



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.

**CULTURAL THEORY MADE CRITICAL: TOWARDS A THEORY OF THE
INDIGENOUS INTELLECTUAL**

**A thesis
submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the Degree
of
Master of Education
at the
University of Waikato
by
HEMI TE RERE HIREME**

University of Waikato

2002

196
.H57
002

UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO
LIBRARY

24/02

CULATION REFERENCE
DESK ONLY

A-4120

ABSTRACT

Despite the fact that Western critical theory has provided us with theories of the power relations that operate within our lives, I argue that the indigenous element is nonetheless understated within these theories. To this end, my thesis is precisely that we must make the “cultural” critical. I argue that various theories of cognitive and moral submissiveness must be supplemented with a theory of submissiveness at the indigenous level in order for issues of latent power to be addressed. This thesis is therefore about developing a theory that for tangata whenua seeks to overcome one of the most debilitating effects of colonial domination – a loss of critical consciousness. I advocate the need for a new type of intellectual – the indigenous intellectual.

I present my thesis in two parts. Part One examines Western critical theory to understand the processes that contribute to colonial domination. Here, I identify relations and processes of power that have contributed to a continuing assault on tangata whenua cultural continuity and well-being. Of particular significance are Foucault’s study of governmentalisation and normalisation and Gramsci’s notion of hegemony and the traditional and organic intellectuals.

Part Two records not only how this understanding is put into action by way of the introduction of a “critical theory” component in programmes at Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi over a number of years, but also offers a critical cultural theory in the form of the indigenous intellectual. While it acknowledges the extreme value of Western critical theory in allowing tangata whenua to understand the relations of power and the effects of colonial domination, the programme also identifies the many

voids and spaces within Western critical theory that leave unanswered the oppressiveness and hegemony of cultural and ideological colonisation. I conclude my thesis by arguing that, whilst many in leadership positions claim allegiance to Gramsci's concept of the organic intellectual, their ideological stance is anything but organic. By examining why they do not represent indigenous interests "organically", I argue that a new concept is needed to expose the sham of much of our contemporary "inorganic" politics: that our cultural needs are better served by a concept of the "indigenous" intellectual.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In memory of my mother Rangimarie (Polly) Hireme and my father Robert (Paapu) Hudson.

To my whanau for your constant love and support.

To my Hireme, Hudson, Thrupp, Merito, Harnett, Waerea and Nukunuku extended whanau for being there.

To my supervisor Debbie Hill – He mihi aroha, tena rawa atu koe.

For my grandsons Tristan and Blaike Harnett.

CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
INTRODUCTION	6
CHAPTER ONE: I Am Not A Maori: Being Indigenous In a Neoliberal Environment.	
1.1 Introduction.....	9
1.2 I Am Not A Maori: The Application of a Foucauldian Toolbox.....	11
1.3 Governmentalisation of Power Relations.....	15
1.4 Tohunga Suppression Act (1907).....	20
1.5 Leapfrog, Tapu and Noa.....	25
1.6 Normalisation: Urbanisation, the “MDO” and Tangihanga.....	30
1.7 Regimes of Truth and the Insurrection of Subjugated Knowledges.....	32
1.8 Conclusion: Knowledge is the Liberator.....	35
CHAPTER TWO: Indigenous Education in Aotearoa: Change or Chimera?	
2.1 Introduction.....	37
2.2 A Loss of Land and a Loss of Consciousness.....	39
2.3 Educating a Culture of Silence: Freire’s Message.....	41
2.4 Indigenous Schooling in Aotearoa: McLaren’s Three Phases.....	46
2.5 Phase Four: Taha Maori.....	47
2.6 “New” Developments in Indigenous Schooling.....	51
2.7 Change or Chimera?.....	57
2.8 Kura Kaupapa – A Child of Neoliberalism.....	61
2.9 The Need for a Real Alternative.....	64
CHAPTER THREE: Gramsci and Althusser’s Contribution to Radical Change: Lessons on Cutting the Shackles at the Whare Wananga.	
3.1 Introduction.....	67
3.2 A Philosophy of Praxis and Historical Materialism.....	68
3.3 Base and Superstructure.....	70
3.4 Hegemony – Overcoming Intellectual and Moral Submissiveness.....	72
3.5 The Role of the Intellectuals.....	74
3.6 Althusser’s Application of Gramscian Theory.....	79
3.7 Althusserianism in a Neoliberal Society.....	83
3.8 Conclusion: Resisting the Silence.....	85

CHAPTER FOUR: Cutting the Crap

4.1	Understanding a Culture of Silence.....	87
4.2	Engaging With Language: The Use of Key Themes	88
4.3	From a “Culture of Silence” to a “Culture of Finance”	93
4.4	War – A Theoretical Framework.....	94
4.5	Overcoming a Culture of Silence – The Practice	96
4.6	Schooling as a Deliberate Strategy	99
4.7	Althusser’s Apparatus.....	101
4.8	A Taste of Hegemony.....	102
4.9	Bourdieu’s Cycle of Cultural Reproduction	103
4.10	A Freirean Connection.....	105
4.11	Conclusion: Western Philosophy and Tangata Whenua.....	107

CHAPTER FIVE: Understanding a Culture of Finance

5.1	Introduction.....	111
5.2	Colonisation by a Culture of Finance	111
5.3	War – A Theoretical Framework (Again):.....	112
5.4	Uncovering Neoliberalism.....	115
5.5	Individualism	116
5.6	State Devolution and the Free Market	120
5.7	Engaging the Enemy	123
5.8	A Bottom-Up View of Devolution	125
5.9	The Deceit.....	127
5.10	The Crime	130
5.11	The Concerns	131
5.12	The Consequences	133

CHAPTER SIX: Indigenous Intellectualism

6.1	Introduction.....	135
6.2	Kirkness Revisited.....	136
6.3	The Difference Between a Bus and a Train	138
6.4	“Democracy” Redefined	140
6.5	Indigenous Intellectualism in a Neoliberal Environment	144
6.6	Conclusion: Towards a Pedagogy of Emancipation	147

Bibliography	150
---------------------------	-----

Cultural Theory Made Critical: Towards a Theory of the Indigenous Intellectual.

Introduction

...I am advocating that we must first “cut the shackles”, free ourselves from mirroring a system that has not worked, then we must “cut the crap”, by less talk and more action; and then finally we must “cut the mustard”, which is to “practice what we preach.”. (Kirkness, 1999, p.27)

Verna Kirkness (1999) has argued that two factors have been at play which negatively affect the ability of indigenous people to bring to fruition radical changes in education that will work for all of us. The first is the manipulation by the state that sees indigenous peoples administering the schools just as the state has done in the past (p.24). In essence, this reflects the non-neutrality and political nature of schooling in a neoliberal environment. The second factor is our own people's insecurity in taking control and failing to design an education that would be based on “our culture, our way of life, and most important, our world view”. At the base of this attitude, she posits, lies the difficulty in overcoming colonial domination (ibid.).

By cutting the shackles, Kirkness suggests that what is needed is radical change. We must forget about band-aiding, adapting, and supplementing the curriculum with an “indigenous” content. We must also forget about adhering to the so-called standards, “all of which have restricted our creativity in determining our own master plan” (ibid.). We must cease listening to senseless arguments supporting compromising approaches that have not worked for us. Effectively, Kirkness's position is that indigenous people's practice must involve the process of placing “education into culture, not culture into education” and that indigenous people

must believe that “the answers are within us” (p.25). The greatest challenge therefore, lies in the ability of indigenous people “to be radical, to ask the right questions within the community, and to ask the families what they want for their children” (p.24). According to Kirkness, what needs to happen is for indigenous people to cut the shackles, cut the crap, and cut the mustard.

This thesis is about one indigenous tertiary institution’s attempt to do just that. It is a record of the journey undertaken to introduce a critical theory component into Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi’s programmes which directly addresses the two inhibiting factors to indigenous educational development; state manipulation and indigenous people’s insecurity as the result of a difficulty to overcome colonial domination. It is an attempt to introduce a theory and practice that has as its goal cultural continuity and an improved sense of well-being; both of which, for tangata whenua of Aotearoa, have been victims to colonial domination.

The first three chapters are about identifying, and then cutting, the shackles. Through a critique of relations of power and culture, Chapter One identifies the social manipulation Kirkness speaks of at both an individual and collective level. Here, although I predominantly appeal to the concept of power and governmentality as offered us by Michel Foucault, it needs to be stated right from the start that I am not interested in favouring any one theorist’s viewpoint as opposed to another’s. I take an eclectic approach in this thesis in so far as I appeal to many theorists who might be able to shed light on the problem of indigenous self-determination. Chapter Two therefore employs a mainly Marxist/socialist perspective, particularly employing Freirean imagery to identify the manipulation

that has occurred and continues to occur in the history of indigenous schooling in Aotearoa. The third chapter continues this survey. Here, Gramscian and Althusserian concepts are further added to my analysis of “educational” inadequacies, focusing on recent wananga initiatives and their efforts to present real educational solutions. Together, these three Chapters provide the theoretical “knowledge” on which the shackles to indigenous educational advancement can be identified, and then cut. Together also, they identify the circumstances that have contributed to indigenous people’s insecurity; an insecurity that is manifest in a “culture of silence”.

Chapters Four and Five are about cutting the crap, that is, less talk and more action. In particular, we have “stopped fooling ourselves” by acknowledging that the existing tertiary education system needs an “overhaul” and that there is a need to “seek more appropriate materials and strategies for teaching” (p.27). It is a record of how the “knowledge” gained in the previous three chapters is put into practice in a radical way.

Firstly, in identifying knowledge as a social construct (Young, 1971) our programme determines that the “knowledge” contained in Chapters One to Three should not be for graduate students alone, and in fact, should form the theoretical foundation for all critical theory at the wananga. Challenged is the right of “others” to determine for whom this knowledge is directed. For us, it is for everyone.

Secondly, in these chapters, I engage the issue of language. Because I choose to offer “graduate level” concepts to “new” students, invariably the discourse is shrouded in mystique and the exclusivity of academic language. The challenge has been to return language to a form of communication that respects and acknowledges the existential realities of our students, their cultural capital, and the vagaries of an unequal and uncompromising state schooling system. These Chapters are written in the style that is produced at the wananga. It is radical, it cuts the crap, and it is a “real” contribution to indigenous educational development made over a number of years.

Thirdly, these Chapters expose the cultural problematic that is neoliberalism, and how this “culture of finance” is running rampant within contemporary tangata whenua society as a result of a “culture of silence” that has historically been manufactured by the state. They offer an insight into how urgent it is for tangata whenua to cut the shackles and cut the crap if cultural continuity and an improved sense of well-being is to be achieved.

Chapter Six is about cutting the mustard. In other words, getting the job done, or more precisely, critically discussing the role indigenous leadership must play in getting the job done. The “job” in this case is overcoming a culture of silence situated within a culture of finance. This thesis argues that the “job” can be accomplished by the creation of a new form of intellectual – the indigenous intellectual. It will show that this form of intellectualism requires a radical approach; one that cuts the shackles, cuts the crap, and cuts the mustard; and is necessary if we are to get to where we want to go.

Kirkness provides five questions in which to frame this task (pp. 27-28). The first two questions are: “Where are we now and how did we get to where we are?”

Chapters One to Three seek to address these questions. The third question asks: “Where do we want to go?” Chapters Four and Five record the practices adopted at Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi as an example of where *we* want to go.

How will we get to where we want to go is addressed in Chapter Six by the legitimization of the indigenous intellectual. Finally she asks: “How will we know when we are there?” The answer to this fifth question is provided by Kirkness herself:

You will know you have achieved your goal of quality education when your children are enjoying the challenge of school/learning, when their self-esteem and self-confidence is evident, when your children are proud of who they are, and their links with the older generations are made. You will know you have achieved your goal when the majority of children who enter your system graduate and go on to further education or get a job, when they are living happy and fulfilled lives of their own making. This list could go on and on. (Kirkness, 1999, p.28)

Tangata whenua had an education system that met all these aims. This thesis argues that radical change is required to return once again to that position, and that it begins by “cutting the shackles,” “cutting the crap,” and “cutting the mustard.”

This thesis is presented in two parts. Chapters One to Three are written (shackled) to the academy’s expectations of thesis work. For most of the students at Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi this language is elitist, exclusive and incomprehensibly abstract. Arguably, it serves its purpose of denying the knowledge contained within being utilized by the many tangata whenua for whom

it is most relevant. It meets the hierarchical needs of the academy. It is also one of the reasons why there is a distinct lack of critical response among iwi; why the communication “gap” between iwi “leadership” and iwi membership is wider than ever before.

As a gate-keeping mechanism however, that is how it is supposed to be. I have to write in this style because I need to pass this degree so that I can get on with the real issue - obtaining the honourific capital that will enable me to contribute toward designing and controlling our own “knowledge” industry. It is an example of indigenous people’s contestation of Foucault’s knowledge/power nexus juxtaposed against the tyranny of a meritocratic society. For indigenous academics, it is a reality that creates huge personal and professional dilemmas through an apparent and perceived “need” to satisfy “them” to the detriment of a positive contribution for “us”. In short, radical change is about challenging a western intellectual tradition that continues to be the judge and jury for this contest.

Chapters Four and Five are about putting the theory into practice. It is about viewing education as a public good, and in this case, an absolutely good thing for tangata whenua who are concerned about cultural continuity and well-being. It challenges hierarchical notions of knowledge. It is *about* radical change. It is about writing a thesis in a language and style that may communicate to all people who may find it interesting, not just for the exclusive few. It is a *record* of radical change. It exposes manipulation for those who are being manipulated. It confronts. It challenges. It is an attempt to overcome the first challenge for tangata

whenua involved in education - radical change will only come about by radical thinking. It is time to overcome this culture of silence and colonial domination, to identify the manipulation and lose the insecurity. Liberation, not obfuscation, is the ultimate goal.

Chapter Six is about cultural proactivity. It explains the concept of an indigenous intellectual. It acknowledges the extreme value of Western critical theory in allowing tangata whenua to *understand* the relations of power and the effects of colonial domination. It acknowledges also the role Gramsci's organic intellectuals can play in bringing about change. But mostly, the indigenous intellectual identifies the voids and spaces within Western critical theory that leave unanswered the oppressiveness and hegemony of cultural and ideological colonization, and provides a platform from which an *authentic* process of *transformation* can take place.

For example, why is it that some tangata whenua intellectuals in positions of privilege and power measure "success" in terms of economic ideas and values alone, to the detriment of humanistic ones? The indigenous intellectual begins this critical analysis firmly from a cultural rather than ideological position. In this way, the consideration for humanist ideas and values becomes central, and *any* ideology or relationship of power that threatens this position becomes the site of contestation.

Western critical theory invites the indigenous intellectual to reclaim our cultural authenticity – an authenticity, I would argue, that is firmly embedded within indigenous intellectualism.

CHAPTER ONE: I Am Not A Maori: Being Indigenous in a Neoliberal Society

1.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to argue that cognitive submissiveness is inevitably synonymous with cultural submissiveness. Applying the many understandings that I have gleaned from a study of Foucault over these past few years, I have chosen to review such concepts as subjugation, bio-power and care of self and to associate them with various examples thrown up from my own first-hand experience of living.

First, I begin with the genealogical history of the words “Maori” and “rakau” as examples that reveal present-day hegemonic practices that are distinguishable only by the invisibility of contestation, and almost total acceptance, in all sectors of society. Second, I apply a Foucauldian analysis to consider the subjectification of tangata whenua, particularly through the governmentalisation of power relations by means of an anatomo-politics of the human body (discipline) and a bio-politics of the population. Third, I discuss the implications of the Tohunga Suppression Act to matauranga or indigenous knowledge. Fourth, using the seemingly harmless physical activity of leapfrog as an example, I discuss how the two concepts of tapu and noa have been unwittingly undermined, just as other forms of indigenous practice beyond the schooling curriculum have as well. Next, by citing the examples of tangihanga, urbanisation, and “Maori day off”, I reveal the process of normalization, and conclude this chapter with an analysis of “Regimes of Truth” and the insurrection of subjugated knowledges. All taken together, this chapter exposes the extent of the cognitive and moral

submissiveness (see Hill, in progress) that tangata whenua now experience. I reiterate my own argument that we need to reclaim important indigenous knowledge and values, a task, I further argue, that only indigenous intellectuals can achieve.

This personal journey however, should be considered within a context of general well-being for all tangata whenua in Aotearoa. A review of Aotearoa's colonial history in terms of the relations between culture and power can be found in Dr Ngatata Love's "Foreward" to the Ministry of Maori Development's Report, *Progress Towards Closing Social and Economic Gaps Between Maori and Non-Maori* (2000, p. 1). Here it states:

The statistics presented in this report appear to paint an overly negative picture of the status of Maori. However, they do portray a reality for those Maori who face the effects of entrenched and long-term disparity.

Dr Love also mentions that the report's findings "**will not be a surprise** to many but should be of concern to all" (ibid.) [my emphasis]. This report is one more testament to the enduring and effective nature of the power of hegemony. After over one hundred and sixty years, the effect of our colonial history on Aotearoa's indigenous population has been internalized and has assumed a position of social acceptance to the point whereby it does not even warrant being a "surprise".

1.2 I Am Not A Maori: The Application of the Foucauldian Toolbox

What is a “Maori” teacher? Are teacher training institutions producing “Maori” teachers who are primarily proficient in the practice of teaching; that is, perpetuating the pedagogical and epistemological status quo, unquestioning of the knowledge bases used, and who are not even given sufficient opportunity to develop a praxis-oriented approach enamored with a new-found “Maori” epistemology? A continuing institutional hegemony may exist if a predominantly “Maori” management group has conflicting and diverse views over a clear delineation of what constitutes “being Maori”, particularly within a neoliberal society. This is further exacerbated by the question of the revitalization of cultural identity in a “post”-colonial environment. To what degree does the internalization of Western world-views impact on the “authenticity” of “being Maori”? To posit the statement, “A Maori teacher or a teacher of Maori?”, invites a thorough critique of this relationship. Mackie’s (1980) analysis of Paulo Freire’s work regarding the fear of freedom of the oppressed states that “if [the oppressed] are to struggle for liberation then images implanted by the oppressor must be rejected. Freire suggests this can be done through a critical confrontation with, and transformation of, their social reality” (p.107). Mackie further contends that Freire’s literacy programme recognized that “the oppressed can only perceive how they have been conditioned when they are confronted with problems arising from their existential situation” and that this “recognition of oppression comes from [the] consideration of generative words and themes originating as the collective essence of an oppressive existence” (pp.116-117).

Ultimately, whilst questions such as these are important, they nonetheless tend to detract from the main issue – the relationship between power and culture. Rather than adopt a solely cultural approach to this point, Michel Foucault offers a substantive perspective in terms of power and, when considered within my own lived experience, provides the basis by which a hegemony of power can be co-situated with its existential consequences. The point made is not so much what constitutes “being Maori”, or what “Maori” beliefs and values are, but rather, what processes might operate in our society that directly influence beliefs and values. If these processes exist, and they have the ability to transform beliefs and values, then they also have the ability to destroy cultural identity.

For example, consider a seemingly innocent word like “tree”. Arguably, there are two ways to introduce this word into the vocabulary of a language student who wishes to learn the indigenous language of the iwi of that area. You could say “he rakau”, discuss seedlings, and associate it with the provision of fruit, shade, and material for building things. You might also describe it as something to play in, and as something that is either native or introduced. The teacher is a “Maori” (or has a “qualification” in “Maori” language), the word is a “Maori” word, the class is a “Maori language” class. But is it learning “Maori”? This thesis argues that it is not. It is a continuation of assimilation. To leave the association of the word “rakau” at this level is to deny the world-view, beliefs and values contained within the language. What must happen is to introduce the word “rakau” as a child of Tane Mahuta, that is, to begin with its whakapapa. This association then embraces and situates the word firmly within its indigenous context. A failure to make this intellectual and moral connection is an example of the power of hegemony.

What follows is in support of my contention that “I am not a Maori”.

* * * * *

The only rule and method I have kept is contained in a text by Char, where the most urgent and restrained definition of truth may also be read: “ I shall take from things the illusion they produce to preserve themselves from us and leave them the part they concede to us”. (Michel Foucault cited in Dean, 1994, Preface)

Totalizing theories are male Eurocentric metaphysical constructs using binary opposites which produce a discourse of dominance that suppress, exclude, or marginalize certain groups and privilege others. (Osborne, 1992, pp. 180-181)

Academically, I may be categorized as a successful graduate student. Culturally, I belong to the category of “Other” (Said, 1993). That is, as an indigenous person of Aotearoa, as tangata whenua, my life experiences have been the result of my *self*, in particular, and Aotearoa society in general, accepting and perpetuating the suppression, exclusion and marginalisation of what I believe “being indigenous” is all about. The “truth” then would be that I am an academically successful “other”.

If I now took away “the illusion that this produces”, it appears to me that I would have a more “truthful reality”. The first illusion is that I am not academically successful. I barely know my own native language, I have a minimal knowledge of my whakapapa, I have a limited understanding of iwi and waka. I have no understanding of rongoa (medicines) and nga whetu (stars). The second illusion is that I am not an “other”. I am tangata whenua. So, by taking away the “illusion of truth”, I reveal my *self* to be a dumb tangata whenua. *That*, to me, is a more

“truthful reality”. This then helps me understand how a discourse of dominance can give the illusion of “success”, when in actual fact, by stripping away that illusion, what is revealed is a *self* who has been suppressed, excluded and marginalized.

Foucault’s work explicates how the hegemony of power can result in a rather negative self-classification of myself as a barely-adequate indigenous person, and how this understanding has permitted me to feel less fatalistic in my hopes to overcome this hegemony of self-consciousness borne of an intellectual and moral submissiveness.

By providing a history of my life experiences it is possible to “locate power at the extreme points of its exercise” (Foucault, 1980, p.97) and to provide examples of “how things work at the level of on-going subjugation, at the level of those continuous and uninterrupted processes which subjugate our bodies, govern our gestures, dictate our behaviours, etc.” (ibid.). By using my *self*, support can be given to Foucault’s belief that “this modern self is not free because, insofar as it is the outcome of the human sciences, political control and not freedom has been the aim” (Marshall, 1995, p.29).

To begin with, it will first be necessary to define the concepts of power and hegemony (understood as intellectual and moral submissiveness) used in this thesis. I have selected the following two extracts:

For power:

If I were to characterise, not its mechanism itself [the relationship between power, right and truth], but its intensity and constancy, I

would say that we are forced to produce the truth of power that our society demands, of which it has need, in order to function: we must speak the truth; we are constrained or condemned to confess or to discover the truth. Power never ceases its interrogation, its inquisition, its registration of truth: it institutionalises, professionalises and rewards its pursuit. (Foucault, 1980, p.93)

For hegemony:

Hegemony refers to a totalizing (all-encompassing, inclusive) exercise of power which, due to the plasticity of its boundaries of containment, is able to maintain within its embrace all subordinate groups and their possible resistances. Hegemony is a key concept for understanding the dynamic staying-power of development, "its immanent adaptability to changing conditions, which allows it to survive, indeed to thrive, up to the present". (Mulenga, 1994, p.256)

Taken together, these two examples reveal the totalizing, intense and constant power of hegemony. The intention is to create a framework that "takes seriously the relations between culture and power" – to situate the contest for indigenous struggle and identity within a space that begins not in some mysterious void beyond the boundaries of power and hegemony, but rather, inside and within, each of us. In short, to take seriously the relations between culture and power is to *begin* by reclaiming the cultural power within our *selves*. Foucault opens our eyes to not "who" we are, but "what" we are. It is a beginning.

1.3 Governmentalisation of Power Relations

I am a descendant of Maungapohatu, the sacred mountain, and Hinepukohurangi, the mist maiden. I am Tuhoe.

Actually, that's not "true". Apparently, sacred mountains and mist maidens don't have descendants. And I'm not Tuhoe either. Rather, I belong to a race known as

Maori, although today I have a choice of five; Eastern, Western, Northern, Central or Southern, depending on where I am living and according to the latest “Voter Registration Form” I filled out. Foucault has advanced my understanding of power and hegemony in an historical sense by enlightening me as to the importance of concepts such as “anatomy-politics of the human body” *vis-a-vis* I am not descended from whom I thought I was, and a bio-politics of the population *vis-a-vis* I am not Tuhoë. I am a fifth of a group called Maori. He has informed me of the “governmentalization of power relations” (Smart, 1986, p.162).

Marshall states that by “government” Foucault meant something like,

a form of activity aiming to produce subjects, to shape, or to guide, or to affect the conduct of people so that they become people of a certain sort; to form the very identities of people so that they could or should be *subjects*....The art of government was to provide a form of government for each and all, but one which was to *individualise* and to *normalize*. (Marshall,1995, p.29)

According to Williams (1997, p.179), the use of the word Maori as a noun began about 1850 and that early European writers invariably spoke of *natives*, or *New Zealanders*. Walker adds that tangata whenua “did not conceive of themselves as a race *vis-à-vis* other races” but “instead thought of themselves in terms of iwi [for example, Tuhoë]” (1996a, p.26). The origin of the word Maori (as a noun) was based on a need to distinguish tangata whenua from Pakeha (white man). The white skin of Pakeha was seen as “a strange and abnormal condition” while the term Maori was used as an adjective to describe their own skin as normal or natural (*ibid.*). With this usage, the universalizing of tangata whenua was intended as a means to differentiate ethnicity only.

The “governmentalisation of power relations” began with the introduction of the 1867 Maori Representation Act, which made allowance for four Maori members to sit in the House of Representatives (Orange, 1987, p.181). This Act was introduced at a time when the country was in turmoil and the government had its hands full with the campaigns of Titokowaru on the west coast and Te Kooti on the east coast (ibid.). The point of contestation was land (Titokowaru) and justice (Te Kooti) and was waged against imperial, colonial and kupapa (tangata whenua allies of the state) soldiers. Orange notes further that in 1868 as “[s]evere as some of this fighting was, no one doubted that government authority would eventually be established” (ibid.). And so it was that,

[o]n 9 July 1868 the new governor, Sir George Bowen, convened Parliament in Wellington. Four Rangatira (chiefs) participated, elected to the House of Representatives by native **allies** of the government. They represented north, east, west and southern Maori...But what influence could four members have over fifty? (Vaggioli, 2000, p.218) [my emphasis]

Dom Felice Vaggioli first published those words in 1896. The question he posed remained unaddressed for one hundred years. It was only with the introduction of the Mixed Member Proportional voting system in 1996 that the number of Maori Representatives in the House has increased and, along with this change, the potential of Maori representation in government has become more than a mere token gesture. When seen in this light, the symbolic assertion that I make in this thesis - that I am not a Maori - is philosophically underpinned by Foucault’s analysis of the governmentalisation of power relations in terms of the origin of the noun Maori. Further, it can be argued that its genealogical history was nothing more than to create *subjects* of tangata whenua.

* * * * *

The forming of a homogenous, collective group called “Maori”, as an example of the “bio-politics of the [indigenous] population”, had huge implications for tangata whenua. Through this one piece of legislation the political autonomy of iwi was subsumed. Traditional forms of political leadership, representation and decision-making processes were destroyed. Any credibility from the colonial government to honour the tino rangatiratanga of hapu, as accorded in Article Two of the Maori version to the Treaty of Waitangi, was removed.

In understanding Foucault’s notion of the governmentalisation of power relations as the vehicle by which political control denies freedom, it is contested that all indigenous resistance strategies against the negative effects of colonialism, and in pursuit of tino rangatiratanga, must first and foremost begin with a rejection of the term Maori. Every effort must be made to legitimate and validate the authority and genealogical truth of iwi. This is a fundamental and basic necessity in the search for indigenous liberation if we are to affirm Freire’s position that “if [the oppressed] are to struggle for liberation, then images implanted by the oppressor must be rejected” (1980, p.107). Failure to accept this position could arguably be considered as either a conscious or subconscious “fear of freedom”.

The earlier examples of “Maori” and “rakau” represent, in an everyday context, a form of linguistic imperialism if allowed to continue uncontested. To deny “rakau” its whakapapa is to deny the systems of thought, world-view, beliefs and values contained in the language of our culture. To construct a universal, homogenizing social grouping called “Maori” is to deny us our genealogical

history through hapu and iwi. I am Tuhoe, Ngati Awa, Whakatohea and Raukawa. I am not a Maori. At the whare wananga where I worked, my whakapapa has meaning and consequences. Wairaka saved the Mataatua waka. We are the originators of the kumara here in Aotearoa. These are our truths. Other iwi have their own.

Staff and students are acknowledged through their iwi connections. It is only outside this environment that the oppressiveness of the word “Maori” can be felt. None of the three Whare Wananga describe themselves as “Maori” institutions. They are known as Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi, Te Wananga O Raukawa and Te Wananga O Aotearoa. They connect to eponymous ancestors or the land. To a large degree, “Maori” progress in terms of understanding the power of hegemony can possibly be gauged by the acceptance of all educational institutions to acknowledge this fact through the renaming of “Maori Studies” programmes and departments (notwithstanding and acknowledging the challenges that had to be overcome in establishing these in the first place). More constructively, however, would be the legitimating and validating of such a stance in the writings and practices of indigenous intellectuals.

With this in mind, an easily identifiable characteristic of an indigenous intellectual would be the continuous rendering as problematic of the noun Maori, and its wholesale rejection. This would be substantiated through a clear understanding of the bio-politics of the population as a means to subjugate its constituents, and would be reinforced by an understanding of the “unsurprising” and disproportionate representation of “Maori” in all the negative socio-economic

indices. Chapter Five will discuss how the “language” and action of neoliberalism (beginning with the devolution of the Maori Affairs Department), while appearing to support this position of a return to iwi-based identity, organisation, leadership, representation and decision-making processes, inevitably works to further suppress, exclude and marginalize tangata whenua and to instead privilege others.

This one hundred year example of governmentality is paralleled endlessly in the colonial history of Aotearoa. The Treaty of Waitangi lost all relevance to the bureaucratic machinery of this country when, in 1877, Chief Justice James Prendergast declared it a legal “nullity” (Orange, 1987, pp.186-187). It is generally accepted that this lasted for ninety-eight years until the enabling of the Treaty of Waitangi Act in 1975. It can also be argued that an analysis of the English and Maori versions of the Treaty of Waitangi differ most markedly in terms of political legitimacy and the ability to contest the right to make laws, which in turn, determines the efficacy to contest the governmentalisation of power relations through a bio-politics of the population. As Ranginui Walker points out, Foucault reminds us that sovereignty, in the form of the Crown, is one of the great inventions of bourgeois society and that real power resides with Parliament, which was not bound by the Treaty (Walker, 1996b, p.259).

1.4 The Tohunga Suppression Act (1907)

In fact, as Walker reminds us further, the most glaring example of anatomo-politics in the colonial history of Aotearoa can be evidenced in the passing of the Tohunga Suppression Act of 1907. It was a “Maori”, Maui Pomare, who begged

the government to introduce this measure in order to abolish the “demoralizing practice of witchcraft” (Walker, 1990, p.181) and, as a Native health officer and member of parliament, Pomare saw “no room in [his] scheme of health for the spiritual healing of tohunga” and thus, along with charlatans and quacks, tohunga were subsequently banned from practicing (ibid.). Walker identifies the consultation process used to introduce this legislation rather tellingly when he says that “Maori people lived with these **forced** changes by Pomare” (ibid.) [my emphasis] and that Pomare had taken on “Anglophile values” which occasionally led to his being “alienated...from his people” (p.180). In fact, Walker concludes this particular segment by saying that Pomare identified too closely with the Pakeha and inevitably ended up offending “the people who voted him into power” (p.181).

Foucault’s notion of anatomo-politics of the human body (discipline), applied to this particular episode of our history, provides the philosophical position underpinning my assertion that, “apparently”, I am not a descendent of Maungapohatu, the sacred mountain, and Hinepukohurangi, the mist maiden. Tohunga were far more than spiritual healers. In terms of cultural identity, they are the keepers of systems of thought, world-views, beliefs and values that distinguish between cultures. Although the Tohunga Suppression Act remained in force for over fifty years before it was finally repealed (ibid.), the degree of damage done to indigenous episteme through this legislation has been immeasurable. Immeasurable because how does one measure systems of thought, world-views, beliefs and values? While this question should provide an incentive to continue further studies toward that end, for the purpose of this thesis I will try

to explain how I believe the Tohunga Suppression Act impacted on me personally. I believe that I would be representative of many indigenous people of my generation and that, in terms of systems of thought, world-view, beliefs and values, the following generations were and continue to be, even further excluded. It is within this line of reasoning also that I contend that there is a need for a new form of intellectualism; indigenous intellectualism.

Born before the Tohunga Suppression Act was repealed, and raised in a predominantly urban and non-Maori environment, my earliest recollections of beliefs and values were influenced greatly by Christianity, especially through my mother's side of the family. I remember going to catechism classes and sometimes going to church. I also remember that there was only one God, and "He" has blond hair and blue eyes. When I was nine years old however, I fell off my bike and hurt my ankle. The next morning this koro of ours came to our place to see me. All I can remember is that I was lying on my bed being tragic when he came in with his hat in his hands and some water sitting in the crown of his hat. He said a lot of things in Maori (I didn't understand the language then), sprinkled some water on my ankle, then left. The next morning my memory tells me that I was up and running about.

There are two points to this story. The first is that the koro was one of ours. That is, he was a close relation. What the Tohunga Suppression Act has done is cause many of these elders to lose their societal position. Today, tohunga are very rare and, as a consequence, it would take more than a soft-tissue injury to warrant a visit. The second, and to me most important, is the impact that this one life-

experience had on me. What I will never get over is how my koro fixed a soft-tissue injury *overnight*, by incantations I never understood, using water I knew must have been special, but did not understand why or how, and finally, that it worked. Whenever I tell this story to people, there are generally two reactions; one is empathy (or what I choose to believe is so), the other is a polite “now moving on”. This experience as a nine-year old “Maori” boy living in the city, influenced me greatly. At that time I can remember thinking that the adventures and stories of God (with the blond hair and blue eyes) were impressive, but my koro’s actions were unbeatable! Unsurprisingly, since then, my systems of thought were reformed because now, Christianity had competition.

I am by no means knowledgeable in matoranga or indigenous knowledge, but over the last thirty-five years since that experience, I have been a “believer”. I believe in the stories of our old people. I believe in the “myths and legends”. I believe in the whaikorero (speeches) on the marae. I believe in tapu (things sacred) and noa (free from tapu). I wish today that more people could have experienced the power of tohunga. The Tohunga Suppression Act, in its fifty years of existence, negated that. In terms of the development of systems of thought, world-views, beliefs and values, the competition was eliminated.

Unfortunately, now, I know that I am part of an ever-dwindling group of “believers” - victims to the charge of “progress”. I am a nutcase who belongs in another (past) time. Why? – because since my koro worked his magic on me, I thought that every “Maori” believed. And my thoughts were confirmed when in the 1980s and 1990s, with the advent of kohanga reo and kura kaupapa, we were

all heading back towards those systems of thought, worldviews, beliefs and values of our old people. Concerned parents were doing anything and everything to establish kohanga reo all around the country. A few Maori communities were offering primary school alternatives in te reo without the support of government (Chapter Two looks more closely at the development of kohanga reo and kura kaupapa). Then, as a result of *Tomorrow's Schools* and the 1989 Education Act, government support through the provision of funding to existing and new kura kaupapa saw community interest in these schooling alternatives expand; enrolments at kohanga reo blossomed and demand exceeded supply for a place in kura kaupapa. At the same time, teacher training institutions and universities were falling over each other to attract students (EFTS) to newly established bilingual and immersion teacher training programmes. And so it was in 1994 that I got caught up in the whole excitement of it all. I joined the Rumaki (Immersion) teacher training programme of a university with every intention of being a teacher in an immersion or bilingual classroom. At last, schooling underachievement in Aotearoa could be addressed “by Maori, for Maori”, and cunningly, so I thought, we (Maori) could covertly reintroduce an indigenous episteme as part of the philosophy of these exciting new schools, and make up for the devastation caused by the Tohunga Suppression Act.

Within two months of starting, I began to have serious concerns. First, to all intents and purposes, the curriculum content we were covering seemed to be the same as the English version. At the same time, it also became apparent that there was a distinct shortage of lecturers who could deliver in two languages, let alone

immersion. And then my world came crashing down – because of a Physical Education (PE) class – and leapfrog!

1.5 Leapfrog, Tapu and Noa

In my eyes, the disproportionate representation of tangata whenua in all the negative socio-economic indices that “unsurprisingly” reflect societal inequalities in Aotearoa today, are a product of colonialism. Christianity, a major element of the colonizing process, had competition from one of my koro, not only because he believed, but in turn, from our very brief meeting, made me also a believer. As mentioned earlier, one of the things that I do believe in, thanks to him, is tapu and noa. Barlow describes tapu as sacred, or set apart and states that “the important thing to remember is that tapu comes from the gods, and embraces all powers and influences associated with them” (1994, p.129). Williams defines noa as “free from tapu or any other restriction” (1997, p.222). While I was not aware of the “academic” definition of these words, my lived experiences had told me that women are known as whare tangata (house of people) because they bear children. This then makes them tapu and what I have always believed is that because of this, it is seen as insensitive for *a woman to step over a man*. Again, while I am not an acknowledged expert on matauranga, I do respect and acknowledge this informal knowledge learned as a result of my own upbringing.

Therefore, to consider leapfrog as a physical activity for this programme seemed problematic to me, if only from a philosophical perspective. I like to believe that the programme designers were unaware of the contradictions that such an activity,

for a bilingual or immersion class, would create. I argue here that one can not assume a particular philosophical position (in this case the legitimacy and validity of tangata whenua tikanga) and be selective at the same time. My position is such that if the female members of society are traditionally afforded a particular position within that society and, in this case, it is the manner in which male and female interact in a *non-private situation for a particular activity*, then the theory should also be practiced, and what is more, every opportunity should be taken to explain to the children (and teacher trainees) the reasons why this activity does not take place (i.e. where tangata status of women).

Furthermore, from a purely sociological perspective, and placed within a contemporary perspective, this tikanga (custom) has much to offer in terms of the development of educational resistance strategies initiated by tangata whenua. One of the many contributing factors affecting the well-being of tangata whenua has been the disturbing increase in domestic violence, particularly involving women and children. This has been located to some degree in the fact that many colonized people “each one being socially oppressed by one more powerful than he [sic], always finds a less powerful one on whom to lean, and becomes a tyrant in his [sic] turn” (Memmi, 1991, p.17).

The point here is not to dwell on the negative affects of colonialism, but rather to see the opportunity to circumvent the failings of Western tikanga. To apply Memmi’s quote to Aotearoa, it could be argued that the disproportionate number of domestic violence incidents suffered by indigenous women and children is a result of the intellectual and moral oppressiveness suffered by indigenous men. If

however, one is brought up to believe that women are tapu, I would not claim that the statistics would lessen, but I would claim that the schooling system has, by default, contributed to the challenge to overcome the social reality of domestic violence, and of which the reigning ideology of this country seems quite content to slumber in its victim-blaming mentality.

This is because, in the first instance, a society true to this belief would not countenance such behaviour, and would also not countenance the lack of state empathy and sense of urgency to quickly address this *dis-ease*. Second, it is arguable that males would not resort so quickly to such an action, and thirdly, many women would not as easily accept such treatment in terms of their own “understanding” of themselves as “tapu”, rather than assume a co-dependency mentality. For fundamental to the belief that women are tapu is the concomitant realization that all people are tapu, and that each individual has their own mana. This system of thought, Foucault argues, was lost when “the Delphic maxim, ‘to know yourself’ [took] over from the other Greek antiquity, ‘to take care of yourself’” (Marshall, 1995, p.28). When people care for themselves, Marshall suggests, it is,

not merely to know one’s self but also to improve, to surpass and to master one’s self. Caring for the self would prevent one being a *slave* (of another city, or authority, of family, friends and colleagues, and of one’s own passions). (p.29)

This transition from “caring for oneself” to “knowing oneself” in the twenty-first century,

has come to be to fit oneself out, retail, with a set of “truths” which, by being learned, memorized, progressively put into practice, construct a subject with a certain mode of being and a certain visible manner of acting. (ibid.)

For too many tangata whenua, “knowing oneself”, one’s role and one’s actions are being reinforced daily through the power of the media and television that constantly presents a negative and dehumanizing picture of our “truth”.

Notwithstanding the philosophical and sociological arguments I have presented for this one small example of the potential for indigenous educational resistance strategies to overcome contemporary social realities (should they be fully realized), the “collapsing” of my world had more to do with the reception I received when I dared to articulate my concerns to my peers. Without going into detail, the word “nutcase” will suffice, and which I think, unsurprisingly, is a shame. Hence, my determination to provide discourse regaling the need for indigenous intellectualism arose. The speed with which these new initiatives have developed ensures that any form of indigenous “quality control” over acceptable and appropriate pedagogies and epistemologies has been minimal, and that the development of a clear, concise and specific philosophy marginalized. In Chapter Two, I will argue that, rather than these indigenous educational initiatives being seen as opportunities to challenge prevailing pedagogical processes and epistemological foundations that create a continuing lessening of life chances and opportunities for tangata whenua children, quite the opposite is happening. That is, these initiatives have more to do with conforming to the ideological characteristics of neoliberalism, and the commodification of knowledge and the schooling system.

In this particular case, I have used two instances in my life that were separated by over thirty years. One was the experience of having our own “tohunga” come and affect forever my systems of thought in terms of a contestation between God and “the old ‘Maori’ way” and the inherent beliefs and values contained within. The second was the manifestation of concerns and unease over the apparent “watering-down” of a basic belief in the notions of tapu and noa, and more precisely, the reactions produced when trying to express these concerns. I have no doubt whatsoever that this reaction was a product of the Tohunga Suppression Act, in the sense that, over that thirty year period, fewer and fewer people have been afforded the opportunity to experience an occasion with a tohunga such as the one that I have described. Consequently, they have never been presented with a legitimate alternative to that which they already know.

Tangata whenua in contemporary society and, indeed, all indigenous people of the world, are becoming increasingly more subjected to the power of anatomo-politics of the human body through the increased capacity of new technologies to reshape and reform indigenous systems of thought, world-views, beliefs and values. Subsequent chapters will further discuss this subjection of indigenous thought and continued intellectual and moral submissiveness and will likewise show that it is much bigger than a school-ground physical activity called leapfrog.

Effectively, where the 1907 Tohunga Suppression Act removed most tohunga from society, they have now been replaced by television and the internet. The global “tohunga” of today are about as far removed from where our old people were as one could ever get, and yet the proliferation of “indigenous” educational

“resistance strategies” continues unabated and unchecked. If removing one little exercise called leapfrog from a Physical Education programme is so problematic to those in authority (and regardless of ethnicity), what chance is there for you or I to really believe that my father is a sacred mountain and my mother is a mist maiden?

Finally, to show that Foucault’s notion of the anatomo-politics of the human body (discipline) contributes significantly to the subjectification of all people, not only indigenous people, consider the more common indigenous relationship between people and nature, that is, the earth as earth-mother and the sky as sky-father.

Now consider the implications for multi-national corporations if generation after generation of school children believed that the earth was their mother to the point that any form of pollution would simply not be tolerated. The manufacture of non-biodegradable packaging materials such as plastics would cease. Or would it?

1.6 Normalisation: Urbanisation, the “MDO” and Tangihanga

I was born forty-four years ago at Waiotapu, a forestry village in the heart of the Kaingaroa Forest, into an extended family of forestry workers enjoying the security of the burgeoning forestry industry. By the age of five, we had moved to Rotorua, a big city with plenty of employment opportunities for my parents and city schools for us kids. I even did OK at school, nearly getting UE. From school I eventually got a family, a mortgage, a secure and well-paying job, two cars, a boat, golf club membership, two cats and a dog. Life was pretty good.

I thought at the time this was true. However, Foucault has advanced my understanding of power and hegemony by introducing me to the concept of “normalisation”. Marshall describes the exercise of power through “disciplinary

blocks” which are essentially concerned with the organisation of space, time and capacities (1995, p.26). Looking back, I now understand what he means. Our family’s move to Rotorua was part of what is commonly referred to as the “urban drift”. Maori in large numbers moved from rural settings to urban areas in search of, or encouraged to partake in, employment. A major reorganisation of “Maori space” was undertaken. This resulted in a depreciation of Maori cultural “norms” and the attempted appropriation of European cultural “norms”. Apples were trying to be oranges. It was not until moves to initiate Kohanga Reo began that the magnitude of this loss of Maori space was realised.

“Maori-time” and the “Maori day off” became socially acceptable as derogatory indicators for the assumed proliferation of Maori workers in the lowest echelons of industry, and social mobility would not eventuate unless “time-discipline” was established. For me, personally, the most devastating consequence of this was the social subordination of the tangihanga ritual - “normalisation” was to be achieved at the expense of cultural responsibility. Tangihanga is a funeral ritual. It is generally held over a three-day period and exemplifies the importance of “the person” over all other aspects of life. Attendance over the whole duration exhibits a love and caring of not only the deceased but also the bereaved family. Attendance on the last day only is considered inappropriate unless for travelling or other exceptional circumstances. Unfortunately, this trend is fast becoming fashionable, due I imagine, to “time” constraints.

The history and eventual succession of the Kaingaroa forest to “market forces” is indicative of Foucault’s position that “power designates relationships between partners where certain actions modify the actions of others” (ibid.). In terms of

capacities, Foucault has informed me of the need for societies to maintain a “reserve army” of workers and that historically, this “need” has been delegated, disproportionately, to Maori. These “techniques of power” have come to be effectively incorporated into the social whole because of the economic advantages and political utility that derives from them (Foucault, 1980, p.101).

1.7 Regimes of Truth and the Insurrection of Subjugated Knowledges

Over this twenty-year period, Foucault has described the role I played through his analyses of relations of truth and power in general (regimes of truth) (Smart, 1986, p.163). The “social contract” I had made with my chosen lifestyle had been the result of “the development of individualising techniques and practices which are reducible neither to force nor consent, techniques and practices which have transformed political conflict and struggle through the constitution of new forms of social cohesion” (p.162). I had become a fully-paid, bona-fide participant in the “techniques of power”, acting as a factor “of segregation and social hierarchisation...guaranteeing relations of domination and effects of hegemony” (p.163).

I was thirty-five, a “successful” graduate of the “normalisation process”, and completely at odds with the world. Something was missing! Why do I feel like a barely-adequate person?

Foucault’s genealogical research methodology and the “insurrection of subjugated knowledges” (1980, p.81) provided a focus. What is encouraging is his proclamation that “genealogy should be seen as a kind of attempt to emancipate historical knowledges from...subjection, to render them, that is, capable of

opposition and of struggle against the coercion of a theoretical, unitary, formal and scientific discourse” (p.85). It is at this point that I have regained “hope”, and found possible answers to the “why” questions.

Why do I classify myself as a barely-adequate person? Is it because I took French at school, as my own language was not an “option”? Is it because I did not go to the marae, because there was not enough “time” left after doing everything else? Is it because, after forty years, I’m desperately trying to “be indigenous”, to rediscover that something that is missing? In terms of Foucault’s role in advancing my understanding of power and hegemony, these concerns will be addressed when we are able to:

direct our researches on the nature of power not towards the juridical edifice of sovereignty, the State apparatuses and the ideologies which accompany them, but towards domination and the material operators of power, towards forms of subjection and the inflections and utilisations of their localised systems, and towards strategic apparatuses. We must eschew the model of Leviathan in the study of power. We must escape from the limited field of juridical sovereignty and State institutions, and instead base our analysis of power on the study of the techniques and tactics of domination. (Foucault, 1980, p.102)

It is here that I have found Foucault’s work most enlightening. As Ranginui Walker has noted, a combination of his insurrection of subjugated knowledge and an analysis of power based on the study of techniques and tactics of domination exposes the contestation of power and knowledge by subordinate classes within the nation state and identifies the multi-layered structure of power within society that necessitates interrogation at all levels (Walker, 1996, p.6).

It is here, also, that the magnitude of the task becomes evident. In order to validate indigenous knowledge, the great educational challenge will be to incorporate that knowledge into the discourse and ideology of New Zealand schools and educational institutions. Only then will the “material operators” of the future, that is, the “technicians, administrators, and symbolic workers in the exercise of power and ideological justification of the social order” (Held quoted in Walker, 1996, p.251), truly believe and accept that I am indeed a descendant of Maungapohatu, the sacred mountain, and Hinepukohurangi, the mist maiden.

This theoretical expose of techniques of power is, indeed, critical for indigenous people to be able to reclaim their identity – simply by not categorizing themselves as “Maori”. While Foucault speaks of notions such as genealogical histories, anatomo-politics, bio-politics, governmentalisation and normalization, for the indigenous intellectual, these are all encapsulated in one term – whakapapa. Every person and every thing has a whakapapa. What has been shown here is that the whakapapa of “Maori” (as a noun) begins with the arrival of tauwiwi. Through these techniques of power, the cultural identity of tangata whenua has been reformed, reshaped and redistributed. To continue using a classification imposed as a consequence of colonisation is to render problematic contesting discourse in pursuit of self-determination.

Understanding these techniques of power is an essential element to contesting notions of “Maori progress” within contemporary society. For indigenous people, it has more relevance because this “knowing” then creates counter-histories and counter-memories. This understanding can also reveal the extent of our own

assimilation, because it is through the power of language that we shape our consciousness to the degree that “language is consciousness in practice” (Mackie, 1980, p.109).

1.8 Conclusion: Knowledge is the Liberator

Within this Chapter I have argued that all indigenous resistance strategies against the dominating effects of colonialism, and in pursuit of tino rangatiratanga, must first and foremost begin with a rejection of the term Maori, and that every effort must be made to legitimate and validate the authority and genealogical truth of iwitanga. This argument has been supported by some of Michel Foucault’s work which has afforded us the opportunity to understand how power “operates through a set of technologies and mechanisms rather than through a social class”. Further, by this power being “diffused throughout society rather than imposed by one class upon another” (Fiske, 1993, p.11) the subjection of tangata whenua has been readily identifiable. As I have shown also, this has occurred through the governmentalisation of power relations. This governmentalisation has included: the usurpation of the word “Maori”; the effects of the Tohunga Suppression Act; the imposition of Western notions of space, time and capabilities; and an understanding of the individualizing and normalizing processes that operate through and upon the body, or *self*. My focus question remains throughout: Are we, in our own practices, contributing unknowingly to continuing processes of assimilation, albeit through te reo?

In my next chapter (Chapter Two), I conduct a philosophical and sociology analysis of a history of schooling for tangata whenua in Aotearoa from a rather different position: that is, by applying a Marxist perspective to explore further the effects of power and hegemony on indigenous knowledge. Here, I appeal to the work of Paulo Freire and look more through the lens of concepts such as ideology, consciousness and class (p.9) to expose the structural constraints which promise similarly to impede progress towards indigenous self-determination. As will be shown, the loss for tangata whenua of a “critical consciousness” as a consequence of the schooling system creates a “culture of silence” that is later exacerbated by the adoption of a culture of finance. That said, all is not hopeless, as Freire urged. Change can still become a realistic and decided possibility - but only by engaging in “pedagogical practices that are not only transdisciplinary, transgressive, and oppositional, but also connected to a wider project designed to further racial, economic and political democracy” (Giroux, 1999, p.viii). This, too, is my own position.

CHAPTER TWO: Indigenous Education In Aotearoa: Change or Chimera?

2.1 Introduction

Ka warea te ware
 Ka area te rangatira
 Hongihongi te whewheia
 Hongihongi te manehurangi
 Kei au te rangatiratanga

Ignorance is the oppressor
 Knowledge is the liberator
 Know your adversaries
 Know your vision
 The power is mine

This whakatauki identifies the powerlessness of the oppressed when denied access to knowledge which is both liberating and critical. Colonial domination is underpinned not through some glorified notion of contestation between vested interest groups and indigenous people but rather through a deliberate and pre-determined schooling system that ensures tangata whenua remain in a constant state of a-critical ignorance. In short, the colonizers greatest weapon is to invert Foucault's knowledge / power nexus in practice so that no knowledge equates to no power.

This Chapter discusses the intangible cost of colonisation for tangata whenua by focusing not on economic loss, but rather, intellectual loss. It begins by noting that if a position of power is manifest through the ability to know your adversaries and know your vision, Paulo Freire has argued that both these necessities can be denied by controlling the schooling system and effectively "educating a culture of silence". This theoretical positioning is then followed by a synopsis of a history of schooling for tangata whenua that considers how this theory has been applied in

practice. It begins with McLaren's (1992) analysis of three distinct phases of a philosophy of schooling for tangata whenua over the period 1814 to the early 1970s. These are described as conversion, conversion and assimilation, and then, complete assimilation. This is followed by a discussion of the apparent "softening" by the state toward indigenous schooling with the introduction of Taha Maori in schools. What is shown is a state manoeuvre that supports Mulenga's (1994, p.256) contention that hegemony as an exercise of power "is able to maintain within its embrace all subordinate groups and their possible resistances". What follows next is a discussion of indigenous reaction to this reality by the formation, outside the "system", of kohanga reo and kura kaupapa. An important position is adopted however when, after 1989, these initiatives were brought back within the "embrace" of the state, and at a time when Aotearoa was undergoing a massive ideological shift through the introduction of neoliberalism.

It is contended that, having returned to the embrace of the state, further schooling development for tangata whenua has been as a result of conforming to vested interest groups rather than an expression of liberating and emancipating indigenous schooling initiatives - effectively a continuation of Perry's (1999) contest between powerful state constituencies and tangata whenua which is viewed throughout this thesis as an actual "no-contest". This position is then supported in a subsequent chapter by revisiting the concept of hegemony and the role of intellectuals through the work of Antonio Gramsci, and examining the significance of Louis Althusser's two forms of apparatus (state ideological and repressive) to cultural continuity and well-being. In particular, it is argued that while these "new developments" have generated much interest and excitement

among tangata whenua, they do not present themselves as *bona fide* challenges to overcoming the intellectual and moral submissiveness of hegemony. Moreover, this thesis asserts that they are in danger of making no substantial contribution at all and, in actual fact, are possibly reflecting more the characteristics of this contemporary, hierarchical, individuated and a-cultural global society.

2.2 A Loss of Land and a Loss of Consciousness

The ideological hegemony of the ruling class is established, as Freire makes abundantly plain, through strategies of conquest, divide and rule, manipulation, and cultural invasion. (Mackie, 1980, p. 110)

During more than three decades of anthropological study, Professor Richard Perry described the writing of his book, *From Time Immemorial: Indigenous Peoples and State Systems* (1996), as “a discouraging project [which] has involved immersion in case after case of injustice, cruelty and exploitation” (1996, p.xv). Arguably, then, a review of the colonial history of Aotearoa from an indigenous perspective, shares a commonality with all colonized indigenous peoples, and that the contestation of culture and power which produces this oppression is supported by Freire who explicitly states that “the concept of the third world is ideological and political, not geographic” (cited in Mackie, 1980, p.119). Furthermore,

the so-called “first world” has within it and against it its own “third world”. And the third world has its first world, represented by the ideology of domination and the power of the ruling classes. The third world is in the last analysis the world of silence, of oppression, of dependence, of exploitation, of the violence exercised by the ruling classes on the oppressed. (ibid.)

An attempt to critically analyse this phenomenon through relations of culture and power invariably needs to address a broader question – why does it happen this way? Professor Perry (1996) offers persuasive evidence that competition for resources is the crucial factor in conflicts between indigenous peoples and the powerful constituencies that drive state policies. The loss of land (hence an economic base) by tangata whenua exemplifies Aotearoa's situation. Tangata whenua in pre-colonial times had undisturbed access to the sixty-six million, four hundred thousand acres that make up Aotearoa. Today, tangata whenua have access to just over three million, four hundred thousand acres. Over ninety-four percent of this land has been lost through confiscation, Crown land purchases, and Maori Land Court decisions (Durie, 1998, pp117-119).

Whether through strategies of conquest, divide and rule, manipulation, cultural invasion, injustice, cruelty or exploitation, the extent of the loss of land substantiates the assertion of the contestation of powerful constituencies and tangata whenua over resources. Furthermore the consequent and continuing disproportionate disparity between tangata whenua and colonizer reflects the omnipresence of those powerful constituencies that drive state policy, to the detriment of tangata whenua well-being in Aotearoa.

How, then, does this happen? Foucault's "techniques of power" described in Chapter One indicates how colonisation amounts to more than the loss of tangible resources by tangata whenua. While the loss of land, forest and sea resources have had enormous economic consequences, and the near-loss of cultural icons such as te reo me ona tikanga has led to the development of resistance strategies such as

kohanga reo, kura kaupapa and whare wananga, less recognized and scarcely acknowledged has been the manifestation of Freire's "world of silence" which, as a result, produces a "culture of silence" (Connolly, 1980, p.70). This thesis argues that this culture of silence imbued by tangata whenua reveals itself in the loss of a critical consciousness. This, in turn, reflects on the lack of contestation by tangata whenua, making Perry's contest between powerful constituencies that drive state policies and tangata whenua an actual "no-contest".

2.3 Educating a Culture of Silence: Freire's Message

One powerful constituency in this case is the schooling system. Perry turns to Louis Althusser to show how ideology is an important aspect of state stability in so far as "no class can hold State power over a long period without, at the same time, exercising its hegemony over the state ideological apparatuses" (1996, p.7). Through the state ideological apparatus of schools, a hegemony of power over tangata whenua is established. In Freirean terms,

[p]ower is inseparable from education. Those who hold power define what education will be, its methods, programmes and curriculum. Learners as passive objects become not only dependant, but also mute in the face of superior knowledge and power – the culture of silence. It is impossible for the dispossessed, who are forced to mimic the dictates of their paternal overlords, to have authentic voices of their own. Silence does not signify an absence of response, but rather a response which lacks a critical quality. (Connolly, 1980, p.70)

Research of so-called "Maori underachievement" in schools reflects this legacy. Alton Lee et al. state that "the statistics on Maori failure in the education system provide longstanding evidence for the discriminatory nature of the education

system” and that “the overt and covert ways in which an education system is monocultural and discriminatory need to be identified so that effective change can be wrought” (1987, p.1). Benton (1987, p.35) relates this to Pierre Bourdieu’s term “cultural capital” when he says that “Maori children at present often cannot invest their cultural capital because it is in a currency rejected by the school, often from the moment they first walk in the doors”.

From within this environment, many indigenous students develop an expectation of failing, and consequently develop behaviours that enable them to “succeed at failing. They too, become part of a self-fulfilling prophecy” (Hirsch, 1990, p.69). Inevitably, this lowering of expectations by teachers, pupils and parents make Maori failure the rule rather than the exception, and acceptable as part of the natural order of things (Benton, 1987, p.35). This scenario is also reflected across other societal indices such as health, unemployment, criminal activity, welfarism and socio-economic factors (Smith, 1993, p.1). As mentioned earlier, the cumulative, negative effect of this regime then comes as “no surprise”.

The importance of critical consciousness, that is, a response that does not lack critical enquiry, can be found in the whakatauki,

Ko te manu e kai i te miro, nona te ngahere
Ko te manu e kai i te matauranga, nona te ao.

The bird who partakes of the miro berry, his is the forest.
The bird who partakes of knowledge, his is the world.

This whakatauki indicates that our tipuna identified the dialectical relationship between the miro berry and knowledge; the forest and the world. Paulo Freire,

following on from Sartre's critique of the notion, "to know is to eat" (Mackie, 1980, p.117), embraces this same relationship in terms of illiteracy and literacy; the word and the world. Although these analogies appear "worlds" apart, conceptually there would appear to be no difference. Indigenous educational initiatives within Aotearoa over the last decade have sought to implement interventionist strategies in the hope of getting our children out of the "forest" and into the "world". Freire's adult literacy education programmes have sought to enable illiterate people to "read the word" so that they may be able to "read the world". This pedagogy for the oppressed is aimed specifically at overcoming a "culture of silence". And it is through the schooling system that the disrespectful and dehumanizing effect of Aotearoa's colonial history on tangata whenua can be identified. By closely analyzing Freire's work, and, in particular, criticisms leveled against him, a clearer understanding can be gained on how the colonisation process leads inevitably to the deterioration of tangata whenua well-being on the basis of continuing and worsening socio-economic disparities which are disproportionately suffered by Aotearoa's indigenous population.

An indication of the commitment and motivation that drives Paulo Freire can be evidenced in the dedication of the book that first gained him international recognition and widespread acclaim; *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1972). This reads, "to the oppressed, and to those who suffer with them and fight at their side". Within this volume, key understandings are: that a pedagogy for the oppressed is an instrument for critical discovery; that both the oppressed and the oppressors are manifestations of dehumanisation (p.25); and, that man's ontological and historical vocation is to be more fully human (p.31). Freire saw a

literacy programme for illiterate, oppressed adults as a means towards which this goal could be initiated. Situating this particular theory within Aotearoa is to acknowledge that, beyond the political rhetoric, oppression, imposition and cultural invasion have been the hallmarks of Aotearoa's colonial history.

Central to any understanding of Freire's work is the question of his own politics. Mackie (1980) describes Freire as a revolutionary socialist (p.105) as opposed to a humanist or Marxist socialist. While acknowledging that he adopts the humanist theories of, say, Fromm, Memmi and Kolakowski, Freire goes further by endorsing revolution as a central component of his pedagogy possibly because, as Mackie argues (p.104), he had lost faith in democracy after the overthrow of Joao Goulart's reformist government. This endorsement, however, does not extend to Marxist socialism because, although he emphasises both the humanistic bases of revolution and its roots in collective praxis, he ignores the political economy of revolution by establishing the revolutionary process as a cultural revolution (p.106). Notwithstanding this, it could be argued that Freire's cultural revolution presupposes an ultimate shift in the political economy due to the natural contradictions inherent in the capitalist makeup having the capacity of always subverting the cultural intent towards a new ethical and political form of relationship among individuals.

It is from this background that Freire continually asserts the non-neutrality of education and repeatedly stresses its essentially political nature (p.104). For Freire, education is either domesticating or liberating (Lankshear, 1993, p.99). Through his literacy programme, Freire circumvents the domesticating effect of

“banking” education in favour of a more potentially liberating “problem-posing” approach. In this way, as Goulet describes, “the unifying thread in his work is critical consciousness as the motor of cultural emancipation” (Freire, 1974, Introduction). This critical consciousness, or conscientisation, coupled with a “problem-posing” approach to education through dialogue, enables Freire to provide “a literacy programme which could be an introduction to the democratisation of culture” (Taylor, 1993, p.53). In effect, what underlies Freire’s pedagogy is the importance of linking “word” with “world”. As Roberts points out, “just as “words” in the conventional sense can be “read” and “written”, so to, for Freire, can we talk of “reading” (interpreting) and “writing” (transforming) the world” (1995, p.6). Through critical, dialogical praxis, the process of rewriting social reality can begin (p.7). Colonisation re-named tangata whenua as “Maori”. To assert “I am not a Maori” is to regain the right to “name the world”, insofar as,

To exist, humanely, is to *name* the world, to change it. Once named, the world in its turn reappears to the namers as a problem and requires of them a new *naming*. Men [sic] are not built in silence, but in word, in work, in action-reflection. (Freire, 1972, p.61)

So how does a theoretical understanding of Paulo Freire have implications relating to the well-being of tangata whenua in Aotearoa? In interpreting hegemony as a cognitive and moral submissiveness (Hill, in progress) which contributes to an a-critical and a-political indigenous population immersed in a “culture of silence”, the role of schooling demands a serious critique within the broader contestation of relations between culture and power.

2.4 Indigenous Schooling in Aotearoa: McLaren's Three Phases

A history of schooling in Aotearoa from 1814 to the early 1970s followed three distinct phases: conversion, conversion and assimilation, and then, complete assimilation. These phases provided the foundation for the social “truth” of Maori today; that the disproportionate representation of Maori in all negative socio-economic indices are “no surprise”. It gives support to Louis Althusser’s thesis that the schooling system is a major component of the state’s ideological apparatus (when viewing the relationship between indigenous groups and powerful constituencies that drive state policies as a contestation over resources). Moreover, it reinforces the often-quoted words of Sir Michael Sadler, Director of the British Office of Special Inquiries and Reports, who in a 1900 lecture, said that “In studying...systems of education we should not forget that the things outside the school matter even more than the things inside the schools, and govern and interpret the things inside” (McLaren, 1994, p.1). In essence, up until the early 1970s, the assimilatory nature of Aotearoa’s schooling system reflected the context of society at large where the prevailing attitude was still a desire to “save the savages” through the assimilation of Western beliefs, values and morals.

During the early 1970s this realization was manifest nationally by the growing politicization of tangata whenua in terms of protests over land and a demand to “Honour The Treaty” - politically, socially, economically and culturally. These demands were also being made at a time when, internationally, a growing concern over the domesticating nature and ideological persuasion of the curriculum and schools was being manifest by the appearance of a “new” sociology of education

(see Young, 1971) and critical theorists such as Paulo Freire and Antonio Gramsci. These events were further strengthened by the emergence of an indigenous intelligentsia such as Nga Tama Toa. Access for tangata whenua to this liberating knowledge allowed these early pioneers to “know our adversaries” and removed the oppressiveness of ignorance. Over a decade later, these developments accrued with the introduction of Taha Maori in our schools. It also marked the beginning of a serious contestation in Aotearoa of relations between culture and power.

2.5 Phase Four: Taha Maori

The rejuvenation of the Maori Affairs Department in the 1970s provided tangata whenua with an opportunity to examine our own situations in society and came to the conclusion that we were disadvantaged because of “the present forms of racism, present forms of structural inequalities and present barriers to choice” (Penetito, 1986a, p.2). By 1986, we had realized that education for us had not been a worthwhile experience, while for others, it had been. Penetito described this thus: “Good education is cumulative and sequential. But so, obviously, is bad education” (ibid.).

It was seen that for the majority of tangata whenua children in Aotearoa’s schooling system, the opportunities for “immersion-English” schools to make a difference to their life-chances were negligible. Any opportunity for this to change was best described by Benton when he quoted Jim Cummins in saying that “the

schools [should] transform society by empowering minority students rather than reflect society by disabling them” (Cummins in Benton, 1987, p.35).

It is this realization for the need to change that I now move to discussing the difficulties of creating change for tangata whenua students from within the schooling system, and how these difficulties eventually led to change from outside the system. It is important to remember that these “changes” were occurring at a time when the wider political agenda was being greatly influenced by vested interest groups representing a Neoliberal perspective. The impact of this for Maori will be seen in Chapter Three.

Significant emphasis in the mid-eighties and early nineties concerning directions for “change” centred on the notion of “good schools, bad schools”. Hirsch (1990) made reference to two studies that describe the attributes of a “good school”. The first was a 1980 research project in Britain conducted by Rutter et al., and published as *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children*. They found that good schools were characterized by the quality of the teachers, the professional structure and coherence of the institution, the degree of co-operation at all levels, the degree the school reflected its community, and the expectations of the teachers, children and parents. Rutter believed that “good schools” had four times the impact, in terms of enhancing a child’s life chances, than “bad schools” had (Hirsch, 1990, p.65).

The second study Hirsch referred to was more specific to New Zealand. This was by Ramsay et al., (1981) and titled *Tomorrow May Be Too Late*. They reached conclusions that were similar to those of Rutter, agreeing that the level of

teacher's expectations both academically and socially marked the "successful" school from the less successful. With regard to the characteristics of multicultural schools, Ramsay argued that the way forward was "the development of a nation composed of multicultural people". Hirsch added that good schools will work towards that goal (1990, p.66). In 1986, the government moved towards this direction with the introduction of "Taha Maori" into the curriculum.

Wally Penetito (1986), in his address to West Auckland principals about the concept of "Taha Maori", spoke of three themes that defined its introduction as a potential alternative to mainstream thinking. First, it signalled harmony and unity as an evolutionary process, where cooperative relationships might replace the traditionally competitive relationships found within dominant schooling administrative and pedagogical practice (p.4). In acknowledging perhaps a Freirean perception, he added, "procrastination, as the privilege of evolutionists, is a condition we cannot afford" (p.6).

Second, systems that started with racism, sexism and classism at their core are the legacy of colonialism that has been left with us. Political domination that gives rise to exploitation, cultural hegemony and educational cognito-centrism must eventually end in revolution. Revolutionaries who are Maori would focus on separate development, while those who were Pakeha would focus on the principles of equity and equality (p.8).

Third, Penetito spoke of transformation, whereby transformationists, like evolutionists, believe in "working within the existing system but with the major

objective of radically changing it structurally and therefore, culturally” (p.11). This change would be achieved, firstly, by a form of Maori control and, secondly, through the incorporation by more teachers of a “critical pedagogy” (ibid.). The critical pedagogy that Penetito supports are principles that are also maintained by Joan Metge as a common feature of any Maori pedagogy (1984). Furthermore, Penetito describes Metge’s own publication as compulsory reading for all teachers who wish their practice to make a difference.

The fundamental criteria for successful change ultimately centres on whether Maori values are accepted and acknowledged equally as those of Pakeha (Penetito, 1986, p. 15). In other words, there must be a legitimatiōn and validation of Maori knowledge. As time has proven, however, the subsequent unpopularity of “Taha Maori” has shown that the intended evolutionary process was unacceptable for Maori as a truly concrete alternative. By way of a response, the revolutionary process of establishing Kura Kaupapa Maori was initiated outside of the system in order to overcome an inability and/or unwillingness of “immersion-English” schools to undertake fundamental change. In this regard, a significant question remains, however: Can Maori educational initiatives based on kohanga reo and kura kaupapa Maori deliver the fundamental changes perceived to be absent in the “Taha Maori” initiative? What follows is a critical discussion of these initiatives with regard to improving the life chances of tangata whenua children.

2.6 “New” Developments in Indigenous Schooling

E kore te patiki e hoki tuarua ki tana puehutanga

A flounder will not return to the dust it stirred up

Fear and uncertainty, borne of a need to survive, are usually the main reasons why the flounder moves in such a hurry as to disturb the dust of its resting place. It is palpable to suggest that Maori educational initiatives like kohanga reo and kura kaupapa Maori, like the flounder, are stirring its own dust. Unlike the flounder, however, whether or not Maori educational aspirations return to their original resting place is dependent on the success and acceptance of this society acknowledging the legitimacy and validity of a Maori pedagogy, epistemology and ontology.

Accepting the proposition that “improved life chances” are directly related to “improved educational opportunities”, it is important to first recognize the “fear and uncertainty” that motivated these initiatives. The need to ensure the survival of te reo me ona tikanga was the over-riding factor in establishing kohanga reo *only*. The establishment of kura kaupapa Maori had more to do with what Maori educators saw as an opportunity to improve the educational inequalities of all Maori students through a pedagogy and epistemology more suited to our culture, as a result of the success of kohanga reo, and as a means of escaping the assimilatory practices of the existing system. In short, this initiative was directed towards recognizing the validity of Maori, as well as Pakeha knowledge.

Graham Smith (1986, p.12) described schools in Aotearoa as the social reproduction of Pakeha culture, and that reproduction was dependent on the control over the validity of knowledge. As far as Maori were concerned, he says that the validity of Maori knowledge is relegated to a position of gate-keeping mythologies (p.18). What we teach in schools is dictated by Pakeha people in key positions of decision-making within the Education Department (p.19), as the Ministry of Education was then known. This power is not shared, and, as Martin Luther King once said, privileged groups seldom give up their privileges (cited in Gilling, 1989, p.4). Smith uses Pierre Bourdieu's "Cycle of Cultural Reproduction" to highlight the major influence a vested interest group can obtain when it has control of the design, implementation and monitoring of the national curriculum.

Connolly, noting Freire, exposes the use of education by the oppressor to maintain a state of neutrality, in which the oppressed have a resigned acceptance of their fate. By maintaining this neutrality, the oppressor is able to maintain power, and through power, they maintain neutrality in education (1980, p.72). Sultana describes the negative affect of this phenomena by the term "cultural imperialism" (1989, p.2) and argues that the response from Maori children is to create an anti-school culture to "affirm class and ethnic identity in front of a monolithic, monocultural establishment" (ibid.). Freire and Shor (1987, p.175) expand on Connolly's paper in so far as it discusses not only methods of change, but also addresses problems of implementing such changes within the classroom. Key aspects include how critical pedagogy can help us see the hidden, manipulative forces that are used to deny us a true understanding of reality; in particular, that

real change will not happen in the classroom until structural changes occur within the society beyond the school gate.

In Aotearoa, Smith posited an additional argument that there is a need to not only change the *overt* material influences within education, but also the *covert* structural influences at the levels of ideology and power relations (1990, p.74). Linda Smith also specifies the importance of an atmosphere of wider political unrest and resentment as having significance on the critiquing of the education system that ultimately led to the establishment of kura kaupapa Maori (1992, p.222).

The opportunity for students to go through the education system in te reo Maori, from kohanga reo to whare wananga, is a move which satisfies Freire's notion; that is, for education to be a liberating force, "the oppressed require their own pedagogy" (Connolly, 1980, p.70). This opportunity was made possible by tangata whenua educators of the time reflecting critically on the unequal educational opportunities for tangata whenua, and then initiating "change".

These initiatives afforded the opportunity for tangata whenua to address the oppressiveness of cognitive and moral submission (see Hill, in progress) that resulted from the imposed use of the English language as the medium of communication in schools. From the beginning, discourse relating to the efficacy of kohanga reo and kura kaupapa Maori were couched within this framework; that is, the "problem" was in the language and therefore that tangata whenua children could overcome perceived schooling underachievement through the use of te reo as the medium of instruction. Pauline Gibbons (1992, p.227) wrote that the hidden

curriculum of schooling is the student's development of a cognitive academic language which is the medium through which most knowledge is acquired, processed and demonstrated. Such theoretical positions were used to allay the "fear and uncertainty" of parents and communities who doubted the merits of total immersion schooling. For a student who is fluent in te reo, that previous linguistic knowledge will aid learning English. Gibbons describes it as a bridge into their second language and as a peg on which to hang new learning (p.225).

Consequently, being fluent in te reo is beneficial for assisting one's learning of English. Linda Smith adds that it is no more difficult than for English-speaking students (Smith, L., 1992, p.225).

Benton (1987, p.4) writes that bilingualism is potentially a tremendous asset, as any bicultural scholar, businessperson, or diplomat could testify. Le Francois (1991, p.173) states that immersion programmes of children learning a second minority language develop a high level of proficiency in that language, and contributes to general academic achievement and frequently strengthens the first language. Apart from the academic advantages, by acknowledging a tangata whenua child's cultural identity, their own self-esteem would be raised, countering Sultana's creation of an anti-school culture. In addition, an increase in self-esteem would further enhance the cognitive development of the student, according to Maslow's (1973) "Hierarchy of Needs" (where a lack of self-esteem prevents further development into self-actualisation). Arguing along similar lines, Paul McLean (1990) concurs stating that an increase in intelligent reasoning would result from the subsequent increase in self-esteem.

Supported by such theoretical arguments, the kohanga reo movement was established at the 1981 Hui Whakatauria in response to the imminent death of te reo. The first center was officially opened on 13 April 1982 at Pukeatea. In 1984, delegates at the Maori Education Conference at Ngaruawahia passed a resolution pointing to the way in which the existing schooling system failed tangata whenua, and urging that there be established an alternative school system modeled on the principles underlying the kohanga reo. Consequently, in 1985, the first model kura kaupapa was officially opened by the then Prime Minister, David Lange, at Hoani Waititi Marae in Auckland. This kura, as well as Te Kura O Waipareira and Ruamata of Rotorua, operated as private schools until 1989 when, with government approval and funding, another three pilot schools began.

The kohanga reo movement was, at its inception, state funded through the Department of Maori Affairs, not the Department of Education (Middleton et al. 1990, p.118). With the introduction of *Tomorrow's Schools*, a National Kohanga Reo Trust was established and funding was provided directly to the Trust, through the Ministry of Education. Responsibility for the training of teachers remained with the National Trust. As mentioned previously, between 1985 and 1989, kura kaupapa were operated as private schools with no state support. They did not follow a structured syllabus. They sometimes had unpaid teachers and had few resources available for teaching through te reo (Jeffries et al, 1994). The *Picot Report* of 1988 identified two key features needed by these schools. The first was the development of a charter, which would give tangata whenua more scope to exercise a fair measure of influence over their children's education (p.2). The second was the lack of a procedure enabling tangata whenua to develop an

alternative system. *Tomorrow's Schools*, as a result, suggested it should be “possible for a group of parents (representing at least 21 students) [to] withdraw from existing arrangements and to set up their own learning institution, which would be funded by the state in the same way as other institutions under [the] proposed new structure” (p.3). Both these key recommendations were incorporated in the 1989 Education Act and the 1990 Education Amendment Act (p.4).

Three further features of reform for indigenous education followed from the *Picot Report* and the *Tomorrow's Schools* document. These were: the provision to co-opt Board members to reflect the ethnic background of students; the appointment of non-certified teachers of te reo (a short-term solution to the lack of trained, fluent teachers); and, the inclusion of the Maori Language Funding Factor (ibid.). As well, the Ministry of Education's 1993 document, *Education for the 21st Century*, included plans to ensure full participation and achievement by Maori in all areas of education. It suggested, for example, that the number of fluent speakers in the teaching workforce should be, by 1995, at least 1000, by 1998, at least 1200, by 2001, at least 1500. Also, on 20 April 1994, a formal agreement was signed between the Ministry of Education and Te Runanga Nui O Nga Kura Kaupapa Maori O Aotearoa (which represents kura kaupapa), that guarantees a say in all future decisions affecting Maori language schools. As well, on 11 September 1994, the Ministry of Education launched the curriculum statements for the teaching of Maori language, mathematics and science in te reo.

2.7 Change or Chimera?

These then, were the exciting new developments happening in Aotearoa in terms of providing schooling alternatives for tangata whenua children. However, as I have mentioned previously, by what means does one measure the efficacy of such programmes? How does one measure systems of thought, world-views, beliefs and values? When deciding on any level of improvement, one must first need to know on what foundation that improvement is based. If educational success is to be gauged on the gaining of a post-primary or tertiary qualification, there is irrefutable statistical support to show that tangata whenua students of “immersion-English” schooling are “unsuccessful”. It is too early yet to declare whether kohanga reo and kura kaupapa will improve within these parameters – however, the “target to beat” is not great. The adage that springs to mind is “anything must be better than this”. Also, for indigenous people, the use of credentials to measure success becomes clouded through the easy manipulation of research instruments. For example, it could be argued that School Certificate pass rates for iwi were greatly inflated with the transition from 4-subject passes to single-subject passes. The life chances and opportunities of gainful employment for single-subject (School Certificate Maori) “successes” did not increase in proportion to the inflation of the “statistics”.

What is more measurable is undoubtedly the change in pedagogy and epistemology from the initial development of kohanga reo and kura kaupapa to the present time. Prior to 1989 and *Tomorrow's Schools*, these initiatives were owned by tangata whenua and they taught what they wanted. There was no

government funding and involvement. They were symbols of resistance and mirrored Freire's dictum of gaining liberation through the oppressed having their own pedagogy. The 1989 Education Act and the 1990 Education Amendment Act, however, saw the introduction of government involvement within this system as a result of government provided funding. Through this, these initiatives returned to the "embrace" of the state. As a consequence, the state has been able to implement "control measures" through accountability of funding, the Education Review Office, Teacher Registration Board criteria, the previously mentioned "uncontrolled" proliferation of teacher-training programmes for "Maori" teachers, the New Zealand Qualifications Authority and the curriculum. In line with these external controls there has nonetheless come expansion, and consequently, an accompanying fractionalisation.

Even within the concept of kura kaupapa there has emerged challenges to the philosophical underpinnings of the original movement. The movement's founding document, Te Aho Matua (ancestral beliefs and principles), has become contested. This document is the philosophical foundation on which kura kaupapa stand. It embraces all the physical and spiritual dimensions unique to tangata whenua. It combines the knowledge and wisdom of our forebears with the knowledge that is available in contemporary society. Today, there is contestation between some whanau and hapu and educational organisations over such things as the perceived threat of once again homogenizing and universalising indigenous knowledge to the detriment of localized iwi knowledges. It is ironic that Smith (1993) used this same argument when referring to the failure of state developed initiatives to address "Maori" schooling crises. Furthermore, although the Ministry of

Education signed an agreement with Te Runanganui O Nga Kura Kaupapa Maori that allows this representative body to represent schools supporting Te Aho Matua, the Ministry under section 115 of the 1989 Education Act, still retains authority.

Paulo Freire and Graham Smith stated that to gain improvement, change had to be more than superficial – it had to be structural. Since government involvement, that opportunity to create structural change has been defeated. From what once may have seemed like a positive step to removing barriers of an old regime, is being turned into creating a new regime with the same barriers.

This situation has come about through the need for funding – all education resides in a politico-economic sphere. Until tangata whenua have secured a capital base that will free us from government dependency, or alternatively, the right for iwi to have more than a “consultative” role in the decision-making process, any thoughts of tino rangatiratanga in education will be short-lived.

Kura kaupapa will become embroiled over the direction of education as imposed by the New Right – in the scramble to prepare for the technological and scientific demands of the marketplace. Predictably the pursuit of Pakeha knowledge will again take precedence over the acceptance of tangata whenua knowledge. Money and effort will be spent on building up a tangata whenua word-base to accommodate this pursuit, despite the fact that these initiatives were established to provide a new direction in pedagogy and epistemology more suited to our culture than that of Pakeha culture. Undoubtedly, kura kaupapa also came as a response

to an inability of the system to initiate both infrastructural and structural changes that would overcome existing assimilatory practices. This system exists through the manipulation of power and control over schools and teacher training institutions. It also exists as a result of Foucault's governmentalisation of power relations and its affects on tangata whenua. The example I used in Chapter One about tapu, noa and leapfrog indeed shows that hegemony is a key concept for understanding the dynamic staying-power of development, "its immanent adaptability to changing conditions, which allows it to survive, indeed to thrive, up to the present" (Mulenga, 1994. p.256).

The existing system has "failed" tangata whenua and the advent of kohanga reo and kura kaupapa, before *Tomorrow's Schools* was seen as the only option left available. Post *Tomorrow's Schools* has afforded the government, through its ideological apparatus, the opportunity to regain control and power. This reclamation of control and power is distinguishable by the control of intellectual and moral development. The leapfrog example confirms who exactly is controlling the moral development of children in these institutions. So unlike the flounder, kura kaupapa are in danger of returning to the place it once fled. This is not because it is afraid to "compete" for space on the technological or scientific stage. It is because it is in danger of losing the philosophical underpinnings that would cater for the "unsurprisingly" disproportionate number of tangata whenua children who, through no fault of their own, can find no room on the hierarchical stage of a meritocratic society.

Under the existing system, tangata whenua children who “fail” feel ostracized from both worlds; their own and the beliefs and values of Western society. Kura kaupapa looked to correct that imbalance by securing success in our own world, while pursuing Pakeha knowledge. That success, however, is not decided on fluency of te reo alone – it must be accompanied with a firm understanding of wairua, aroha and manaakitanga – just a few of the concepts embodied in tikanga. To forsake this aspect in the pursuit of Pakeha knowledge (via the curriculum and ERO) and ideology, albeit in te reo, would be detrimental. To produce generations of fluent speakers, who have no concept of whanaungatanga, is both criminal and unethical.

Notwithstanding the improved cognitive learning opportunities for the child, the most important advantages of these initiatives were the introduction of a pedagogy and epistemology that was initiated for and by tangata whenua, with the resultant support and increased involvement in their child’s schooling by the parents and community.

2.8 Kura Kaupapa – A Child of Neoliberalism

While longitudinal research concerning kura kaupapa is still in progress, the generally assumed position taken by most indigenous educators and communities is that kura kaupapa is by far the most exciting educational initiative yet undertaken, and much of the discourse relating to indigenous educational achievement is centred around them. The irony is, however, that when “taking seriously the relations between culture and power” the picture becomes somewhat

less rosy, for the reality continues to be that kura kaupapa **caters for less than 4% of the Maori school-age population** (Ministry of Education, 2000, p.8).

Considering that 40% of the total Maori population is at or under school-age, and the state's unwillingness to establish new kura kaupapa in line with increasing whanau, hapu and iwi needs, one must seriously question the state's empathy and support for this project. I would argue that kura kaupapa has every potential to create an "elite" or "bourgeois" indigenous grouping within contemporary society as a direct consequence of these state-inspired limitations, and that this scenario sits comfortably with the prevailing neoliberal ideology of Aotearoa society - that kura kaupapa do indeed reflect the society in which we live – a neoliberal society that legitimates and creates social, political, economic and cultural inequality.

In other words, state influence on the limited growth of kura kaupapa will ensure that 92% of Maori schoolchildren (and 40% of the total Maori population) continue to be locked into the existing inadequate schooling system. The "fortunate few" may very well become the "market face" of tangata whenua – to be "consumed" when required, for tangihanga, for powhiri, for "Maori" classes, for iwi and state public relations promotions and other false advertising campaigns purporting "progress". We are in danger of replicating the exclusiveness and elitism of "market forces" – reducing indigenosity to a "discipline", a product, a service, a commodity - returning again to a purely instrumentalist approach to schooling – attendance at an "exclusive" kura kaupapa ensures economic and social mobility "through market demand". Apple identified this phenomenon when discussing the contest between property rights and person

rights in America in the late 1970s, when neoliberal ideology was being first introduced there. Person rights (or the primacy of the individual):

took on ever more importance in nearly all our institutions, as evidenced in aggressive affirmative action programs, widespread welfare and educational activist programs, and so on. In education this was very clear in the growth of bilingual programs and in the development of women's, black, Hispanic, and Native American studies in high schools and colleges... Yet even with these gains, the earlier coalitions began to disintegrate. In the minority communities, class polarization deepened. The majority of barrio and ghetto residents "remained locked in poverty," while a relatively small portion of the black and brown population were able to take advantage of educational opportunities and new jobs (the latter being largely within the state itself)... progressive social movements had to fight over a limited share of resources and power. Antagonistic rather than complementary relationships developed amongst groups. Minority groups... had difficulty coming to an agreement over programs, goals, and strategies. (Apple, 1993, p.105)

This concern is reiterated here in the Ministry of Education's 1998 report on the compulsory schools sector:

At the beginning of 1998, five new kura kaupapa Maori were established, bringing the total to 59. During 1998 the establishment process for kura kaupapa Maori was reviewed to ensure more robust and transparent processes for establishment and to align these as closely as possible with those for general new schools. As a result of this review, no new kura kaupapa Maori will be established in the 1998/99 financial year. (Ministry of Education, 1999, p. 12)

Cultural continuity is a living phenomenon of the people – not a privilege.

Restrictions, limitations, epistemological and pedagogical redefinition and above all else, an acquiescence of these things by tangata whenua, is the general rule.

Concern, critique and contest over these "new" developments are the exception.

Almost three decades after the politicisation of *some* tangata whenua, the continuing "culture of silence" remains disconcerting and perhaps indicative of

our continuing intellectual and moral submissiveness. In short, the hegemony of tangata whenua remains constant in a neoliberal environment.

2.9 Conclusion: The Need for A Real Alternative

Earlier I alluded to the Foucauldian dictum; “ask not who we are, but rather what we are”. By extension, and on present patterns, in forty years time over ninety percent of Aotearoa’s indigenous population will be victims of a mainstream schooling system that has been captured by neoliberal ideologues and caught up in the all-consuming momentum of globalisation. Already the signs are there to be seen. Our tamariki are every day indoctrinated into the global village mentality. Technological fundamentalism is an insidious individuating and individualizing Pavlovian process. Indigenous and non-indigenous educators have, for the past three decades, been obsessed with a sense of urgency in confronting the continuing cultural and ideological assimilatory processes, the inequity of our schooling system, and the domesticating, dumbing-down of offerings that constitute knowledge. But to what effect?

A synopsis of Aotearoa’s schooling system juxtaposed against a serious analysis of the relations between culture and power question whether much has changed at all since 1814. With the introduction of Taha Maori, we saw the “fluid dynamism” of power used to curtail indigenous dissent. Real resistance from “outside” the system was soon returned to the “embrace” of the state. By limiting these potentially liberating and emancipatory initiatives, the state has arguably again curtailed indigenous dissent. And this is at a time when a global assimilation

process provides the greatest threat ever to indigenous cultural continuity. For example, mass marketed, packaged, and heavily advertised icons like traditional design, medicines, songs and haka position tangata whenua cultural property alongside other commodities and are seen more often for their intrinsic economic, rather than cultural, value (notwithstanding the rhetoric of the sponsors).

This Chapter has shown how power can be used to maintain its own position through the utility of schooling. I have shown how tangata whenua have, through the schooling system, been imbued with a response that lacks a critical quality and manifests in a culture of silence. Freire, Foucault, Althusser and Bourdieu have shown that the state and its “powerful constituencies” maintain this leverage through the control and manipulation of the curriculum and schools. It therefore stands to reason that one way of overcoming this phenomenon is to operate outside of the state’s control, as was the case with kura kaupapa before *Tomorrow’s Schools*. Another option is tertiary education where the state’s control of the curriculum, at the moment, is not so palpable.

The establishment of whare wananga created such a potentiality, as will be introduced in the next chapter (Chapter Three). It provided a timely opportunity to introduce knowledge that was both liberating and critical. Whilst Chapter Three therefore contains an outline of some of the key theoretical understandings gleaned from the work of Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser, Chapter Four describes the **application** of these concepts to the creation of a critical theory component which seeks to maximize the potential for radical theory in Wananga. The purpose of this programme is to not only “know our adversaries”; it also

serves to provide a core of graduates who have an understanding of the relations of culture and power - how hegemony operates - and who may contribute to the intellectual leadership that will be required to mount a legitimate and sustained effort to overcome a culture of silence.

CHAPTER 3: Gramsci and Althusser's Contribution to Radical Change: Lessons on Cutting the Shackles at the Whare Wananga

3.1 Introduction

In this Chapter, I turn to the ideas of both Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser to lay the groundwork for a new and radical theory and pedagogy which lies at the heart of attempts to facilitate a developing critical consciousness within the students at Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi. As I will argue subsequently (in Chapter Four), it is essentially the work of both these theorists which provides the additional means of defending the development of the critical theory component at the wananga. Rather than try to outline the whole of the wananga programme in this chapter, I will begin here by outlining the importance of various conceptual underpinnings, the application of which will then be described in greater detail in Chapters Four and Five. Whilst this chapter is principally about the *theory* of how to cut the shackles, Chapters Four and Five are essentially about the *practice*.

I begin here with a synopsis of Gramsci's position *vis a vis* four key conceptual understandings: his dialectical rendering of historical materialism; the base/superstructure reconceptualisation which underpins his notion of the "integral state"; his theory of hegemony; and the role of intellectuals. Combined, these concepts provide us with powerful theoretical tools to explore the tenacity of "hegemony" and to highlight the importance of intellectual leadership in countering the stultification arising from our own tendency to be made governable. To this end, firstly, I will briefly describe Gramsci's philosophy of praxis and how this philosophy led Gramsci to reformulate "historical materialism

in such a way as to allow for both the influence of ideas on history and for the impact of the individual human will” (Joll, 1977, p.8). Secondly, I will examine the concept of base/superstructure in order to explain how Gramsci “made an original contribution to the development of historical materialism through his elaboration of the concept of the relations between infrastructure and superstructures” (Textier, 1979, p.48). Thirdly, I will discuss how Gramsci’s theory of hegemony is consequential to his definition of the “integral state”. Finally, Gramsci’s position regarding the role of the intellectual will be explored.

Following an analysis of Gramsci’s work, I then turn to Louis Althusser and, in particular, his notion of the state ideological and repressive apparatuses. Althusser provides the theoretical explanation for many, if not all, of the outcomes resulting from interaction between tangata whenua and Tauwiwi as a consequence of colonialism. Similar connections can also be made as a consequence of these continuing interactions within a neoliberal environment, and in both cases, the most devastating outcomes can be seen to have been inflicted through the schooling system.

3.2 A Philosophy of Praxis and Historical Materialism

Gramsci’s philosophy of praxis is both a philosophy and a practical activity. Insofar as he rejected positivism within socialism as a credible “philosophy of transition”, he saw the fallaciousness of any theory of “inevitability”. A simple cause and effect rendering of complex economic and ideological factors led Gramsci to reject positivistic prophecies which relied on capitalism to collapse via “determined economic conditions” (Hill, 1995, p.4). His notions of hegemony and

the integral state instead put “emphasis on intellectual and cultural influences rather than on purely economic ones” (Joll, 1977, p.8).

By doing this, Gramsci went some way in repairing the damage that was done by those Russian communists who “appropriated” Marxist philosophy and reduced its concept to “historical and economic determinism” (Textier, 1979, p.48). By engaging in a dialectic manifest in his reconceptualisation of historical materialism, the prominence of man within the social change process was highlighted. Although Marx never used the term “historical materialism”, he did speak of his own dialectical method “by which he simply referred to the fundamental conditions of human existence” (Fromm, 1961, p.9). Marx’s whole criticism of capitalism was, in fact, its assumption of money and material gain being the key motivator of men. His concept of socialism was essentially a critique of this material interest; a critique of the effect of this reduction of man’s being to a purely possessive dimension (p.14).

Gramsci’s notion of historical materialism involved a dialectical relationship between and within the base and superstructures. This meant not treating them as isolated concepts or as one determining the other, but more as “a theory of relations between infrastructure and superstructure, the theory of their unity, and of the “historical bloc” which they comprise” (Textier, 1979, p.49). In this way, Gramsci returns Marxism to a philosophy that is “neither idealism nor materialism but a synthesis: humanism and naturalism” (Fromm, 1961, p.11).

3.3 Base and Superstructure

Historical materialism, as propounded by orthodox Marxists, is a materialist interpretation of history in that the social, cultural and political phenomena are determined by the mode of production of material things. This mode of production is located in the base (economy) of society. The base consists of three elements; the labourer, the means of production and the non-worker who eventually purchases the product. The difference between economies is how these three elements are combined, either through a relation of possession (either the labourer can control and direct, or not) or a relation of property (the non-labourer owns either the means of production or labourers or both, in which case he can then take the product) (Abercrombie et al., 1984, p.18). Each economy, however, is distinguished by the different relationships between the forces and relations of production – the mode of production (p.157). The forces of production consist of both the materials worked on and the tools and techniques employed in the production of economic goods (p.98), while the relations of production determines the constitution of the classes, of capitalists and workers (p.206).

The superstructure consist of “other social forms” such as the state, the family, and ideology. The class-theoretical explanation of the relations of production means that the character of the superstructure is largely determined by the economic interests of the dominant class (p.19). The overall determinant capacity of the mode of production gives causal priority to the economy rather than to ideas in the explanation of historical processes, as seen in this orthodox Marxist distinction of the base/superstructure (p.113). In other words, the economy

directly determines man's existential experiences – matter determines consciousness. And because of the class-theoretical explanation of the relations of production, one social group is able to hold dominance over others. Gramsci, however, saw that “the rule of one class over another does not depend on economic or physical power alone but rather on persuading the ruled to accept the system of beliefs of the ruling class and to share their social, cultural and moral values” (Joll, 1977, p.8). His response was “a decisive rejection of the so-called orthodox and scientific Marxism” (Morgan, 1987, p.297).

Gramsci's contribution to Marxist philosophy was in his reconceptualisation of the base/superstructure. His notion of historical materialism involved a more dialectical relationship in that, while acknowledging that the base “is indeed [a] “primary” and “conditioning” factor” (Textier, 1979, p.58) man's “creativity occurs in the development of the productive forces of social work” (p.60). Gramsci is reiterating the Marxist idea that “it is on the terrain of ideology that men become aware of economic conflicts” (p.57).

This “upgrading” of the factor of cultural leadership led Gramsci to study the role of the intellectuals in society (Bates, 1975, p.353). This, in turn, led him to break down the superstructure into two, which he described as “civil society” and “political society”. Civil society comprises private organisms such as schools, clubs, journals and political parties and political society comprises institutions such as the government, courts, police, and army (ibid.). From this, Gramsci was able to afford a theory of the state in its integral sense which includes not only the governmental apparatus of coercion (or political society) but also the hegemonic

apparatus (or civil society), by means of which the class in power rules society as a whole with its consent. The integral state incorporates the whole body of superstructural activities (Textier, 1979, p.63). By not separating these two societies, Gramsci shows that “they are interrelated with class control [which is] dependent ultimately on the degree of equilibrium that obtains between the two segments” (Morgan, 1987, p.299). This emphasis on intellectual and cultural influences enabled the development of Gramsci’s doctrine of hegemony (Joll, 1977, p.8).

3.4 Hegemony – Overcoming Intellectual and Moral Submissiveness

Williams has described Gramsci’s concept of hegemony as his “specific, original and creative contribution to Marxism and to the worker’s movement” (cited in Morgan, 1987, p.299). This may be attributed to the fact that, as previously mentioned, Gramsci was one of the first to realize that class domination did not depend on economic or physical power alone. Morgan describes the Gramscian use of the term as both the economic and the political dominance of a social class buttressed by the ideological diffusion of a class viewpoint until both political and civil society are permeated by its systems of values and beliefs (ibid.). It was therefore this notion of hegemony, developed through the concept of civil society and the integral state, which enabled Gramsci to “reiterate the humanistic values” that underpinned Marx’s concept of man, and in so doing, turn the tide of philosophical discourse.

Fundamentally, Gramsci's notion of hegemony was an elaboration of the dialectical relationship between the base and the superstructures and uncovered the importance of beliefs and values in relation to "common sense" and "good sense". From this it was possible "to grasp immediately *the historical class character* of all superstructural activities and in particular, **intellectual and moral activities**" (Textier, 1979, p.63) [my emphasis in bold]. It exposed the "complex of practical and ideological social relations which [are] established and grow up on the base of determined relations of production" (p.71). Gramsci identified that the role of the intellectuals was an integral part of this development. Through the development of his notion of hegemony, it can become possible to attack "the essential problem of penetrating bourgeois hegemony over worker's consciousness and establishes the need of the workers, through the worker's party, "to think themselves into historical autonomy"" (Williams cited in Morgan, 1987, p.299). The work for intellectuals, the party and the masses in this counter-hegemonic role then becomes an educative one in pursuit of the development of "a *regulated society*" – a non-coercive, self-governing society" (McLean, 1985, p.190). It is at this point that Gramsci sees the evolution of revolution as a long, drawn-out "war of position" – a battle for hegemonic control and the "passage from objectivity to subjectivity, from necessity to freedom" (p.197). The "real" is made possible via the development of social productive forces and the political initiative of men (Textier, 1979, p.52). Gramsci's notion of hegemony has awakened the need for humanity not to remain embedded in its prehistory (ibid.) and has laid the foundation for other philosophers, such as Paulo Freire, Louis Althusser and Pierre Bourdieu, to challenge the dehumanizing of humanity as a result of hegemony, by giving man a history; a past, a present and a future. The

relevance and value of Gramsci's contribution to Marxism cannot be understated for tangata whenua, and they are, in fact, essential for our efforts to "know the enemy". Walker is succinct when he writes that "domination was achieved in stages by a process of capitalist penetration, in which Maori were willing partners, followed by cultural invasion, manipulation and violence" (1996b, p.257). Tangata whenua continue to be "willing partners" in this age of neo-capitalism.

3.5 The Role of the Intellectuals

Gramsci's reconceptualisation of the base/superstructure which underpins his notion of the integral state, stresses that "the struggle was to be fought on the vital level – the level of *ideas and culture* rather than the level of economic concerns alone" (Hill, 1996, p.53), confirming that by necessity, "the struggle will ultimately be *ideological*" (ibid.). What was required was "a *rearticulation* of ideology which would determine a reform of consciousness and of methods of knowledge simultaneously" (McLean, 1985, p.197). This rearticulation of ideology, or the articulation of a counter-hegemony, was such a necessary prerequisite for the unity of the struggle (p. 195) that Gramsci asserted that "there had to be 'a revolution' before there could be a revolution. It had to be a moral and intellectual one" (p.196) - in essence, "a revolution in the minds of men" (p.197). This, Gramsci argued, was an organizing task that "historically belonged to the intellectuals" (Hill, 1996, p.53).

While Gramsci points out that "everyone has intellectual potential...[that] can be developed through education, allowing individuals to work out, in a conscious and

critical way, their own view of the world” (Morgan, 1987, p.302), he identifies two specific groups “who are intellectuals by social function” (p.303). These he identifies as traditional intellectuals and organic intellectuals. Traditional intellectuals are those who:

possess a monopoly of the knowledge of that society: they are the competent manipulators of the literary language of that society. These intellectuals...are subject to an anti-historical and anti-progressive (non-revolutionary) temptation...their philosophy is static, and they act as agents for the status quo; they unconsciously identify with existing society and become the propagators of its values; they are the functionaries who preserve and diffuse its “hegemony””. (Cave, 1983, p. 157)

Organic intellectuals are characterized by:

their sense of history, not merely that they know the past – this they have in common with the traditional group – but that they know the present. That is, they are aware of the forces at work in society; they are in touch with the emergent oppressed, and they identify with this group; they become its teachers and they learn from it. They are aware that their philosophy, or world-view, is historically valid, historically necessary, in fact, and they are convinced that this awareness obliges them to be involved in the actualization of this new philosophy, i.e. they must be politicians, not in the usual sense, but in the sense of working side by side with the oppressed for the articulation of their aspirations and for the actualization of a new and better socialist world. (Cave, 1983, p.157)

The distinction Gramsci makes between traditional and organic intellectuals comes about through his awareness of the severe limitations of “common sense” thinking (Hill, 1996, p.54) and has its origins with the reformists who “vulgarized” Marxist philosophy by “portraying the Socialist Party as solely a *political* entity and reducing the liberation goals of Marxism to the capitalist concept of democracy” (ibid.). What was apparent was an inherent inability of these traditional intellectuals to frame the struggle *outside* capitalist definitions

and values, and so consequently prematurely ending “the struggle in economic compromise, instead of extending beyond the immediate to the important long-term goals” (ibid.).

For Gramsci, the challenge to capitalism was to be achieved through redefining “revolution” as a process rather than a spontaneous and specific event, which took place on two fronts simultaneously: one being a process of de-mystification in order to penetrate the world of appearances, rooted in dominant belief systems, and the other to create an entirely fresh pattern of ideas and values that would form part of a counter-hegemonic platform revealed in political practice (Morgan, 1987, p.301) - hence the evolution of revolution as a long, drawn-out war of position.

Essential to the conduct of this new revolution was “the elaboration of intellectuals either organic or sympathetic to the cause of Socialism” (McLean, 1985, p.199). The problem for Gramsci was in overcoming the intellectual and moral submissiveness (Hill, 2002, in press) of the working class as a result of a lack of resources and opportunities – a consequence borne of the fact that these resources and opportunities “usually lie in the hands of the dominant class, as segments of its hegemonic control” (Morgan, 1987, p.303). To counter this, Gramsci “insisted on the conscious, active, educational intervention of the workers” party” in order to “educate the proletariat and train it to become the ruling class of the future” (ibid.). Through the workers” party, this core of organic intellectuals would be primarily responsible for “the education of the masses, their

role being to transform the “spontaneity” into “consciousness”, the “compromise” into “revolution”” (Hill, 1996, p.54).

Through alliance and solidarity Gramsci was able to “broaden the base of socialism to represent a *nationally unifying movement*”, and “extend the struggle for “democracy” from a *class* to a *national* level” (ibid.). There was also potential to move this struggle to an international level based on Gramsci’s redefinition of “democracy” in socialist terms...as a *humanistic* rather than simply a *parliamentary political term*” (ibid.). This expansive tendency ensured also that “the Party struggle... shifts from the economic-corporative to the ethico-political, which embodies a move from the “quantitative” to the “qualitative” dimension” (p.55).

An immediate concern for Gramsci in establishing this core of organic intellectuals was in being able to educate sufficient numbers of organic intellectuals from the working class who could in turn educate the masses. What he considered was the need to win “over some traditional intellectuals initially to the cause, until such time as a body of organic intellectuals could emerge” (McLean, 1985, p.199). This task for Gramsci, had to be accomplished “within the climate of another regard – Fascism” (ibid.). It was the surprising (to Gramsci) stranglehold Facism was to take in Italy that eventually saw Gramsci imprisoned on 8 August 1926, and led him to challenge continuously this adversary through his *Prison Notebooks* up until the time of his death in confinement on 27 April 1937 (Hill, 1996, p.55).

It is in similar circumstances that the focus of this thesis is based. Since the 1980s and the advent of neoliberalism in Aotearoa, the distinction between traditional and organic intellectuals has become clouded in terms of challenging neoliberalism “on the vital level of *ideas and culture* rather than the level of economic concerns alone”. Where Gramsci sought to challenge capitalism, this thesis argues that the challenge for tangata whenua is to maintain cultural continuity and well-being against the ever-increasing tide of the economic fundamentalism that is neoliberalism. Where Gramsci saw the need for a unifying national movement that also had potential at an international level, this thesis argues that tangata whenua need that same unifying movement, but at the level of traditional social structures of whanau, hapu and iwi. Where Gramsci saw the need for the Party struggle to shift from the economic-corporative to the ethico-political, this thesis argues the same need for tangata whenua at a time when most iwi are being seduced by corporatism. Where Gramsci saw the utility of the workers’ party as a vehicle to educate the working classes, this thesis argues that the establishment of whare wananga provides the same potential to foster “a *rearticulation* of ideology which would determine a reform of consciousness and of methods of knowledge simultaneously”.

In Gramscian terms, organic “Maori” intellectuals have been instrumental in establishing whare wananga. What is argued however is that this potentially liberating institution (as also with newly reconstituted Iwi formations) is in danger of being constrained within (neo) *capitalist definitions and values* to the detriment of pursuing the challenge on the level of indigenous *ideas and culture*. What is argued is that in the case of tangata whenua in a neoliberal environment, organic

“Maori” intellectuals are failing to contest and make space at this vital level of indigenous ideas and values. Progressive development is measured in competing with other institutions for increased student numbers, more consumer (student) choice and technological advancement (distance education over face-to-face pedagogy). Contemporary organic “indigenous” intellectuals are unable or unwilling to consider the effects of commodification, corporatisation and privatization on cultural continuity and well-being *at the level of ideas and culture*, and outside a purely economic paradigm. And it is in order to fulfill this specific task, I contend in Chapter Six that requires a new form of intellectual – the indigenous intellectual.

3.6 Althusser’s Application of Gramscian Theory

In discussing Gramsci’s concept of historical materialism, his base/superstructure reconceptualisation, his theory of hegemony, and the role of intellectuals, the intention is to synthesize these concepts in order to place the importance of each within his philosophy of praxis. This is to show how Gramsci influenced Orthodox Marxism’s concept of historical materialism, and in so doing, became instrumental in the ongoing salvaging of Marx’s original intentions concerning the sociological development of humanity. By including the influence Gramsci has on other philosophers, it is intended to unveil the influence Marx had on Gramsci. Notwithstanding the fact that the concepts of historical materialism, dialectical relationships of base and superstructure, and the political, economic and ideological aspects of hegemony are but a part of Gramsci’s philosophy of praxis, I believe it is vitally important to not lose sight of Marx’s aim; “the spiritual

emancipation of man, of his liberation from the chains of economic determination, of restituting him in his human wholeness, of enabling him to find unity and harmony with his fellow man and with nature” (Fromm, 1961, p.3). To always have faith in this intention and to work towards exposing and eliminating dehumanising practices forms, I believe, the essence of the philosophy of praxis.

Louis Althusser, a French Marxist social philosopher aligns his concerns over orthodox Marxism with those of Gramsci through his objection of the economic determinism which he thinks is implicit in most accounts of that model. To this end, he similarly acknowledges the legitimacy of human agency when he proposes that ideology and politics are conditions of existence of the economy, supporting the dialectical relationship between base and superstructure (Abercrombie et al, 1984, p.10). Integral to this position is his concept of the mode of production being a complex relationship of economy, ideology and politics.

From this position it is a short step across to what is considered Althusser’s most influential contribution - the concept of ideological state apparatuses and repressive state apparatuses. Repressive state apparatuses (police, military, etc) overtly ensure the political conditions of the reproduction of relations of production primarily through the use of force, and state ideological apparatuses (church, mass media, family, schools, etc) work more covertly to meet the same ends through ideology. Althusser considers that of these ideological apparatuses, the schools are the most important (Gordon, 1989, p.5).

When considering this notion of schools as an ideological state apparatus in conjunction with a reading of Gramsci's hegemony as intellectual and moral submissiveness (Hill, in progress), the existential reality for tangata whenua is made explicit in terms of inequality. Walker identifies this connection thus:

In 1931 T.B. Strong, Director of Education, made explicit the role of schooling in the reproduction of structural relations of inequality with the assertion that Maori education should turn out boys to be good farmers and girls to be good farmers' wives. This provision of inferior education in the native schools persisted well into the middle of this century. (Walker, 1996b, p.265)

Recognition that this inequality still persists is manifest in the continuous need to "close the gaps". Similarly, it is evident in a societal, almost fatalistic, assumption that these inequalities "come as no surprise". While state-prescribed "knowledge" for tangata whenua was, and continues to be, limited to menial, manual and assimilatory outcomes that contribute to the intellectual submissiveness of tangata whenua, Althusser also identifies a moral submissiveness in that:

following Gramsci, [he] has spoken in this connection of *cultural hegemony*. He uses this concept to cover a situation where a wide range of values, attitudes and beliefs, particularly, but not entirely, of a moral nature, that support the existing order and the interests of those who dominate it, is accepted as legitimate by those without power. (MacDonald cited in Musgrave, 1979, p.202)

Althusser also argued that "ideology amounted to more than false consciousness and played a real role in social life, especially through the cultural and social reproduction of capitalism" (Johnson, 2000, p.358). Reproduction theories such as these have been criticized for "adopting a deterministic stance to societal processes... [being] overly pessimistic, and as denying the possibilities of political and social change" (Gordon, 1989, p. 560). What these critics saw was the denial of the phenomenon of resistance. Indigenous experience in schooling

since the 1980s supports Althusser's contention that ideology amounted to more than false consciousness. Resistance initiatives such as kohanga reo and kura kaupapa were knowingly initiated as resistance strategies in a capitalist environment, in response to the inequities of a capitalist environment, in order to overcome the cultural and social production of *capitalism*. It would then appear that tangata whenua have taken advantage of both Althusser's contribution and the alternatives offered by his critics. What this thesis argues, however, is whether or not these initiatives, and "new" initiatives such as whare wananga, are being driven by an equal "awareness" of a concurrently changing social, political and economic environment - that is, a neoliberal environment that purports to be capitalist. As Saul argues, this "capitalism, in its modern form, ha[s] become so divorced from the means of production and obsessed with paper profits that it ha[s] become irrelevant to the real economy" (Saul, 1993, p.362). Corporatisation, managerialism, profit motive and the "free" market has changed the "face" of capitalism to such a degree that Saul describes the modern capitalist as "not an owner of the means of production. This is an employee in drag" (p.363).

The point to be made here is that Althusser and Gramsci help us understand the relations of power in society, whether capitalist or otherwise. The challenge for tangata whenua, is to "know the present" – a present that not only dismisses indigenous sovereignty, but is, in every instance, continuously causing the state to contest its own right to govern against powerful vested interest groups. A failure to apply this theoretical understanding of power relations to the changed reality of ideological assimilation through neoliberalism would indeed affirm my position that, as children of neoliberalism, indigenous schooling initiatives and the

continuing corporatisation of iwi reflect the dynamic flexibility of hegemony and arguably, may induce tangata whenua society to a previously absent form of false consciousness. At least with cultural assimilation, indigenous “radicals” consistently contested its application. The insidiousness of this “second wave of colonisation” presents a far greater threat because it is hidden behind the façade of capitalism’s mode of production. The abrogation of state social and moral responsibility, the lack of processes of accountability and transparency with national and iwi Treaty settlements, the capture of schooling in general by neoliberal technocrats and technopols, and the machinations of the repressive state apparatus (ERO and truancy cases taken to court) against indigenous schools in particular, that we have witnessed over the last decade and a half, not only situate iwi development, indigenous schooling and politics firmly within this paradigm; it should also serve as a reminder that we have learnt nothing from our history and these theories.

3.7 Althusserianism in a Neoliberal Environment

As I have argued earlier, 4% of tangata whenua attending kura kaupapa are *not* contesting the ideological apparatus that is school initiated. Profit-driven, “managed” (not led) iwi corporations are not creating economic independence in the form of long-term, sustainable and meaningful employment for iwi that a truly *capitalist* society would encourage – rather they have been seduced by the rhetoric of investment, efficiency, effectiveness, and the “trickle-down” myth. In reality they have become pawns to the will of a global “free” market that believes the

best “relations of production” are to be found in third-world countries – certainly not in Aotearoa.

Althusser has shown us that schools contribute to social and cultural reproduction to ensure the reproduction of relations of production. What if those relations of production change? Does that mean a redefinition of the purpose of schooling – that schools revert to being a means in themselves, rather than a more instrumentalist means to an end in meeting marketplace demands? What happens if the marketplace requires, through improved technology (means of production) fewer, but more specialised “workers” (relations of production)? What happens when indigenous schools have to compete in this environment of information over knowledge, instant results, consumer choice, and competition – when iwi corporations have to compete in a similar environment? The commodification of knowledge and iwi are the direct result of the insidiousness of neoliberalism. There are questions – many questions. Some of the answers however, are not great. Student loans have opened up the gates to once inaccessible knowledge – well, it was knowledge when it was inaccessible. Iwi by the droves are signing up. Iwi leaders, educationists and state officials are beside themselves with the improved “statistics”. But what good is information, when it is gained at the expense of an informed, critical, and politicized mass? What good is te reo when there is no history, no whakapapa, no tikanga – when New Zealand Qualifications Authority approved courses, run by quick-fix degree qualified tutors, reduce it to just a means of communication? What good is a Bachelor of Arts, when the minimum requirement is a Philosophy Doctorate?

Gramsci shows us that where Wananga for tangata whenua can be a vehicle to achieving the goal of fostering “a *rearticulation* of ideology which would determine a reform of consciousness and of methods of knowledge simultaneously”. Althusser tells us that very soon, if not already, mechanisms of power will ensure that this will not happen. The development of critical theory in wananga, and a good understanding of Western critical theorists such as Foucault, Gramsci, Freire, and Althusser are essential. The absence (or token presence) of their work in wananga will be testament to the veracity of Althusser’s concept of ideological state apparatus. The “indigenous” institutions would still run, the managers would still “manage”, the teachers would still “teach” – in essence, the “business” side will be fine. The only “loser” in this case will be the unknowing “Maori” student... with her student debt... lacking confidence to korero “Maori” to anyone other than her classmates... an antipathy toward Maori political development... and no job. Now wouldn’t that be a surprise?

3.8 Conclusion: Resisting the Silence.

By looking at the work of Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser, oppressiveness can be situated in a broader social, political and economic theoretical context. Specifically this analysis affords the opportunity for radical educators to identify the link between a culture of silence and the maintenance of hegemony through our own (ill-informed) consent. The challenge it poses however, is an urgent need to critically analyse the role indigenous intellectuals play in this scenario – and whether or not there is any attempt at all to “cut the shackles”. What follows then, is a record of how this philosophy has been applied in practice at Te Whare

Wananga O Awanuiarangi over the past few years. The aim has always been a simple one – to overcome a culture of silence by knowing our adversaries – and in this contemporary society, the adversary is a culture of finance borne of neoliberal ideology. It is a record of how Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi has attempted to “cut the shackles” and to “cut the crap”.

CHAPTER FOUR: Cutting The Crap

4.1 Understanding A Culture of Silence

Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end

My own experience of “immersion-English” university was that the most enlightening, exciting and relevant learning experiences are hidden from most students. Some of this learning I have outlined in Chapters One, Two and Three and came from graduate studies classes. Throughout that time I remember thinking that this “stuff” should be available to all teacher trainees committed to addressing educational inequalities, and particularly those willing to accept the challenge of working to address educational issues for tangata whenua. Everyone agreed but that was where it ended – just rhetoric. Working at Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi has allowed me to “cut the crap” which is “Kirknessian” for less talk and more action. In Freirean terms, I was in a position to “make the road by walking”.

This Chapter describes the challenges that accompanied the development of a critical theory component at the Wananga. It sought to deliver a historical and contemporaneous understanding of tangata whenua existentialities both within and without a neoliberal environment to all our students. This Chapter describes how the introduction of a critical theory component at the Wananga has been aimed at identifying, and then overcoming, a “culture of silence”.

It begins by engaging with language and describes how the use of key themes was essential to prevent obfuscation and confusion. Next, it was found that a discipline

known to most students – war – provided a beneficial theoretical framework. For many of us, the “war” against inequality, injustice, assimilation and racism has never ended. The next challenge was overcoming our intellectual and moral insecurities through understanding the dynamics of the power of hegemony. This was achieved through acknowledging the intellect of our tipuna and recognizing the political nature of schooling. In short – coming to understand that ignorance, like knowledge, is a social construct. Western theorists such as Louis Althusser, Paulo Freire, and Antonio Gramsci make major contributions to this understanding. Finally, every effort is made to ensure that what is learnt in class is not reduced to an academic exercise. What is discussed is the importance of praxis – not simply reflecting on dehumanizing practices but of taking a stance and rejecting them outright.

4.2 Engaging With Language: The Use of Key Themes

The pedagogy that has been developed at this Wananga in order to overcome the difficulties of academic language is the use of key themes. This is intended to negate the need to use heavy academic prose, or, as the students describe, “twenty dollar words”, and which invariably serve only to obfuscate and render “incomprehensible” the messages contained within for many of the students.

The use of key themes also acknowledges the inadequacies of the schooling system described in Chapter Two, which many of our students have previously and unsuccessfully endured. Indifferent opportunities for our students during their

compulsory schooling period requires a respectful understanding of the academic capabilities they bring with them.

One, in particular, is reading. Many of our students have not yet developed a strong reading ethic. As a consequence, the selected readings for these programmes need to be “user-friendly” and ideally written by tangata whenua. To this end, the contributions of Ranginui Walker, Graham and Linda Smith and the staff and students of the Research Unit for Maori Education (RUME) and more latterly, the Indigenous Research Institution (IRI) of Auckland University, have been invaluable. So, too, have the contributions of Mason Durie, Pat Hohepa, Pita Sharples, Annette Sykes, Moana Jackson, Kathie Irwin, Wally Penetito and Anaru Vercoe. The issue of reading though, in relation to seeing the wananga as a liberating institution, should be considered alongside Freire’s observation that:

The actual act of reading literary texts is seen as part of a wider process of human development and growth based on understanding both one’s own experience and the social world. Learning to read must be seen as one aspect of the act of knowing and as a creative act. Reading the world thus precedes reading the word and writing a new text must be seen as one’s means of transforming the world. (Freire, 1983, p.5)

The use of key themes allows for a very selective reading base that concentrates more on an overall understanding of issues, to the acknowledged detriment of a more detailed analysis. In defence, however, I would state that this course of action is more in recognition of an overall failure by the existing schooling system to prepare our students for tertiary study, rather than a reflection of the students themselves. What is not bought into as part of this pedagogical practice is resorting to any form of victim blaming.

Secondly, this methodology focuses more on a clear and comprehensive conceptual understanding of relations of power, and in particular, the relations between tangata whenua and state systems (c.f. Perry, 1996) rather than a more detailed “academic” approach. For example, when considering “official” histories of the arrival of our tipuna (forebears) to this land, the discussion in class is unique, when compared to a non-indigenous institution.

An example would be “The Great Migration”. The “official” version has it that tangata whenua arrived here in 1350 as part of a “Great Migration”. The image of this arrival is portrayed through Goldie’s painting of near-death, emaciated people reaching land in a storm. What we now know, of course, is the argument that this particular painting renders invisible the intelligence and sailing skills of our tipuna. What it portrays is that Aotearoa was “discovered” by chance, by luck, by fluke. Walker (1987, p.29) uses the term “the untutored people who had been ‘washed-up’” to describe this example of “another put-down of Polynesian navigation” (p.41). The imposition of hegemony through intellectual and moral submissiveness (Hill, 2002, in press) had already begun.

Further still, a student would challenge that “official” version on the basis of their tipuna arriving here on the back of a whale, while another would say that they were already here because they were made from the soil of this earth. Still another would say that they also were already here on the grounds that they originated from the mountain and the mist. This then begins a process Foucault defines as genuine counter-discourses by legitimating what society calls:

Naïve knowledge, located down on the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition and scientificity. Through the emergence of these low-ranking knowledges, these unqualified, even directly disqualified knowledges...it is through the reappearance of this knowledge, of these local popular knowledges, these disqualified knowledges that criticism performs its work. (Foucault cited in Mulenga, 1994, p.260)

Our “non-academic” approach to this scenario is to acknowledge that, in the environment of the wananga, we have the “truth of power...we must speak the truth; we are constrained or condemned to confess or to discover the truth. Power never ceases its interrogation, its inquisition, its registration of truth: it institutionalises, professionalises and rewards its pursuit (Foucault, 1980, p.93).” So therefore, the “scientificity” of the “truth” relating to the 1350 arrival becomes; “In 1350 on a Tuesday morning, at twenty minutes to nine on a slightly overcast day with a twelve knot south-westerly blowing, our tipuna arrived”. To paraphrase Fiske (1993, p.62), the argument here is not over *what* constitutes the arrival of our tipuna, but over *who* controls its constitution.

The point to be made is that Western knowledge is contestable, and so therefore, are notions of “truth”. To contest the “condition” in which our tipuna arrived is to allow the construction of a “Westernised” framework in which the discussion takes place. Instead, what needs to be challenged is the taken-for-granted imposition of Western notions of “time, space, and capabilities” in a language and conceptual environment that is both relevant to, and respectful of, the students. Each student has their own perception of their genealogical “truth”. All indigenous cultures have their own perceptions of “time, space and capabilities”. What is unique about being at the Wananga is that there are so many questions

about the “truth” that there is not enough “time”, in an undergraduate programme, to get “specific” about any of them. Hence the attack on 1350 and the need, as a liberating institution, to pay homage to Freire by first understanding how to “read the word” (understand our world) in order to “read the world” (transform our world). The detail comes with graduate study.

If I were to do this same exercise in a graduate class, I would introduce them to what Marshall describes as “the exercise of power through “disciplinary blocks” which are essentially concerned with the organisation of space, time and capacities” (1995, p.26). First-year indigenous students of the wananga understand this concept, although in a language and way that is relevant and respectful to them.

This, then, arguably parallels Freire’s development of a literacy programme for Brazilian peasants by the use of “generative words and themes originating as the collective essence of an oppressive existence” (Mackie, 1980, pp.116-117). What becomes recognizable when using a pedagogy incorporating key themes is that tangata whenua students of Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi have a great empathy and come to understand more readily the supposedly more “intellectually challenging” discourses determined by “immersion-English” universities to be of a “higher” level, and reserved only for graduate students of the system. Arguably, this empathy and understanding eventuates because this kind of analysis at the level of power and knowledge provides the “why” to our existential experiences as a colonized people. Each of us can see ourselves, our families, our history, in this discourse.

The key theme's used to critically discuss the impact of neoliberalism on indigenous identity are Freire's "*culture of silence*" (Connolly, 1980, p.70), and Bruce Jesson's "*colonisation by a culture of finance*" (1999, p.144). Effectively, the manifestation of a culture of silence reflects the consequences of a first wave of colonization for tangata whenua through the processes and practices of cultural assimilation. The manifestation of a culture of finance reflects the consequences of a second wave of colonization for tangata whenua through the processes and practices of neoliberalism and globalisation.

4.3 From a "Culture of Silence" to a "Culture of Finance"

Undertaken in the programme is an interrogation of the mechanisms and processes that sustain and perpetuate the marginalisation and subjection of Maori. The development of a "culture of silence" analyses the intellectual and moral submissiveness of tangata whenua accruing from the "first wave of colonisation". That is, it examines cultural assimilation through a colonial schooling system - by considering how this "first wave of colonisation" was initially premised on greed, or as Perry discerns more academically, was a contest over resources between powerful constituencies that drive state policies and tangata whenua (1996, p.9). This is then followed by a discussion on the misguided belief that cultural assimilation was in the best interests of the natives. Durie records that the prevailing attitude of the late 1880s was such that "the widely held government view was that the Maori population would become extinct and that the government's obligation was to "smooth the pillow of a dying race" (1998, p.54).

This analysis of the “first wave of colonisation” is then followed by an analysis of a culture of finance, and how the introduction of neoliberal economic determinism changed the shape and form of contemporary tangata whenua society. Within this section a critical comparison is then made of these two era’s by way of explicating these comparisons within the framework of a second wave of colonisation. It is then argued that this present-day “culture of finance” is not only more arrogant than the first wave of colonisation, but also threatens to be far more effective than its predecessor.

It is also argued that the significant difference between the two forms of assimilation - the first being a *cultural* form of assimilation and the second assuming an *ideological* form - is that the development and implementation of policies and practices under a neoliberal regime will see contemporary tangata whenua become the executioners and witnesses of our own cultural demise.

4.4 War – A Theoretical Framework

If you have entered the teacher training programme at Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi for your own personal advancement alone, to gain social prestige, or to just secure employment, then I suggest you go to a mainstream institution. If you have entered to contribute to the educational advancement of tangata whenua, welcome aboard. We need more fighters – not more teachers.

This is the introduction I give annually to new students. It is premised on Foucault’s inversion of Clausewitz’s dictum whereby politics is seen as a continuation of war by other means (1980, p.90). Chapter Two has shown how this war has been waged. To overcome these barriers, we must first assume a war

footing. I then introduce the students to Sun Tzu, the Chinese military strategist of two thousand five hundred years ago (Saul, 1993, p.185), and his first rule of war: Know Your Enemy. In order to understand “why” it is that tangata whenua are constantly and disproportionately represented in the negative socio-economic indices of Aotearoa, we must understand the relations of power (politics) that sanction and uphold the disequilibrium of forces that [are] displayed in war (Foucault, 1980, p.90). The war, in our case, is not only against social, economic and political inequality; it is also against cultural and ideological assimilation.

To do this, as has been explained, we consider the contributions of Louis Althusser, Pierre Bourdieu, Paulo Freire, Antonio Gramsci and Michel Foucault as a means to interrogate the mechanisms and processes of power and control within contemporary Aotearoa society. From within this theoretical framework, there is importance in understanding the notion of culture. The position adopted, however, is to focus the analysis on what contemporary society determines is *not* valid, what is *not* legitimate, what is *not* seen, what is *not* heard, and what is *not* practiced. For example, consider the earlier proposition regarding the word Maori used as a noun. It is a definition borne purely from contact with Western civilization. It is a constant reminder of our colonised past and present. It renders invisible traditional and contemporary notions of indigenous social grouping; hapu and iwi. In a Foucauldian sense, our critical analysis begins with asking not “who we are”, but rather “what we are”, and posits the view that being tangata whenua is no longer determinable by the colour of one’s skin, but rather by the constitution of one’s heart. This is the basic difference between cultural assimilation and ideological assimilation.

Simply put, cultural assimilation is when the emphasis is on being “one people”. It is an honest attempt to “smooth the pillow of a dying race.” It is an acknowledgement that being Pakeha is more advantageous than being “Maori”. Ideological assimilation is more insidious. It is dishonest. It assumes that cultural identity is being advanced, when the “truth” of the matter is that in terms of systems of thought, world-view, beliefs and values, the “culture of difference” between tangata whenua and Pakeha becomes less and less distinguishable. A major feature of this process is the almost perceived resignation shown by tangata whenua to the inevitability of this cultural genocide. This resignation, however, is reflective of Freire’s position that this “silence does not signify an absence of response, but rather a response which lacks a critical quality” (Connolly, 1980, p.70). The colonial history of Aotearoa has ensured that not only did tangata whenua lose our lands, fisheries and forests; we also lost our right to a critical consciousness.

4.5 Overcoming A Culture of Silence – The Practice

In an interview with Ira Shor, Paulo Freire commented that:

There is also a fear of freedom...A liberating educator challenges people to know their actual freedom, their real power. As a result, people may feel manipulated when asked to reflect on such a difficult subject, because it is something they do not want to talk about or they want to deny, their fear of becoming free, taking responsibility for their freedom. (Freire & Shor, 1987, p.173).

In recognition of Freire’s statement that the oppressed have to overcome their “fear of freedom” (1980, p.28), the first obstacle to overcome at the wananga is

the hegemony of intellectual submissiveness (Hill, in progress) that has been internalised by the students. Effectively it has to be shown that tangata whenua are not dumb, regardless of what the statistics and our own existential experiences tell us. This is done in two ways: first by celebrating the intelligence of our tipuna; and second by showing that our history of oppression has been a *deliberate* strategy.

Vercoe (1998) provides a solid foundation for recognising the intellectualism of our tipuna as a means of overcoming the hegemony of this intellectual submissiveness. In asserting that our ancestors had sharp, inquisitive minds developed over centuries of experimentation, study and further analysis (p.7), he turns to the kumara as an example:

When Captain James Cook, the great adventurer and bringer of diseases, limped his way to Aotearoa, my people had already developed an earth science that, even by today's standards, was astounding. They brought from the islands the treasured kumara. This plant grew in abundance, soaking up the warm climate that prevailed in the mid-Pacific. When they arrived here they found that the land and environmental conditions were very extreme and unfavourable. They didn't break down and propitiate the gods for guidance and mercy. They didn't give up and hope that something better might come along – they experimented! Considerable archaeological work performed in greater Oceania and New Zealand indicates that for successful kumara cultivation to have occurred, particular attention had to be given to chemical and environmental factors. So, using the available resources, Maori scientists (yes, Maori scientists, would you believe?) created soil conditions similar to those found in the islands. (Vercoe, 1998, pp.15-16)

Vercoe's style and content has a particularly strong following at the wananga.

There is also the revisionist historian James Belich (1986). His publication, The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict, is, in part, an attempt to overcome a natural tendency of writers "who are party to a conflict

[and] are likely to favour their own side, and those holding to convictions of superiority find it difficult to be fair to their “inferiors”” (p.13). This thesis of course, holds to that view. The position taken here is that what revisionist historians like Belich are attempting to do is reclaim notions of “truth” that have been rendered invisible by the pursuit of power through an assumption of cultural and intellectual superiority, at the very expense of “truth”. Belich identifies the military superiority of our tipuna during the New Zealand Wars, a position of cultural and intellectual superiority that to this day, remains marginalized. For example, it is acknowledged that during the 1800s British military strength and global activity was at its highest. When the British fought tangata whenua however, they were to come across *for the first time* pekerangi (a fore-runner to barbed-wire) (p.49), advanced ground fortifications and anti-artillery defences (pp. 317-318). Belich explains this “disequilibrium” of the “knowledge” war by saying that:

The British consistently sought to avoid the conclusion that the Maori possessed the higher military talents, despite the fact that a major manifestation of these talents, the modern *pa*, was constantly before them. (Belich, 1986, pp.316-317)

Belich also goes on to allude that there is every possibility these superior military tactics of our tipuna were taken back to Sandhurst, the premier Military Officer training institution in England, but despite “persistent attempts at reform” and “as the British performance in later years made clear”, none of this knowledge of trench and bunker systems was passed on (p.317). What we take from this example was that if our tipuna’s knowledge was validated in the 1800s by the British, chances are that the Great War would not have been the disaster that it

eventually was. It is the “reappearance” of knowledge’s such as these two examples that the battle against intellectual submissiveness can commence.

4.6 Schooling As A Deliberate Strategy

Notwithstanding the record of Aotearoa’s schooling system and tangata whenua participation discussed in Chapter Two, a useful resource to summarise the *deliberate* strategies adopted by the state for Maori schooling is found in the summary of Judith Simon’s (1999, pp.8-9) Statement of Evidence to the Waitangi Tribunal in the matter of the Wananga (WAI 718) claim. She raises five issues:

1. Maori embraced schooling as a means of maintaining their sovereignty and enhancing their life chances. The Government on the other hand, sought control over Maori and their resources through schooling. Maori wanted to extend their existing body of knowledge. The Government, with its assimilation policy, intended to replace Maori culture with that of European. In seeking to do so however, the state was also concerned to limit both the amount and type of European knowledge made available to Maori. Such objectives were rationalised through racial ideologies claiming that Maori were more suited to manual work than mental work.
2. With urbanisation, Maori children have attended public primary schools and large secondary schools. At these schools, they have been subjected to streaming and standardised intelligence or achievement tests that have placed most of them in low streams. There they have been subjected to curricula that focus primarily on practical rather than intellectual skills and thus channelled them towards a future as manual workers – or unemployed. This has been achieved largely through the “*natural*” workings out of the curricula and guidance programmes of the schools.
3. While the ideologies of race are no longer officially promoted as rationales for controlling Maori access to knowledge and power, they are still operational within the system.
4. Since the 1950s, numerous education policy changes aimed at reversing the trend of under-achievement in Maori have been formulated. Yet in spite of some genuine efforts from

educationalists to accelerate the performances of their Maori pupils, gains have been small.

Wananga

5. Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi, as indeed do all three Wananga, now seek capital funds from the Government to put them on an equal footing with other tertiary education institutions. If this funding is not provided, it will effectively continue the historical regime of the state to limit the life chances of Maori by controlling the amount and type of knowledge to which Maori have access.

Only a very fortunate few of the students I have worked with while at this wananga do not see themselves, their children, their parents and their grandparents in this report. In fact, the “limited life chances” referred to in item five is specifically *about* the students themselves. It is not difficult to get them enthused about this “war” when you ask them if they can also see their grandchildren, great grandchildren and great-great grandchildren in there as well. So from this one example, we set about coming to understand “why” it has to be like this. In terms of a process of conscientisation Freire has described it as being at the “first level of apprehension of reality” or the “praise de conscience” (1976, p.224):

At this level of spontaneity [where] there is a consciousness of reality, but, as yet, not a critical attitude, there is a perception of reality which includes a certain kind of knowledge of it. The Greeks called this “doxa” – simple opinion or belief. Knowledge that remains at the level of “doxa” and does not go further to reach the level of “opus”, the intrinsic reason why of reality (as Mao Tse Tung would put it), does not reach the stage of full knowledge; it is not the “logos” of reality. (Freire, 1976, p.224)

And so it is to this end that we turn to our first European theorist, Louis Althusser.

4.7 Althusser's Apparatus

Through Althusser's state ideological apparatus (Gordon, 1989, p.559) we come to know the influence of the church on indigenous beliefs and values; how all "our" gods were replaced by a white, male, blue-eyed, blond one. We come to know why many of our "radical" brothers, sisters and cousins, who are not interested in the "theory", are all learning about our old gods. We come to know the devastation of the Tohunga Suppression Act, the "sickness" of a consumer society, the myth of the "level playing field", the tyranny of democracy, and begin to understand hegemony as a form of intellectual and moral submissiveness (See Hill, 2002, in press).

We discuss the importance of Tukuroirangi Morgan's underpants, and how vital it was to prevent tangata whenua from having our own television network – even if it meant going through a rubbish bin in a back alley. We understand how a whole nation can be made to support a boat race by wearing red socks, when 95% of the nation will never get to ride on one. In terms of the three indigenous current affairs television programmes, we understand why it is that Te Karere is on at five in the afternoons (unless there is a cricket match on) and why Waka Huia and Marae are on Sunday mornings. We also come to understand why Alan Duff gets more national media and publishing coverage than Ranginui Walker.

We consider why it is that many of our parents and grandparents do not like to talk "politics", or challenge the school, or the shopkeeper. We understand why

open encouragement from many of them to learn our own language is still a relatively new phenomenon.

But most of all, we come to understand schools, not yet in the way that Judith Simon does, where she talks of the continuing “historical regime of the state to limit the life chances of Maori”. What we come to understand is that there has been a *deliberate* strategy to “dumb us down”. We begin to understand hegemony as a form of intellectual submissiveness, and begin to see the foundation blocks for a “culture of silence”.

Althusser’s state repressive apparatus of the police, military and courts tells us that there is hope in Aotearoa for a peaceful society, thanks to Robert Muldoon’s attack on Bastion Point. Because of his decision to use both the Army and Police to clear away the “protestors”, both young and old, the national media coverage of this overuse and misuse of state muscle shocked the consciences of a fair, honest, but invisible Pakeha citizenry. And it was with the support of this once silent majority that partially helped Maori calls for justice stemming from historical breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi to begin to receive political legitimacy.

4.8 A Taste of Hegemony

It is at this point also that we “dip” into Gramsci and hegemony by consent or force (coercion). For our students, Gramsci’s notion of *tangata whenua* “consenting” to our own oppression is shown through an understanding of Althusser’s state ideological apparatus. When that consent is denied however,

such as through “unstable” actions like learning our language and customs without state approval, or trying to make “unproductive” communally-owned land productive, or trying to learn from our old people who have not obtained a degree in early childhood education, or, if you are a Maori politician, saying “holocaust” (or anything remotely “unstable” for that matter), or land occupations and protest marches, we can be sure to expect some form of forceful reaction to restore “democracy”. It also lets us understand why the present campaign to prosecute parents of truant students is so very “coercively repressive”, and necessary for the state through an understanding of Pierre Bourdieu.

4.9 Bourdieu’s Cycle of Cultural Reproduction

Pierre Bourdieu (Walker, 1989, p.45) informs us of why it is that Althusser considers schools the most important state ideological apparatus (Gordon, 1989, p.559). Bourdieu’s “Cycle of Cultural Reproduction” is received almost reverently by the students of this wananga, which is something I’ve never experienced in a Pakeha institution. Perhaps it may have something to do with the “politically incorrect” labelling of the two social groupings – Privileged and Underprivileged. Such simplicity leaves no ground to hide. What it does do for many of our students is answer a legion of unasked questions. For instance: “Why don’t I know my own language and customs? ”; “Why didn’t I do well at school? ”; “Why do I know more about Sir Francis Drake than I do about Te Kooti? ”; “Why do ERO give Maori schools such a hard time? ”; and “Why am I at this wananga so late in my life?”.

An understanding of Bourdieu's theory allows our students to come to understand the power of the curriculum, or rather, the processes in place that design and implement this document. It becomes an introduction to Foucault's knowledge / power nexus and, by making the link between cultural capital and economic capital, it serves to inform us of the reason why so many of our whanau are reduced to a fourteen-day, hole-in-the-wall, life cycle. What this refers to is the daily struggle for the disproportionately large number of tangata whenua whose life chances and opportunities have been reduced to trying to survive between the fortnightly visits to the Automatic Teller Machine. This "cycle" is a constant reminder of the "dependency" status imposed on too many of us. The image and reality for too many tangata whenua is that it too closely resembles Friere's position that: "this total emotional dependence can lead the oppressed to what Fromm calls necrophilic behaviour: the destruction of life – their own or that of their oppressed fellows" (1980, p.47). This is the real issue behind indigenous calls for independence. Through understanding Bourdieu's work, we come to know the political nature of schooling, and it serves the purpose of coming to understand "freedom" as intellectual, moral and economic *independence*.

Helping students to come to know these aspects of Althusser's and Bourdieu's work is not a difficult task at this wananga. The empathy is almost instant. The connections from theory to reality are quickly made, and the seeds to Freire's process of conscientisation are securely imbedded. Althusser and Bourdieu begin the transition from "praise de conscience" to conscientisation. As Freire states:

[Conscientisation] is the deepening of the praise de conscience, it is the critical development of the "praise de conscience".
 [Conscientisation] implies going through the spontaneous stage of

apprehension of reality into a critical stage in which reality becomes a cogniscible object towards which man [sic] takes an epistemological attitude, man [sic] searching for deeper knowledge. Thus [conscientisation] becomes a *test* of reality. The more one acquires [conscientisation] ([conscientises] oneself), the more one discovers reality, the more one penetrates the phenomenological essence of the object one has in front of oneself in order to analyse it. For this very reason [conscientisation] is not a falsely intellectual attitude towards reality. [Conscientisation] cannot exist without or outside praxis, that is outside action-reflection. The two unities express the permanently dialectical characteristic of the way man is and the way he transforms the world. (Freire, 1976, p.224)

And it is to Freire that the programme now progresses.

4.10 A Freirean Connection

An empathy with Freire's work can be made immediately with the students when the connection is made between his work and the development of kohanga reo. It is not a commonly known fact that many of his publications served to "legitimate" and support initial discussions that led to establishing this indigenous initiative (cf. Nepe, 1991).

As an introduction to Freire's work, we first look at his animal / human distinction. While Freire bases his observations on the life cycle of a Brazilian peasant and compares that life cycle to his oxen, for the purposes of our programme we take the same analogy and compare it to the fourteen-day, hole-in-the-wall life cycle of a beneficiary. By doing this, we are able to introduce the basic difference between humans and animals as one of intentionality. By understanding Bourdieu's "Cycle of Cultural Reproduction" in terms of schooling inequality, and Althusser's state ideological apparatus juxtaposed beside Simon's

declaration of a “historical regime of the state to limit the life chances of Maori”, a base foundation is provided in which a more critical analysis of the relations of power between the state and tangata whenua can be made.

Notwithstanding the plethora of publications by and about Freire’s contribution to adult education, the core reading that provides the main basis for an analysis of his work on our programme is Connolly’s (1980) “Freire, Praxis and Education”. Within this reading we begin to understand how the existing schooling system is oppressive for many tangata whenua, not so much by “what” is done, but rather by what is “not” done. For instance, there is a need for ensuring that levels of achievement between cultures are comparable and not disproportionate; for ensuring the provision of cultural security through the availability of adequate and sufficient funding and resources; and most importantly, for ensuring that tangata whenua potentialities and possibilities for a more humane life are given every opportunity. The state’s “historical regime” does not sit easily alongside these simple requests and inevitably, constitutes an oppressive act in our eyes because it prevents too many tangata whenua from being more fully human (Freire, 1980, pp.38-39). In Chapter One, for instance, I showed how Foucault’s notion of normalisation manifests this oppressiveness; our sense of not feeling fully human. Despite my own feelings of inadequacy within myself, I was supposed to be “successful”, and thankful for it. The privilege of working at this wananga is the rule, not the exception. This point makes for stimulating “dialogical relationships” and exciting learning.

4.11 Conclusion: Western Philosophy and Tangata Whenua

Antonio Gramsci's contribution to our programme is "reduced" to a conceptual understanding of hegemony as intellectual and moral submissiveness (See Hill, in progress). Hegemony is known by the phrase "kei raro tonu e putu ana" which means something like "still at the bottom of the heap" and "rawakoretanga", which means "without possession". Possession in this sense transcends material possession alone to also encapsulate spiritual meaning as well. Combined with Bourdieu's "Cycle of Cultural Reproduction", it explains to us why we are now having second and third generation beneficiaries in our whanau.

Chapter Three looked at the contribution Gramsci made in terms of a reconceptualisation of the relationship between the base and superstructure, civil and political society. Together with Althusser's state ideological and repressive apparatus, what we do in our programme is come to understand that because of the "magnitude" of such power relations, when working with critical theory, *nothing should be taken personally*. As part of our critical development, we focus on adopting a "macro" view of relations of power. For instance, when we discuss schooling, I know that we are progressing when the students stop blaming the problems their children are having at school on the "red-neck Principal" or the "racist teacher".

As earlier mentioned, we do not dwell on the "details" in terms of coming to know what in society functions to make Principals and teachers appear in our eyes to be "red-necks and racists". We don't dwell on our shared experiences of being followed around the shop by the store detectives as if we had a neon sign flashing over our heads. We also don't dwell on ringing up for a flat sounding "flash",

getting an appointment to view it, and then on arrival, being told that it has been let already. No, with our “non-academic” approach, there are too many of those experiences to dwell upon. What we do, however, is adopt Freire’s maxim in that:

... [a]s the oppressed, fighting to be human, take away the oppressors’ power to dominate and suppress, they restore to the oppressors the humanity they had lost in the exercise of oppression. (Freire, 1980, p.38)

As a Whare Wananga, we practice under a philosophy that has been determined by our ancestors. This is manifest in “whakatauki” or proverbs. One of them is; “He aha te mea nui o te Ao, he tangata, he tangata, he tangata” – “What is the greatest treasure in the world, it is people”. We all agree, in our programme, that Freire would have made a wonderful tipuna. What Freire does, and indeed Althusser, Bourdieu, and Gramsci as well, is remind us that these philosophers, these critical theorists, and our tipuna, all have one thing in common – a belief in humanity. While they may be on different “waka”, the ultimate destination is still the same.

The exciting thing about the work we do in our classrooms, is being able to develop the capacity to “see” how, intellectually and morally, what our tipuna believed in, what we so desperately want to have restored, and what “humanists” around the world advocate, we *can* contribute to a return to these systems of thought, world-views, beliefs and values. By understanding conceptually these works, and being able to empathise with them in both a cultural and intellectual manner - by not taking hegemony personally - we are in a far better position to reflect more positively about our existential reality.

That is the aim of critical studies at Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi – the development of our ability to think critically, in essence, the first stage of praxis (reflection and action). When the students graduate, it is in their hands to provide a response in “their world” – one that does not “lack a critical quality”.

As each of the students develop, what is consistently remarked upon is how “new” this learning is for them. Considering that Ranginui Walker has spent a great part of his life-time writing exactly about these subjects, and in a language that is both user-friendly and comprehensible, my first reflection is an appreciation of the relations of power and culture that deny, in a myriad of ways, tangata whenua access at a “flax-root” level. What these comments also confirm can be summed up in an indigenous whakatauki, “he mana to te matauranga”. This means that “knowledge is power”, which is precisely Foucault’s contribution to our programme. Anything more becomes “obfuscating and incomprehensible” at an undergraduate level. But this small contribution is enough to come to know “why” it is that things “are as they are”. With “knowledge”, each student is in a position to “do” something. In fact, each student, by the end of the course, does not say “do” any more. What is more commonly heard is “act”. “We’re ready for “action” - because it isn’t praxis unless there’s reflection and action!!”

Then they are gone, back to their whanau, their hapu, their marae, their classrooms – ready to overcome the oppressiveness of this “culture of silence” and confront the challenges before them in this “culture of finance”. The changes that are occurring in this society so heavily influenced by neoliberalism for tangata whenua have been almost breath-taking. Examples have been the Sealords

Deal, the introduction of kohanga reo, kura kaupapa, wananga, immersion and bilingual classes, and iwi Treaty settlement processes. Each of these events have one thing in common: the need to obtain the consent of whanau, hapu and iwi.

Chapter Five shows that invariably, this consent is often given with an almost complete disregard for the role neoliberal ideology has played in events leading up to those moments (there are a few exception of course, with some iwi having the ability to successfully challenge this process). Chapter Five is an account of how the critical theory component at Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi uncovers the influence neoliberalism has had, and continues to have, on tangata whenua.

CHAPTER FIVE: Understanding A Culture of Finance

5.1 Introduction

This Chapter begins with a theoretical framework based on war. This is followed by the uncovering of neoliberalism through an analysis of individualism, state devolution and the free market that is focused completely on our lived experiences. This is essential to keep the subject relevant and consequently, interesting and of personal interest. This analysis is then followed by a dialogical practice that uncovers the deceit, the crime, and the concerns. Unique to this type of learning environment is that the *subjects* of this discourse are ourselves. Finally we reflect on the consequences of neoliberalism for tangata whenua and consider the creation of the indigenous intellectual.

5.2 Colonisation by a Culture of Finance

The indigenous peoples of Alaska stress the collective whole and the responsibility of the individual towards the group. This sets them in opposition to the ethos prevalent in the American society that surrounds and dominates them. As a result, disputes and negotiations concerning Alaska Natives' resources are carried out in dialogues where often well-meaning people talk past each other. The problem, however, is that the price of misunderstanding and disagreement is normally paid by Alaska Natives....The seemingly generous settlement of ANCSA [Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act] also served to extinguish important indigenous rights and turn indigenous communities into corporations which may cease to function as communities before too long. ANCSA can thus be seen as the latest and kindest, but also the most sophisticated of the various efforts in the past 500 years to destroy indigenous cultures. (Maybury-Lewis, 1998, p.3)

David Maybury-Lewis is Professor of Anthropology at Harvard University. This quote from his editorial in the 1998 issue of Cultural Survival Quarterly serves to position this "culture of finance" in its global perspective. That is, the impact of

neoliberalism on tangata whenua in Aotearoa is neither a unique nor an isolated case, but rather indicative of a global phenomenon affecting all indigenous peoples. Within Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi's undergraduate programme however, the critical analysis of this global phenomenon is framed within a national context. This international example does serve however to support my earlier contention that the "language" and action of neoliberalism, while appearing to support the position of a return to iwi-based identity, organisation, leadership, representation and decision-making processes, inevitably works to further suppress, exclude and marginalize the majority of tangata whenua, while concurrently privileging a very small group of tangata whenua. In effect, and to paraphrase Maybury-Lewis, what this thesis argues is that in Aotearoa, the Treaty Claims Settlement process can be seen as "the latest and kindest, but also the most sophisticated of the various efforts in the past 160 years to destroy the indigenous culture of tangata whenua in Aotearoa".

5.3 War – A Theoretical Framework (Again)

Western military command is based on the "Orders Group". Regardless of the level of command, the same basic structure is followed. First comes an analysis of the ground. Within the context of globalisation the focus of this thesis is limited to a national one - Aotearoa. For students of Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi, the focus is on perhaps one of the most pristine coastal locations within Aotearoa – the East Coast of the North Island - from Nga Kurei-A-Wharei (Katikati) to Tihirau. This is the traditional area of Mataatua, the lands of the tribal confederation to which the wananga belongs. Where once the "isolation" of both

Aotearoa and the East Coast made visiting and trading with such areas a less attractive option than regions more closer to hand, rapid technological advancements being made in information technology, transport and communications have now “opened” up these regions in terms of their “attractiveness”. The consequence of this is that tangata whenua are now even more in danger of losing what little of our land there is left to lose. This one fact alone needs to be considered throughout this section, particularly when trying to understand why Jane Kelsey’s description of the 1984 Labour Government’s Structural Adjustment Programme as a “second wave of colonisation” (Trotter, 1995, p.16) causes great consternation for *some* tangata whenua (people of the *land*).

Next in the “Orders Group” is an appreciation of the Enemy Forces. In this case, the “enemy” is neoliberal ideology. Saul’s appreciation is blunt: “ Nothing could be less disciplined than the New Right, with its romantic mythologizing of freedom, equality and individualism in order to obscure such practical policies as the legislation of dishonest speculation through financial deregulation” (1993, p.337). He adds further that:

At first glance the New Right seems quite different [compared to the Left] because it makes a point of praising individualism and attacking bureaucracy. However, this is a false debate. The question in their minds is not bureaucracy, but which bureaucracy. Wherever the Right holds power, the administrative elites of the large corporations and the financial sector grow. And those of government do not shrink. Programs aimed at social well-being are simply cut, while those which benefit the private administrations and certain categories of personal fortunes grow. (Saul, 1993, p.583)

In terms of land and war, I find Pilger's example sobering, particularly in view of Freire's statement that "the third world is ideological and political, not geographic" (cited in Mackie, 1980, p.119):

The Canadian economist Michel Chossudovsky, a specialist in Third World issues, wrote in 1994, "the achievements of past struggles and the inspirations of an entire nation are [being] undone and erased...No Agent Orange or steel pellet bombs, no napalm, no toxic chemicals: a new phase of economic and social (rather than physical) destruction has unfolded. The seemingly neutral and scientific tools of macro-economic policy constitute a non-violent instrument of recolonisation and impoverishment.

The World Bank, together with the International Monetary Fund and the Asia Development Bank, are overseeing the implementation of these 'reforms'. The World Bank began by rewriting the land laws, affecting two thirds of the population. Subsistence farming, which had kept famine at bay, is being replaced by cash-cropping for export, as Vietnam is fully integrated into the dynamic region". (Pilger, 1998,p.573)

Of relevance to our students in these two examples is that Saul identifies the burden's that are accruing today for tangata whenua, while Pilger identifies the processes that were experienced by tangata whenua during the first wave of colonisation, and which gives rise to Kelsey's assertion that this is indeed, a "second wave of colonisation" for tangata whenua.

Sun Tsu (Saul, 1993, p.189) has written that " Speed is the essence of war". This essential military tactic was fundamental to the introduction of neoliberalism, to the point where Kelsey refers to Douglas's speech on how to implement radical change as a "blitzkrieg speech" (1999, p.63). Douglas himself, had this to say to would-be structural adjusters:

Do not try to advance a step at a time. Define your objectives clearly and move towards them in quantum leaps. Otherwise the interest groups will have time to mobilise and drag you down. Once the programme begins to be implemented, don't stop until

you have completed it. The fire of opponents is much less accurate if they have to shoot at a rapidly moving target. Consensus among interest groups on quality decisions rarely, if ever, arises before they are made and implemented. It develops after they are taken, as the decisions deliver satisfactory results to the public. (cited in Kelsey, 1997, p.34)

This “tactic of war” was used very effectively by Douglas in the mid 1980s. In this chapter, we will see how even more effective this strategy is when tangata whenua are further “immobilised” by a “culture of silence”. As it will be argued, the consequences for tangata whenua have been, and continue to be, catastrophic.

5.4 Uncovering Neoliberalism

Aotearoa has entered the new millennium well entrenched in a political direction engendered by consecutive governments’ dogmatic adherence to the New Right’s policies of economic fundamentalism. While this “colonisation by the culture of finance” (Jesson, 1999, p.144) has impacted severely on issues of social and moral responsibility within New Zealand society generally, it has created a somewhat more devastating effect for tangata whenua by virtue of its paradoxical positioning alongside accepted notions of “being Maori”. Inherent in this situation are direct challenges to the very nature and essence of tangata whenua cultural identity.

When introducing the characteristics of the New Right to students at Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi, we follow Smith’s description in that it consists of “two distinct and at the same time overlapping components” (1993, p.4). These are firstly the economic thrust concerned to overthrow the Keynesian “welfare

state” interventionist economic approach and replace it with the notion of the free market (ibid.). Second there is a moral thrust concerned to overthrow liberal societal attitudes and behaviours and to reinstate conservative values and moral standards (pp. 4-5).

The key themes we use to explain this “colonisation by a culture of finance” are *individualism, state devolution* and the *free market*. The core reading is Graham Smith’s “Tane-Nui-A-Rangi’s Legacy...Propping Up The Sky: Kaupapa Maori as Resistance and Intervention” in Creating Space in Institutional Settings for Maori. (1993). Again, the essence of this form of argument is to focus more on a clear and comprehensive conceptual understanding of relations of power, and in particular, the relations between tangata whenua and state systems (c.f. Perry, 1996) rather than a more detailed “academic” approach. To this end the key themes are constantly and continuously connected to how they have impacted on tangata whenua, and where possible, tangata whenua who continue to live in their home areas, or turangawaewae. This invariably means rural areas, and in our case, we examine this impact more specifically in terms of its consequences for the tangata whenua of the Eastern Bay of Plenty. The iwi are Ngati Awa, Tuhoe, Whakatohea, Ngai Tai and Te Whanau-A-Apanui.

5.5 Individualism

Smith’s response to the free market principle of individual freedom that “every individual is regarded as being born with equal life chances and with equal opportunities to participate and achieve whatever they desire” (p.5) is to assert

that “ this of course has the outcome of maintaining the status quo and that those already privileged and in positions of power will be able to maintain their positions of advantage” (ibid.) For the students of the wananga, an understanding of Bourdieu’s Cycle of Cultural Reproduction and Freire’s concept of “banking education” (1970, p.53) makes this clear in terms of the political nature of schooling in a meritocratic society. Indeed, the fallacy of such a principle should come as “no surprise” to any member of this society who considers victim blaming a worthless exercise.

For tangata whenua however:

notions of the primacy of the individual, the emphasis on meritocracy and the fundamental need for competition stand in direct contradiction to Maori culture and values which support notions of collectivism, emphasizes shared mana (status and power) and regards cooperation as a fundamental value. (Smith, 1993, p.4)

When we discuss this quote in class, we asked ourselves what has happened over the past decade to support such a position. It is with exercises such as this that the liberating potential of whare wananga is realized, because some of the examples are sobering in their acuteness. By “understanding their world” the students are able to critically analyse this statement by applying it to often taken-for-granted, and thus potentially problematic, situations.

For example, consider the potato-peeling machine. One student posited the argument that this machine is destroying the collectivism and cooperation of her marae, effectively threatening the traditional concept of whanaungatanga and manaakitanga. As their marae became more “affluent”, much energy was spent

making life “easier” for the hapu members. On this occasion they purchased a potato-peeling machine, and from all accounts, it was the worst thing they could have done. “Peeling spuds” was what one did at the marae. Regardless of the occasion, there is always a need for potatoes. What the machine replaced was the social interaction such a practice enjoyed. To this student, the machine was an unwelcome intrusion at the back of their marae.

Jane Kelsey refers to Cooper’s (1988) distinction between modernization and development to explain a reaction such as this:

Modernisation represents “an intense level of economic seduction” which has the potential to corrupt completely or totally destroy Maori customs and values. It elevates individualism and self-interest above all else, and reduces natural human resources to mere commodities exploited for commercial gain.

True development involves an integrated and harmonious balance of socio-economic factors in a way that serves Maori social, cultural, material, environmental and spiritual needs.
(Kelsey, 1997, p.364)

In this example, we see how important the need is to understand our world, and the threats that are constantly presented upon it. What this student is defending is the traditional role of marae *not* being reduced to a “community facility”.

Providing food and shelter (manaakitanga) is not an end in itself. As essential is the collective effort and cooperation involved, the sense of personal and hapu achievement (whanaungatanga) – the human element.

We compare the introduction of potato-peeling machines on marae to the advent of television. While everyone rejoiced at such a wonderful technological invention, no one truly appreciated the assault television would make on the art of

communication within the family, and the huge influence television plays in the formation of views and opinions. Peeling spuds is political, educative, humorous – and it is the great equalizer. Even I can do it! It manifests a feeling of belonging that is indescribable. To go to the marae is to have your potato peeler in your pocket.

Other examples come forth; the increasing use of “caterers” on marae being one of the sadder ones (especially when there is no shortage of ringawera (cooks)), and yet the reality is such that these things are happening. Even within our own wananga, the introduction of language programmes via the Internet provides considerable grounds for critical reflection on the basis of such positions. Nothing could be more “individuating” (and contradictory) than one-on-one, “interfacing” between two computer monitors posing as people. Furthermore, as Walker (1987, p.123) states; Communication in the Maori world is based on direct contact....The essence of the philosophy is encapsulated in the aphorism “He Kanohi Kitea” (the face that is seen).

Notwithstanding the advantages technology provides in terms of access, from a purely philosophical position, “space” needs to be created in which continuous critical reflection can take place contesting the possible philosophical contradictions Smith speaks of, and particularly, to identify whether or not these are true developments or the consequence of “economic seduction”. The great restriction in this onslaught of cultural diffusion is the *speed* with which these “developments” are being made.

The point being made here is not to say that marae should, or should not buy potato-peeling machines nor use caterers. Rather, hapu members should be allowed the opportunity to consider the implications and consequences of such things in terms of cultural identity and the insidiousness of ideological assimilation. And this is where the liberating potential of iwi-based whare wananga is so exciting. These students are able to reflect carefully on these discussions, and more importantly, become involved within their own hapu in processes that may discern whether they are victims of “economic seduction” or participants in “true development”. Our students are then able to offer a position on the purchasing of a potato-peeling machine that may not otherwise have been considered. Undoubtedly many ringawera (cooks) would already know this, but may not put forward their argument sufficiently strong enough to sway the fervent “progressives” within hapu who see modernization as the only way to go - especially if these “progressives” are “professional” people and particularly if most of the hapu are still entrapped within their own “culture of silence”.

So when students at this wananga speak about notions of individualism and the implications for tangata whenua, what is important is to situate the theory at its most relevant position, where it can contribute to action. This, as Freire would explain, is praxis.

5.6 State Devolution and the Free Market.

Undoubtedly the Treaty of Waitangi occupies a position of privilege within all programmes of the wananga. The position taken to understand the Treaty is

somewhat different however, in that, with critical studies, we view the Treaty as

Perry notes:

Agreements with indigenous peoples often arose from widely different assumptions about human relationships to the land, about the relationship of the contractual parties to one another, and in general, about what the exchanges entailed. While in many cases inadequate communication introduced inadvertent confusion to these arrangements, sometimes they involved outright deceit. As the invading populations became more numerous and indigenous populations declined – often ravaged by diseases that arrived with Europeans – shifts in the balance of power led states to abrogate or disregard many such agreements. (Perry, 1996, p.16)

The history of the Treaty of Waitangi stands as testimony to Perry’s observation, and there is no shortage of discourse and debate regarding this. Our position at the wananga is that this situation is entirely “normal” in terms of the colonisation process, and that as long as the legitimacy and validity of the Treaty of Waitangi is limited purely to a contest between the “defendant” and the “respondent”, without the involvement of an “impartial Judge and jury”, the desire for justice through honoring the Treaty of Waitangi will remain a utopian vision. This is explained through an analysis of the Articles. Article One is problematic in that notions of kawanatanga and sovereignty remain contested. Article Two is encumbered by the different interpretations of “possessions”, and whether they include intangible (language, beliefs, values, airwaves) as well as tangible (forests, fisheries, land, waterways) properties. The debate over whether these differences in text were “inadvertent” or “outright deceit” continues unabated - for indigenous peoples globally. Article Three however is the only Article that says the same thing in both the English and indigenous versions – that tangata whenua are guaranteed the same rights and privileges as British subjects.

The process of state devolution as a consequence of neoliberal fiscal policy honours Article Three implicitly. That is, the abdication of social and moral responsibility displayed by consecutive governments since the introduction of neoliberalism in 1984 has impacted on both Pakeha and tangata whenua. For instance, where restructuring took place in the workforce, tangata whenua received the same rights and privileges as Pakeha to be laid off; when user charges were introduced in to the health system, tangata whenua and Pakeha had the same right and privilege to pay for what was once free. Walker puts it succinctly when in 1987 he wrote “the obscenities of capitalism are now being burned into the psyche of Maori and Pakeha alike” (1987, p.230)

This unique position regarding the Treaty of Waitangi and the impact of state devolution is taken to reinforce the view that neoliberalism is not culturally specific – “efficient and effective” state owned enterprises are business (profit) orientated. In fact, as Smith observes;

The structural imperative of New Right ideology appears to discredit and destroy the anomalies presented by non conformists to the new economic order such as Maori, because they are “constructed” as not contributing fully to the maximization of production, and therefore to the benefit of the Nation. (Smith, 1993, p.7).

Non-conformists include a wide range of social groupings, such as supporters of Keynesian economics and tangata whenua, and read in this light, Cooper’s term “economic seduction” appears very appropriate. The fact that there may be some form of inequality in the sense that proportionately, more tangata whenua are directly affected by the restructuring, serves only to reinforce the historical relationship between tangata whenua and the state. Neoliberalism cannot be

credited with this situation; the inequality was already in place. All that changed was an increase in the numbers involved and the degree of hardship endured as Aotearoa's "nanny state" was replaced by "nanny's accountant".

5.7 Engaging The Enemy

As is plainly clear, the "language" and "metaphysical constructions" used in our classroom at the wananga to describe the impact of neoliberalism on Aotearoa in general and tangata whenua in particular can be construed as anything from "raw" to "over-generalised". This is intentional. A major characteristic of neoliberalism is their capture of language. As Fiske has commented:

Language is a crucial site of struggle, for of all our circulation systems it is the one with the widest terrain of operation. It works extensively across the globe and across the nation to spread its own preferred ways of thinking, and intensively to carry the same cultural work into the innermost areas of consciousness. A language is a historical product and has inscribed within it the knowledges that serve the interests of the social formations who have dominated that history. Though it is a resource available to all members of a society, it is neither neutral, nor equally available. (Fiske, 1993, p.31)

Chapter Two discussed the non-neutrality of language with the words "Maori" and "rakau" – "Maori" as a noun is an example of bio-politics and the "rakau" reduced simply to "a tree" was an example of language's assimilatory potential through a reconstruction that denies it of its whakapapa to Tane Mahuta (indigenous genealogy).

With the capture of language by neoliberalism, effectively, what is *said* is generally manifest in the exact *opposite*. For example, consider the effective use of the word “efficiency” – the pursuit of which is the single most commonly used justification for the lay-offs of thousands of workers:

The rational advocacy of efficiency more often than not produces inefficiency. It concentrates on how things are done and loses track of why. It measures specific costs without understanding the real costs. This obsession with linear efficiency is one of the causes of our unending economic crisis. It produces the narrow logic which can demonstrate that arms production is the key to prosperity. Worst of all, it is capable of removing from democracy its greatest strength, the ability to act in a nonconventional manner, just as it removes from individuals their strength as nonlinear beings. (Saul, 1993, p.582)

Price describes this phenomenon occurring in Aotearoa as:

The very words we use are changing their meaning: we are told that New Zealand Post is much more *efficient* than the old Post Office ever was – but Post Offices are now fewer and post boxes scarce, and daily home deliveries threatened, so that the word “efficiency” must have changed its meaning. Further, Ruth Richardson harped on about *growth* and *efficiency*, while the overseas debt swells...surely the ultimate in inefficiency. (Price, 1994, p.5)

The intentionally uncluttered nature of our “language” is an example of the development of a liberating pedagogy that fits comfortably with the wananga and its students. It is a developing practice that reflects the importance of addressing the power of a language that is being *re-constructed* within this economic colonialism. This practice is cognizant of Fisk’s assertion that:

Practices are the tactics of everyday life, they are the means by which commodities are transformed into significant things, they are the ways in which people can produce from the language system their own sayings. These particular expressions evade the power of language to “speak” its subjects and are instances of people’s ability to speak for and of themselves. It is tempting to

suggest that the most materially deprived social formations, who materially possess fewest things to make significant, will accord proportionately greater significance to linguistic practice and creativity, for language is always available to everyone [although, of course, not equally available]. (Fiske, 1993, p.211)

Therefore, the practices developed at the Wananga in terms of language and critical theory for our undergraduate programmes serve to “demystify” these power games. In Gramscian terms, it is one of the “fronts” of a “war of position”, in that “a process of de-mystification would have to be undertaken in order to penetrate the world of appearances, rooted in dominant belief systems” (Morgan, 1987, p.301). The aim is to communicate, not obfuscate – and the position is always a bottom-up one, not top-down (Fiske, 1993). That is, we analyse the impact of neoliberalism from how we see it, not how it is told to us from “above”. As a form of resistance these practices reflect the Vietnamese Buddhist monk Thich Nhat Hahn who said that:

...resistance, at root, must mean more than resistance against war. It is a resistance against all kinds of things that are like war...So perhaps, resistance means opposition to being invaded, occupied, assaulted and destroyed by the system. The purpose of resistance, here, is to seek the healing of yourself in order to be able to see clearly...I think that communities of resistance should be places where people can return to themselves more easily, where the conditions are such that they can heal themselves and recover their wholeness. (Cited in hooks, 1990, p.43)

5.8 A Bottom-Up View of Devolution

Before the 1980s, the Maori Affairs Department was the “Maori” inter-face in our community. If there was anything we wanted, we went to “Maori Affairs”. If the state wanted anything, they sent someone from “Maori Affairs”. Consequently, the Department of Maori Affairs had large offices and many staff. An example I

use was that my first job after leaving school was with the Department of Maori Affairs in Rotorua. We had one of the largest buildings in town and it seemed like all the “important” Maori in our community worked in the “Welfare Section”. I was in Housing! Maori Trust Boards were almost invisible, or at least, conspicuous by their subordinate position in community life. Nobody worked for the Trust Board. This was not only because of an inadequate economic base but also because “the 1955 Maori Trust Boards Act definition of board functions... indicate[d] their subaltern role in maintaining social hegemony” (Walker, 1996, p.82) Runanga were still a thing of the past – the initial steps to their “recreation” was not to occur until the short-lived Runanga Iwi Act 1990.

Now, from its position of “privilege”, the Department of Maori Affairs has been reduced to a family-sized, “corner dairy” called Te Puni Kokiri. The state’s moral and social abrogation, in terms of the Treaty of Waitangi, has manifest in the creation of high-profile Maori Trust Boards and Runanga. In our eyes, the cost to the state in operating the Maori Affairs Department has been “devolved” to one billion dollars, and called the Treaty of Waitangi Claims Settlement process. A state department obligated to protect the interests and well-being of tangata whenua was commodified and “sold” back to the very people it was supposed to protect. And, like dogs fighting over the scraps, contemporary tangata whenua society have been “economically seduced”. That is how we see state devolution - blunt, uncluttered, but through our eyes.

The *speed* with which this process has taken place has been breathtaking. The “cost” to tangata whenua has been enormous. And the power games and

“linguistic gymnastics” of neoliberalism has been palpable. The difference this time around is that the rhetoric is being produced, not by uri (descendants) of Hobson, but rather from our “own”.

Important in our classroom discussions is an understanding that everything that has happened in Aotearoa since 1984 has been as a result of neoliberal ideology. There is no concession for tangata whenua. So the first lie is the biggest one – the Treaty of Waitangi Settlement process is about redressing the historical injustices of the past. We take the view that this process is about the “devolution of tangata whenua” and reflects the pervasiveness of neoliberalism, not the cultural continuity and well-being of tangata whenua. It is a deceitful continuation of cultural genocide.

5.9 The Deceit

We consider that the debacle that is the Sealord’s Deal showed the deceitfulness of the state at a Pan-Tribal level, and again is evidence of the strength of Gramsci’s notion of subalterns as state weapons to maintain hegemony. With the benefit of hindsight, it is inconceivable to suggest that the state embarked on this masquerade with the best intentions of tangata whenua at heart. Not uncommon in our class discussions, as a result of our own “marginalised” involvement, is the frustration being articulated rather frustratingly through negative comments such as “benefisheries” and “chocolate fish”. Gramsci helps us understand our frustration.

We also consider that the formation of Runanga was the vehicle by which this deceit could be conducted at an Iwi level. Continuing with the role of subalterns, we discuss how some negotiators for tangata whenua are in actual fact, negotiators for the state who have become “economically seduced” by the rhetoric of neoliberalism. Classroom discussion from different iwi members also reveals how this has occurred even among the negotiators themselves. Local knowledge informs us that state complicity has occurred without the knowledge or participation of some negotiators (representative of the iwi) who, for whatever reason, are considered “obstacles” to progress, and left out of the “loop”.

Like the word “rakau”, the whakapapa of iwi has been reduced to a piece of legislation (i.e. a Runanga). Genealogy is replaced by “shareholding”. Notions of tino rangatiratanga are determined by the Companies Act and the marketplace.

This then leads to the second lie (and paradox); the formation of Runanga will give back to iwi their traditional identities and promote tribal autonomy. No more will we have the universalizing, patronizing “Maori Affairs” – a derivative of the “Maori” argument in Chapter One. We consider the argument that this is a lie because nothing is actually given back to iwi. The initial concept of devolving Maori Affairs was in line with the overall neoliberal strategy of devolving state social services to the “community” - the same strategy that was used to devolve responsibility and accountability from the state to the community for schooling through Boards of Trustees – a transfer that involved the states abrogation of all historical and contemporary responsibility for the inequalities of the schooling system without the abrogation of power and control. While newly established

Runanga eagerly chased the “welfare dollar”, not considered was the worsening social, economic and political fallout as a result of neoliberalism. Overseas examples of third-world conditions in “first-world” countries (particularly marginalized groups) were not presented. In its place was the familiar dogmatic infatuation reflective of neoliberal ideologues intoxicated by economic fundamentalism. Perpetuated was the continuing “ambulance at the bottom of the cliff” approach to social change underlying this restructure. Blindly accepted was responsibility to “fix” 160 years of colonizing devastation with no political clout and a questionable funding lifeline. The euphoria was encapsulated by various slogans such as “Maori doing it for ourselves”. The position we take at the Wananga is a consideration of the possibility that maybe the increased political profile of a few iwi members may have had more to do with it.

We consider that maybe the establishment of “tribal entities” had more to do with a much broader neoliberal agenda – the commodification and eventual “selling-off” of the Treaty of Waitangi. Created were the largely invisible, up to that time, Iwi “chiefs” with whom the state could conduct its primary mission, the settling of Treaty claims through the time-proven strategies of subalternism and divide and rule. What was established was a continuation of governmentalisation such as when Gore-Browne in 1859 caused the communal system of ownership to be broken down by the Pakeha concept of individual ownership (Walker, 1987,p.45). In this case, this thesis argues that the devolution of Maori Affairs and the creation of Runanga was premised on the need for Douglas Graham to conduct his now famous negotiations “chiefs to chiefs”. Supposedly basic tenants of “democracy” such as accountability, transparency and responsibility to the

“people” flew out the window. Consultation and informed consent become illusionary. The corporatisation of iwi is inevitable. And neoliberal ideologues have achieved their aim; the state devolution of political, economic, cultural, moral and social obligations to tangata whenua – and the establishment of the Treaty of Waitangi as a quantified, commodified, negotiable document – in short, the legitimisation and validation of the English version alone. Iwi calls for sovereignty will not be supported by a once supportive Pakeha majority who did so in the 1970s on issues of equality and justice. In a neoliberal society these two notions have an economic value, and one billion dollars is a steal.

5.10 The Crime

These views are posited on a simple observation: tangata whenua are not *ready* for this massive cultural revolution. Most are still victims of a culture of silence. Many do not understand this “culture of finance” and the consequences and implications. It is the continuation of our oppression because it denies any opportunity for informed consent to be given, by tangata whenua, to the changes that are taking place. It reaffirms our hegemony through our giving of “consent” (for those who even bother) while in a state of intellectual and moral submissiveness. And, as Walker described when discussing the inadequacies of the existing schooling system, it denies us the benefit of Freire’s contention that “knowledge of the alienating culture leads to transforming action resulting in a culture which is freed from alienation” (1990, p.193).

More importantly however, the supposedly protective legislative framework in which this process is occurring is absolutely inadequate. While Runanga may have their own legal “identity”, this legislation is still subject to an obsolete 1955 Maori Trust Board Act. The Mason Report (Ministry of Maori Development, 1996) highlights these inadequacies but has been shelved in favour of Runanga designing their own legislation, *after* any settlement has been agreed to. In short, the lack of accountability and transparency so evident to date is sanctioned by existing legislation. Negotiators *should*, not *must*, consult with iwi. As a consequence, what consultation is taking place, is misleading - not in so far as what is happening, but rather, what *could* be happening. The Mason Report mentions three alternatives –

- Option A – Amendments to the current Act
- Option B – Replacing the Act with legislation as proposed by the Mason Committee
- Option C - Combinations of options A and B or other alternatives.

Smith identifies three further options – The Corporate Iwi, The State Iwi and The Cultural Iwi (1995), and yet what is being presented is almost a *fait accompli* towards corporatism. Iwi are being denied choice – intentionally. In Freirean terms, iwi are still being oppressed, through a distinct lack of “communion on behalf of our leaders” (Freire, 1970a. p.74).

5.11 The Concerns

At Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi we can assert these points, because they are about and of us. We ask each other what we know or don't know of these

processes. We hear first-hand experiences of the manipulation and obfuscation that happens on marae and in Runanga rooms. We talk to whanau in other rohe (areas). The only thing that remains consistent between how it “used” to be and how it is now, is our own perception of ourselves – and that still remains as “beneficiaries”. This time we are beneficiaries of the Runanga, not the state. As beneficiaries, we notice that any talk of creating local employment is rubbish, unless it is part of the “misery industry” – that is, developing Iwi Social Services.. And we at the Wananga can understand why; in a neoliberal environment, work is about profit. We know our learning is being productive when, regardless of the rest of society, our Runanga choose to view work as being about people. That is, people working in enjoyable, sustainable, full-time jobs - not money working for people. And just as we do not buy into any victim blaming exercises, we just as strongly do not buy into neoliberal myths like “trickle-down” theory which are continually used to counter such arguments.

What we are seeking is an end to the “war”. If *speed* is a weapon, then give us *time*. Time to understand, to reflect, to consider, and as a consequence, to be in a position to offer *informed* consent. If *language* is a weapon, provide hapu with their own lawyers with which they may clearly understand the implications for *them* contained within the plethora of legal documents being produced.

Unfortunately, the “ghost” of Roger Douglas lives on in that; “the fire of opponents is much less accurate if they have to shoot at a rapidly moving target. Consensus among interest groups on quality decisions rarely, if ever, arises before they are made and implemented”(Douglas, 1993, p.218). With the Treaty of Waitangi Settlement process, the “opponents” and “interest groups” are those who

choose to speak on an understanding that too many of our people, both within and outside Runanga, remain cocooned within a “culture of silence” – an intellectual submissiveness that is both hegemonic and oppressive.

5.12 The Consequences

The language is “raw”, it is passionate, it is emotive. But if there is an apology to be made, it is only that we are human – and refuse to render invisible a humanist perspective that is considered “non-conformist”. We are neither “activists” nor “intellectuals”, but we are seeking to understand “our” world. And the practice we have adopted in the wananga to critically analyse the impact of neoliberalism on “us” is effective. In essence, the practice we are developing at the wananga acknowledges the feelings of bell hooks when she wrote of a quote from Lorraine Hansberry, a black playwright in 1962:

The statement she makes that has urged me on in moments when I feel too tired to struggle is the militant reminder that: “ The acceptance of our present condition is the only form of extremism which discredits us before our children. (hooks, 1990, p.187)

While Walker (1987, 1990, 1996) provides excellent publications on the history of our oppression, we benefit also from being able to position his work alongside Western critical theorists and notions of hegemony and oppression to identify recurring patterns in the relations between culture and power. What is abundantly clear is that it is no longer a game of “them and us”. The enemy now lies within. All we at the wananga are trying to do is to identify the enemy, and in this case, the enemy is ideological. Walker introduced us to the term “tyranny of the majority” (1987, p.96). What we are now witnessing as a result of neoliberalism

influencing an ill-regulated Runanga legislative framework is the “tyranny of the minority”. Walker noted in 1996 that:

Freire warns that educated men from subordinate strata are determined from above by a culture of domination, which constitutes them as dual beings. But they are necessary to the reorganization of the new society, for which purpose they have to be reclaimed by the revolution. (Walker, 1996 p.80)

This thesis argues that the Treaty of Waitangi Settlement process will contribute nothing to the well-being of tangata whenua, but will further the process of cultural genocide on the basis that tangata whenua are not yet in a position to reclaim those responsible for the tyranny being wrought by an “indigenous minority”.

As we shall discuss in Chapter Six, these continuing acts of “subalternism” are being conducted by those who are arguably our organic intellectuals, and that there is a need to articulate and legitimate a third type of intellectual, that is, an indigenous intellectual.

Chapter Six – Indigenous Intellectualism

6.1 Introduction

So the issue crystallises down to opposition to the emancipatory power of that last one per cent [that which deals with a critical analysis of historical relations of power and domination]. It exemplifies the task ahead of those engaged in the transformation of all our social and political institutions through the pedagogy of emancipation. It is a daunting task but worth the effort, because if we engage in it as an act of love, it is a measure of our humanity. (Walker, 1996b, p.267)

This quote from Walker was describing the media frenzy that took place over the Anna Penn – nurse training curriculum fiasco of 1993 - an example of media bias he described as “a one-sided war on behalf of Penn” (ibid.). Throughout this thesis, I have focused on the need to understand relations of power and culture as a precondition to overcoming colonial domination. I have also shown how Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi has sought to establish a pedagogy of emancipation over the past few years by way of the development and delivery of a critical theory component that underpins all programmes. And I have variously alluded to the need for a new form of intellectual – the indigenous intellectual. The genesis of this call could aptly be defined as an act of love and a measure of our humanity.

In this Chapter I will begin by revisiting the questions framed by Verna Kirkness in the introduction as a means to briefly summarise the previous Chapters. I will use the example of the development of iwi radio to explain the problem that we are facing in terms of how our “organic intellectuals” seem unable or unwilling to

position cultural values and ideas above economic ones. I will then use the analogy of a bus and a train in order to highlight the ideological contest that is being fought at grassroots level. From this it will be shown why Gramsci's notion of organic intellectual does not adequately provide the intellectual leadership that is required of tangata whenua in a neoliberal environment, and that the terrain of struggle for indigenous peoples extends beyond the dichotomous polemic of competing Western ideologies. Above all else, there is a need to engage with all Western notions of society and social organisation to ensure our cultural continuity and well-being. The focus of this discussion will center primarily on a critique of the dehumanizing processes that contribute to cultural assimilation and eventual cultural genocide through the reigning ideology that is neoliberalism. This will then be followed by attributes that I would consider fundamental to the development of a pedagogy of emancipation for and by indigenous intellectuals.

6.2 Kirkness Revisited

In recalling the questions posed by Verna Kirkness in the introduction, the first two questions - where are we now and how did we get to where we are - were discussed in Chapters One to Three by describing the techniques of power and state manipulation that is generally referred to as colonial domination. For indigenous peoples colonial domination is the result of a failed programme of cultural genocide – we are still alive, but “shackled”. The third question - where do we want to go - was covered in Chapter Four. In the first instance, there is a need to overcome our own insecurity, or culture of silence - a process of conscientisation and politicization that would allow us to “wrestle” for and over,

control of the driver's seat on the bus to our future. Effectively, in order to “cut the shackles” and “cut the crap”, we must ensure that we have control of the “knife” with which the cutting can be done. At the moment, the “knife” is wielded by Gramscian organic intellectuals.

Chapter Five raised issues that directly questioned the amount of control, both perceived and real, we actually have as a consequence of this culture of finance or neoliberalism. In short, we *appear* to be driving the bus. I argued that the bus is in fact, a train, running along a neoliberal track – surveyed, laid and maintained by powerful and a-cultural vested interest groups. The appearance is one of “cutting the mustard”. This Chapter seriously contests that appearance. I will argue that far from tangata whenua “cutting the mustard”, neoliberalism has repositioned materialism ahead of humanism – and cultural genocide is once more the aim. At issue is the (neoliberal) train. We need to get off the “train” but in order to do this, the focus must shift to one of leadership. Contemporary “Maori” leadership is over-run with organic intellectuals in “train driver” roles whose “control” is both limited and illusory – and yet for all intents and purposes they fit the criteria defined by Gramsci as organic intellectuals, albeit in pursuit of neoliberal rather than socialist goals. A point to be made here is that historically, colonized peoples suffer despite, not because of, the prevailing dominant ideology. Indigenous intellectualism is about confronting the hegemony of colonization in whatever ideological form it presents itself.

In essence, the contribution of indigenous intellectualism as a necessary development to Gramsci's traditional and organic intellectuals has parallels with

Gramsci's reconceptualisation of Marx's historical materialism and base / superstructure. Where Gramsci saw Marx's reading of capitalism as being overly influenced by economic determinism which rendered invisible the capability of human agency in shaping history, so too does indigenous intellectualism challenge a similar "European determinism" in Gramsci's organic intellectual that renders invisible the capability of indigenous human agency in shaping our history. Contemporary "Maori" leadership associates easily with Gramsci's organic intellectualism in that the framework for change or revolution is still limited to competing dominant European ideologies. It just so happens that rather than defending a socialist position, "Maori" organic intellectuals have shifted towards accepting a neoliberal one.

Indigenous intellectualism, while accepting the importance of the economy, legitimates indigenous human agency by considering the influence of all three factors equally in terms of cultural continuity and well-being. That is, competing dominant ideologies, civil society and political society would all be contested in terms of their negative or debilitating effects on cultural continuity and indigenous well-being. The following analogy of a bus and train is intended to show this contest.

6.3 The Difference Between A Bus and A Train.

Throughout this thesis I have used Western critical theories in order to "know the enemy". I have used a framework of war to situate the contest within a cultural, social, economic and political context. I have argued that state manipulation and our own insecurity, as a consequence of colonial domination, combine to threaten

cultural continuity and affect our well-being. And I posit the notion that the result of all this lends me to fear a return to processes and practices that will end in cultural genocide. All this is at a time when state representatives, community leaders and iwi leaders are applauding the future for “Maori”.

So what is at issue? At issue is the lack of understanding, or more seriously, a rejection of the ideological threat that is neoliberalism by some of our intellectuals, or “leaders”. I will turn to one of my own iwi to show an example of this ignorance or arrogance.

Iwi leaders and intellectuals around Aotearoa fought long and hard for the right of iwi to receive state funding for their own iwi radio stations. Most of the debate centered around the Treaty of Waitangi and the fact that iwi radio would contribute significantly to the promotion of te reo. From a neoliberal perspective, this request from iwi sat well in terms of iwi having a “choice” of stations that could compete in the “market” through the general liberalization programme of state assets. What Althusser tells us also is the potential of radio as an ideological apparatus, and therefore, the liberating potential of iwi radio.

Before long, Taranaki iwi had a talk-back programme on Friday mornings that was linked into by most other iwi stations. The content was political, informative and at times controversial – essential in any form of politicization process. In terms of the analogy used earlier to compare iwi control of iwi development, this model represents a bus being driven by politicized, informed iwi members.

In appreciating the need for this type of iwi radio programme for our local “consumption”, a request was made to my iwi radio station to link into the Taranaki station. The written reply from an “organic” intellectual (who was a “reclaimed” traditional intellectual) was to reject this proposal as it would scare away our Pakeha advertisers (personal correspondence). This is a train. For our “leaders” having our “own” iwi radio station was successful development and further evidence of our progress. In terms of affording the opportunity to provide for iwi “a critical analysis of historical relations of power and domination”, this was further evidence of cultural assimilation and subalternism. I argue that not using iwi radio (and any other iwi-owned ideological apparatuses) as a means to provide a counter-hegemonic discourse, is *not* development, but rather capitulation to neoliberalism through economic seduction. It is adopting a *reductionist* view of autonomy and self-determination. Similar to the example I used in Chapter Three in discerning a liberating whare wananga, to operate iwi radio on this reasoning is to remain limited within *capitalist definitions and values*, to the detriment of pursuing the challenge on the level of indigenous *ideas and culture*.

6.3 “Democracy” Redefined

Gramsci’s contribution of the organic intellectual was to take this contest to the level of *ideas and culture* through the workers’ party. These intellectuals were to come from the working class, although he acknowledged the need to “reclaim” some traditional intellectuals so that this process could begin. The ideas and culture Gramsci spoke of were those relating to relations of production, and the

legitimation of human labour as an integral component in the mode of production – in Freirean terms, a process of conscientisation and politicization that sought to understand *their* world in order to *transform* it. In short, the need was for the workers’ party to assume a “new” social, cultural, economic and political relationship with the bourgeoisie – a revolution in the minds of men. Effectively, Gramsci fought an ideological battle.

The integral state - civil society and political society, the reconceptualisation of base and superstructure and his dialectical rendering of historical materialism, were contributions that sought to “revolutionise” existing relations of production *outside* capitalist definitions and values, by “broaden[ing] the base of socialism to represent a *nationally unifying movement*”, and “extend the struggle for “democracy” from a *class* to a *national* level”, by redefining ““democracy” in socialist terms...as a *humanistic* rather than simply a *parliamentary political term*”(Hill, 1996, p.54).

From an indigenous perspective, notions of “democracy” have always been problematic. What Gramsci may not have been aware of in Italy was the devastation wrought on *indigenous* people *in the name* of democracy – or the “tyranny of the majority”. Ideas and culture were limited to *Western ideas and culture*. The “Southern Question” exemplified the inequity and oppressiveness of hegemony *within* the land – between tangata whenua. Traditional intellectuals perpetuated this hegemony. Organic intellectuals sought to revolutionise the *masses* as a counter-hegemonic strategy.

For indigenous people who have been colonised, this “war-of-position” between tangata whenua and coloniser induced assimilation and near cultural genocide. To “us”, we know it as the “one-people” myth. Colonisation gave us traditional Western intellectuals. It took away our indigenous intellectuals, or indigenous traditional intellectuals – our tohunga. It is debatable whether tangata whenua had organic intellectuals as defined by Gramsci – that is, anti-capitalists. Colonialism brought capitalism and Christianity - tangata whenua were “willing partners” (Walker, 1996b, p.257). Most of the resistance that did ensue, it could be argued, was limited to capitalist definitions and values – land, resources, power and control over modes of production.

While the cultural “battle” for tangata whenua began with the advent of colonisation, the ideological “battle” in a Gramscian sense in Aotearoa did not commence until the formation of the Labour Party by workers to combat the misuse of state power by Massey in 1912-13. Because of the alliance between the state, the employers and the farmers, workers came to the conclusion that the only way to protect their interests was to form their own political party, fight elections, and eventually take control of the state through parliamentary means. Thus in 1916 they founded the modern Labour Party. This Party however, was also unable to frame the struggle *outside* capitalist definitions and values, and so consequently was to prematurely end “the struggle in economic compromise, instead of extending beyond the immediate to the important long-term goals” (Hill, 1996, p.54). An important long-term goal in this sense was viewing socialism in a humanistic rather than simply parliamentary political term (ibid.). It is conceivable that relations between tangata whenua and colonizer would have been

markedly and positively different had this opportunity to “revolutionise” existing relations of production *outside* capitalist definitions and values eventuate.

For tangata whenua however, history shows that Gramsci’s fall to Fascism was to have uncomfortably similar repercussions here – not only economically, but also in terms of intellectual and moral submissiveness. This irony is not lost on students of indigenous intellectualism. To label democracy a myth is to advocate the continuing reality of fascism in our own country. Indeed, many colonized people would agree that Facism was simply colonialism brought home to Europe (Young, 1990).

Indigenous intellectualism fills the void in Gramsci’s work on the role of the intellectuals in facilitating an emancipatory pathway for indigenous peoples who are victims of colonization. The reality for a disproportionately large number of tangata whenua is the continuous reminder of Memmi’s contention that “colonialism denies human rights to human beings whom it has subdued by violence, and keeps them by force in a state of misery and ignorance that Marx would rightly call a subhuman condition” (1965, p. xxiv).

Historically, indigenous resistance of a “revolutionary” nature came notably from Te Kooti and Titokowaru, who earn this distinction on the grounds that *they* initiated armed “rebellion” *outside* any pretext of Treaty rights and obligations or state sovereignty. The issue was purely one of armed revolution against the tyranny of the state that had removed any pretext of pursuing humanistic goals of equality and justice. The war against the Kingitanga movement in 1860 was more

a product of the intervention of the state repressive apparatus to confiscate land than in response to armed rebellion. In actual fact, one of the great historical myths of this country was the state assertion that the King movement was deemed to be in rebellion. It was not “in rebellion” – at issue was a right to a dual administration (Walker, 1996b, p.261) – that is, the right to become an equal party in a capitalist society. It is ironic also that Gramsci, Te Kooti and Titokowaru should all share a similar fate – incarceration. For Gramsci it was prison, for Te Kooti and Titokowaru, it was restricted movement. For defenders of humanism, they were both acts of fascism. At least Mussolini was openly anti-democratic.

6.4 Indigenous Intellectualism in a Neoliberal Environment

For indigenous people in a neoliberal society, as well as battling the ravages of this ideology, what is paramount is our cultural “continuity”. Indigenous intellectualism challenges the dehumanizing processes that are attempting to *reject* who we are – our ideas and our culture. “Our” culture speaks of collectivism, of people first – John Rangihau encapsulated this paradigm when he spoke of “I-Am-We”. Ranginui Walker uses the “Being A Maori” selection as a measure against the one-people myth. It ends; “Being Maori is hard, being Maori is sad, being Maori is to laugh, being Maori is to cry, being Maori is forever” (1987, pp. 134-136).

Indigenous intellectualism is anti-reductionistic in that there is more at stake than economic compromise. Fundamental to this discipline is a continuous critique of dehumanizing processes that reject our right to be who we are. Neoliberalism is

the ideological colonisation of indigenous definitions and values. It legitimates possessive individualism and individual flourishing, to the detriment of collective responsibility and social flourishing. It reduces notions of “people” to “human resources” and has alliances with market materialism. This materialism creates social identity through material ownership. Collective social responsibility becomes secondary to individual earning power. The intrusion of this form of colonisation for tangata whenua is quickly realized in simple, everyday rituals of encounter – “what do you do?” (read - how much do you earn?) is replacing “where are you from?” (read – we may be related) as the first question after “kia ora”. Individual social and economic position assumes priority over collective, genealogical connectedness.

Indigenous intellectuals celebrate who we are as indigenous people. In doing this, there is a need to know in the first instance, “who we are not” – followed by developing discourse that continuously seeks to find “who we are”. By asking “who we are not” *first*, we acknowledge Foucault’s contention that we should begin by questioning “what” we are, not “who” we are. For example, we begin to see that the social grouping called “Maori” is a colonial construct. And so it is with neoliberalism. The characteristics inherent in neoliberalism are anathema to notions of collectivity and social responsibility. The capture of language and the disparagingly disproportionate *re*-allocation of wealth and resources, nationally and internationally, attest to this. Iwi development that is couched in neoliberal-speak should set off alarm bells for those who refuse to be seduced by the glib rhetoric of some of our own “organic” intellectuals – managers masquerading as leaders (see Vercoe, 1998). They form the vanguard to which their subalternism

maintains the hegemony of not just the state, but also the vested interest groups who themselves contest sovereignty rights with the state.

To openly challenge these “leaders” inevitably produces calls for you to be silent, to “get out of grievance mode”, and attempts to marginalise your argument as being reflective of a “small disruptive element”. The assumption of course, is that the silent majority are unanimously in favour of the proceedings – and are not ill-informed at all! Indigenous intellectuals should take heart however, for what are exposed are the structures for what they are – fascist tangata whenua intellectuals who seek to silence criticism and dispense ridicule in lieu of constructive and critical debate, whose rejection of transparency and accountability in decision-making procedures confirms the absence of “democratic” process. Even Westminster parliamentary processes legitimate the opposition as an important and integral element of process.

Most of all, the indigenous intellectual accepts her or his social function as organisers and educators, and carries out this role knowing the present, are aware of forces at work in society, who believe our world-view is valid, and work for the majority of our people who are still subsumed in a “culture of silence” and consumed by a “culture of finance”.

To challenge neoliberalism at the level of ideas and culture is to support localized development ahead of market trends, to return notions of employment to job creation rather than profit generation, to “go local” and ignore the injunction to “go global”. It is, at the end of the day, to put people first. It is a passionate aim of

all opponents of globalisation – a rejection of neo-capitalism with its faceless, unsympathetic “shareholders” - for a return to a mode of production that prioritises humanism over monetarism. For indigenous intellectuals, it is all of that, and more. It is a continuous and concurrent challenge against and engagement with both cultural and ideological assimilation. It is a right to be who we are, for and on behalf of our children and grandchildren. It is an act of love. It is a measure of our humanity.

6.5 Conclusion: Towards A Pedagogy of Emancipation

The advent of whare Wananga, the proliferation of marae-based decolonisation programmes, a growing iwi awareness of globalisation, environmental pollution and genetic engineering and the ever-increasing “critical mass” of indigenous students and academics in state tertiary institutions has provided the opportunity for iwi to access knowledge that is beyond state control. Iwi members within these environments are privileged to appreciate the power of knowledge in its most liberating and emancipatory form – as a means to intellectual independence. Concurrently we are constantly and painfully reminded of the peculiarities of iwi leadership and representation in a neoliberal environment – within hapu and runanga, and between iwi and the state. Issues of power and control are compounded further by the internalized oppression and culture of silence inflicted on too many iwi members – victims still of colonial domination. Illusions of grandeur, honourific capital and symbolic violence take precedence over the importance of consensual and informed consent.

Power for the once powerless is intoxicating. Walker referred to Foucault when he wrote that “power infects men with madness and only those who distance themselves from power and stand aloof from tyranny can discover the truth” (1996b, p.261). He was referring to the pseudo-speciation rhetoric used by the colonizers of this country to justify the violence of colonial despoliation (ibid.) during the first wave of cultural colonisation. In this thesis it has been argued that contemporary iwi society is undergoing a new wave of ideological colonisation and that the individuals whom power infects with madness today are an elite and privileged group of tangata whenua who justify their actions as being for the benefit of the collective good. Addressing historical grievances through the construction of state-condoned autocracies that pursue economic ideas and values over humanistic ones is dehumanizing.

It has also been argued that in order to “discover the truth”, iwi must engage in a determined strategy to educate the masses through a critical analysis of historical relations of power and domination, and most significantly, it is some of our self-proclaimed “organic intellectuals” who must be initially “won over”. This task must be done by those indigenous intellectuals who are intellectuals by *iwi* social function, and who specialize in a critical analysis of power and culture. This is the indigenous element missing from Gramsci’s traditional and organic intellectuals – the consideration of cultural and ideological colonisation on indigenous intellectuals by iwi social function. The design and delivery of a critical theory programme within Te Whare Wananga O Awanuiarangi sought to achieve this objective, and in so doing, has identified in a Gramscian sense, a third “type” of intellectual - the indigenous intellectual.

It is now in the hands of indigenous intellectuals to develop the terrain on which our war to defend cultural continuity and well-being can be contested – a terrain whose boundaries have no boundaries, a terrain that is multi-frontal and yet has no fronts, a terrain that is both real and virtual. In order to cut the shackles, cut the crap, and cut the mustard, indigenous intellectuals must fight to reclaim our cultural authenticity. As I have argued here, this is the struggle to regain the lost dimension of organicity; that is, the indigenous dimension.

Bibliography.

- Abercrombie, N., Hill, S., & Turner, B. (1984). *Dictionary of Sociology*. London: Penguin.
- Alton-Lee, A., Nuthall, G., & Patrick, J. (1987). Take Your Brown Hand Off My Book: Racism in the Classroom. *Set*. No. 1, 1-4.
- Apple, M.W. (1993). Education, Equality, and the New Right. In L. D. Dworkin & L.G. Roman (Eds.), *Views Beyond the Border Country: Raymond Williams and Cultural Politics* (pp.91-115). New York: Routledge.
- Barlow, C. (1994). *Tikanga Whakaaro: Key Concepts in Maori Culture*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Bates, T. R. (1975). Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 36, 351-366.
- Benton, R. (1987). How Fair is New Zealand Education? Part 2: Fairness in Maori Education: A Review of Research and Information. In *The Royal Commission on Social Policy*. New Zealand Council for Educational Research, November.
- Berger, P. (1974). 'Consciousness Raising' and the Vicissitudes of Policy. In P. Berger (Ed.), *Pyramids of Sacrifice: Political Ethics and Social Change* (pp.111-132). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Bowers, C. A. (1983). Linguistic Roots of Cultural Invasion in Paulo Freire's Pedagogy. *Issues in Focus*, 84 (4), 935-953.
- Cave, D. (1983). Working-Class Education: The Nature and Role of 'The Intellectual' in the Writings of Antonio Gramsci. *Melbourne Studies in Education*, 145-168.
- Connolly, R. (1980). Freire, Praxis and Education. In R. Mackie (Ed.). *Literacy And Revolution: The Pedagogy of Paulo Freire* (pp. 70-81). London: Pluto Press.
- Cummings, J. (1986). Empowering Minority Students: A Framework for Intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*. 56 (1), 18-36.
- Dean, M. (1994). *Critical and Effective Histories: Foucault's Methods and Historical Sociology*. London: Routledge.
- Douglas, R. (1993). *Unfinished Business*. Auckland: Random House.
- Durie, M. (1998). *Te Mana, Te Kawanatanga: The Politics of Maori Self-Determination*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Freire, P. (1974). *Education: The Practice of Freedom*. London: Writers and Readers.
- Freire, P. (1983). The Importance of the Act of Reading. *Journal of Education*, 165, (1), pp. 5-11.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1993). A Dialogue with Paulo Freire. In P. McLaren & P. Leonard (Eds.), *Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter*. London: Routledge.
- Freire, P. & Shor, I. (1987). *A Pedagogy for Liberation*. London: MacMillan.
- Fromm, E. (1961). *Marx's Concept of Man*. New York: Frederick Ungar.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Two Lectures. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* (pp. 78-108). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Gibbons, P. (1992). Supporting Bilingual Students for Success. *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 15 (3), 225-236.
- Gilling, M. (1989). *Maori Education in Pakeha Hands*. Hamilton: University of Waikato
- Giroux, H.A.(1993). Paulo Freire and the Politics of Postcolonialism. In P. McLaren & P. Leonard (Eds.), *Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter*. London: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (1999). Series Forward. In M. Peters (Ed.), *After the Disciplines: The Emergence of Cultural Studies* (pp. vii-x). Westport, Connecticut: Bergin & Garvey.
- Gordon, C. (Ed.). (1980). *Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Gordon, D. (1989). Neo-Marxist Approaches to Curriculum. In T. Husen & T. Neville Postlewaite (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Education* (pp. 559-561). London: Pergamon Press.
- Gould, B. (1995). *Waikato Times*, 1 June, 6.
- Hill, D. (1995). *Antonio Gramsci: An Introduction to his Life and Times*. Personal Notes.
- Hill, D. (1996). Antonio Gramsci: An Introduction to his 'Notebook' Legacy. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 2, 43-58.

- Hill, D. (in progress). *Reconsidering 'Hegemony' as both a Cognitive and a Moral Problem: Gramsci, Education and Radical Democracy Revisited*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Waikato.
- Hill, D. (2002 in press). More Free or Less Constrained? Freire and Foucault on Freedom and the Problem of Human Submissiveness. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 37 (1).
- Hirsh, W. (1990). *A Report on Issues and Factors Relating to Maori Achievement in the Education System*. Ministry of Education, August.
- Jeffries, P., Mitchell, C., & Ramsay, P. (1994). *Monitoring Today's Schools*. Report No. 9, Nga Take Maori, Waikato University.
- Johnson, A.G. (2000). *The Blackwell Dictionary of Sociology*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Joll, J. (1977). *Gramsci*. London: Fontana.
- Kirkness, V. J. and Barnhardt, R. (1991). First Nations and Higher Education: The Four R's – Respect, Relevance, Reciprocity, Responsibility. *Journal of American Education*, 30 (3), May, 1-15.
- Lankshear, C. (1993). Functional Literacy from a Freirean Point of View. In P. McLaren & P. Leonard (Eds.). *Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter* (pp. 90-118). London: Routledge.
- MacLean, P. D. (1990). *The Triune Brain in Evolution*. New York: Plenum Press.
- McLaren, I. A. (1994). *Nineteenth Century Educational Encounters in the South Pacific: Missionaries, Colonists and the Maori in New Zealand, 1815-1877*. Unpublished Notes.
- McLaren, P. (1986). Review Article - Postmodernity and the Death of Politics: A Brazilian Reprieve. *Educational Theory*, 36 (4), 389-401.
- McLaren, P., & da Silva, T. T. (1993). Decentering Pedagogy: Critical Literacy, Resistance and the Politics of Memory. In P. McLaren & P. Leonard, (Eds.), *Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter*. London: Routledge.
- McLean, D. (1985). *Reading Gramsci's Writings on Education*. Unpublished M. Phil. Thesis, University of Auckland.
- Mackie, R. (Ed.) (1980). *Literacy and Revolution: The Pedagogy of Paulo Freire*. London: Pluto Press.
- Mackie, R. (1980). Contributions to the Thought of Paulo Freire. In R. Mackie (Ed.), *Literacy and Revolution: The Pedagogy of Paulo Freire* (pp. 93-120). London: Pluto Press.

- Marshall, J. (1995). Michel Foucault: Governmentality and Liberal Education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 14 (1), 23-34.
- Maslow, A. H. (1973). *Dominance, Self-Esteem, Self-Actualisation*. California: Cole.
- Maybury-Lewis, D. (1998). The American Experience in Alaska. *Cultural Survival Quarterly: World Report on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Ethnic Minorities*. Fall, 3.
- Memmi, A. (1965). *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Metge, J. (1984). *He Tikanga Maori*. Wellington: Department of Education.
- Middleton, S., Codd, J., & Jones, A. (Eds.) (1990). *New Zealand Education Policy Today*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.
- Ministry of Education (1999). *New Zealand Schools: Nga Kura o Aotearoa 98: A Report on the Compulsory Schools Sector in New Zealand*. Wellington: Origin Design.
- Ministry of Education (2000). *Nga Haeata Matauranga: Annual Report on Maori Education 1999/2000 and Direction for 2001*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Maori Development (1996). *Reform of The Maori Trust Boards Act 1955: A Discussion Paper*. Wellington: Ministry of Maori Development.
- Morgan, J. (1987). The Pedagogical Politics of Antonio Gramsci – Pessimism of the Intellect, Optimism of the Will. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 6 (4), 295-308.
- Mulenga, D. C. (1994). Participatory Research for a Radical Community Development. *Australian Journal of Adult and Community Education*, 34 (3), 253-261.
- Musgrave, P. W. (1979). *The Sociology of Education*. London: Methuen.
- Nepe, T. M. (1991). *Te Toi Huarewa Tipuna*. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Auckland.
- Orange, C. (1987). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.
- Osborne, R. (1992). *Philosophy for Beginners*. New York: Writers and Readers.
- Penetito, W. (1986). Taha Maori in Schools: Evolution, Revolution or Transformation. In Smith, G. (Ed.), *Nga Kete Wananga: Maori Perspectives of Tahah Maori*. Auckland College of Education.

- Penetito, W. (1986a). Ideology and Practice in Maori Education: Two Sides of the Same Coin. In G. Smith (Ed.). *Nga Kete Wananga: Maori Perspectives of Taha Maori*. Auckland College of Education.
- Perry, R. (1999). *From Time Immemorial: Indigenous Peoples and State Systems*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Ramsay, P. D. K. (1981). *Tomorrow May Be Too Late: Schools With Special Needs in Mangere and Otara*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Roberts, P. (1994). Education, Dialogue and Intervention: Revisiting the Freirean Project. *Educational Studies*, 20 (3), 307-327.
- Roberts, P. (1995). *Literacy, Freire and the University*. Unpublished D. Phil. thesis, University of Waikato.
- Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf.
- Smart, B. (1986). The Politics of Truth and the Problem of Hegemony. In D. Cousins Hoy (Ed.). *Foucault: A Critical Reader* (pp. 157-173). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Smith, G. (1986). Taha Maori: A Pakeha Privilege. *Delta*, 37, 11-23.
- Smith, G. (1990). The Politics of Reforming Maori Education: The Transforming Potential of Kura Kaupapa Maori. In H. Lauder & C. Wylie (Eds.) *Towards Successful Schooling* (pp. 73-87). London: The Falmer Press.
- Smith, G. (1993). Tane-Nui-A-Rangi's Legacy... Propping Up the Sky: Kaupapa Maori as Resistance and Intervention. In *Creating Space in Institutional Settings for Maori* (pp. 33-39). Auckland: Research Unit for Maori Education.
- Smith, G. H. (1995). New Formations of Colonisation. In *Economics, Politics And Colonisation: Fisheries and Commodifying Iwi*. 1, IRI / Moko Productions.
- Smith, L. (1992). Kura Kaupapa Maori and the Implications for Curriculum. In G. McCulloch (Ed.), *The School Curriculum in New Zealand: History, Theory and Policy and Practice* (pp. 219-231). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Sultana, R. (1989). What's Keeping Them Back?! Life Choices and Life Chances. *Set*. 1 (12), 1-4.
- Taylor, P. V. (1993). *The Texts of Paulo Freire*. Buckingham: Open University.
- Textier, J. (1979). Gramsci, Theoretician of the Superstructure: On the Concept of Civil Society. In Mouffe, C. (Ed.), *Gramsci and Marxist Theory* (pp.48-79). London: Routledge & Keegan Paul.

- Vaggioli, D. F. (2000). *History of New Zealand and Its Inhabitants*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Vercoe, A. E. (1998). *Educating Jake: Pathways to Empowerment*. Auckland: HarperCollins
- Walker, J. (1980). The End of Dialogue: Paulo Freire on Politics and Education. In R. Mackie (Ed.), *Literacy and Revolution: The Pedagogy of Paulo Freire*. London: Pluto.
- Walker, R.J. (1989). Maori Identity. In D. Novitz & B. Willmott, (Eds.). *Culture And Identity in New Zealand* (pp. 35-52). Wellington: GP Books.
- Walker, R. J. (1990). *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Walker, R. J. (1996). Contestation of Power and Knowledge in the Politics of Culture. *He Pukenga Korero*, 1, (2), 1-7.
- Walker, R. J. (1996a). *Nga Pepa a Ranginui: The Walker Papers*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Walker, R. J. (1996b). Maori Resistance to State Domination. In M. Peters, W. Hope, J. Marshall & S. Webster (Eds.), *Critical Theory, Poststructuralism and the Social Context* (pp. 257-268). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Williams, H. W. (1997). *Dictionary of the Maori Language (7th Edition)*. Wellington: GP Publications.
- Young, M. F. D. (1971). *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*. London: Collier-Macmillan.
- Young, R. (1990). *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West*. London: Routledge.