *Cultural studies in Aotearoa New Zealand: identity, space and place*. South Melbourne Victoria, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Bentley, T. (1999). *Pākehā Māori: The extraordinary story of the Europeans who lived as Māori in early New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Bentley, T. (2007). *Images of Pākehā-Māori: A study of the representation of Pākehā-Māori by historians of New Zealand from Arthur Thomson (1859) to James Belich (1996)*. A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History at the University of Waikato: Unpublished thesis.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1993). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.

- Binney, J. (1987). Māori oral narratives, Pākehā written texts: Two forms of telling history. *New Zealand Journal of History* 21(1), 16-28.
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: whakawhanaungatanga*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R. (1999). Kaupapa Maori research: An indigenous approach to creating knowledge. In N. Robertson, (Ed.), *Maori and psychology: Research and practice*. Hamilton, New Zealand: Māori and Psychology Research Unit. University of Waikato Proceedings of a symposium sponsored by the Maori & Psychology Research Unit, Department of Psychology, University of Waikato, Hamilton, Thursday 26th August 1999 (pp. 1-6).
- Black, R. (2000). Political Implications of the name “Pakeha”. In *Living Justly in Aotearoa Newsletter*. Auckland: Catholic Justice and Peace Office 3.
- Boast, R. P. (2000). Maori Fisheries 1986-1998: A reflection. *Indigenous Peoples and the Law*, March 11, 2000. Retrieved November 1, 2008, from Indigenous Peoples and the Law web site:
<http://www.kennett.co.nz/law/indigenous/2000/48.html>
- Bonnett, A. (2000). *White identities: Historical and international perspectives*. London: Pearson Education.
- Borgatti, S. (2008). Introduction to grounded theory: Discussion drawn from the work of Glaser and Strauss (1967), *The discovery of grounded theory*, and Strauss and Corbin (1990) *Basics of qualitative research*. Retrieved on November 1, 2008, from Analytic Technologies web site:
<http://www.analytictech.com/mb870/introtoGT.html>
- Brah, A., & Coombes, A. (Eds.). (2000). *Hybridity and its discontents: Politics, science, culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Brash, D. (2004). *Nationhood*. An address by Don Brash, Leader of the National Party to the Orewa Rotary Club on January 27, 2004. Retrieved on November 1, 2008, from Scoop Independent News web site:
<http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PA0401/S00220.html>
- Brown, M. W. (2004). *Orientalism in contemporary Aotearoa: In-group Pākehā (IGP) vs. out-group Pākehā (OGP): The Othering of Pākehā in contemporary Aotearoa: A Pākehā perspective*. Unpublished Master's thesis: University of Otago.
- Campbell, B. M. (2005). *Negotiating biculturalism: Deconstructing Pākehā subjectivity*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Massey University.

- Campbell, I. (1998). *'Gone native' in Polynesia: Captivity narratives and experiences from the South Pacific*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Charmaz, K. (1983). The grounded theory method: An explication and interpretation. In R. Emerson (Ed.), *Contemporary field research*. (pp. 109-126). Boston: Little, Brown.
- Charmaz, K. (2002). Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis. In J. Gubrium & J. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: context and method*. (pp. 675-694). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Charmaz, K. (2003a). Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis. In J. Holstein & J. Gubrium (Eds.), *Interviewing: New lenses, new concerns*. (pp. 311-330). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Charmaz, K. (2003b). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. (pp. 249-291). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cheyne, C., O'Brian, M., & Belgrave M. (1997). *Social policy in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Oxford, UK: University Press.
- Cheyne, S. (1975). *Search for a constitution: People and politics in New Zealand's crown colony years*. Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Otago.
- Chris Kahui: Exclusive Interview. (2008). Retrieved February 1, 2009, from Stuff.co.nz web site: <http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/764357>
- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. A. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Collins, H. 1999. Ngā tangata awarua: The joys and pain of being both Māori and Pākehā. *National Oral History Association of New Zealand Journal*, pp. 1-5.
- Collins, H. M. (2004). *Te putahitanga o nga tae e rua: The meeting of two tides- journeys of mixed heritage Maori/Pakeha towards identity strength*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Wellington, New Zealand: Massey University.
- Consedine, R., & Consedine, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Healing our history: The challenge of the Treaty of Waitangi* (2nd ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Cowan, J. (1911). *The adventures of Kimble Bent: A story of wildlife in the New Zealand bush*. London: Whitcombe and Tombs.
- Cowan, J. (1935). *A trader in cannibal land: The life and adventures of Captain Tapsell*. Dunedin, New Zealand: A.H. and A. W. Reed.

- Cox, L. (1993). *Kotahitanga: The search for Maori political unity*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Dalley, B., and Phillips, J. (Eds.). (2001). *Going public: The changing face of New Zealand history*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Darwin, J. (1988). *Britain and decolonisation: The retreat from empire in the post-war world*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Davenport, F. G. (Ed.). (1917). *European treaties bearing on the history of the United States and its dependencies*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Institute of Washington.
- De Bres, B., & Campbell, R. (1976). *The overstayers: Illegal migration from the Pacific to New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland Resources Centre for World development.
- Deloria, V. Jr., & Lytle, C. M. (1984). *Nations within: The past and future of American Indian sovereignty*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989a). Interpretive biography. *Qualitative research methods, Series 17*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989b). Interpretive interactionism. *Applied Social Research Methods 16*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Durie, M. H. (2004), Public sector reform: Indigeneity and the goals of Māori development. *Commonwealth Advanced Seminar*, Palmerston North, New Zealand: Massey University 17(Feb), 1-18.
- Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. London: Routledge.
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction*. London: Verso.
- Enriques, V. (2000). In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming indigenous voice and vision*. (pp 150-152). Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.
- Fanon, F. (1963 [1961]). *Wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Feagin J. R., & Feagin, C. B. (1978). *Discrimination American style: Institutional racism and sexism*. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice hall.
- Feagin, J., & O'Brien, E. (2003). *White men on race: Power, privilege, and the shaping of cultural consciousness*. Boston: Beacon Press.

- Feagin, J., Vera, H., & Batur, P. (2001). *White racism*. New York: Routledge.
- Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class? The authority of interpretive communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fleras, A., & Spoonley, P. (1999a). *Recalling Aotearoa: Indigenous politics and ethnic relations in New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Fleras, A., & Spoonley, P. (1999b). Rewriting the past, rethinking the future. In *Recalling Aotearoa: indigenous politics and ethnic relations in New Zealand*. (pp. 1-38). Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Flick, U. (2006). *An introduction to qualitative research*. (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Flood, M. (1997). *Frequently asked questions about profeminist men and profeminist men's politics*. Retrieved November 1, 2008, from XYonline web site: <http://www.xyonline.net>
- Flores, L. A., & Moon, D. G. (2002). Rethinking race, revealing dilemmas: Imaging a new racial subject in Race Traitor. *Western Journal of Communication* 66(2), 181-207.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. (Colin Gordon, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of Whiteness*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Frankenberg, R. (Ed.). (1997). *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in social and cultural criticism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- 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.
- Gambrill, E. (1997). Interpersonal helping skills. *Social work practice*. (pp. 298-302). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays by Clifford Geertz*. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. London: Routledge.

- Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. (Eds.). (1994). *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Glaser B., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goldberg, D. T. (1993). Modernity, race and morality. *Racist culture: Philosophies and the politics of meaning*. (pp. 14-40). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Goldberg, D. T. (Ed.). (1994). *Multiculturalism: A critical reader*. Boston: Blackwell Publishers.
- 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.
- Grace, P., & Grace, W. (2003). *Earth, sea, sky: Images and Māori proverbs from the natural world of Aotearoa New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). Selections from the Prison Notebooks. In Q. Hoare & G. Nowell Smith (Eds.), London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Guess, T. (2006). The social construction of Whiteness: Racism by intent, racism by consequence. *Critical Sociology* 32(4), 650-673.
- Hall, S. (1992). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held, & T. McGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and its futures*. (pp. 273-327). Oxford, UK: Polity.
- Harris, A. (2004). *Hīkoi: Forty years of Māori protest*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Hawke, S. (Ed.). (1998). *Takaparawhau: The people's story*. Orakei, New Zealand: Moko Productions.
- Hill, L. (1956). Negroes, look around you. In *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 13, 1956. Retrieved November 1, 2008, from The Montgomery Bus Boycott web site: <http://home.att.net/~reniqua/whiteandopposition.html>
- Hill, M. (1997). *Whiteness: A critical reader*. New York: New York University Press.
- Hill, M. (2004). *After Whiteness: Unmaking an American majority*. New York: New York University Press.
- Hindmarsh, J. H. (1995). Looking back to go forward: 1990-95. In *Te Tiriti o Waitangi - towards 2000*. Wellington: A lecture series organised by Te Whare Pukenga, Te Whare Wānanga o te Upoke o te Ika a Maui, New Zealand, 24 May to 5 July.

- Hindmarsh, J. H. (2000). Biculturalisms (and antiracisms) in education in New Zealand. In M. Leicester, C. Modgil, and S. Modgil, (Eds.), *Systems of education: Theories, policies and implicit values, Volume 1*. (pp. 126-143). RoutledgeFarmer.
- Hingangaroa Smith, G. (1999). Paulo Freire: Lessons in transformative praxis. In P. Roberts (Ed.), *Paul Freire, politics and pedagogy*. (pp. 35-41). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Hingangaroa Smith, G. (1997). *The development of kaupapa Māori theory and praxis*. A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Auckland, New Zealand: The International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education.
- Hokowhitu, B. (2004). Collaborative storytelling: Co-constructed meaning within a Māori context. *University of Otago Indigenous theory and method course readings book*, Unpublished Essay (Week 9, May 15, 2004).
- Hoogvelt, A. (1997). *Globalization and the postcolonial world: The new political economy of development*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- hooks, b. (1992). Representations of Whiteness in the black imagination. In *Black looks: Race and representation*. (pp. 165-178). Boston: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (1994a). Feminist politicization. In M. M. Green & S. Davis (Eds.), *Toward a new psychology of gender: A reader* (pp. 533-539). New York: Routledge.
- hooks, bell. (1994). *Sisters of the yam: Black women and self-recovery*. Boston: South End Press.
- Hope, W. (2002). Whose All Blacks? *Media, Culture and Society*, 24, 235-253.
- Howe, K. R. (1977). Race relations: Australia and New Zealand. In D. Pearson. (1990) *A dream deferred: The origins of ethnic conflict in New Zealand*. (pp. 39-40). Wellington, New Zealand: Allen & Unwin.
- Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. (pp. 428-444). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Huygens, I. (2002). Journeys away from dominance: Dissonance, struggle and right relationships - the journey to accepting indigenous authority. In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha treaty work: Unpublished material*. Manukau, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology.

- 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. (2007). *Processes of Pākehā change in response to the Treaty of Waitangi*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis: University of Waikato.
- Huygens, I., Black, R., & Hamerton, H. (2003). Reflections on Pakeha identity. *Bulletin – New Zealand Psychological Society* 101, 13-16.
- Irwin, K. (1994). Maori research methods and practices. *Sites*, 28, 25-43.
- Jackson, R. L. (1999). White space, white privilege: Mapping discursive inquiry into the self. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 85, 38-54.
- Jackson, S. J. & Hokowhitu, B. (2002). Sport, tribes and technology: The New Zealand All Blacks and the politics of identity. *Journal of Sport and Social Studies* 26(1), 125-139.
- Jackson, M. (1988). *The Maori and criminal justice system, He Whaipanga Hou: A new perspective*. Wellington: New Zealand Department of justice.
- Jardine, A., & Smith, P. (Eds.). (1987). *Men in feminism*. New York: Methuen.
- Jellie, M. (2001). *The formation of Pākehā identity in relation to te reo Māori and te ao Māori*. Unpublished master's thesis. Christchurch, New Zealand: University of Canterbury.
- Johnson, J. (2002). In-depth interviewing. In J. Gubrium & J. Holstein. (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and Method*. (pp. 103-120). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Johnson, M. (2005). "The land of the long wrong white cloud": Anti-racist organisations and Pakeha identity politics in the 1970s. *New Zealand Journal of History* 39(2), 137-157.
- Jones, A. (1999). The limits of cross-cultural dialogue: Pedagogy, desire and absolution in the classroom. *Educational Theory* 49(2), 299-316.
- Jones, A. (2002). Cross-cultural pedagogy and the passion for ignorance. *Feminism and Psychology* 11(3), 279-292.
- Jones, J. (1997). *Prejudice and racism (2nd edition)*. New York: McGraw-Hall.
- Kawharu, I. H. (Ed.). (1989). *Waitangi: Māori and Pākehā perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

- Kelsey, J. (1991). In J. H. Hindmarsh, *Biculturalisms (and Antiracisms) in education in New Zealand*, In M. Leicester, C. Modgil, and S. Modgil, (Eds.). (2000). *Systems of education: theories, policies and implicit values, Volume 1*. Oxon: RoutledgeFarmer (Chapter 12, p. 127).
- Kennan, D. (Ed.). (2008). *Terror in our midst? Searching for terror in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.
- Kightley, O. (1997). *Dawn Raids*. Wellington, New Zealand: Playmarket.
- Kimmel, M. S. (1987). Men's responses to feminism at the turn of the century. *Gender and Society* 1(3), 261-283.
- King, M. (1985). *Being Pakeha: An encounter with New Zealand and the Maori renaissance*. Auckland, New Zealand: Hodder and Stoughton.
- King, M. (1999a). *Pakeha: The quest for New Zealand identity*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- King, M. (1999b). *Being Pakeha now: Reflections and recollections of a white native*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Kirton, J. D. (1997). *Paakeha/Tauwiwi: Seeing the unseen: Critical analysis of links between discourse, identity, 'blindness' and encultured racism*. Kirikiriroa, Hamilton: Waikato Antiracism Coalition.
- Krizek, S. (2006). Finding my Whiteness: A narrative of cultural identification. In L. Samovar, J. Potter & E. R. McDaniel (Eds.), *International communication: A reader*. (pp. 61-70). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Laenui, P. (Hayden F. Burgess). (2000). Process of decolonization. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming indigenous voice and vision*. (Chapter 11, pp. 150-160). Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press
- Lauer, R. H. (1982). *Perspectives on social change*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Lawson, A. (1995). Postcolonial theory and the "setter" subject. *Essays in Canadian Writing*, 56, 20-36.
- Lewis, R., & Mills, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Feminist postcolonial theory: A reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Lofland, J. (1971). *Analyzing social settings: a guide to qualitative observation and analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Maclean, M. (1996). The silent centre: Are Pākehā in biculturalism? *Continuum* 10(1), 108-120.

- MacPherson, C., & Spoonley, P. (2004). Mediated ethnicity: Media in the management of ethnic images in Aotearoa. In P. Spoonley, C. MacPherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata tangata: Changing ethnic contours of New Zealand*. (pp. 221-246). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Maning, F. (1863). *Old New Zealand: A tale of the good old times/by a Pakeha Maori*. Auckland, New Zealand: Robert J. Creighton and Alfred Scales.
- Māori Advisory Unit. (1985). *Māori Advisory Unit report*. Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland, New Zealand: Department of Social Welfare.
- Margaret, J. (2002a). *Pakeha treaty work: An annotated bibliography*. Auckland, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.
- Margaret, J. (2002b) *Pakeha treaty work: Unpublished material*. Auckland, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1989). *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McCreanor, T. N. (1995). *Pakeha discourses of Maori/Pakeha relations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University.
- 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. (2009). *Challenging and countering anti-Maori discourse: Practices for decolonisation*. Keynote speech delivered to the New Zealand Psychological Society Conference, 27th August. (pp. 1-11). Media Health Project, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- McGrath, P. (2003). *Kōrero hau kura: A collection of whakatauki and whakataūki (Māori proverbs)*. Hamilton, New Zealand: Kaitoro Publishers.
- McGregor, J. (Ed.). (1996). *Dangerous democracy?* Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- McGregor, J., & Comrie, M. (Eds.). (2002). *What’s news? Reclaiming journalism in New Zealand*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Mead, L. T. (1996). *Ngā aho o te kākāhu mātauranga: The multiple layers of struggle by Māori in education*. Te Tari Rangahau o te Mātauranga Māori, Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.

- Melbourne, H. (1995). *Maori sovereignty: The Maori perspective*. Auckland, New Zealand: Hodder Moa Beckett.
- Memmi, A. (1965 [1991]). *The colonizer and the colonized*. (Howard Greenfeld, Trans.). New York: Orion Press.
- Meredith, P. (1998). *Hybridity in the third space: Rethinking bi-cultural politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Paper presented to Te Oru Rangahau Maori Research and Development Conference, 7-9 July, University of Otago.
- Meredith, P. (1999). Being half-caste: Cultural schizo or cultural lubricant? *Tū Mai*, 4(July), 24.
- Mezirow, J. & Associates. (1990). *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipator learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mitcalfe, M. A. (2008). *Understandings of being Pākehā: Exploring the perspective of six Pākehā who have studied in Māori cultural learning contexts*. A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Management: Communication Management at Massey University, New Zealand. Unpublished thesis.
- Moorfield, John. C. (2000). *Ngā kupu me ngā tikanga*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education New Zealand.
- Morse, J. M. (1991). Approaches to qualitative-quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing Research* 40(1), 120-123.
- Mulgan, R., & Sanders W. (1996). Transforming indigenous affairs policy: Labour's contribution to 'internal decolonisation'. In F. Castles, R. Gerritsen, & J. Vowles. (Eds.), *The great experiment: Labour parties and public policy transformation in Australia and New Zealand*. (pp. 129-148). Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Nairn, M. (1989). Changing my mind: Transitions in Pākehā thinking. In H. Yensen, K. Hague, & T. McCreanor (Eds.), *Honouring the Treaty: An introduction for Pākehā to the Treaty of Waitangi*. (pp. 75-89). Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Nairn, M. (2001). Decolonisation for Pākehā, In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pākehā treaty work: Unpublished material*. (pp. 203-206). Auckland, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.

- Nairn, M. (2002). Decolonisation or denial: A case study to Pākehā responses to the trauma of colonisation In J. Margaret (Ed.), *Pakeha treaty work: Unpublished material*. (pp. 209-213). Auckland, New Zealand: Manukau Institute of Technology Treaty Unit.
- 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.
- 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, New Zealand.
- Network Waitangi Taranaki (2000). *Constitutional Change: Why all the Fuss About it Now?* Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland: Treaty Conference 2000 Publication Group.
- Ngata, H. M. (1993). *English-Māori dictionary*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong' o. (1986). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. London: J Curry.
- O'Reilly, T. & Wood, D. (1991) Biculturalism and the public sector, In J. Boston, J. Martin, J. Pallot & P. Walsh (Eds.), *Reshaping the State: New Zealand's bureaucratic revolution*. (pp. 329-342). Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- O'Sullivan, D. (2007). *Beyond biculturalism: The politics of an indigenous minority*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Obama's Acceptance Speech. (2008). (Paragraphs 21-27). Retrieved January 6, 2009, from Council on Foreign Relations web site: <http://www.cfr.org/publication/17703/>
- Orange, C. (1987). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Allen and Unwin/Port Nicholson Press.
- Osterhammel, J. (1997). *Colonisation: A theoretical overview*. Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener Publishers.

- Papastergiadis, N. (1997). Tracing hybridity in theory. In P. Werbner & T. Modood, *Debating cultural hybridity: Multi-cultural identities and the politics of anti-racism*. (pp. 257-281). London: Zed Books.
- Pearson, D. (1989). Pakeha ethnicity: Concept or conundrum. *Sites*, 18, 61-72.
- Pearson, D. (1990). *A dream deferred: The origins of ethnic conflict in New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Allen & Unwin.
- Perkins, R. (1996). Imag(in)ing our colonial past: Colonial New Zealand on film from "The birth of New Zealand" to "The Piano". *Illusions* 25(2), 17-27.
- Phillips, J. (1987). *A man's country?: The image of the Pākehā male, a history*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Phillips, J. (1996). *A man's country?: The image of the Pākehā male, a history*: (Rev. ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Pincus, F. L. (2006). *Understanding diversity: An introduction to class, race, gender, and sexual orientation*. Boulder, CO: Lynn Rienner Publishers.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and social psychology*. London: Sage.
- Powick, K. (2002). *Māori research ethics and implications of kaupapa Māori research involving Māori for researchers, supervisors and ethics committees*. Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research/School of Education: University of Waikato.
- Preview of the 'Declaration of Segregation'. (1956). In *Montgomery Advertiser*, February 11, 1956. Retrieved November 1, 2008, from The Montgomery Bus Boycott web site: <http://home.att.net/~reniqua/whiteandopposition.html>
- 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.
- Puao-te-Ata-Tu*. (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.
- Race Traitor. (n.d.). Retrieved November 1, 2008, from Race Traitor web site: <http://racetraitor.org/>
- Ragin, C. (1994). *Constructing social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Rangihau, J. (1992). Being Maori. Michael King (Ed.), *Te Ao hurihuri: Aspects of Maoritanga*. (pp. 183-190). Auckland, New Zealand: Reed Books

- Rata, E. (2005). Rethinking biculturalism. *Anthropological Theory* 5, 267-284.
- Reilly, M. (1986). Te matakite hou o nga korero nehe no Niu Tireni: Revisioning New Zealand history. In P. Spoonley, D. Pearson & C. MacPherson (Eds.), *Nga patai: Racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Ritchie, J. (1992). *Becoming bicultural*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Ritchie, J., & Ritchie, J. (1978). *Growing up in New Zealand*. Sydney, Australia: George Allen and Unwin Australia.
- Ritchie, J. S. (1971). *One nation-or two? Māori and Pākehā in contemporary New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand University Press.
- Roberts, B. (2002). *Biographical research*. Buckingham, MK: Open University Press.
- Royal Commission on Social Policy. (1988). *Towards a fair and just society*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Rutherford, J. (1990). The third space: Interview with Homi Bhabha. J. Rutherford, *Identity, community, culture, difference*. (pp. 207-221). London: Laurence and Wishart.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, E. (2003). *Orientalism*. (Reprinted with a new Preface, 2003). London: Penguin Books.
- Salmond, A. (1991). *Two worlds: First meetings between Māori and Europeans 1642-1772*. Auckland, New Zealand: Viking.
- Salmond, A. (1997). *Between worlds: Early exchanges between Māori and Europeans 1773-1815*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Sardar, Z. (1999). *Orientalism*. Buckingham. UK: Open University Press.
- Sassoon, A. S. (1993). Hegemony. In W. Outhwaite & T. Bottomore (Eds.), *Dictionary of Twentieth Century Social thought*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schlunke, K. (2004). Unsettling Whiteness. In B. McKay (Ed.), *Unmasking Whiteness: race relations and reconciliation*. (pp. 173-179). Brisbane, Australia: Griffith University.
- Schram, T. (2006). *Conceptualizing and proposing qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

- Scott, D. (1954). *The Parihaka Story*. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann & Southern Cross.
- Scott, D. (1975). *Ask that mountain: The story of Parihaka*. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann & Southern Cross.
- Sharp, A. (1990). *Justice and the Maori*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Shears, R., & Gidley, I. (1981). *Storm out of Africa: The 1981 Springbok tour of New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Macmillan.
- Sheenan, W. T. (1956). Overbearing bus drivers. *Montgomery Advertiser*, January 4, 1956. Retrieved November 1, 2008, from The Montgomery Bus Boycott web site: <http://home.att.net/~reniqua/whiteandopposition.html>
- Simpson, T. (1979). *Te riri Pākehā: The white man's anger*. Martinborough, New Zealand: Alister Taylor
- Sinclair, K. (1986). *A destiny apart: New Zealand's search for national identity*. Wellington, New Zealand: Allen and Unwin in Association with the Port Nicholson Press.
- Slack, D. (2004). *Bullshit, backlash and bleeding hearts: A confused person's guide to the great race row*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Smith, L. (1993). Notes toward theory in biography: Working on the Nora Barlow papers. In D. Flinders & G. Mills (Eds.), *Theory and concepts in qualitative research: Perspectives from the field* (pp. 129-140). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Smith, L. (1998). Biographical method. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. (pp. 184-224). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Smith, T. L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. New York: Zed Books.
- Sneddon, P. (2005). *Pākehā and the treaty: Why it's our treaty too*. Auckland, New Zealand: Random House.
- Spanish, French, and English settlement. In *U.S. History: From the colonial period to 1877*. (pp. 2-3). Retrieved November 1, 2008, from History Sources Web site: <http://historysources.tripod.com/us-classnotes/Topic%202.3-Spanish%20French%20and%20English%20Settlement.pdf>

- Spartacus Educational. Retrieved on November 1, 2008, from the Spartacus Educational Web site:
<http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/Wcontagious.htm>
- Spivak, G. (1999). *A critique of postcolonial reason*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Spoonley, P. (1984). *Tauivi: Racism and ethnicity in New Zealand*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore.
- Spoonley, P. (1986). Being Pākehā: an interview with Michael King, In *Sites, 13*, (pp. 6-13).
- Spoonley, P. (1988). *Racism and ethnicity*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Spoonley, P. (1991). Pākehā ethnicity: A response to Māori sovereignty. In P. Spoonley, D. Pearson & C. MacPherson (Eds.), *Ngā take: Ethnic relations and racism in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. (pp. 154-170). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Spoonley, P. (1993). *Racism and ethnicity* (2nd ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Spoonley, P. (1995). Constructing ourselves: The post colonial politics of Pakeha. In M. Wilson & A. Yeatman (Eds.), *Justice and identity: Antipodean practices*. (pp. 94-115). Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
- Spoonley, P., Macpherson, C., Pearson, D. (Eds.). (2004). *Tangata, tangata: the changing ethnic contours of New Zealand*. Southbank: Thomson.
- Spoonley, P., Pearson, D., & MacPherson, C. (1991). *Nga take: Ethnic relations and racism in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Spoonley, P., Pearson, D., & MacPherson, C. (Eds.). (1996). *Nga patai: Racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998a). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998b). Grounded theory methodology: An overview. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. (pp. 158-183). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strobel, L. M. (2001). *Coming full circle: The process of decolonization among post-1965 Filipino Americans*. Quezon City, The Philippines: Giraffe Books.
- Sullivan, S. (2006). *Revealing Whiteness: The unconscious habits of racial privilege*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Sutherland, I. (1940). *The Maori people today: A general survey*. Christchurch: Whitcombe & Tombs.
- Taylor, D. (1997). Transculturating transculturation. In B. Murrain & C. Dasgupta, *Interculturalism and performances*. (pp. 60-74). New York. PAJ Publications.
- Temm, P. B. (1990). *The Treaty of Waitangi and Maori rights in New Zealand*. First published as part of Treaty of Waitangi resource kit / compiled and developed by Kiri Scott. Wellington, New Zealand: Early Childhood Development Unit.
- Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools*. New York: Falmer.
- The Montgomery Bus Boycott. (2000a). Retrieved November 1, 2008 from The Montgomery Bus Boycott web site: <http://home.att.net/~reniqua/>
- The Montgomery Bus Boycott. (2000b). *Who was involved*. Retrieved November 1, 2008 from The Montgomery Bus Boycott web site: <http://home.att.net/~reniqua/who.html>
- Thorn, G. (2000). *End of empires: European decolonisation 1919-80*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Thorp, D. B. (2004). Going native in New Zealand and America: Comparing Pākehā Māori and white Indians. *History Now: Te pae tawhito o te wā 10*(1), 5-12.
- Tilbury, F. (1999). "Some of my best friends are Māori but . . .": *Cross-cultural ethnic friendships, ethnic identity attitudes to race relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University.
- Titon, J. (2006). The life story. In M. David (Ed.), *Case study research: Volume IV*. (pp. 131-148). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tolich, M. (2001). (Ed.). *Research ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand: Concepts, practice, critique*. Auckland, New Zealand: Longman.

- Treaty FAQs (2010). *How many claims are there, and how many have been settled?* Retrieved February 1, 2010 from New Zealand History web site: <http://www.nzhistory.net.nz/politics/treaty/treaty-faqs>
- Trevithick, P. (2000). *Social work theory*. London: Macmillan.
- Turner, S. (1999a). Settlement as forgetting. In. K. Neumann, N. Thomas & H. Ericksen (Eds.), *Quicksands: Foundational histories in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand*. (pp. 20-38). Canberra, Australia: University of New South Wales.
- Turner, S. (1999b). A legacy of colonialism: The uncivil society of Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Cultural studies* 13(3), 408-422.
- Tyler, F. B. (1992). Ethnic validity: A model for families on uncharted seas. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 1, 203-222.
- Vasil, R. (2000). *Biculturalism: Reconciling Aotearoa with New Zealand*. (Rev. ed.). Wellington, New Zealand: Institute of Policy Studies.
- Walker, R. (1983). The History of Māori Activism. Paper presented at 15th Pacific Sciences Congress, Dunedin, New Zealand.
- Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Walker, R. (1996). *Ngā pepa a Ranginui: The Walker papers*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Wall, M. (1997). Stereotypical constructions of Māori “race” in the media. *New Zealand Geographer* 53(2), 40-45.
- Warren, J. T. (2003). *Performing purity: Whiteness, pedagogy, and the reconstitution of power*. New York: P. Lang.
- Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Williams, D. (1999). *Te Kooti Tango Whenua: The Native Land Court 1864-1909*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.
- Women’s AntiRacism Group. (1984). *Institutional racism in the Department of Social Welfare*. Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland, New Zealand: Treaty Conference Publications Group.

- Wright, H. (1959). New Zealand 1769-1840: Early years of Western contact. In D. Pearson (1990), *A dream deferred: The origins of ethnic conflict in New Zealand*. (Chapter 2, pp. 40-41). Wellington, New Zealand: Allen & Unwin.
- Yensen, H., Hague, K., McCreanor, T., with Kelsey, J., Nairn, M., & Williams, D. (Eds.). (1989). *Honouring the Treaty: An introduction for Pākehā to the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Young, R.J. C. (1990). *White mythologies: Writing, history and the west*. London: Routledge.
- Young, R.J. C. (1995). *Colonial desire: Hybridity in theory, culture and race*. London: Routledge.
- Young, R.J. C. (2001). *Postcolonialism: An historical introduction*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Young, R.J.C. (2003). *Postcolonialism: A very short introduction*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Young, R.J. C. (2004). *White mythologies: Writing history and the west*. (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.