

## **New Zealand History *is* Māori History:**

### TIKANGA AS THE ETHICAL FOUNDATION OF HISTORICAL SCHOLARSHIP IN AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND



IT SHOULD COME AS NO SURPRISE TO FIND that New Zealand history is Māori history. In 1987 when Tipene O'Regan stated that the 'the past belongs to all New Zealanders, but first it is ours', he was drawing attention to New Zealand history's foundation in Māori history.<sup>1</sup> Thinking about New Zealand history as Māori history does not mean denying the histories of European, Asian and Pasifika immigrants, but draws attention to the notion that 'settler' aspirations to claim 'Aotearoa' as home occur within a much broader narrative of indigenous occupation and struggle.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, how can New Zealand history be *the* story of 'here' when it has 'othered' indigenous narratives that speak to the heart of what it is to belong in the land of the long white cloud? Yes, New Zealand history *is* Māori history – and that presents a problem for tangata whenua self-determination. Likewise, for Pākehā, it is an issue because until New Zealand history recognizes and enables the centrality of Māori history it will always fail to articulate the collective 'us' that is so often assumed in the discourse of 'full and final settlement'.<sup>3</sup> In its current form it will never be able to ethically or adequately account for the shaping of a New Zealand identity that finds 'composure' in the story of how Pākehā became 'native' New Zealanders.<sup>4</sup> For Māori, these issues are keenly felt, because while New Zealand history has always been about us, it has predominantly been articulated on the colonizers' terms. In the 'discursive constructions' that are New Zealand histories, the indigenous have regularly been culturally appropriated, dislocated and misrepresented.<sup>5</sup> Even when Māori have turned their back on the writing of New Zealand history it has been, and will still be, a history of being or becoming 'native'. Yes, New Zealand history *is* Māori history – so why does it feel like the story of Pākehā settlers?

To displace Māori historical narratives, the history of New Zealand nation-building has employed the typical colonial strategies of either deliberately ignoring or naming, claiming, subsuming and 'playing native'.<sup>6</sup> For Māori, this Pākehā-centric history of Aotearoa has done more than merely silence or subsume: it effectively pushed Māori to the margins of the national narrative, and in the process repositioned our past as 'pre-history', mythology

or resistance.<sup>7</sup> Māori history gave histories of New Zealand a romantic and exciting back story, but it was a dangerous, inconvenient and unsettling inclusion in the main narrative. Some researchers have avoided the so-called ‘treacherous waters of Māori history’, while writing about what it has meant to live, belong, settle and claim these islands.<sup>8</sup> For some Māori, this is ironic, when for indigenous and colonized peoples, the mainstream waters of colonizer research have always been far more dangerous sites of navigation for native scholars. Describing research in Māori history as ‘treacherous’ and problematic creates misleading warning signs that encourage a ‘strategy of avoidance’, which might in some instances also contribute to what has been called ‘Pākehā paralysis’.<sup>9</sup> This is played out by scholars who begin with a disclaimer that their history project, although contributing to the field of New Zealand history, has nothing to do with Māori.<sup>10</sup> This supposes that the difficult straits of Māori history can simply be avoided by charting a course round them, and tacking away from trouble. Pretending not to do Māori history while engaged in New Zealand history – fooling oneself that history can occur here with no relevance to the indigenous people – requires colonial blinkers, blinkers few historians would admit to wearing.<sup>11</sup> New Zealand historians, and some Māori historians too, must realize that all New Zealand history is relevant to Māori and that Māori are relevant in all New Zealand histories. In these intellectual waters, whatever we write about – law, gender, politics, diplomacy, the environment, economics, Pākehā identity, culture, work, religion, war, birth, death or taxes – it all has a bearing on the long-standing history of tangata whenua. Topics that seem comfortable safe harbours outside the currents of Māori history should be more closely charted to determine how they align with, or disturb, the conventional assumption that New Zealand narratives and Māori narratives are separable. These are the really dangerous waters, the supposed safe harbours away from the rip tides of Māori history; below their calm surfaces lurks a powerful colonial undertow. Heather Came is right to stress that ‘all research in Aotearoa is of relevance and significance to Māori’. Indeed, the converse is also true: Māori are relevant to all research in Aotearoa.<sup>12</sup>

The imaginary safe harbour of most importance is the notion that New Zealand history supposedly provides *the* quintessential narrative of ‘here’. To buy into this imagined community is to be ‘playing native’: to be speaking with the right to claim the story of this land and its people.<sup>13</sup> Conversely, Māori historians might try and ignore New Zealand history, but the longer we remain distant the more we see our history swept away by a tidal wave of settler-centric histories. New Zealand history is Māori history – but how can it present Māori history more appropriately, perhaps even ethically?

This essay explores this question, and contemplates how New Zealand historians might account for Māori history by embedding more robust and relevant ethical approaches within common practice. Coming to know, then implementing, Māori and indigenous ways of doing historical research is crucial to moving beyond the limitations of Pākehā-centred New Zealand history that has previously failed to close the distance to indigenous ways of researching and presenting the past. This paper traverses a broad array of ethical ideas, from issues of collaboration, representation and accountability, to the role of Pākehā researchers and the importance of te reo Māori and tikanga. This is not a comprehensive ‘how to’ manual, but a brief foray into a vast sea of work.

### **Tikanga as Ethical Research in Historical Scholarship**

Acting and researching within relevant and robust ethical boundaries is crucial to upholding the standards of professional history. The dangers that lurk within the discipline are well documented, but it sometimes appears that historians still consider their approaches ‘innocent’, particularly the view that facts speak for themselves and that historians simply research facts and put them together with little need for theoretical explanation or robust critical interpretation.<sup>14</sup> History is not an innocent discipline, and ethically grounded historical research requires careful consideration and preparation before someone should be allowed to enter the field.<sup>15</sup> ‘Ethical research systems and practices’, according to Marie Battiste, ‘should enable indigenous nations, peoples and communities to exercise control over information relating to their knowledge and heritage and to themselves.’<sup>16</sup> Māori are the indigenous people of this land, and – like other native peoples – have long been poised to assert their perspective on research processes and ‘reclaim a voice that contributes to the dismantling of an old order of research practice’.<sup>17</sup> History in New Zealand, like other professions, has a code of conduct for proficient practice which should, then, be more closely examined. The Professional Historians’ Association of New Zealand/Aotearoa (PHANZA) *Code of Practice*, for instance, urges historians to only ‘undertake research you are competent to perform’ and to ‘engage in conduct which is legal, ethical, [and] reflects cultural sensitivities’.<sup>18</sup> Whether or not researchers subscribe to these, or any, ethical codes of conduct in historical scholarship in New Zealand is unclear, but if historians are serious about undertaking culturally sensitive research, then more scholars here must pay closer attention to the growing body of research that deals with indigenous cultural and ethical issues. This should be part of every New Zealand historian’s intellectual toolkit. On this issue, the PHANZA *Code of Practice* explicitly stresses the importance

of keeping ‘up to date with developments in your field’.<sup>19</sup> But how many historians in Aotearoa really pay close attention to the increasing scholarship in Māori and indigenous research ethics and methodologies? Too often, even those scholars who are interested in colonial issues have avoided engagement with Māori and indigenous research by retreating into the friendlier, Pākehā-centric and interpretive realms of postcolonial theory.<sup>20</sup> Even the increasingly commonplace Kaupapa Māori approach has steadily been bypassed as Māori scholars find more iwi-specific ways to research and present their work.<sup>21</sup> Ethical guidelines, like the PHANZA *Code of Practice*, require updating and more explicit instruction to effectively support good ethical practice. In one section, the PHANZA *Code of Practice* advocates ‘an open and free access [policy] to historical records’, but this notion of free and open access is at odds with Māori perspectives on mātauranga (knowledge) that have been archived in publicly accessible spaces.<sup>22</sup> Māori knowledge in the public domain does not mean that anyone is allowed to just help themselves. When researchers deal with mātauranga that has an obvious connection to iwi, hapū or whānau, historians should first and foremost seek out permission or guidance to use that kōrero in a way that retains the mana of those to whom the knowledge belongs.<sup>23</sup> Current ethical codes in Aotearoa New Zealand should be aware of the way in which Māori engage with historical sources.

Like the PHANZA *Code of Practice* (1998), the National Oral History Association of New Zealand (NOHANZ) *Code of Ethical and Technical Practice* (2001) is also outdated. Only a two-page document, it encouraged researchers to ‘guard against possible social injury ... or exploitation’, to ‘develop sufficient skills and knowledge ... through reading and training’, and ‘to conduct interviews with an awareness of cultural or individual sensibilities’.<sup>24</sup> Being aware of cultural issues is important, but these documents have been simply too vague to enable researchers to meet the ethical requirements of indigenous communities like Māori. Produced in the late nineties and early two-thousands, the NOHANZ and PHANZA ethical guidelines might have paid more attention to some of the already published work of Māori scholars on the issues of ethical research in iwi communities. At the beginning of the nineties, for instance, Ngahuia Te Awekotuku identified ethical principles and ideas that researchers should apply when working with Māori.<sup>25</sup> Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s hugely influential *Decolonizing Methodologies*, published in 1999, made a substantial addition to an already growing array of ideas about better research and ethical practice within indigenous communities. For both Te Awekotuku and Smith, understanding Māori ethics meant coming to terms with Māori world views and tikanga. From an indigenous perspective, ‘ethical codes of conduct’,

Smith writes, 'serve partly the same purpose as the protocols which govern our relationships with each other and with the environment'.<sup>26</sup> Concepts such as 'aroha ki te tangata' (to show respect for people), 'kanohi ki te kanohi' (to present yourself to the people face to face), 'manaaki ki te tangata' (to share and host people, to be generous) and 'kia mahaki' (to not flaunt your knowledge) were more culturally accurate phrases which, according to Smith, better articulated and expressed the ways Māori understood issues of respect, empowerment, responsibility and cultural sensitivity.<sup>27</sup> To undertake ethical research, historians needed to immerse themselves in the language and worldviews of the iwi kaenga (local, home people).<sup>28</sup> Within this linguistic and cultural universe, scholars might be better equipped to consider whose interest their research served and convey their findings more effectively to iwi kaenga and other non-academic audiences.<sup>29</sup>

Working with Māori history requires more than a token nod to cultural sensitivity. This means coming to know more thoroughly the details relevant to what culturally appropriate research entails. While Te Awakotuku and Smith offer very useful discussions on various ethical issues specific to Māori, in recent years others have also formulated their own explicit models. Russell Bishop, for instance, has advocated the IBRLA approach: the acronym draws together the ethical concerns of Initiation, Benefits, Representation, Legitimacy and Accountability.<sup>30</sup> 'Initiation' focuses on how the research project begins, and whose concerns, interests and methods determine or define the outcomes. 'Traditional research', Bishop argues, 'has developed methods of initiating research and accessing research participants that are located within the cultural concerns, preferences and practices of the Western world.'<sup>31</sup> Thus, a more indigenous-driven 'initiation' is required.<sup>32</sup> The question of who benefits from the research is also a key concern for Bishop, in particular the circumventing of scenarios where the interests of Pākehā researchers are advanced at the expense of Māori.<sup>33</sup> 'Representation' in the IBRLA model is concerned with the issues of power, legitimacy and epistemology, and has at its heart the question of 'whose research constitutes an adequate depiction of social reality'.<sup>34</sup> This is perhaps Bishop's most significant point for those undertaking Māori history. He condemns the misrepresentations common in 'traditional research' that 'simplified/conglomerated and commoditised Māori knowledge for "consumption" by the colonisers and denied the authenticity of Māori experiences and voice'.<sup>35</sup> This research, Bishop writes, 'has displaced Māori lived experiences with the "authoritative" voice of the "expert"'.<sup>36</sup> The importance of legitimacy in the IBRLA approach highlights concerns about the authority Pākehā have to speak for Māori, particularly given the

history of research that has ‘undervalued and belittled Māori knowledge and learning practices and processes in order to enhance those of the colonisers’.<sup>37</sup> Of this underlying ethical issue, Bishop contends that ‘such research has developed a social pathology research approach’ that has presented Māori culture as inferior to that of the colonizers and ‘perpetuated an ideology of cultural superiority that precludes the development of power sharing processes’.<sup>38</sup> Finally, in emphasizing the importance of accountability, Bishop challenges researchers to consider ‘who they are answerable to, who controls the initiation, procedures, evaluations, text constructions and distribution of newly defined knowledge’.<sup>39</sup> Bishop’s model is helpful, detailed and thoughtful, but is not communicated in Māori terms, and despite advocating the importance of dealing ethically with indigenous peoples, it fails to provide specific Māori concepts for Pākehā researchers to normalize as part of their own practice.

The importance of articulating a model that reflects the way Māori understand and express ethics has been one of the more common features of scholarship in this area. While approaches like IBRLA are useful, most Māori scholars have tended to invoke the language and the culture to assert the fact that traditional and Māori specific modes of conduct have long governed the way we acquire and use mātauranga. Thus, those who write on ethics in regard to Māori research have regularly come back to the need for tikanga and te reo Māori to drive more robust understandings of what works and what is not acceptable in iwi and hapū communities. Writing in 2007, Maui Hudson and Annabel Ahuriri-Driscoll note that tikanga Māori had ‘yet to be given meaning in the context of ethical review’ and that little had been written about tikanga and its relationship to contemporary ethical issues.<sup>40</sup> In contrast to Bishop, Hudson and Ahuriri-Driscoll identify a range of ‘principles’ in te reo Māori that they believe ‘underpin a Māori research ethic’.<sup>41</sup> These include ‘manaakitanga (caring), katiekitanga (guardianship), aroha (compassion), rangatiratanga (self-determination), mana (authority), whānaungatanga (kinship relationships), mauri (life source), tika (right, just), whakapapa (genealogy), tapu (restriction, protection), and noa (free from restriction)’.<sup>42</sup> Like Te Awekotuku’s approach, Hudson and Ahuriri-Driscoll’s list of principles, expressed explicitly in the language, immediately grounds Māori ethics in tikanga and te reo. By 2010, this body of ethical work, drawn from Ngahua Te Awekotuku, Kiri Powick, Fiona Cram and others, had been compiled and added to by the Putaiaora Writing Group in the *Te Ara Tika* guidelines – a study devised to assist both researchers and ethics committees.<sup>43</sup> The *Te Ara Tika* guidelines are a Kaupapa Māori ethical framework based upon the application of tikanga

and Western ethical principles that also integrate Treaty of Waitangi principles.<sup>44</sup> Divided into four key ‘elements’, the guidelines emphasize the importance of whakapapa as Māori control of the research process and an ongoing engagement with Māori; tika, or the use of Māori research paradigms and participation; manaakitanga as an adherence to appropriate cultural behaviour, social responsibility and research integrity; and mana, which focuses on equity, including the ownership of data, tribal consent and reciprocity.<sup>45</sup> These frameworks, Came argues, provide ‘a means for Tauīwi to develop research that responds to this fundamental challenge of how to do ethical research in Aotearoa’.<sup>46</sup> For historians, this growing and already significant body of writing should be taken up in current practice. Developing tikanga that enables a more robust and ethical approach to historical research is not a matter of ticking off the boxes, but is about a willingness to be guided by experts in the area. It is about giving up power to be truly empowered. Even for those who have grown up with tikanga, the application of it within research requires scholars to consistently reassess how it works in the context of new topics and outcomes.

The need to ensure that tikanga corresponds with the kaupapa has been well documented in indigenous scholarship. In Aotearoa New Zealand in recent years, this approach has been articulated as Kaupapa Māori methodology and theory. Kaupapa Māori is simply about understanding how your research fits into, and adds to, the kaupapa. The kaupapa, in most instances, is about understanding how to empower iwi, hapū and Māori more generally. According to the authors of the *Te Ara Tika* guidelines, good ethical practice encourages ‘research that frames Māori Kaupapa as the primary interest of the project, involves Māori as co-constructors of the project, supports Kaupapa Māori theory and uses Māori research methodologies as appropriate’.<sup>47</sup> Historians in Aotearoa might then ask: how does my research support, abandon, or even undermine, the kaupapa of Māori self-determination? Margaret MacMillan reminds us that the power of history ‘can be helpful [and] it can also be very dangerous’. ‘Sometimes’, she writes, ‘we abuse history, creating one-sided or false histories to justify treating others badly, seizing their land, for example, or killing them ... We abuse it when we create lies about the past or write histories that show only one perspective’.<sup>48</sup> A more ethical approach to historical scholarship in New Zealand is not merely a matter of following protocols that show we have consulted Māori during the process, but at a deeper level is really about the history we produce as the end result. The monocultural, Pākehā-centric national narrative that usurps the place of Māori indigenous histories is essentially an ethical issue in historical scholarship. The importance of more robust ethical practice in New Zealand history is, therefore, crucial

to disrupting that power and control. New Zealand history is Māori history, but a more informed and embraced ethical code of conduct may yet assist in ensuring that it more appropriately reflects and articulates Māori perspectives and mātauranga.

### **Tikanga as a Living Practice in Historical Scholarship**

Understanding how Māori ethics work in varied contexts involves seeing them in practice and more explicit detail, observing them in nuanced examples, and most of all, allowing them to become part of a personal experience in which the researcher comes to know tikanga by living them.<sup>49</sup> Generic concepts, such as manaakitanga, mana and whakapapa, have little resonance for those who do not see them operating and functioning in actuality. Most importantly, they have even less application when the practitioner fails to adopt them as part of their own conduct, disregarding them instead as exclusively the cultural codes of the ‘other’. First and foremost, then, historians must learn to listen. This requires a level of respect and reciprocity.<sup>50</sup> ‘We Talk, You Listen’ is an important concept in international indigenous scholarship, and is a crucial tikanga in research with many native peoples, including Māori.<sup>51</sup> This requires a giving up of control and power, and a genuine attempt to understand the position and historical perspectives of indigenous peoples. Learning to listen also includes the need to consider closely your own role as researcher and historian: to pay more attention to who is speaking, and who has the right to speak. Writing on the importance of this tikanga, Smith points out that ‘[i]t is common practice in many indigenous communities for elders to be approached as the first point of contact, and as the long term mentor of an indigenous researcher’.<sup>52</sup> Stephanie Milroy argues that in working with iwi it is important to find the ‘true leaders in the community and not just the most public Māori. The true leaders are those with mana on the marae, regardless of their occupation in the Pākehā world.’<sup>53</sup> There is an underlying tikanga at work here relative to the building of relationships, or whakawhānaungatanga. Being guided by, listening to, and including, the appropriate people, is all part of this protocol. Historians should be mindful that their role here is not to simply assume the position of translator, speaker or mediator. The tikanga in learning to listen and knowing your role is at once a matter of humility, relationship building, decolonization and empowerment. For those with whakapapa (genealogical connection) there is a collective ‘we’ and ‘us’ in this process that is a key part of knowing who you are, and what your position is in researching and writing iwi and Māori history. The chorus of ‘us’ is inextricably connected to accountability to the whānau, hapū

and iwi. In their study of the way the past is present in the lives of ‘everyday’ Americans, Roy Rosenzweig and David Thelen offer a commentary on the way ‘us’ and ‘we’ are used by those who have struggled against colonial and racial oppression: ‘African Americans speak of “our race,” “our roots,” “our people”; American Indians speak of “our history,” “our heritage,” “our culture,” “our tribe”. The “we” they invoke stands in sharp opposition to the triumphant American “we”: the narrative of the American nation state – the story often told by professional historians – is most alive for those who feel most alienated from it.’<sup>54</sup>

Māori often occupy a similar position. The tikanga related to the invocation of these collective pronouns accentuates specific ‘kinship obligations’, a highly political determining of tribal identity, and emphasizes the notion of inclusivity, indicated in the utilization of the collective pronouns ‘our’, ‘us’ and ‘we’. Speaking for, and producing a history of, ‘us’ – a history of Aotearoa New Zealand – should be considered in regard to the right to represent and speak for the indigenous peoples. A tikanga understanding of ‘positionality’ includes knowing how whakapapa works in the research process.<sup>55</sup> All historians writing on topics in Aotearoa should be mindful of the genealogical, political and historical connections between tribes. The tikanga inherent in whakapapa carries with it an appreciation that you uphold the mana of your ancestors.<sup>56</sup> It is a matter of accountability. Having a genealogical connection has immense value, but that alone is not enough. For those who have whakapapa, the political status of ahi kaa and kauruki tu roa (those who keep the long ascending smoke of the home fires burning) is also important when dealing with people of authority in the community.<sup>57</sup> Dealing with the right people is vital to following tikanga, and to enabling mātauranga. Rawiri Te Maire Tau contends that whakapapa is the skeletal structure of mātauranga Māori (Māori epistemologies), and historians should operate within a mātauranga framework to more effectively articulate Māori historical perspectives.<sup>58</sup> More recently, in the context of decision-making about ethics, whakapapa has been highlighted as an important factor when ensuring better quality relationships.<sup>59</sup>

The power dimensions in research relationships, whether they are grounded in whakapapa, friendships or simply working collaborations, should be considered closely to better understand the ethical issues within them. Historians, as I have argued here, should work on recognizing who we are as the researcher, when we are ‘insiders’ or ‘outsiders’, and what this means.<sup>60</sup> There are various ways to be an insider and outsider in indigenous contexts. Those who are ‘insiders’, as Linda Tuhiwai Smith observes, generally ‘have to live with the consequences of their processes’, while outsiders have in the

past too frequently set themselves up as ‘experts’, yet are never, or seldom, seen by the locals again.<sup>61</sup> Many outsiders, who later profess to be experts on ‘us’, do more damage than good to indigenous communities.<sup>62</sup> The tikanga here is essentially based on empowerment and mana. Recognizing our limits, whether they relate to gender, age, language, or culture, is important for navigating the ethical issues of power in your role as an historian. Both gender and age in various Māori communities are critical components that enable or disable access to information and the right to speak. Constraints such as these, relative to the intersections of identity, are critical to both the safety and well-being of the researcher and those involved in the research. The ethical responsibility at play here advocates the need to work within the cultural protocols of the community, and is about power and representation.<sup>63</sup> Leonie Pihama and Patricia Mairangi Johnston draw attention to the issues of power in regard to Māori women, where ‘unequal power-relations that exist in this [Pākehā colonial] society ... have been instrumental in the marginalization of Māori women’.<sup>64</sup> Knowing how to locate yourself more appropriately in historical research thus means navigating the intersections of culture, gender and age, with an ethical understanding of how they are situated by power and control. For New Zealand historians, the issue of insider and outsider status has also been relative to the popular colonizer/colonized binary. Rather than remaining entrenched in the postcolonial position and approach, scholars might yet consider repositioning themselves by adopting mātauranga frameworks that more ethically and adequately empower both Māori and Pākehā. Within mātauranga Māori are the tikanga approaches that enable historians to support the kaupapa of empowerment and decolonization. Decolonizing, then, is not just about Māori empowering ourselves, but is ethically vital for Pākehā in finding a way beyond the colonizer position. To deconstruct the colonial world, postcolonial approaches must give way to the kaupapa; and Pākehā too must find ways to decolonize themselves by doing more than just sharing power. More robust and ethically sound research in Aotearoa, then, depends to a large extent on the Pākehā willingness to decolonize their approach to historical scholarship. Abandoning not simply the colonizer position, but the role of expert, is important in avoiding the problem of speaking for indigenous peoples, and effectively silencing native voices in the process. These so-called experts have been labelled as ‘peeping toms [and] rank opportunists’; ‘interested only in furthering their careers’; ‘predatory’; ‘dishonest in research intentions’; and unable to distinguish between public and ‘private’ knowledge.<sup>65</sup> A more ethical relationship between Pākehā and Māori, then, is not just about collaboration and partnership, but is essentially about a real shift in power. This shift in power is noted by Alison

Jones and Kuni Jenkins, who contend: 'If shared talk becomes an exercise in only making [Māori] more understandable or accessible to colonizer groups, with no commensurate shifts in political power, then it becomes better to engage in strengthening the internal communication and knowledge, as well as self-reliance, of the people.'<sup>66</sup>

Ethical partnership operates with a greater awareness of each group's positions of power. For Māori and Pākehā, collaboration has too often been damaged by broken promises, tokenism, appropriation and a misguided understanding of equality that has done little more than reinforce colonial influences and attitudes. This is not to say that all collaboration between Māori and Pākehā has been unethical. Past experiences where Māori have been let down and misrepresented, however, have left many sceptical about how, and when, they work with Pākehā researchers.<sup>67</sup> Despite this, as Smith points out, 'a non-indigenous, non-Māori person can be involved in Kaupapa Māori research, but not on their own; and if they were involved in this research they would have ways of positioning themselves as a non-indigenous person'.<sup>68</sup> How, then, can Pākehā position themselves in a more ethical way? Some have argued that non-indigenous researchers can not only situate themselves more appropriately, but have an obligation as Treaty partners to do so.<sup>69</sup> There are now many Pākehā scholars working with iwi and Māori who have a genuine desire to improve the way they collaborate and produce history. These 'allies' and 'colleagues in research' are invaluable.<sup>70</sup> They are learning to use and appreciate te reo Māori and tikanga. Most importantly, they are beginning to understand the kaupapa and how it has relevance and benefit to Pākehā, and therefore, are more aware of the role they play in decolonization. This attitude to collaboration is exemplified by Heather Came. In positioning herself, she writes: 'I defer to their expertise of what is ethical practice for working with Māori and welcome access to this framework that provides Tauīwi with an opportunity to enhance and strengthen our work with Māori.'<sup>71</sup>

Perhaps the most obvious and applicable framework for collaborative research is one based on the Treaty of Waitangi. But how can we trust a model that has never satisfactorily empowered Māori, and in practice has done more to perpetuate Pākehā settlement and colonization rather than Māori mana and self-determination? The importance of the Treaty of Waitangi in research ethics is affirmed in the Health Research Council of New Zealand's *Guidelines on Ethics in Health Research*, which states that 'the principles of partnership and sharing implicit in the Treaty should be respected by all researchers'.<sup>72</sup> Likewise, the Ministry of Health's *Operational Standard* asserts that Treaty principles 'must be incorporated in the proceedings and processes of ethics committees' and that 'broad Māori cultural concepts

should be respected and supported through ethical review'.<sup>73</sup> The unique place of te Tiriti o Waitangi in Aotearoa provides a working model for ethical possibility in historical scholarship. The *Te Ara Tika* guidelines referred to above normalize Treaty principles in their framework, and pay significant attention to the Māori interpretation of ethical ideas and procedures.<sup>74</sup> For historians in New Zealand, the Treaty model provides an opportunity to finally allow Māori interpretations of collaboration and partnership to take precedence in their own ethical practice. In decolonizing the popular New Zealand history nation-making narrative, the indigenous story becomes key to a more ethical and empowering alternative. Thus, while a more ethical approach relies on tikanga as a foundation, so too should New Zealand history find firmer purchase in a narrative more able to speak for 'here'. Māori history is New Zealand history, and it has the potential to belong to, and speak for, all New Zealanders.<sup>75</sup>

The Tiriti ethics model is one that requires both Māori and Pākehā to reassess their partnership role. It is not a collaboration built on a vision of simplistic equality, but one in which Pākehā acknowledge their already entrenched position of power, and give up control, close the distance and let Māori speak while they listen. The role of the non-indigenous researcher, then, is defined by this process; yet in the Treaty model it is yet to be articulated in more culturally specific terms. One particularly important aspect of this relationship is transparency, in which 'good faith, fairness and truthfulness is captured' in what Hudson and others describe as 'the concept of whakapono (hope)'.<sup>76</sup> In negotiating the space where Māori and Pākehā history merge, researchers should be clear about how this intersecting dialogue reflects important issues relevant to both parties. Jones and Jenkins have referred to this as 'working the colonizer-indigene hyphen', where there have been far too few good collaborations.<sup>77</sup> Rather than the hyphen being a site of simple fusion, they argue, the collective "'us" cannot stand in place of the hyphen', and thus, 'the hyphen is to be protected and asserted', but is still 'a positive site of productive methodological work'.<sup>78</sup> They note that it is sometimes 'non-negotiable', and should be approached with caution because of its reliance on the problematic essentialist colonial binary.<sup>79</sup> For New Zealand historians, these are important issues. However, the 'us' that materializes from a more ethical interactive approach at once enables nuanced perspectives of Māori and Pākehā histories and simultaneously accentuates those indigenous realities while deconstructing powerfully oppressive settler discourses. In this way the hyphen is helpful, but only inasmuch as it disrupts essentialism and colonial hegemony, and assists in a more ethical dialogue relative to a decolonized national community. I argue here that when both Māori and

Pākehā historians explore their role and place in more ethical historical research, the problematic ‘us’ is no longer an impediment to articulating shared past experiences. How could it be, when Māori have already offered viable tikanga and te reo-based examples that speak to the potential of ‘us’ in Aotearoa New Zealand?

One of the more immediate examples is that of tangata whenua and manuhiri. While some have positioned Pākehā as settlers, natives, or even invaders, there are other possibilities that arise directly from te reo and tikanga contexts. The status of manuhiri, though a potentially provocative reassessment of the Pākehā position, is apt to a narrative of arrival, welcome and belonging that is expressed in indigenous terms and ethical codes of conduct. In Aotearoa, Māori still assign the important manuhiri role to all outsiders, including themselves when stepping into the domain of other iwi. For those who reside in the territories of another tribe, manuhiri status requires an acknowledgement of the home people, their mana and tikanga. In conducting appropriate ethical research in Aotearoa, historians should be willing to act within indigenous terms of engagement that are no longer controlled by the dominant group.<sup>80</sup> While manuhiri offers one potential collaborative possibility based on tikanga Māori, whānau research approaches are yet another framework posited by scholars in the field. Both Kathie Irwin and Russell Bishop, for instance, have argued for the importance of whānau as supervisory bodies and organizational structures in research. Irwin refers to a ‘whānau of supervisors’, while Bishop writes of the need to build a ‘research whānau of interest’.<sup>81</sup> The whānau model for better ethical collaboration is a useful framework in that it enables whānau and hapū tikanga to set the markers and rules in terms of positioning the researcher. For Māori, whakapapa plays an important role here, while for those who do not have indigenous whakapapa connections, other possibilities arise, particularly that of whangai. A whangai is an adopted whānau member, who may or may not have specific whakapapa connections. Graham Hingangaroa Smith has written of the merits of a whangai or adoption model, which differs from the mentoring ‘tiaki model’ in which those with authority ‘sponsor and guide the research and the researcher’.<sup>82</sup> According to Smith, in the whangai approach the researcher is ‘incorporated into the daily life of the people’ and maintains a lifelong relationship well beyond the time of the research.<sup>83</sup> The whangai role firmly places the power in the hands of the whānau and iwi in order to facilitate and support the researcher. Ethically, there are interwoven tikanga at play here that highlight the importance of reciprocity, trust and accountability. When you become part of the whānau, and are entrusted with mātauranga and history, you take on – whether you want it or not – a kaitieki responsibility.

This kaitiekitanga (guardianship, caretaking) is not only about how you deal with, present and look after whānau and iwi mātauranga, but also about how that custodianship is always aligned to the mana motuhake of the whānau. Historians cannot, then, remove themselves from these responsibilities and argue for the supposed strengths of ‘objective’ and impartial research. It is entirely unethical from a Māori or indigenous point of view for any historian to write about us, without our permission. Mana motuhake is about self-determination, the power and ability to define your past, present and future on your own terms. It is also about ownership and accountability. Historians are caretakers or repositories of knowledge that often have no genealogical or whakapapa relationship to the community, their history and taonga. They become kaitieki of that knowledge, but there is a difference between those who simply act in a caretaking role and those with real kaitiekitanga authority. Dr Apirana Mahuika points out that ‘Ko te tangata kaitieki, he whakapapa tona / a guardian is a person who has genealogy’.<sup>84</sup> Thus, for many Māori, kaitiekitanga is essentially about the genealogical relationship the historian or researcher has to taonga, mātauranga and kōrero. The roles of kaitieki and whangai, then, are always a matter of tikanga, and are determined by the interpretation of that tikanga within a specific iwi and hapū context. Of indigenous peoples’ understandings of custodianship and control of their own knowledge, Battiste notes that they are prescribed ‘from the customs, rules, and practices of each group’.<sup>85</sup> Scholars here in Aotearoa should be aware of these cultural ways of understanding the historian’s role as a type of caretaker of knowledge that is carried by others. In this regard, Ermine, Sinclair and Jeffrey point out that ‘taking credit alone for such work would be profane’, and that it is important to honour the ethic of reciprocity based on traditional protocols, irrespective of whether the researcher is qualitative or quantitative.<sup>86</sup> More often, the kaitieki role is one that is generally left to Māori, iwi, hapū and whānau, and those who have a direct whakapapa relationship to the mātauranga and kōrero at hand.<sup>87</sup> Whether they are manuhiri, whānau, whangai or kaitieki, the underlying ethical responsibility here is founded within issues of mana, and an accountability to empower (whakamana) the home people.

In order to be accountable and to whakamana, then, historians should be aware of the kaupapa (aspirations, goals and aims) that are important in this process. Indeed, how can you be a caretaker, custodian and transmitter of knowledge when you do not understand the kaupapa? Ethical accountability is crucial to upholding the mana of those most affected, and vulnerable, in research. When scholars understand the kaupapa, they are able to present their world in ways that have meaning to themselves and the researched, rather

than pretending to do so from an omnipotent objective position. Historians working in Aotearoa should, then, consider who they are accountable to, who benefits from, and who is most adversely impacted upon by, their research. One way in which historians can support the 'kaupapa' of empowerment is to work harder on the revitalization and normalization of te reo Māori in their own work. Monty Soutar has argued that competency in the language is an important part of doing iwi research, and that it opens and closes doors to sources, histories and people. He points out that researchers who are 'competent in the language and culture', and have access to both documentary evidence and resources of tribal scholarship, are more adequately placed to interpret the tribe's history than others.<sup>88</sup> The use of language in historical scholarship, particularly for indigenous peoples, is an act of empowerment and revitalization. Language conveys knowledge, and the currency of historical research in the language of the colonizer is a major problem in historical research in Aotearoa. Researchers, according to Battiste, 'cannot rely on colonial languages to define indigenous realities'.<sup>89</sup> Thus, only the indigenous language in Aotearoa can fully realize the kaupapa: that is a more ethical and empowered understanding of New Zealand history beyond the colonial settler linguistic universe. All historians in New Zealand, then, should be learning te reo Māori, and making it a common and important part of the way in which they narrate the past on these shores. The use of te reo Māori is crucially important to repairing, transforming and finding solutions to ethical issues in historical research in Aotearoa. As Battiste points out: 'Indigenous languages offer not just a communication tool for unlocking knowledge; they also offer a theory for understanding that knowledge and unlocking a paradigmatic process for restoration and healing.'<sup>90</sup> The reo is a vital component in more robust ethical historical research in Aotearoa. Māori history written only in English in the long term assists ongoing colonization, while New Zealand history produced in Māori only adds more value, supports reo revitalization and assists Pākehā in understanding how to speak within the Aotearoa indigenous vernacular. This is an issue of broader cultural and social proportions, but the history fraternity should be aware of how te reo Pākehā has prejudiced the New Zealand historical narrative. Thus, the longer we allow English to be *the* language of New Zealand history, the more its articulation remains imbalanced, colonially warped and therefore ethically questionable.

In addition to empowering te reo Māori, better ethical historical practice in Aotearoa requires more robust consultation, and a more widespread 'giving back' of the knowledge researchers acquire from, or that is relevant to, those communities. The ethical models of research presented above, particularly

those that identify culturally specific roles, are a good start to ensuring the stronger application of tikanga. Giving back to the community is based within the crucially important tikanga of utu or reciprocity. In the consultation mode, for instance, there is a level of accountability that should be understood on iwi and Māori terms. Stephanie Milroy writes that ‘for Māori, there was none of the concept of “researcher” as an independent, neutral observer who was accountable to himself/herself or the academic community rather than the community being researched’.<sup>91</sup> Māori, she notes, ‘like to see proof that the good intentions of the researcher are being carried out’.<sup>92</sup> Being accountable and giving back requires historians to follow a tikanga in which they accept that their work is not theirs alone. Historians, when giving back to the community, should be continually consulting with an intention to follow through and enable ownership. Thus, as Tipene O’Regan has stressed, ‘the past’ indeed ‘belongs to all New Zealanders’, and it is for historians to enable that sense of belonging. For Māori, as Maui Hudson asserts, the ethical importance of consulting with Māori is essentially relative to a ‘constructive critique of the proposed project and its potential impact’.<sup>93</sup> Community representatives, as Linda Tuhiwai Smith observes, have to ‘be convinced that the research project is worthwhile and in their interest’.<sup>94</sup> An awareness of these issues is all part of a better approach to accountability, a giving back to the community by understanding what their needs and aspirations are throughout the whole research process. In a tikanga-based approach to history, researchers must give back to communities and not take simply for their own personal needs and careers. This requires close and regular consultation and not simply a one-off consent form that enables future writing to proceed. This tikanga, then, requires a long-term commitment. For non-Māori, particularly those who have built careers on the back of Māori historical research, there is an important ethical responsibility to give back to the community. Linda Tuhiwai Smith argued some time ago now that ‘with very few trained indigenous researchers available, one of the roles non-indigenous researchers have needed to play is as mentors of indigenous research assistants’.<sup>95</sup> Mentoring, from a tikanga perspective, is very much about manaakitanga and mana.<sup>96</sup> Historians who display manaakitanga are willing to give up their time to enable and empower the iwi and hapū. At the heart of this ethical approach is the need to understand how one might contribute and ensure ‘the mana of both parties is upheld’, to act with care and aroha, seek advice from kaumātua and respect privacy and confidentiality.<sup>97</sup> Mentoring the next generation of indigenous scholars is essentially about manaakitanga and returning the mana to the home people. A more ethically robust process, then, in Aotearoa, requires historians to find ways to navigate this issue. Giving back allows

researchers to clearly acknowledge the intellectual whakapapa from which their own mātauranga has been produced.<sup>98</sup> Returning the control of historical knowledge to those with whakapapa in the community is an important act of empowerment. Most ethical guidelines refer to the importance of empowering participants and research communities, yet it often appears that historians tend to see their research as exclusively their property. In the competitive research environment, it can be easy for scholars to focus on protecting their work, to decide who has access, and when, how and in what form the histories they write are disseminated. But historians should also remember that their research is not merely a matter of recounting events and narratives, but is about making identities and contemporary politics, and often has an intensely important value to the community. Holding on to research is an act of power, and not giving back can then effectively remove power. Thus, in the New Zealand historical landscape, historians might ponder more deeply on how their decision to share, mentor, give back, or withhold, adversely or positively impacts on individuals and groups. Carrie Hamilton points out that empowerment can sometimes require a sense of ‘solidarity’ that involves ‘both an analysis of relations of power in the past and a commitment to action in the present’.<sup>99</sup> Historians, when thinking ethically about their research, should not forget how significant their accounts, and the details within them, are to those stakeholders in the present.

Ethics in historical scholarship are inextricably connected to the how past narratives contribute to, and are utilized within, present-day issues and situations. Historians who are aware of current concerns should be conscious of the need to give back, to be accountable, and find ways to empower the communities in which their research has present-day resonance. Giving back is one way to do this, and requires a desire to give time, knowledge and expertise, where a need is obvious. Historians should, then, be working to support and mentor beyond just the confines of the university. To truly empower is not to maintain the role as expert and trap indigenous peoples in a type of dependency, but is about supporting the growth of tribal researchers to assert themselves as specialists and authorities. Too many historians have focused primarily on establishing their careers, yet have given little back, have taken their knowledge from willing informants and have failed to groom an expert to take their place. Better tikanga and ethics would have seen these same historians mentor a small group of tribal scholars to take on the mantle and ownership of important historical knowledge for future generations. Thus, historical scholarship and practice are inextricably linked to ethical issues in our present and future. Although many historians would like to remain unrestricted by tikanga, we should all be concerned with the outcome

of our work, and not just the process. On this issue, Linda Tuhiwai Smith has argued that ‘the move towards research that is more ethical, and concerned with outcomes as well as processes, has meant that those who choose to research with Māori people have more opportunities to think more carefully about what this undertaking means’.<sup>100</sup> New Zealand history is Māori history, but in its current incarnation often feigns its ‘innocence’ by asserting the view that contemporary politics or cultural issues and perspectives should have no bearing on the way we present and research the past. However, a closer look at our ethical practice and conduct should dispel this outdated approach. Māori history is New Zealand history, and those who conduct research there must account for the ethical codes of conduct or tikanga that enable a more culturally appropriate and empowering navigation.

### **Ngā Kupu Whakamutunga**

This paper has toiled with, and advocated, the idea that New Zealand history is Māori history; but it could be equally useful, if not more accurate perhaps, to assert that Māori history is in reality, if not in practice, New Zealand history. Whichever way we choose to see it, the ethical issue here is about power, and the subordinate role that Māori history has been forced to play in the production of narratives about nation, ‘us’ and ‘here’. This article, then, has argued that a more robust practice based on tikanga Māori understandings is highly important and relevant to more ethical historical research in Aotearoa New Zealand. Indeed, ethics in New Zealand historical scholarship, as has been argued above, should be inextricably connected to indigenous protocols because the history under examination is essentially a history of Aotearoa, of belonging, becoming and understanding what it means to be ‘native’ New Zealanders. This article has argued that if New Zealand history is Māori history, then historians of Aotearoa New Zealand should strive harder to update their ethical standards. For the PHANZA and NOHANZ national organizations, revision and modifying of current ethical guidelines and codes are necessary to enable better practice. There are now multiple frameworks and models available that historians should be aware of, each of which has its own terminology and has dramatically advanced thinking about research ethics over the past two decades. Most tend to emphasize the importance of understanding ethics in relation to indigenous ways of knowing, and frequently draw on the language to reframe the meaning of specific ethical ideas within a Māori cultural and linguistic universe. Issues of access, insider and outsider positioning, responsibility and empowerment are repeated; yet for many, these terms are presented in specifically indigenous terms, including the importance of kaupapa, mana, aroha and manaakitanga. These tikanga,

as this essay has stressed, are parts of the essential foundations of a more robust ethical practice in New Zealand history, within which Māori have their own process and conceptions of ethics that are based in the language and day-to-day protocols or tikanga inherited from deep tribal tradition. Most significantly, historians must look closely at their attitudes to ethical conduct, and rather than going through the motions, seek to make tikanga a part of their commonplace approach to historical research and writing. This requires, as this essay has argued, a much more informed understanding of where to start, and particularly a stronger self-awareness about the historian's role as expert, as an insider or outsider, as caretaker and as a partner or collaborator. Finding an appropriate model and framework demands more articulation and thought in historical scholarship in New Zealand. Historians might yet consider in more detail their role in regard to the Treaty of Waitangi, and specifically where it speaks to possibilities for an ethical framework for the future. If te Tiriti enables a partnership narrative for an ethical way forward, then historians might consider further the importance of following, and operating within, a Māori version of ethics rather than a Pākehā or non-indigenous interpretation. Likewise, the New Zealand historical narrative, with a first peoples' interpretation in mind, might then, in a more robust ethical framework, be led by a Māori grand narrative and not a Pākehā settler story. Decolonizing as ethical historical practice, as has been addressed in this essay, requires those working with indigenous communities to learn to listen, exercise a shift in power, pay attention to who are the true leaders, and work on understanding how the past is perceived through native eyes. Historians who listen when indigenous peoples talk should also consider who speaks for native peoples, and in New Zealand would be wise to pay closer attention to the tikanga relative to whakapapa, ahi kaa and kauruki tūroa. This paper has noted the varying ethical issues relevant to collaborative research, whether it be working the hyphen, escaping the colonizer binary, or simply dealing with the tension between Māori, iwi, hapū and non-Māori approaches to research. Working on a tikanga ethical basis, historians might consider the roles of manuhiri, whānau research groups, whāngai and kaitieki when contemplating how they might update and improve the way they produce research in and about Aotearoa. Closing the gaps, and learning to undertake historical research that reflects tikanga, requires a meaningful engagement with te ao Māori (the Māori world), in which the language and culture becomes a living rather than tokenistic part of the historian's process. Thus, in becoming truly accountable and empowering, historians too should consider how they are giving back, and reflect more regularly on their desire to mentor and whakamana new historians and generations. A tikanga and

te reo-driven approach to ethics in historical scholarship in Aotearoa can be immensely transformative and empowering – not just to those who have endured colonialism, but for those who want to belong and write histories that assist them in claiming ‘here’ in more ethical refrains. New Zealand history is Māori history, but until historians recognize this, and shape their practice within an ethical approach that allows Māori to speak, then we are stuck with a national history that is only playing native. Indeed, Māori history is New Zealand history, and for Pākehā who have long been searching for national identity, then this may be an uncomfortable and obstructive truth. Maybe it is time to renew a dialogue on these matters: one in which we talk and you listen, where the power dynamics are transformed by more robust ethical protocols, where together we might find the language, practice and narrative that finally speaks to ‘our’ history.

NĒPIA MAHUIKA

*University of Waikato*

## NOTES

I would like to thank all those who have provided feedback and encouragement during the preparation of this essay, particularly in Te Pouhere Kōrero and the New Zealand Historical Association.

1 Tipene O'Regan, 'Who Owns the Past?: Changes in Māori Perceptions of the Past', in John Wilson, ed., *From the Beginning: The Archeology of the Māori*, Auckland, 1987, p.145.

2 Although Aotearoa New Zealand history includes the experiences of Chinese, Pacific Island and other migrant groups, it is the British (and later Pākehā) 'settler' narrative that has shaped the national story of 'becoming'. James Belich writes that 'New Zealand has long seen British history as its own prehistory'. James Belich, *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders: From Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century*, Auckland, 1996, p.16. William Pember Reeves sought to claim Aotearoa as home as early as 1898, pointing out that he had 'seen it and studied it from end to end ... it is my country'. William Pember Reeves, *The Long White Cloud, Ao-tea-roa*, 1st ed., London, 1898, preface.

3 Pākehā rather than Tauīwi is used deliberately in this essay. The term is relative to a Māori view of colonizer nation-making in which the Pākehā-centric archetype and settlement narrative have been used to subsume all other 'migrants' – including Māori. The discursive problems of 'full and final settlement' have been addressed by several authors. See Ani Mikaere, 'Settlement of Treaty Claims; Full and Final or Fatally Flawed', *New Zealand Universities Law Review*, 17, 1997, pp.425–55; and more recently the multiple essays in Nicola R. Wheen and Janice Hayward, eds, *Treaty of Waitangi Settlements*, Wellington, 2012.

4 Alistair Thomson writes that 'composure' is about the ways in which individuals and communities draw on, and navigate, collective myths and discourses in order to 'compose' narratives and reach a sense of composure about who they have become. See Alistair Thomson, *Anzac Memories: Living with the Legend*, Melbourne, 1994, p.8. This desire to become native is addressed in Michael King, *Being Pākehā Now: Reflections and Recollections of a White Native*, Auckland, 1985. This essay focuses on Pākehā because it is this group that has dominated the construction of New Zealand nationalism and identity.

5 The discursive construction of New Zealand history and cultural appropriation are issues dealt with in Peter Gibbons, 'Cultural Colonization and National Identity', *New Zealand Journal of History* (NZJH), 36, 1 (1997), pp.5–17.

6 New Zealand history 'plays native' whenever it pretends to assert the essential narrative of 'here'. The history and politics of colonizers who 'play native' can be considered further in Phillip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian*, New Haven and London, 1998.

7 Māori were not included in the production of the national narrative. Keith Sinclair has written that well into the twentieth century 'Māoris were still peripheral to Pākehā society' and not 'central to Pākehā thinking about their own national identity'. Keith Sinclair, *A Destiny Apart: New Zealand's Search for National Identity*, Wellington, 1986, p.204. A lonely exception to the dominant settlement narrative of New Zealand history can be seen in Ranginui Walker, *Ka Whāwhai Tonu Mātou: Struggle Without End*, Auckland, 1994.

8 Māori history is referred to as 'treacherous waters' by Angela Ballara. Angela Ballara, "'I Riro i te Hoko": Problems in Cross-Cultural Historical Scholarship', NZJH, 34, 1, (2000), p.21. This essay avoids outing histories that might be seen as unethical or ethically sound. This decision is influenced by discussions with indigenous scholars who have expressed concern at being labelled 'angry natives' when drawing attention to colonizing research and practice. It is also driven by a desire to have readers focus on the issues raised in this essay rather than become distracted looking for heroes and villains.

9 This issue of 'paralysis' is referred to by Martin Tolich, "'Pākehā Paralysis": Cultural

Safety for Those Researching the General Population of Aotearoa’, *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 19, (2002), pp.164–78. Nevertheless, there are many outstanding histories in Aotearoa, and it is important to note here that many historians have tried to develop their practice with greater sensitivity and appreciation for tikanga, te reo Māori, and Māori and iwi perspectives and aspirations.

10 Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 2nd ed., London, New York and Dunedin, 2012, p.179.

11 This is another reason why explicit examples are not offered in this essay. Turning the spotlight on to the practice and studies of historians who fall into this category of behaviour is problematic and dangerous for native scholars. Indigenous scholars are cautious not to just ‘call out’ the culprits as if we are responsible for policing ethical or racist attitudes or standing watch over the ongoing systematic and long-standing practices that have marginalized, subsumed or ignored Māori histories.

12 Heather Came, ‘Doing Research in Aotearoa: A Pākehā Exemplar of Applying Te Ara Tika Ethical Framework’, *Kōtuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences*, Online, 8, 1–2, (2013), p.65.

13 New Zealand is an imagined community. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London and New York, 1991.

14 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.32. The question of empiricism and objectivity has been well documented in historical scholarship. See Peter Novick, ‘Nailing Jelly to the Wall’, in *That Noble Dream: The ‘Objectivity Question’ and the American Historical Profession*, Cambridge, 1988.

15 Maurice Punch notes the importance of robust preparation to ensure ethical precision, particularly in qualitative research like history. Maurice Punch, ‘Politics and Ethics in Qualitative Research’, in Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds, *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Oakland, 1994, p.83.

16 Marie Battiste, ‘Research Ethics for Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: Institutional and Researcher Responsibilities’, in Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, eds, *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, London, 2008, p.503.

17 This essay refers interchangeably to indigenous peoples and Māori. It draws on the International Labour Organization definition which describes indigenous peoples as ‘tribal peoples in independent countries whose social, cultural and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regarded wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations’, cited in Battiste, 2008, p.499. Dismantling older systems is a consistent idea in the production of indigenous ethical codes of conduct. See Willie Ermine, Raven Sinclair and Bonnie Jeffery, ‘The Ethics of Research Involving Indigenous Peoples’, *Report of the Indigenous Peoples Health Research Centre to the Interagency Advisory Panel on Research Ethics*, July 2004, p.9.

18 The Professional Historians’ Association of New Zealand/Aotearoa (PHANZA), *Code of Practice* (1998): [www.phanza.org.nz/content/code-practice](http://www.phanza.org.nz/content/code-practice). The PHANZA *Code of Practice*, adopted at the 1998 AGM, is a small one-page document (online) that divides itself into sections focused on ‘responsibilities’ to ‘clients’, ‘those who provide information and materials’, ‘the history profession’, ‘other professionals’, and ‘the public’.

19 PHANZA *Code of Practice*, 1998.

20 Postcolonialism was the subject of a 2011 special edition of the *NZJH*. In that edition, I argued, as I do now that postcolonialism is an inadequate way of addressing the imbalances of colonial historiography because it relies on a non-indigenous theoretical and analytical frame of reference. Nēpia Mahuika, ‘Closing the Gaps: From Post-colonialism to Kaupapa Māori and Beyond’, *NZJH*, 45, 1, (2011), pp.15–32.

21 Kaupapa Māori has a now broad literature. A good starting point, however, would be to consider Graham Hingangaroa Smith's doctoral thesis. Graham Hingangaroa Smith, 'The Development of Kaupapa Māori: Theory and Praxis', PhD thesis, University of Auckland, 1997. Ani Mikaere, 'KEYNOTE: From Kaupapa Māori research to re-searching Kaupapa Māori: Making our contribution to Māori survival', in Te Wāhanga, Dr Jessica Hutchings, Dr Helen Potter and Katrina Taupo, eds, *Kei Tua o te Pae Hui Proceedings: The Challenges of Kaupapa Māori Research in The 21st Century*, Pipitea Marae, Wellington, 5–6 May, 2011, pp.29–37.

22 PHANZA *Code of Practice*, 1998.

23 This question of open access for researchers and scientists has been a major contention in many indigenous communities. In the United States, for instance, Native American scholars clashed with scientists working on discovery of 'The Kennewick Man'. For further reading here, see Larry J. Zimmerman, Karen D. Vitelli and Julie Holowell Zimmer, eds, *Ethical Issues in Archaeology*, California, 2003, pp.158–61; Suzanne J. Crawford and Dennis F. Kelley, eds, *American Indian Religious Traditions: An Encyclopaedia*, California, 2005, pp.432–5; James C. Chatters, *Ancient Encounters: Kennewick Man and the First Americans*, New York, 2002.

24 National Oral History Association of New Zealand (NOHANZ), *Code of Ethical and Technical Practice*, Wellington, 2001: [www.oralhistory.org.nz/code.htm](http://www.oralhistory.org.nz/code.htm).

25 Te Awēkotuku's guidelines were based on the New Zealand Association of Social Anthropologists code of conduct, which itself had been based on the American Anthropological Association model. Ngahua Te Awēkotuku, *He Tikanga Whakāro: Research Ethics in the Māori Community: A Discussion Paper*, Wellington, 1991.

26 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.125.

27 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, pp.124, 126. These phrases, she writes, were selected, heard, observed at Atārangi and in other Māori language learning contexts.

28 Te 'iwi kaenga' here means the home people. I use this phrase to remind scholars of the need to think about how their ethical approach might be more fully informed by those iwi and hapū that are local to their area.

29 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.10.

30 Russell Bishop, *Freeing Ourselves*, Netherlands, 2011, pp.3–4. This publication is drawn from previous work on collaboration and Kaupapa Māori education.

31 Bishop, *Freeing Ourselves*, p.3.

32 Bishop, *Freeing Ourselves*, p.3.

33 Again, Bishop notes that Māori have become increasingly 'concerned about this important political aspect because traditional research has established an approach to research where the benefits of the research serve to advance the interests, concern and methods of the researcher and locate benefits of the research at least in part with the researcher, others being of lesser concern'. Bishop, *Freeing Ourselves*, p.3.

34 Bishop, *Freeing Ourselves*, p.3.

35 Bishop, *Freeing Ourselves*, p.3.

36 Bishop, *Freeing Ourselves*, p.4.

37 Bishop, *Freeing Ourselves*, p.4.

38 Bishop, *Freeing Ourselves*, p.4.

39 Bishop, *Freeing Ourselves*, p.4.

40 Maui L. Hudson and Annabel L.M. Ahuriri-Driscoll, 'A Māori Ethical Framework: The Bridge between Tikanga Māori and Ethical Review', in Joanna Kidman, Joseph Te Rito and Wally Penetito, eds, *Proceedings of the Indigenous Knowledges Conference: Reconciling Academic Priorities with Indigenous Realities*, 22–25 June 2005, Wellington, 2007, p.26.

41 Hudson and Ahuriri-Driscoll, p.26.

42 Hudson and Ahuriri-Driscoll's work here drew largely on the earlier work of Fiona Cram and Kiri Powick, cited in Hudson and Ahuriri-Driscoll, p.26. For further reading, see

Fiona Cram, 'Rangahau Māori: Tona Tika, Tona Pono', in M. Tolich, ed., *Research Ethics in Aotearoa*, Auckland, 2001, pp.35–52; Kiri Powick, *Māori Research Ethics: A Literature Review of the Ethical Issues and Implications of Kaupapa Māori and Research Involving Māori for Researchers, Supervisors and Ethics Committees*, Hamilton, 2002.

43 Maui Hudson, Moe Milne, Paul Reynolds, Khyla Russell and Barry Smith, eds, *Te Ara Tika Guidelines for Māori Research Ethics: A Framework for Researchers and Ethics Committee Members*, Auckland, 2010. The guidelines draw on a wide body of work, and make reference to other ethical frameworks produced by Māori, including Kaa Williams, Te Pa Harakeke o te Tangata; Manuka Henare, Koru of Māori ethics; Hugh Kawharu, Te noho kotahitanga; Hirini Moko Mead, Tikanga tests; Linda Smith, Kaupapa Māori Practices; Mason Durie, Rangahau painga; Stephanie Palmer, Homai te waiora ki aha. See Hudson et al., p.22.

44 Came, p.65.

45 Hudson et al., pp.3–17.

46 Came, p.71.

47 Hudson et al, p.10.

48 Margaret MacMillan, *The Uses and Abuses of History*, London, 2009, pp.xii–xiii.

49 This means that it will take some time and is not an instantaneous understanding.

50 Linda Tuhiwai Smith points out that gaining informed consent to undertake research in Māori communities is, for instance, reliant on 'protocols of respect and practices of reciprocity'. See Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.137.

51 Vine Deloria Jr, *We Talk You Listen: New Tribes, New Turf*, New York, 1970. This is an important contribution to Native American research, method and theory. Deloria's key assertion is that colonizers listen, learn, and give up their position of power in the research process.

52 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.138.

53 Stephanie Milroy, 'Māori Women and Domestic Violence', *Waikato Law Review*, 4 (1996), p.62.

54 Roy Rosenzweig and David Thelen, eds, 'Introduction: Scenes from a Survey', in *The Presence of the Past: Popular Uses of History in American Life*, New York, 1998, p.13.

55 I borrow the self-reflexive interpretation of the term 'positionality' here from the work of geographers. See E. Schoenberger, 'Self Criticism and Self Awareness in Research: A Reply to Linda McDowell', *Professional Geographer*, 44, 2 (1992), pp.215–18.

56 This is perhaps best summed up by Tipene O'Regan, who writes that without whakapapa and tipuna he is 'merely an ethnic statistic'. O'Regan, p.142.

57 'Ahi kaa roa' and 'kauruki tu roa' are defined here as 'home fires' and 'long ascending smoke' – both terms used to refer to those living at home. 'Iwi kaenga' is also used by Apirana Tuāhae Kaukapakapa Mahuika, 'Draft Affidavit in Response to Fisheries Deal', Private Papers (1992), pp.12–13.

58 Rawiri Te Maire Tau, 'Mātauranga Māori as an Epistemology', in Andrew Sharp and Paul McHugh, eds, *Histories, Power and Loss: Uses of the Past – A New Zealand Commentary*, Wellington, 2001, p.68.

59 Hudson et al., p.6.

60 The issues of insider and outsider research are discussed by Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, pp.138–42.

61 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.138.

62 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.140.

63 On these issues, Smith writes that 'gender and age are two quite critical factors in some indigenous contexts. For younger students there is a very real constraint on access to knowledge when working with elders.' Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.137.

64 Patricia Mairangi Johnston and Leonie Pihama, 'What Counts as Difference and What Differences Count: Gender, Race, and the Politics of Difference', in K. Irwin and I. Ramsden,

eds, *Toi Wahine: the Worlds of Māori Women*, Auckland, 1995, p.86.

65 Cited in Ermine et al., p.26.

66 Alison Jones and Kuni Jenkins, 'Rethinking Collaboration: Working the Indigene-Colonizer Hyphen', in Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln, and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, eds, *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, London, 2008, p.481.

67 This is also noted by Jones and Jenkins, p.481.

68 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.186.

69 Russell Bishop, 'Initiating Empowering Research?', *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 29, 1, (1994), p.175.

70 Linda Tuhiwai Smith writes that non-indigenous scholars 'who have a genuine desire to support the cause of Māori, ought to be included, because they can be useful allies and colleagues in research'. Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.186.

71 Came, p.65.

72 Health Research Council of New Zealand, *Guidelines on Ethics in Health Research*, 2002, cited in Hudson et al., pp.24–25.

73 Ministry of Health, *Operational Standard*, 2002, p.2, cited in Hudson et al., pp.24–25.

74 Came, p.64.

75 'Tangata Tiriti' has indeed been employed, discussed briefly by Michael King, who emphasized that although both Māori and Pākehā have been 'joined' by the Treaty, each have 'very often' been 'looking in different directions', Michael King, *Penguin History of New Zealand*, Auckland, 2003, p.191.

76 Hudson et al., p.6.

77 Jones and Jenkins, p.475

78 Jones and Jenkins, p.475.

79 Jones and Jenkins, p.475.

80 Jones and Jenkins, p.477.

81 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.187.

82 Graham Hingangaroa Smith, 'Research Issues Related to Māori Education', in *The Issue of Research and Māori*, Auckland, 1992. Smith posited four models: the 'tiaki model'; the 'whangai model'; the 'power sharing model', where researchers seek the assistance of the community to meaningfully support the development of a research enterprise, and the 'empowering outcomes model', which addresses the sorts of questions Māori people want to know and which has beneficial outcomes; cited also in Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.180.

83 Cited in Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, pp.179–80.

84 Dr Apirana Mahuika, interview with Lawrence Wharerau, *Ngā Taonga Whitiāhua*, Series One, Episode 6, Michele Bristow, kaihautu, Eruera Morgan, Kaihautu Matua, Māori Television.

85 Battiste, p.506.

86 Ermine et al., p.34.

87 Maui Hudson writes: 'A best practice level of "relationship" empowers Māori to take a katieki role within the research project with a view to ensuring that tangible outcomes are realized within Māori communities.' Hudson et al., p.6.

88 Monty Soutar, 'A framework for Analysing Written Iwi Histories', *He Pukenga Kōrero*, 2, 1 (1996), p.48.

89 Battiste notes that 'most researchers do not reflect on the differences between Eurocentric knowledge and Indigenous knowledge'. She writes further that 'most literature dealing with Indigenous knowledge is written and developed in English or in other European languages. Very few studies have been done in indigenous languages. This creates a huge problem of translatability.' Battiste, pp.503, 504.

90 Battiste also asserts that ‘non-indigenous researchers must learn indigenous languages to understand indigenous worldviews’. Battiste, p.504.

91 Milroy, p.58.

92 Milroy, p.58.

93 Hudson et al., p.6.

94 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.141.

95 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.180.

96 Manaaki/Manaakitanga means, here, to assist, support and help.

97 Hudson et al. write that ‘the minimum standard for manaakitanga acknowledges a person’s inherent dignity and the responsibility that people have to act in a caring manner towards others. The responsibility to protect and care for people with aroha and be aware of issues of cultural sensitivity comes to the fore. In this context it includes access to appropriate advice (e.g. kaumātua / elder, advocate) and respect for concepts of privacy and confidentiality.’ Hudson et al., p.10.

98 Ermine et al. write: ‘In the Indigenous context, knowledge is a gift and the researcher is indebted to give credit to the source which means that participants ought to be named if they consent to it and receive recognition in any reporting or publications.’ Ermine et al., p.34.

99 Carrie Hamilton, ‘On Being a “Good” Interviewer: Empathy, Ethics and the Politics of Oral History’, *Oral History*, 36, 2 (Autumn 2008), p.42.

100 She also writes that many Māori ‘believe that researchers are simply intent on taking or “stealing” knowledge in a non-reciprocal and often underhanded way’. More robust ethical practice is, as she points out, one step toward a transformation in better research practice. Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, p.179.