

‘Closing the Gaps’:

FROM POSTCOLONIALISM TO KAUPAPA MĀORI AND BEYOND¹



I ARRIVED AT UNIVERSITY in an era when closing the gaps meant I had the most distance to travel. This expanse was not measured in kilometres or miles but in ‘cultural capital’, signposted in the particularly disparaging landscape of deficit theorizing, where Māori underachievement marked the low-lying outer reaches on a steep incline toward becoming upwardly mobile, the innovative Kiwi, or New Zealand citizen.² ‘Closing the gaps’ had also come to prominence as a Labour Party catchphrase in the 1999 election, and continued as the name of an official government policy that targeted underachieving groups such as Māori and Pacific Islanders. It was criticized by some as a program that encouraged ‘social apartheid’ and denounced as ‘the twenty-first century’s version of the “White Man’s Burden”’.³ To Māori, it appeared helpful in that it identified us as a group whose current situation required special attention and care but was ultimately damaging, in that it perpetuated negative stereotypes that placed Māori on the margins and Pākehā standards of living as the benchmark in New Zealand society. These negative characterizations had long been embedded in historical scholarship but over time had taken on more contemporary markers of identity. By the time I began my history degree, the portrayal of Māori as uncivilized savages had been transformed to describe a group perceived to be typically better suited to labouring, and more likely to fail at school or commit crime.⁴ The Hunn Report in 1960, a review of the Department of Māori Affairs, for instance, advocated a move from assimilation to integration, and offered a three-tiered Māori typology that noted the majority were somewhere in between either ‘a completely detribalized body of Māori with a vestigial culture’ and those ‘complacently living a backward life in primitive conditions’.⁵ In 1991, Winston Peters, then Minister of Māori Affairs, commissioned the *Ka Awatea* report aimed at addressing low educational achievement, high representation in crime and imprisonment, and high state dependency amongst Māori.⁶ Peters would later become a major critic of the ‘closing the gaps’ policy that in many respects was concerned with the same issues. More recently, and in a far more provocative fashion, Michael Laws, the Mayor of Whanganui, has accused the Māori Party of being ‘apologists for the excesses of its ethnicity’, urging them to pay more attention to the Māori issues that really matter, such as ‘gang membership, child murder, the underclass, incest, [and] criminal offending’.⁷ These publicly articulated depictions and stereotypes have not only positioned Māori as the problem group in need of change but have been aided by a dominant national history that in its privileged position has similarly left Māori stranded on the peripheries. Subsequently, in ‘closing the gaps’, it has been Māori who were and are expected to relocate, assimilate and adjust to the more ‘civilized’ political and social order. Today we are still expected to jump through

hoops, to refrain from being ‘wreckers’ and ‘haters’, and to write our history on the margins of the New Zealand story.⁸ When we resist, our self-determination is often misinterpreted as separatism, with our efforts to educate those around us frequently considered offensive and hostile because we refuse to conform in ways that make others feel nervous or — worse — guilty.

Speaking out against the mainstream view can often be an isolating experience for Māori, and frustrating when you constantly feel compelled to provide the ‘other’ perspective. It is often wearisome to feel like you are always on the alert, an indigenous watchdog constantly on guard against the evils of culturally insensitive research. But this is the reality of living within what some might call a ‘postcolonial’, or ‘Kaupapa Māori’, frame of reference.⁹ To think of this situation as postcolonial draws on what some commentators have described as a resistance to further oppression at the hands of those in a position of colonial power by ‘writing back’ (speaking back) from the ‘margins’ in an effort to recover or reclaim one’s identity and even ‘humanity’.¹⁰ In Aotearoa, it has evolved more recently to include a specifically indigenous vernacular embedded within a Kaupapa Māori frame which, as Graham Smith wrote, is ‘a shift away from an emphasis on reactive politics to an emphasis on being more proactive, a shift from negative motivation to positive motivation’.¹¹ Although both have relevance to the way in which Māori might respond to the injustices of colonial oppression, neither approach can be fully realized until it is reconfigured within the more specific and appropriate intellectual locations of the tangata whenua. Indeed, iwi and hapū may well describe their worlds in more local and familiar ways beyond a postcolonial, or archetypical ‘Māori’, world view. This distinctive outlook is vital because it informs a more refined and subjective response to incursions not only from the Pākehā world but from other iwi who do not share their particular aspirations or historical interpretations. It is a perspective we expect most Pākehā will not recognize, yet it is one that an increasing number of Māori are now striving to illuminate on our terms, couched in the various mātauranga-a-iwi that speak to our more personalized beliefs and ambitions.

It is disturbing that many New Zealand scholars still remain distanced from a Māori and iwi interpretation of history. In many ways this absence could be considered unconscious, yet that would be a convenient excuse for those who remain deliberately removed, who carry on as if their work can safely avoid Māori concerns, and therefore need not be mindful of them. Often, it appears as if some tuck themselves away in a subfield of New Zealand history with a belief that empirical research alone will carry the day, and then denounce theory as an obstruction to good research, an inconvenience that essentially stifles the process.¹² Empirical practice, it should be stressed, is not an evil, yet a lack of appreciation of the growing theoretical work in historical scholarship can perpetuate misguided interpretations, maintain cultural power imbalances and contribute to further colonial oppression. In Aotearoa New Zealand, the continuation of historical narratives that refuse to accommodate the evolving theoretical and methodological advancements in Māori and iwi research simply widens the distance between tau iwi, Pākehā New Zealanders, and the tangata whenua. This article considers the need for New Zealand historians especially to close the gaps between themselves and the Māori communities they and their work affects. It explores the vital

role that theory plays in this journey; whether an awakening from apathy and indifference, or the mapping of pertinent approaches to historical research. To this extent, the article is a think piece, and aims to provoke further thought rather than propose definitive solutions or provide ready-made models for historians working within the realms of Māori and iwi history. In exploring the new and old directions in theories such as postcolonialism and Kaupapa Māori, this article endeavours to locate how far we have come, and how much further we might yet need to travel. It notes the limits in postcolonial and Kaupapa Māori theory and practice, and argues for the need to move closer to iwi and hapū communities, interpretations and worldviews to truly close the distance between the colonized and the colonizers. Subsequently, this article draws on the ‘inside’ perspectives of my own iwi, Ngāti Porou, as one example of how postcolonial and Kaupapa Māori approaches might advance beyond their own boundaries to find firmer purchase in the worlds of this country’s first peoples.

The ‘Historian from Elsewhere’? Postcolonialism and Kaupapa Māori

All migrants leave their past behind, although some try to pack it into hidden bundles and boxes.... It is the fate of migrants to be stripped of history, to stand naked amidst the scorn of strangers. Salman Rushdie.¹³

Michael King has stressed that at one stage we were all migrants to these shores.¹⁴ However, it was Māori who were first to inscribe their names and history on the land, with all those who followed ‘fated’, as Salman Rushdie noted, to be ‘stripped of history’ in order to acclimatize and belong in their new homeland. This, obviously, was not the intention of the first European colonizers, who quickly set about writing their history over the top of the indigenous landscape, renaming the whenua, and plotting a new course for the country’s inhabitants. As they set about their colonial enterprise, the distance between their historical interpretations and Māori steadily widened and shifted away from that of the tangata whenua. Subsequently, in closing the gaps, a reconfiguring of the landscape is now vital to re-locating not only a potential destination but each individual’s personal point of departure. The re-claiming, and re-mapping, of these spaces has been one of the major strengths of both postcolonial and Kaupapa Māori theory. Kaupapa Māori, for instance, places mātauranga Māori at the centre, and challenges the place of Pākehā history and power, re-positioning them as historians from elsewhere whose cultural and intellectual frameworks are inadequate for interpreting the histories and worldviews of the indigenous peoples here in Aotearoa. The notion of disturbing the centre has also been a significant aspect of postcolonial theory, one in which writing back meant identifying first how the colonized were essentially a peripheral, depowered and marginalized subject in history.¹⁵ Nevertheless, when I first encountered postcolonial theory, it was ironically defined by a Pākehā academic, a scholar from elsewhere, whose postcolonial perspective focused on the subversive literature of Rushdie and R.K. Narayan.¹⁶ The postcolonialism this Pākehā academic described, though, bore little resemblance to my world, not because Rushdie and Narayan’s depictions were so different but because of his inability to explain how Indian, or rather subaltern, perspectives relate to Māori

colonial experience. Nevertheless, still intrigued by the writing of ‘others’, my fascination with postcolonialism, particularly its focus on the power relationships between the colonized and the colonizer, led me to the work of Edward Said, Frantz Fanon and Gayatri Spivak, whose words resonated with the history I knew.¹⁷ In their highly theorized conceptualizations of the colonized and the other, were possibilities not only for me to engage with but to localize, not simply in relation to how I reclaimed my own historical narrative but how Māori might yet disturb those entrenched histories that had for so long marginalized our stories.¹⁸ This, in my initial introduction to it, was the strength of postcolonial literature and theory: an approach that sought to destabilize the ‘centre’ by writing back against the grain. This transformative potential, though, has not yet prevailed in Pākehā historical writing in Aotearoa, a symptom of not simply a rejection of theory but to some extent a limited understanding of why postcolonialism was important in the first place.

In finding ways to ‘reclaim’ our history, Māori scholars have been intrigued with the merits, and failings, of postcolonial theory. On the one hand, it has provided a highly useful way of thinking about the problems within colonial encounter, while on the other it has been critiqued for its failure to accentuate the obvious continuation of colonialism within our contemporary context. Moana Jackson, for instance, asserts that ‘we are not in a post-colonial or neo-colonial period. Instead we are in a new version of the same old song of the dispossession and denial of the rights of the indigenous peoples.’¹⁹ Despite its potential to assist Māori history, postcolonialism has more often than not been carefully navigated by our scholars, if not by-passed altogether.²⁰ Linda Tuiwai Smith has written of a sneaking suspicion amongst indigenous academics ‘that the fashion of post-colonialism has become a strategy for reinscribing or reauthorizing the privileges of non-indigenous academics because the field of “postcolonial” discourse has been defined in ways which can still leave out indigenous peoples, our ways of knowing and our current concerns’.²¹ In Aotearoa, Leonie Pihama has contended, the use of the notion postcolonial ‘not only centres Pākehā definitions’, but is also disturbing in its denial of the voices of Māori. She argued that ‘the notion of post-colonialism... is itself a contradiction’ in a society where ‘every aspect of our lives is touched and imposed upon by the colonisers’.²² These concerns, among many others, have led indigenous scholars, and Māori in particular, to take what they can from postcolonialism and move on, or rather, move away from what Sheilagh Walker has described as its ‘Pākehā centred theoretical framework’.²³

In many ways this seems ironic for a theory that considered writing back to the centre an empowering act yet forgot that the centre *itself* was the problem. Instead of an examination of the intersecting trajectories shared between post-modern and postcolonial theories, then, ‘past the last post’ might have a certain meaning for Māori, who have sought to place their mātauranga at the core of their work.²⁴ The resulting theoretical approach has been termed by some ‘Kaupapa Māori theory and practice’, a theory of change, liberation and transformation, and even ‘the philosophy and practice of being Māori’.²⁵ Kathie Irwin ‘characterises it as research which is culturally safe, which involves the mentorship of elders, which is culturally relevant and appropriate while satisfying the rigour of research, and which is undertaken by a Māori researcher, not someone who happens to be

Māori’.²⁶ This issue is not a new one in Māori and iwi history but certainly one fleshed out in the growing literature in Kaupapa Māori. In replying to the question, ‘Can a non-indigenous researcher carry out Kaupapa Māori research?’ Linda Tuhiwai Smith wrote that ‘a non indigenous, non-Māori person can be involved, but not on their own, and if they were involved in such research, they would have ways of positioning themselves as a non-indigenous person’.²⁷ The expanding literature in Kaupapa Māori offers insights to the way we might better understand how to research and present Māori knowledge and history, and how we might improve our practice, and communicate with iwi and hapū. ‘Its popularity’, as Kathie Irwin noted, ‘lies perhaps in its ability to both acknowledge and accommodate Māori ways of being within an approach that remains academically rigorous’.²⁸ ‘It is not’, as Graham Smith argued, ‘a rejection of Pākehā knowledge and or culture’, but ‘advocates excellence within both cultures’.²⁹ This is a vital point, because it alludes to the ongoing role that Pākehā scholars have in preventing further colonial oppression, while suggesting the potential for them to truly find themselves and their history in the process. The underlying question remains though: is it really possible for Pākehā scholars to bridge the gap between their worldviews and ours? The answer from a Māori and iwi perspective is a resounding ‘yes’ — but as we have observed, albeit in vastly different circumstances, there is a considerable re-positioning of power that is part of the process.³⁰ Indeed, for a group so versed and capable in the world of our colonizers it seems bizarre to consider the idea that Pākehā people could *not* adapt to our worldviews when we have become past masters at functioning in theirs. Perhaps the real question is not whether it is possible to ‘close the gaps’ but whether Pākehā are conscious of or determined enough to relinquish their positions of power in order to learn, grow and adapt.³¹

But before this can happen, there is first required a reconsideration of some of the confining theoretical approaches that still hinder historical research in our country; approaches that have largely ignored the way Māori and iwi communities conduct research and interpret our histories. It means that many still have to move beyond the opinion espoused by one of our most celebrated colleagues, who wrote: ‘it is not the role of the historian to be involved in this process, other than by saying: “Here is the evidence. This is what we know and do not know. Here is an historical context in which to view that evidence. Draw your own conclusions.”’³² This approach would deny a necessary self-reflective practice that has become central to understanding how to research Māori and iwi history, and would dismiss the obvious cultural, social and political realities of those for whom the work we do matters most. In this regard I would urge us to continue to reject the anti-theoretical stance adopted by historians and commentators such as Keith Windschuttle and Stuart C. Scott, whose denial appears to begin with the strained logic that somehow theory is murdering our discipline, and that we can simply carry on with an outdated empirical practice as if it was never problematic.³³

For Māori and iwi, the re-claiming of our world from the clutches of those who would consume it requires a pathway that has been partially signposted but is still evolving in theory and practice. In redefining our world, we assert the notion that as the indigenous people here we are not ‘other’, and resist those voices, discourses and frameworks that would either marginalize or subsume us.³⁴ To a large extent, this is what the nationalist focus within New Zealand history has done,

and continues to do.³⁵ It was a concern many years ago for Māori scholars, who suggested that Pākehā were taking our knowledge without negotiation because they believed that it was essentially New Zealand culture.³⁶ The nation, and ‘New Zealand-ness’, we realize has been so ingrained in our historical consciousness that it sometimes appears as if there is a clear distinction between New Zealand history and Māori and iwi history. In more recent times, Māori historians have contemplated what it will take ‘for our history writing to become not only the nation’s reading but also the nation’s memory’.³⁷ This perception of the status quo tells us that there is indeed a difference in the way Māori see our history and would like it to be told, and the reality of the way it has been presented in New Zealand scholarship without our consent or consideration.³⁸ The underlying issue here — again not a new one — was touched on by Tipene O’Regan well over a decade ago, when he asserted that ‘New Zealand’s past belongs to all New Zealanders — but first it is ours!’³⁹ Why is it that those sentiments were not picked up and understood by the majority of historians in this country way back then? ‘Perhaps’, as Frantz Fanon once wrote, ‘we have not sufficiently demonstrated that colonialism is not simply content to impose its rule upon the present and the future of a dominated country’. Indeed, as he states, ‘colonialism is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native’s brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of the oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures, and destroys it.’⁴⁰

The continual misinterpreting and disfiguring of our history reflects a failure by many researchers to place our mātauranga at the centre of their scholarship.⁴¹ For Māori and iwi, it is a vital issue, and means, as Linda Tuhiwai Smith commented, ‘that there is unfinished business [for Māori], that we are still being colonized (and know it), and that we are still searching for justice’.⁴² Years ago, it led commentators, such as Keri Kaa, to opine: ‘We have kept quiet for too long about how we truly feel about what is written about us by people from another culture. For years we have provided academic ethnic fodder for research and researchers. Perhaps it is time we set things straight by getting down to the enormous task of writing about ourselves.’⁴³

This ‘coming to know the past’ on our terms, in Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s words, ‘has been part of the critical pedagogy of decolonization’. Indeed, as she has argued, ‘to hold alternative histories is to hold alternative knowledges . . . Transforming our colonized views of our own history (as written by the West), however, requires us to revisit, site by site, our history under Western eyes. This in turn requires a theory or approach which helps us engage with, understand and then act upon history.’⁴⁴ In producing and refining a theoretical approach that appropriately and legitimately informs and enables our methodologies and practices, Māori scholars have increasingly turned to our own mātauranga, the foundational building blocks of our cultural and political communities. These sites are always personalized, tribal and familial locations, in which the mātauranga of our iwi and hapū reside, and upon which our scholarship is subject to the scrutiny of our pakeke, tūpuna and descendants.

*Ngāti Poroutanga: Beyond Postcolonialism and Kaupapa Māori*⁴⁵

Ehara toku maunga a Hikurangi i te maunga haere, engari he maunga tu tonu
My mountain Hikurangi never moves but rather it remains steadfast

Te Kani a Takirau

Despite its usefulness, Kaupapa Māori is not the only approach being used by Māori and iwi scholars, many of whom do not subscribe to it wholesale for a number of reasons. More often iwi scholars now look to centre their research in their own tribal paradigms, *kōrero tuku iho* and *tikanga*, and thus, in the process, have moved beyond a Kaupapa model that homogenizes Māori identity, experiences and *mātauranga*.⁴⁶ The significance of specific tribal and *hapū* interpretive frames has been a subject commented on by numerous Māori scholars. John Rangihau, for instance, pointed out some time ago how ‘being Maori’ has been ‘absolutely dependent’ on his history as a Tuhoe person. On the topic of iwi history he elaborated, ‘There are so many aspects about every tribal person. Each tribe has its own history. And it is not a history that can be shared amongst others. How can I share the history of Ngāti Porou, of Te Arawa, and Waikato? Because I am not of those people. I am a Tuhoe person and all I can share in is Tuhoe history.’⁴⁷

His views not only affirm tribal identity but also note a specific reluctance to speak on behalf of any other iwi. Operating within our own tribal boundaries — their intellectual parameters and structures — allows us to not only tell our own stories but to place our world at the centre of historical scholarship; a process that postcolonialism is incapable of realizing and will be until Pākehā scholars traverse the distance from their world to ours. Beyond a Kaupapa Māori approach, the more tribal-focused emphasis similarly places our *mātauranga* at the forefront, but it does so at a more intimate level, where being Māori is displaced by the more immediate realities of iwi.

This has been the challenge for Ngāti Porou, who have firmly resisted encroachments on our *mana* and self-determination by those who would subjugate us, would see us divided, or would disrupt and dispute our efforts to unite and to protect our history and identity.⁴⁸ Speaking on the topic of Ngāti Porou oral tradition, Apirana Mahuika has defined our history as specifically ours:

It is Ngāti Porou talking about Ngāti Porou. It is not anybody else talking about us. It is not about us writing about ourselves. It is about us talking about ourselves – that is oral tradition. It is about us singing about ourselves in terms of *ngā mōteatea* and so on because our *mōteatea* is part of our history. It is about us doing the *haka* about ourselves. It is not us being written about by other people. . . . In terms of this I don’t expect a Ngā Puhi to come along and talk about Ngāti Porou, in the same way that he doesn’t want me to go there and talk about Ngā Puhi.⁴⁹

In defining Ngāti Porou history on our own terms, the role of *kōrero tuku iho*, *whakapapa*, our own *tikanga* and *reo*, are vital. They are treasures and invaluable components that weave together forming our foundational worldview. When this foundation is attacked and threatened, the response, as Whaimutu Dewes points out, is often swift and unrelenting: ‘It’s a typical Ngāti Porou thing . . . like an overwhelming military response. You challenge their Ngāti Porouness, or anything

about Ngāti Porou... it's like poking a wasp nest, they will come out and they will hose you down, and look out.⁵⁰

Defining our world on our own terms has long been a refrain in Ngāti Porou history. From Te Kani a Takirau's fierce statement of independence in refusing the position of Māori King, to Te Kapunga Dewes's assertion of Ngāti Porou dialect in the simple daily greetings of others, Ngāti Porou have consistently sought to protect ourselves from overbearing outside influences.⁵¹ This defensive strategy has often been reiterated by our people, such as Keri Kaa, and more recently Turuhira Tatare, who in an interview in her home at Turanga nui a Kiwa declared: 'We have to learn to defend ourselves... I've seen my people being put down time and time again.... It's not going to happen to me, and I'm not going to let it happen to anybody else if I'm around. I'm proud of my people. But I don't trust [Pākehā].... They have an ulterior motive. And my people are not going to be put down by another culture. We're supposed to be partners in this country, and where's partnership gone?'⁵²

Although Ngāti Porou have been cautious of Pākehā intrusions, many have equally been careful to ensure their perspectives remain intact despite the sometimes enticing views of others. Reminiscing on his time at university, Herewini Parata recalled how important it was to base his knowledge of te reo within the distinctive, and living, language of home.⁵³ The need to have access to 'specialist people' with 'specialist knowledge', as he noted, enables us to validate our stories for ourselves, on our terms, and in ways that make sense to us.⁵⁴ Being Ngāti Porou has not meant a rejection of other identities but involves an explicit celebration of those whakapapa connections. Apirana Mahuika has argued that the primary role of whakapapa is to include and not exclude.⁵⁵ In Ngāti Porou this concept was emphasized by Ta Apirana Ngata, who in coining the phrase 'Te Wīwī Nāti' made reference to the notion that wīwī — close compacting growing rushes — symbolize a sense of unity and togetherness.⁵⁶ Ngāti Poroutanga, then, embraces the varying mātauranga of our own tūpuna, from Maui, Paikea, Porou Ariki, Uepohatu and Ruawaipu, to Hauti, Te Rangitawaea, Uetuhiao, Ruataupare and Tuwhakairi; ora, to name but a few.⁵⁷ The colourful and vibrant complexities of who we are reflect a rich tapestry of whakapapa and history that is held in varying communities along the east coast. Kura Tibble noted how in her day:

Every community had their own kapahaka group. Like Rangitukia ... and us, we were known as Hinerupe, and there was another crew known as Putaanga ... and of course the ones from Te Araroa ... very active the people here in those days, and we had competitions amongst ourselves. We used to go to Ruatorea, and compete with the ones over there like Hiruharama, and Ruatorea group, Hikurangi, they were known then. Everybody had their own [songs], that's when those composers were in their prime. Because Tuini was here then, and we had Henare Waitoa here.⁵⁸

Understanding and interpreting this world requires a close association with each community, whose experts, composers, stories and songs tell parts of a broader narrative, one in which oral tradition celebrates Ngāti Porou diversity. One of the most well-rehearsed stories in Ngāti Porou history recounts the life and times of the revered warrior chief Tuwhakairiora. His achievements, committed to

print by a number of authors such as the Rev. Mohi Turei, Waipaina Awarau and Bob McConnell are still a more vibrant and living history in oral tradition.⁵⁹ These histories, though, as Herewini Parata pointed out, even in print are never the same because they rely on local storytellers to reflect them as living accounts relative to the communities they reside in now:

My uncle Tamati had done this research and he had found this story about the Tuwhakairiora story written by Waipaina Awarau — Waipaina Awarau’s thesis on Tuwhakairiora. So he thought he had found something totally new ... At that time uncle Tamati was teaching in Te Aroha, and so he went over to papa (Haanara ‘Arnold’ Reedy), to tell papa that he had found this great story about Tuwhakairiora. He had put it onto a tape. The tape had started and papa stopped the tape and said Kaati. That’s not the story, this is the story. So papa started to talk the Tuwhakairiora story from his line, because Waipaina’s was from an Iritekura perspective. Papa’s was from a Paakanui perspective And then you’d probably get someone else from the Wharekahika perspective. It would be slightly different, but it’s all the same story, but at the end of the day you are aligned to the stories that you’ve been told.⁶⁰

The oral traditions and mātauranga that inform who we are, as Herewini highlights here, are complex and living realities for the various communities that retain them. Ngāti Poroutanga, then, is situated within a dynamic body of knowledge, which at once challenges and accepts the notion that siblings, mokopuna and descendants can lay claim to the same tūpuna, and rangatira, but remember them in their own distinctive ways. This again is affirmed by Apirana Mahuika, who noted that: ‘When you get two people reporting on the same incident they will have different emphases, and different aspects of the story they will tell, and they forget other aspects of the story, not that those other aspects did not occur, but because of their particular interest in what they are observing.’⁶¹ The transmission of this knowledge across the generations lies with those whose expertise surpasses others, those who are ‘specialists’, experts in not only the interpretations specific to their own areas but in the subtle nuances that alter them from one marae and hapū to the next.

A Ngāti Poroutanga approach, then, places our local knowledge and theories of the world at the heart of our scholarship. It takes for granted that our mātauranga forms the foundations upon which a narrative of our history should be produced, interpreted and understood. In this way, it highlights the significance of tūpuna such as Maui Tikitiki-a-Taranga, whose importance as the lament ‘Haere ra e hika’ (farewell dear one) reminds us is commemorated in his now famous expedition aboard the waka Nukutaimemeha:

... te waka i hiia ai te whenua nui nei
... the vessel which fished up this great land

More than a song, this mōteatea serves as part of a broader historical narrative that grounds the actions and accounts of our tūpuna within our mātauranga. The history of Maui as a mischievous and adventurous protagonist is only one of the many exemplars of how our society operated then and now.⁶² He, amongst other Ngāti Porou ancestors, provides not only the foundation stories of our

history but templates for appropriate, and even inappropriate, conduct in research and representation. These *kōrero tuku iho*, in combination, form the essential components of a Ngāti Porou paradigm that is crucial to understanding and representing our history.

On the topic of tribal, and particularly Ngāti Porou, history, Monty Soutar has warned against the practice of ‘trying to fit tribal history’ within a Western model of how history should be written.⁶³ The developing of our own *hapū* and tribal perceptions of the past has been a central part of the work amongst generations of Ngāti Porou scholars. Te Pakaka Tawhai, for instance, noted how Sir Apirana Ngata’s night schools were adapted to meet the needs and interpretations of each *hapū* and local community: ‘The school of whakapapa met weekly at the pavilion on Whakarua Park, and the culture school met at Rongomai-a-niwaniwa in Tikitiki. Later the schools would divide into smaller groups and disperse to other venues to study the details appropriate for study there. The classes were held deep into the long nights of the winter of 1942.’⁶⁴ Although these smaller clusters and *whānau* groups divided into their own localities, each remained connected to a broader tribal identity. In reference to this unification Tawhai wrote: ‘We Tairāwhiti folk like the inference of strength that lies in the corporateness implied in the word *iwi*. We therefore present ourselves to the members of other *iwi* and also to one another as Ngāti Porou when we wish to project a united front . . . We encourage other *iwi* to think of us this way.’⁶⁵

The landscape of Ngāti Poroutanga, then, although richly coloured in its own unique shades, draws on multiple interpretations within its *mātauranga*. It highlights those things that are peculiar to, and characteristic of, our worldviews, values, attitudes and theories. For example, writing on the subject of female leadership in Ngāti Porou, Apirana Mahuika has emphasized the equal role that our female ancestors shared with their male counterparts in directing and serving the people.⁶⁶ In addressing the failings of primogeniture as a way of describing leadership within Ngāti Porou his thesis highlights our own distinctive frames of reference by placing our interpretations at the forefront.

Presenting Māori and *iwi* histories within their own interpretive frames of reference has been an issue addressed by various Māori scholars. Danny Keenan, for instance, has suggested that historians might yet consider Māori and *iwi* history as it takes place from the *paepae*, and thus in the process enable a presenting of evidence that makes sense within Māori conventions and paradigms.⁶⁷ Drawing on our *mātauranga* as the templates for not only researching but representing the past requires a commitment to finding and grounding ourselves within those localities. These worldviews, enriched with our perspectives, are often relevant to varying historical contexts and situations as they are retold, and revisited, across generations. Perhaps one of the best examples of this in Ngāti Porou can be found in varying renditions of the *haka Te Kiringutu*. As Ngata wrote:

This composition has come down the generations and had its greatest revival with topical adaptations in 1888, when the Porourangi meeting house was formally opened. Led by the late Tuta Nihoniho, a noted chief of the Hikurangi subtribes, a section of Ngāti Porou registered their protest against the rating of their lands and the taxation of articles of every day consumption, specifying the ‘*pu tōriri*’ or the tobacco plant. It was revived again at

the Waitangi celebrations in 1934 and was adopted by the men of the 9th and 10th Maori reinforcements as the ‘*piece de resistance*’ of the recent celebration of the opening of Tamatekapua at Rotorua. Its main theme is not outdated, the complementary, yet seemingly, contradictory features of civilisation with the still novel but bitter pill of taxation.⁶⁸

Far removed from the ‘loyalist’ and ‘Queenite’ labels that have sometimes been attached to Ngāti Porou, Te Kiringutu tells a more accurate story, one that aligns with Te Kani a Takirau’s assertion of independence. Indeed, in its own fierce and confronting prose, it reflects in poetic form a similar affirmation stressed by Monty Soutar in his biographical account of the life and leadership of Rapata Wahawaha: that is, an overarching concern to protect and assert what is in the best interest of Ngāti Porou.⁶⁹ In this regard the haka asserts:

A haha! Na te ngutu o te
Māori, pohara,
Kai kutu, na te werweri koe
i hōmai ki konei
E kāore iara, I haramai tonu
Koe
Ki te kai whenua

To remove the tattoo from Māori
lips, relieve his distress,
Stop him eating lice, and cleanse
him of dirt and disgust
Yea! But all that was a deep-lined
design, neath which to
devour our lands!⁷⁰

Although Ngāti Porou have been quick, and often eager, to embrace theories and practices from elsewhere, these lines stand as a reminder that at every point in the evolvment of our mātauranga we have carefully considered and negotiated their strengths and limitations. Subsequently, despite the seemingly intrusive and corrosive embedding of colonial discourses and ideologies, Ngāti Poroutanga has constantly been shaped from within, and remains the living and vibrant body of knowledge central to understanding our world.

Framing the past within these paradigms requires a movement beyond just a postcolonial or a Kaupapa Māori approach. It necessarily involves a relocating that places Ngāti Poroutanga at the centre, builds on our theories about the formation and naming of the land, accentuates our tikanga, narrative structures and historical perspectives, and invokes the nuances and peculiarities that exist within our language and people from one valley and bay to the next. This is a people whose historical narrative affirms Maui not as some imaginary figure but as a vital protagonist in history whose now-famous fishing expedition anchors our relationship with the land.⁷¹ To apply a foreign interpretive mode of analysis to this world would be akin to navigating our history using a compass from ‘elsewhere’, set in a latitude and longitude that simply has no bearing within the realities of

Ngāti Porou. Such an undertaking would only serve to widen the distance between us, to perpetuate the mistakes of earlier researchers and historians, and to produce misguided and ill-informed descriptions of a history that belongs to the people it represents. Moving beyond postcolonial and Kaupapa Māori theory to embrace the epistemological and theoretical frameworks of iwi and hapū is a journey that requires a closing of the gaps. It reconfigures the positions of power that have for too long expected Māori to assimilate and align with Western views of history. Moreover, it allows Pākehā living and writing within the boundaries of Māori communities to truly belong as they immerse themselves in a culture, community and history that is a unique and ultimate expression of ‘here’.⁷²

‘Oku Kaenga Waewae’: Finding the way ‘home’⁷³

kia hora te marino, kia whakapapa pounamu te moana, kia tere te karohirohi i mua i to huarahi⁷⁴

We share a history that has predominantly been represented by writers and researchers from elsewhere. The New Zealand histories that they write about, and explore, often remain removed from the narratives and perspectives of the tangata whenua, and will continue to do so until there is a more active effort to acclimatize and adjust to the Māori and iwi world they inhabit. Despite its usefulness, postcolonial theory in its various guises does little to narrow this expanse, and if anything maintains the illusion that ethical and culturally appropriate research might be done at a distance. Similarly, Kaupapa Māori, although a much more preferred and appropriate theoretical approach, is limited in its ability to bridge the gaps between those who are outsiders and insiders. Indeed, there are still many areas, as Tipene O’Regan has stated, into which ‘the outsiders, the tauiwī, step at their own peril’, yet whether most realize it or not, they have already been treading those pathways without a compass or map for some time.⁷⁵ This is because most seem to operate under the belief that New Zealand history and Māori and iwi history are not the same, and therefore suppose that ‘the treacherous waters of Māori history’ might safely be avoided in their research.⁷⁶

New Zealand history is not simply Māori history but is built on the living and still breathing worlds of iwi and hapū. Beyond the postcolonial gaze, and even that of the Kaupapa Māori model, are particular tribal paradigms, such as that of Ngāti Porou, whose interpretive theories reside within our tikanga, reo and mātauranga. For New Zealand historians, the way is mapped clearly by these foundational markers, which signpost the most appropriate paths by which the distance might be bridged from their position to ours. The way forward has always been here, but the problem of unconsciousness and a lack of determination remain the real barriers to any movement from those already in power.⁷⁷ Becoming more fully aware of the ways in which colonial oppression is still ongoing in New Zealand historical scholarship is only a small step. Finding the determination and courage to do something about it requires a major shift in thinking and attitude. However, neither of these alone is enough to transform the current situation. It necessarily requires a ‘giving up of power’ to enable Māori to lead in a dialogue of change. Thus, closing the gaps requires change on multiple levels and layers, facilitated

by the willingness in action of all manuhiri to embrace and empower the tangata whenua, and to essentially throw off the identity of settlers and colonizers, and be clothed again in the garments, language, identities and histories common to the home people.

In the meantime, Māori are still waiting while they toil away at navigating a future many Pākehā seem reluctant to share. The mātauranga-a-iwi that is steadily emerging in more and more Māori scholarship signals the future of both Kaupapa Māori and postcolonialism in New Zealand, and has a ready space available to non-Māori researchers should they be courageous and forward thinking enough to embrace it.⁷⁸ But it necessitates a bold revisioning of their world and not ours, which places our mātauranga at the centre and asks them to consider their reality as historians from elsewhere, submitting to a stripping of their history in order to more fully understand ours. The mātauranga-a-iwi approach applies as much to our own people as it does to tauwi and Pākehā, because it provides a map home for those who suffered from the indignity of having their identities, language and history systematically taken away from them. Like postcolonialism and Kaupapa Māori, it too offers a theory of change and transformation, and a methodological artifice to assist liberation and self-determination. For this reason, it also offers a way forward for non-Māori, whose role and place within the future and past of these communities is viewed as vital to the emancipatory process. How this is articulated in each iwi and hapū, though, remains one of the peculiarities that highlights the nuances from one location to the next.

Closing the gaps, as I have suggested in this article, challenges those who are committed to belonging and finding their way ‘home’ in Aotearoa to first reassess their position in this historical landscape. Most Māori and iwi researchers traverse these highways and byways at every moment not only in their scholarship but in their daily lives, and they are constantly aware of their role in negotiating the divides that separate our past, present and future worlds. Some have now grown tired of waiting for our colleagues to reciprocate, are wearisome of the burden of reminding them at every second conference about their ethical obligations as Treaty partners or their vital place in the shaping of a world we can both satisfactorily inherit. The significance of postcolonial and Kaupapa Māori theory in not simply awakening scholars but assisting them in producing more appropriate and sound research is central to the process of closing the gaps. However, beyond these theories of resistance, reclamation, liberation and self determination are real communities within which those theories are refined, personalized and living. They provide the essential mātauranga that give local meaning to how these theories work in practice. Without these foundations in place — at the heart of historical scholarship here in Aotearoa — there will always be a gaping chasm between Māori, iwi and tauwi interpretations of the past. Kaupapa Māori and postcolonialism can only take us so far. Their usefulness is inextricably dependent on how they materialize within the work of those who have sought to ground themselves in the language, tikanga, and mātauranga of the iwi kaenga.⁷⁹ Only then can one truly belong.

NOTES

1 I would like to acknowledge all those who have read drafts and suggested amendments to this article. ‘Closing the gaps’, as it is envisioned here, was inspired from a number of conversations with Peter Gibbons, whose re-envisioning of this concept prompted my own desire to explore the idea further in these pages. Ngā mihi aroha hoki ki ōku iwi, Apirana Mahuika, Herewini Parata, Turuhira Tatare, Kura Tibble me Whaimutu Dewes, mo ō ratou manaakitanga.

2 P. Bourdieu refers to the concept of cultural or social capital as ‘the aggregate of actual or potential resources linked to a group’. See P. Bourdieu, ‘The Forms of Capital’, in J.G. Richardson, ed., *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*, New York, 1986, pp.241–58. In contrast, those ‘who do not have the appropriate cultural capital are considered “other” by virtue of their ethnicity, language and class’ and are therefore in a position of disadvantage. See Russell Bishop and Ted Glynn, eds, *Culture Counts: Changing Power Relations in Education*, Palmerston North, 1999, pp.139, 151. ‘Deficit theorizing’ has become a phrase associated with the pathologizing of particular groups as inferior. For further reading here see Carolyn M. Shields, Russell Bishop and André Elias Mazawi, eds, *Pathologizing Practices: The Impact of Deficit Thinking on Education*, New York, 2005.

3 See Winston Peters, ‘Treaty Lunacy and Treaty People’, Speech delivered to Clevedon Electorate Public Meeting, Beachlands Community Hall, 49 Wakelin Road, Beachlands, Auckland, 28 May 2002.

4 The ‘native’, ‘savage’ and ‘rebel’ were well-rehearsed identifiers of Māori well into the twentieth century. See Angela Ballara, *Proud to be White? A Survey of Pakeha Prejudice in New Zealand*, Auckland, 1986; W. Hugh Ross, for instance, refers repeatedly to Te Kooti as the ‘arch-rebel’. See W. Hugh Ross, *Te Kooti Rikirangi: General and Prophet*, Auckland, 1966. Māori education, for some time, favoured a ‘natural’ pathway to labouring work. See Judith Simon, ed., *Ngā Kura Māori: The Native Schools System, 1867–1969*, Auckland, 1998.

5 J. K. Hunn, *Report on Department of Maori Affairs with Statistical Supplement*, Wellington, 24 August 1960, pp.15–16.

6 The Ka Awatea Report, commissioned under a National-led government, noted low educational achievement, poor health, high levels of unemployment, high state dependency and high representations in crime and imprisonment as key issues facing Māori development. The Ministry of Māori Development, *Ka Awatea, a Report of the Ministerial Planning Group*, Wellington, March 1991, p.9.

7 Michael Laws, ‘Maori Party Apologist for excesses of its people’, *Sunday Star Times*, 29 March 2009, <http://www.stuff.co.nz/sunday-star-times/opinion/2298978/Michael-Laws-Maori-Party-apologist-for-excesses-of-its-people> (accessed 17 January 2011).

8 Former Labour Party leader Helen Clark offered these comments following the 2004 Foreshore and Seabed hikoi: ‘What it is, is the same old faces. The Ken Mairs, the Harawira family, the Annette Sykes, the haters and wreckers, the people who destroy Waitangi every year, now wanting to do a Waitangi in every town in New Zealand on the way to Wellington where they will do a Waitangi on the steps of Parliament. Is this not what New Zealand has got absolutely sick and tired of?’ Interview for TVNZ *One News*, 4 May 2004.

9 Although Kaupapa Māori draws on some postcolonial literature, its primary points of difference lie in (a) its focus on an emancipatory solution, and (b) its centring on Māori frames of knowledge. There is also a much more specific exploration of the role of the insider and outsider in Kaupapa Māori literature.

10 See Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, Dunedin, London and New York, 1999, p.23.

11 Graham Hingangaroa Smith, ‘Kaupapa Māori Theory: theorizing indigenous transformation of education and schooling’, paper presented at NZARE/AARE Joint Conference, Kaupapa Māori Symposium, Auckland, December, 2003, p.2.

12 The importance of theory is not a new issue in historical scholarship. For many, a better understanding of theory will enable a deeper appreciation of the ways in which history is created, interpreted and represented. The narrow empirical practice of objective history, for instance, has been critiqued by a number of scholars. Perhaps one of the most notable, Peter Novick, argues against an unachievable objective position inherent within the discipline. See Peter Novick, ‘Nailing Jelly to the Wall’, in *That Noble Dream: the “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession*, Cambridge, 1988.

13 Salman Rushdie, *Shame*, London, 1984, pp.63–64. This subtitle adopts Rushdie's concept of the 'Writer From Elsewhere', and accompanies a short quote from his acclaimed novel, *Shame*, in which the migrant or historian from elsewhere's journey involves a leaving behind of their past as they seek to belong in a new world. In the context of this article it refers to the starting point from which some historians might yet move beyond their entrenched views to an understanding of how Māori perceive and represent history. See also Stefano Manferlotti 'Writers from Elsewhere', in Iain Chambers, and Lidia Curti, eds, *Postcolonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons*, London, 1996, pp.189–95.

14 Michael King, *Being Pakeha Now: Reflections and Recollections of a White Native*, Auckland, 1999, p.235.

15 For further reading on postcolonial theory see, Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, eds, *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*, London, 1995.

16 Rushdie and R.K. Narayan have both written extensively on the postcolonial condition in India. Rushdie's *Midnight's Children* and *The Satanic Verses* are perhaps the two best examples of his flair for historical fiction and magical realism. He is a highly provocative and subversive novelist who has earned both acclaim and infamy. Narayan is also a prolific author. His work, although not as confrontational as Rushdie's, is also well versed in postcolonial literature. See Salman Rushdie, *Midnight's Children*, London, 1981; *The Satanic Verses*, London, 2006; R. K. Narayan, *The Vendor of Sweets*, Harmondsworth, 1983.

17 I deliberately do not seek to define postcolonialism in this article, but rather note that its invention and perpetuation as a theory and practice related to colonial struggles is multifaceted and complex. Thus, it has certain meanings for those in various colonial contexts, including India, Australia and the United States, which do not necessarily reflect the realities of Māori.

18 Edward Said, *Orientalism*, London, 1978; Gayatri Spivak, 'Can the Subaltern Speak?', in Cary Nelson and Larry Grossberg, eds, *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Chicago, 1988, pp.271–313; Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, London, 1965; Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, translated by Myra Bergman Ramos, Harmondsworth, 1972.

19 Moana Jackson, 'Research and Colonisation of Māori Knowledge', *He Pukenga Kōrero*, 4, 1 (1998), p.71.

20 Leonie Pihama maintains that 'few Māori people use the term to describe or locate their work, rather, Māori works tend to be labelled as 'postcolonial' by Pākehā. This then raises issues about who defines Māori writing'. See Leonie Pihama, 'Ko Taranaki te Maunga: Challenging Post-colonial Disturbances and Post-modern Fragmentation', *He Pukenga Kōrero*, 2, 2 (1997), p.11.

21 Linda Tuhiwai Smith, p.24.

22 Pihama, p.9.

23 Cited in *ibid.*, p.9

24 'Past the last post' is a phrase used by a number of postcolonial scholars. Adam and Tiffin's edited collection of essays focused on the often competing discourses at work in post-modernism and postcolonial scholarship, examining the terminology and theoretical strains, ironies and tropes that have accentuated the creation of meaning through 'text', the 'lived' experience, and other formal and political contemporary contexts. See Ian Adam and Helen Tiffin, eds, *Past the Last Post: Theorizing Post-Colonialism and Post-Modernism*, Calgary, 1990; and more recently in the New Zealand context Giselle Byrnes, 'Past the Last Post? Time, Causation, and Treaty Claims History', *Law Text Culture*, 7 (2003), pp.251–76.

25 A Kaupapa Māori approach is inextricably connected to the local mātauranga, which is unable to be deciphered or articulated within a postcolonial frame built on non-Māori intellectual frameworks. See Graham H. Smith, 'Tane-nui-a-rangi's legacy: Propping up the sky. Kaupapa Māori as resistance and intervention'. Paper presented at NZARE/AARE Joint Conference, Deakin University Australia, published in *Creating Space in Institutional Settings for Māori*, Auckland, 1992, p.1; Graham Smith, 'Whakaoho Whanau: New formations of whanau as an intervention into Māori cultural and educational crises', *He Pukenga Kōrero*, 1, 1 (1995), pp.18–36.

26 Cited in Linda Tuhiwai Smith, p.184.

27 *ibid.*

28 Cited in Rangimarie Mahuika, 'Kaupapa Māori Theory is Critical and Anti-Colonial', *Mai Review*, (2008), p.2.

29 Graham Smith, 'Kaupapa Māori: Educational resistance and intervention in Aotearoa (New Zealand)', in G. Smith, ed., *Higher Education for Indigenous Peoples*, Auckland, 1993, p.5.

30 It should be noted that never at any time have Māori maintained the dominant power position in adapting to and negotiating their way in the Pākehā world. For Pākehā, the process of closing the

gaps is simply not the same, but nevertheless requires them to relinquish their power. On this topic, the Hawaiian historian Huanani-Kay Trask has written that ‘if it is truly *our* history Western historians desire to know, they must put down their books and take up our practices.... They must come... not in the Western way, but in the indigenous way’ (emphasis added). See Huanani-Kay Trask, ‘From a Native Daughter’, in Calvin Martin, ed., *The American Indian and the Problem of History*, New York, 1987, p.178.

31 In regard to the role of the colonizer Paulo Freire has argued that ‘the oppressor... is unable to lead this struggle’, but in ‘discovering himself to be an oppressor’ must necessarily seek ‘true solidarity with the oppressed’ by ‘fighting at their side to transform the objective reality’, pp.29; 31.

32 King, *Being Pakeha Now*, p.207.

33 See both Keith Windschuttle, *The Killing of History*, Sydney, 1996, and Stuart C. Scott, *The Travesty of Waitangi: Towards Anarchy*, Christchurch, 1995. It should be pointed out that Windschuttle’s belief that traditional history has suffered from the rise of literary and social theories has largely been rejected by New Zealand historians. Similarly non-academic historians such as Stuart C. Scott and other ‘anti-Treatyists’ have been critiqued for their resistance ‘rather than addressing of modern scholarly developments’. See Richard Hill, ‘Anti-Treatyism and Anti-Scholarship: An Analysis of Anti-Treatyist Writings’, Treaty of Waitangi Research Unit: Occasional Papers Series, no. 8, Wellington, 2002, p.11.

34 I draw here on some of the words and phrasing of Leonie Pihama, p.14.

35 Kerry Howe writes that New Zealand’s historiography is determined by an underlying ‘national focus’. See Kerry Howe, ‘Two Worlds’, *New Zealand Journal of History* (NZJH), 37, 1 (2003), p.50.

36 Hirini Moko Mead made this observation some time ago, ‘Maoritanga, Should It Be Shared?’, *Listener*, 10 December 1977, p.56.

37 Aroha Harris, ‘Theorize This: We Are What We Write’, *Te Pouhere Kōrero, Māori History, Māori People*, 3 (2009), p.89.

38 A recent example of this is Paul Moon’s disappointing history of Māori cannibalism, in which little consideration was given to mātauranga Māori and virtually no kōrero or hui with Māori scholars or communities were held to seek their views, advice or support in regard to the way our people are depicted in the book. Paul Moon, *This Horrid Practice: The Myth and Reality of Traditional Maori Cannibalism*, Auckland, 2008. See further Rawiri Te Maire Tau, ‘Review of Paul Moon, This Horrid Practice’, *Te Pouhere Kōrero, Māori History, Māori People*, 3 (2009), pp.123–4. Moon’s book is, however, a rather extreme example of history writing in New Zealand that is not located within a Māori or iwi framework. Most New Zealand histories tend to relegate Māori to the peripheries as they assert and re-assert their overarching narratives. For further comment on this see Nēpia Mahuika, ‘Migration and the Nation: Revitalizing te-ika-a-Maui’, *NZJH*, 43, 2, (2009), pp.133–49.

39 Tipene O’Regan, ‘Who Owns the Past? Change in Māori Perceptions of the Past’, in John Wilson, ed., *From the Beginning: The Archaeology of the Māori*, Auckland, 1987, p.145.

40 Frantz Fanon, ‘On National Culture’, in Guarav Desai and Supriya Nair, eds, *Post-Colonialisms: An Anthology of Cultural Theory and Criticism*, Piscataway, N.J., 2005, p.200.

41 For instance, see Vincent Ward’s feature film *Rain of the Children*, South Melbourne, Victoria, 2008. Ward’s film has been criticized by Tairihia Black, who argued that its ‘mono-cultural’ frame reflected a skewed perspective that effectively ‘displaced’ and ‘exiled’ the colonized by allowing a ‘ghost story’ based on a warped interpretation of ‘mākutu’ to take centre stage. See Tairihia Black, ‘That’s My Nan!’ Review of the Film-Documentary *Rain of the Children* directed by Vincent Ward. Ngā Oho Whakaari: Māori in Film and Television Inc (2008). See http://www.ngaahowhakaari.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/2009/12/naw_thats_my_nan.pdf (accessed 17 January 2011).

42 Linda Tuhiwai Smith, p.34.

43 Cited in King, *Being Pakeha Now*, p.184.

44 Linda Tuhiwai Smith, p.34.

45 Ngāti Poroutanga encapsulates the mātauranga, the tikanga, history, songs, life and language of the descendents of Porourangi, whose traditional boundaries lie between Potikirua and Te Toka-a-Taiau on the east coast of the North Island. For a more sustained discussion on the Ngāti Porou perspective see Apirana Mahuika, ‘A Ngāti Porou Perspective’, in Malcolm Mulholland and Veronica Tawhai, eds, *Weeping Waters: The Treaty of Waitangi and Constitutional Change*, Wellington, 2010, pp.145–63.

46 Two published examples of this are Te Maire Tau and Atholl Anderson, eds, *Ngāi Tahu: A Migration History*, Wellington, 2008, and Mere Whaanga, *A Carved Cloak for Tahu*, Auckland, 2004. There are older examples, too, such as Ruka Broughton’s unpublished masters thesis, ‘Ko nga Paiaka o Nga Rauru Kītahi’, MA thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, 1979, and Monty Soutar, ‘A History of Te Aitanga-a-Mate’, MA thesis, Massey University, 1998.

47 John Rangihau, ‘Being Māori’, in Michael King, ed., *Te Ao Hurihuri: Aspects of Māoritanga*, Auckland, 1992, p.190.

48 These challenges to our identity, history and mātauranga have not only come from the outside world but more recently from within, and have been fuelled by a claims process that enables the contestation and distorting of the past as a perceived means of discerning legitimate tribal representation. The contestation of tribal identity remains an issue on the east coast. However, this article positions itself in the life experience and history of the author, and those who maintain a definitive identity as Ngāti Porou. In 2001, the Ngāti Porou population reached 61,701, the second largest iwi group in the country. See Statistics New Zealand, *2001 Census: Iwi*, 1, p.11.

49 Apirana Tuahae Mahuika, Interviewed by Nēpia Mahuika (NM), Gisborne, 2009.

50 Whaimutu Dewes, Life Narrative recorded by NM, Rotorua, 2007, 1.05.30–1.06.02.

51 See Te Kani a Takirau’s whakatauaaki (proverb) at the beginning of this section. Here he refers to the steadfastness of Hikurangi as an anecdotal affirmation of his resolve to remain king in his own territory. This is at once a parochial declaration of Ngāti Porou independence, as well as a reminder that our future and aspirations will remain grounded in our world on our terms. During a hui at Hinerupe marae in 1995 Te Kapunga Dewes responded to a visitor’s greeting, ‘kei te pehea koe? (how are you), by declaring ‘Eta, you’re in “kei te aha country” now’ – a distinctive greeting within Ngāti Porou.

52 Turuhira Tatare, Life Narrative recorded by NM, Gisborne, 2008, 22.53–23.54.

53 Herewini Parata, Life Narrative recorded by NM, Gisborne, 2008, 1.42.25–1.42.57.

54 Parata, 1.37.21–1.37.32; 1.44.05–1.44.36.

55 He made these comments at a marae graduation ceremony at Waikato University in 2004. On the topic of whakapapa he also emphasized that our strength lies in our diversity as much as the close relationships we share.

56 See Tamati Reedy, ‘Ngāti Porou’, in *Māori Peoples of New Zealand*, Auckland, 2006, p.168.

57 Tamati Reedy notes that the tribe has taken Porourangi’s name for two reasons. First, because of his status as an individual from whom descended the major lines of Polynesia, including Toi and Whatonga, and, secondly, because his descendants ‘produced warriors whose conquests in battle, along with strategic marriage alliances, subdued many of the competing forces in the Gisborne and East Coast regions’. Reedy, p.164.

58 Kura Tibble, Life Narrative recorded by NM, Tikitiki, 2007, 21.21–22.34.

59 Mohi Turei, ‘Tuwhakairiora’, *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 20, 1 (1911), pp.17–34; Te Waipaina Awarau, ‘Tuwhakairiora’, MA thesis, University of Canterbury, 1972; Bob McConnell, *Te Araroa*, Gisborne, 1993.

60 Parata, 1.22.45–1.25.13.

61 Mahuika, 4.01–4.17.

62 The models for behaviour exhibited within the stories of Maui and others are the subject of Ranginui Walker’s essay, ‘The Relevance of Māori Myth and Tradition’, in Michael King, ed., *Te Ao Hurihuri*, pp.170–82. These models are highly relevant to understanding the paradigms at work within each tribal history. Ranginui Walker, *Ka Whāwhai Tonu Mātou: Struggle Without End*, rev ed, Auckland, 1994.

63 Monty Soutar, ‘A Framework for Analyzing Written Iwi Histories’, *He Pukenga Kōrero*, 2, 1 (1996), p.44.

64 Te Pakaka Tawhai, ‘He Tipuna Whareniui o te Rohe o Uepohatu’, MA thesis, Massey University, 1978, p.45.

65 *ibid.*, p.92.

66 Apirana Tuahae Mahuika, ‘Ngā Wahine Kaihatu o Ngāti Porou/ Female Leaders of Ngāti Porou’, MA thesis, University of Sydney, 1974.

67 Danny Keenan, ‘The Past from the Paepae: Uses of the Past in Maori Oral History’, *Oral History in New Zealand*, 12/13 (2000–1), pp.33–38.

68 Te Kapunga Dewes, ed., *Māori Literature, He Haka Taparahi: Men’s Ceremonial Dance poetry, na Te Hāmāna Mahuika, Arnold Reedy, Rev. Tipi Kaa, Mārū Karaka, Moni Taunaunu, Sir. Apirana Ngata*, Wellington, 1972, p.13.

69 Monty Soutar, ‘Ngāti Porou leadership: Rapata Wahawaha and the Politics of Conflict “kei te ora nei hoki tātou, me tō tātou whenua”’, PhD thesis, Massey University, 2000.

70 Dewes, p.13.

71 Nēpia Mahuika, pp.133–49.

72 ‘Here’ is an expression of the country we share together. This belonging, though, is dependent on the iwi kaenga, and particularly their process in enabling those from outside to share in their world.

73 The proverb ‘oku kaenga waewae’ here denotes the significance of traversing on foot the landscape that one might call home, and through the familiarity of that journey, coming to associate with the whenua and history of that space. It is vital to the notion of closing the gaps; that is, the treading of a pathway that allows one to understand through experience and time the world within which they might one day call home.

74 An invocation for those who might undertake a journey: ‘May peace be widespread, may the sea glisten like greenstone, and may the shimmer of light guide you on your way’. I use it here to encourage the beginning of a departure from ‘elsewhere’ to here.

75 O’Regan, p.145.

76 Angela Ballara has asked ‘should European scholars even attempt to enter the treacherous waters of ‘Māori history’? Angela Ballara, “‘I riro i te Hoko’’: Problems in Cross-Cultural Historical Scholarship’, NZJH, 34, 1 (2000), p.21. Compare her remarks with those of Te Maire Tau, ‘Mātauranga Māori as an Epistemology’, in Andrew Sharp and Paul McHugh, eds, *Histories, Power and Loss: Uses of the Past—A New Zealand Commentary*, Wellington, 2001, p.73.

77 Graham Smith wrote that ‘Conscientisation develops out of critique which is informed by both theoretical understandings and practical experiences’. He noted further that ‘Critique must not only indulge in forming a critical de-construction of “what is wrong”, it must also be provocatively generating positive and proactive intervention ideas, and strategies and transformative pathways’. As I have argued here, when iwi lead this process, Pākehā are then able to action these ‘ideas’ in a form of ‘praxis’ that shifts closer to iwi aspirations. Graham Hingangaroa Smith, ‘The Development of Kaupapa Maori: Theory and Praxis’, PhD thesis, The University of Auckland, 1997, p.484.

78 Some short examples can be found in the following: Rawinia Higgins, ‘Kei ngā Ngutu o ōku Kuia: It is tattooed on the lips of my Kuia’, *Te Pouhere Kōrero, Māori History, Māori People*, 4 (2010), pp.61–71; Ngarino Ellis, ‘The PhD Monologues: Navigating the Conventions of Māori Art History’, *Te Pouhere Kōrero, Māori History, Māori People*, 4 (2010), pp.6–14; Hirini Kaa, ‘PhD Monologues: Navigating Conventions in Māori History’, *Te Pouhere Kōrero, Māori History, Māori People*, 4 (2010), pp.72–78; Melissa Williams, ‘When It Comes To Your Own: Stories of Post-War Māori Migration’, *Te Pouhere Kōrero, Māori History, Māori People*, 4 (2010), pp.14–23. All these writers draw on their own iwi mātauranga to frame and discuss their topics. These are only a few examples of the growing array of work being produced by Māori historians.

79 The ‘iwi kaenga’ are the ‘home people’, those who have the right and responsibility to welcome and whakatau (seat), feed and house the manuhiri (visitors), who maintain the tikanga (protocols), and whose responsibility as kaitiaki (guardians) place them in an immediate position of accountability in retaining the tribes’ local practices, histories, knowledge and identity. They fulfil a vital role for the people, and are the ahi kaa.

Copyright of New Zealand Journal of History is the property of New Zealand Journal of History and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.