Bringing Home The Body:

Bi/multi Racial Maori Women's
Hybridity in Aotearoa/New Zealand

A thesis
submitted in fulfilment
of the requirements for the Degree

of
Doctorate of Philosophy

at the

University of Waikato

by

TESS HUIA MOEKE-MAXWELL

University of Waikato
Hamilton, New Zealand
2003

Abstract

This thesis examines the exclusion of bi/multi racial Maori women from dominant representations of Maori women's identity. As such, it engages with a new articulation of Maori women's difference through a narrative of cultural hybridity. Presented in two parts, Part One engages with a theoretical overview of the formation of the New Zealand nation, the social construction of Maori and Pakeha cultural groups and the race relations that developed through the discursive practices of colonialism. Through a study of key texts on the history of New Zealand and dominant articulations describing Maori nationalists' efforts to invoke equality for New Zealand's indigenous people during the 1970s - 1980s, I exemplify how an *essentialist* Maori women's identity was promoted within Maori nationalist appeals to bicultural nationalism. This textual research indicates that an *exclusive* and *traditional* narrative of Maori women's identity emerged to exclude the specificities of bi/multi racial Maori women. As such, their experiences are ignored within dominant academic, feminist and Maori articulations of what constitutes Maori women's cultural identity. Current articulations of Maori women's identity do not include an analysis of race, gender and class, nor the way they operate simultaneously to position the bi/multi racial woman discursively in the nation today.

In order to extend a narrative of Maori women's identity to include bi/multi racial women, Part Two engages with a qualitative research methodology. The social construction and 'performance' of Maori women's cultural hybridity is identified. Twenty women who position themselves as bi/multi racial were interviewed using a 'Kaupapa Bi/multi Racial Research' methodology, which was developed using a feminist oriented 'life-history' approach, sensitised to Maori research cultural specificities. Interviews allowed the participants' unique experiences to emerge, permitting an examination of Maori women's cultural hybridity. These narratives, when grounded in the theoretical ideas outlined in Part One, provide the experiential evidence needed to support an articulation of bi/multi racial identity. My research insists that the raced and gendered body must be reinstated within articulations of Maori women's identity through situating corporeal difference within discussions on their subjectivity and related marginalisation. Until then, the materiality of the raced and gendered body will remain detached and suspended from bi/multi racial women's cultural and material existence.

Preface

"Bringing Home The Body"

I make use of the popular Maori phrase "Bringing Home The Body" to emphasise the place of the body in notions of 'belonging' within traditional Maori culture. One of the questions asked respectfully when a loved one passes over will often be "When are they bringing home the body?" It is a significant moment when the body *returns* to its familiar landscape, to where it *belongs*. According to local marae protocol, once the body is positioned in the correct location it will be greeted by its loved ones. The body will be stroked, kissed and touched by members of the whanau and people close to the deceased. Until the body is farewelled, there is a respectful acknowledgment that the person's spirit is still present. Communication with the deceased, coupled with the fact that they are never left on their own, highlights the significance that the *body* plays in the rituals associated with death. The *body* continues to play an important part in the relationships Maori have with their loved ones. The actual presence of the body during the tangihanga helps family and friends to express and release their love and loss in culturally appropriate ways during the grieving process.

Further, corporeal 'bodies' play an important function in that they provide each member of the community with a sense of *individual* identity. The body is the *physical* house that enables each individual to engage with and experience human life. To this end, the body provides a physical vehicle that also enables individual *mobility*. However, the *significance* of the body is omitted in dominant conversations about Maori women's identity, in favour of academic narratives which are focused on culture and class. By showing *how* the body is intimately linked to the identity formation of bi/multi racial Maori women, my intention is to reinstate the *body* to its rightful place within articulations of Maori women's identity. By introducing the example of the cherished 'dead body', I suggest that an examination of the *meaning* and *significance* of the 'living body' will provide a richer, more meaningful understanding of bi/multi racial Maori women's identity.

My interest in bi/multi racial Maori women's identity is informed by my own experiences of Maori/Pakeha biraciality. I am descended from Maori, New Zealand's tangata whenua. Unlike my mother, who was born in her rural

tribal area, my siblings and I are part of the first born urban generation. My whakapapa situates me as a descendant of two main iwi/indigenous cultural groups. I identify as Ngati Pukeko on mother's maternal side. My maternal grandmother, Minaora (Moeke) Maxwell, known to me as Nanima, was classified as a 'full-blooded Maori'. My maternal grandfather, George/Hori Maxwell, known to me as Nanipa, was also a descendant of the Scottish Maxwell clan. On my mother's paternal side I also identify as Ngai Tai (Umupuia). I access my Pakeha ethnicity through my father's middle class genealogy and his forebears' status as colonial settlers during the 1800s.

My siblings and I range in physical appearance from brown skin, brown eyes and wavy black hair to white skin, blue eyes and brown hair. Positioned as 'racial liquorice allsorts', we have received differing treatment from relatives, school teachers and strangers alike. For example, my thirst for knowledge about tikanga was often overlooked by older Maori, yet I was privileged in Pakeha environments. I also recall times when my brown whanaunga were identified as Maori when they did not want to be and they were subjected to overt acts of racism in a way that I was not. Did these experiences have anything to do with my *whiteness* and their *brownness,* I wondered.

These questions continued to intrigue me during my travels to the United States of America where I was thought to be English because of my fair skin and New Zealand accent. For example, a New York taxi driver asked me if I went to school with Princess Diana. I concluded that if one is white, has a New Zealand accent and wears a hat then one must be British. Further, when I reached Germany a sister (brown skin, black hair and brown eyes) told me that, when she is in Germany, everyone thinks she is an Italian. Yet, she enunciates as a New Zealander. Across the border in Switzerland, my blue-eyed, fair skinned sister, who has lived for twenty years in Australia and who speaks fluent Swiss German, has *never* been likened to a German woman. To my surprise, my own cultural ethnicity was called into question in both Switzerland and Germany, where I appeared to be a middle class American.

Back in New Zealand, I am confronted with Maori women's racial and cultural differences in my professional capacity as a specialist Maori counsellor for the New Zealand Government's *Accident Compensation Corporation.* Further, in providing cultural supervision to New Zealand counsellors and other health professionals, I am often engaged in discussions over what constitutes Maori identity. I have become increasingly aware of the contradictions and instabilities contained within the phrase 'Maori woman' and seek a space within my professional practice to retheorise her in 'terms' befitting her unique racial and cultural specificities.

Acknowledgments

To the participants: *Your intelligent, articulate and courageous voices enabled the experiences of Maori women's bi/multi racial cultural hybridity to come to life in this project. Thank you all.*

To Chief Supervisor, Professor Sue Middleton: The completion of this research is attributed to your excellence as a supervisor. Thank you for helping me to liberate Maori women from the shadows of colonialism. Tena koe, e kui. To Associate Professor, Ann Sullivan: Thank you for your commitment and patience in your capacity as Second Supervisor. Also to Dr Radhika Mohanram, who supervised the first two chapters before leaving for the United Kingdom: Thank you for leading my supervision panel for the first three years and for guiding me towards an understanding of cultural hybridity.

To Jeanette Scurr, my soulmate and companion: How could I have written this without your love, understanding, compassion and support! Ko taku aroha ki a koe.

To my mother, Joyce Taylor: Your belief in higher education has often been a light shining in the darkness. I think I am beginning to see now. To my father, Ron Lyons: Your love during my childhood, will be remembered in your patient attempts to correct my English. Thank you for this.

To my tamariki Rach, Amy and Mark, and my mokopuna Raven and Dante: You are as precious as water, sunshine and pounamu. I love you all and thank you for your patient generosity.

To friends, fellow students and Tauranga Help colleagues who have supported me: Thank you. In particular, thank you Mum Scurr, Hee Barnett, Cherie Chapman, Dr Hilary Lapsley, Professor Anna Yeatman, Dr Sarah Calvert, Liz Mckinley, Paul Meridith, Heeni Collins, Sandra Phelps, Dr Robin Peace, Lyn Connelly, Dr Rachel Kumar, Jan Wilson, Leane Goldsbury and Fay Riddell. To Kathryn Parsons and the University of Waikato Library Staff: Thank you. To Betty Don, for teaching me all the things I *didn't* know about the English language, for your honesty and expertise in proof-reading and editing this work, and for your love and friendship over the last thirteen years: Kia ora e hoa. To my wonderful Moeke and Maxwell Aunties, Uncles and Cousins: Blessings and love to you all. Finally to my sisters Maree, Ann, Joy, Louise, Markelle and Jeanette (in spirit), and my brothers Bill and Jon: This is for *all* our children and their children too.

Dedication

I dedicate this thesis to Becky, who felt as though she never fitted in anywhere. She took her own life in 1999. She was 21.

Contents

Chapter One

Contesting the Maori/Pakeha Binary

> Children with a white parent become a potent counterforce when they acknowledge their taha Maori. They have the skills of the white nation, and dwindling allegiance to it. But their identity crises [and they all have those] are unnecessary. Whakapapa is the key. With whakapapa links to the land and the cosmos give an unshakeable claim to intimacy with this place. White blood is not the problem. White culture is the problem [Donna Awatere, 1984, p. 86].

This chapter foregrounds the exclusion of bi/multi racial women from dominant articulations of Maori women's identity in Aotearoa/New Zealand and suggests that a feminist analysis of bi/multi racial women's subjectivity will contribute to a new body of knowledge on Maori women. As Donna Awatere's [1984] epigraph demonstrates, bi/multi racial subjects are conceptualised with an 'identity crisis'. It is no wonder that little has been written about our dual and multiple cultural subjectivities and the complexities that living on the margins produces. It is not surprising that little is understood about the way new forms of racism operate to subjugate us or the forms of resistance we engage in for survival. Positioned as neither Maori nor Pakeha, but *both*, the social and political constraints that are placed upon us as children, daughters, grandaughters, sisters, mothers, partners, grandmothers, workers, consumers, family members, members of whanau, hapu, and iwi, and participants in local, national and global communities remain unexamined. Where are the stories of women who straddle both cultural identities and who live with the ambivalent markings of being mis/identified as either Maori or Pakeha through their ambivalent racial corporeality? What happens to New Zealand's *brown* and *white* racial borders when both Maori and Pakeha racial corporeality are present within the same corporeal woman's body?

This chapter explains the scope of this thesis and the questions that underpin this research project. At a fundamental level, I place the social construction [and exclusion] of bi/multi racial Maori women within a framework of New Zealand nationalism. But first, I demonstrate that three alternative readings of Maori identity are currently employed to describe Maori identity via a traditional, assimilated or, more recently, hybrid subjectivity. In brief, I argue that a *traditional* narrative of identity excludes the cultural specificities of bi/multi racial women, while an *assimilated* articulation conceals

the fact that women of Maori ancestry live with multiple racial and cultural subjectivities. These narratives do not speak to the way that racial corporeality combines with the bi/multi racial woman's gender specificities to position and place her in the nation in particular ways. Nor do they theorise the forms of racial and gendered discrimination that she may be subjected to.

In so doing, I illuminate the gaps in each 'identity' narrative and argue that a feminist post modern, post colonial articulation of bi/multi racial women's subjectivity provides a more accurate description. A re-reading of her subjectivity through a lens of cultural hybridity will allow the specificities of her gendered multiple cultural subjectivities *and* her racial and gendered corporeality to emerge. This requires engaging with the New Zealand feminist movement to determine how feminists address the 'subject' of bi/multi racial Maori women's identity. I illustrate why I draw on printed representations of Maori women's identity, as well as interview transcripts, to enable me to understand Maori women's cultural hybridity.

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section 'Authenticity', 'Assimilation' or 'Dual/Multiple Subjectivity' looks at three alternative constructions of Maori subjectivity. I first look at Grace's [1998] traditional/authentic representation of herself as a 'Maori woman', while Awatere's [1984] ideas are extended when Maori identity is approached through a lens of assimilation. Also, Meridith's [1999a, 1999b] self-representation of cultural hybridity is examined. The second section 'New Zealand Feminism: 1970s - 2000s' looks at Maori and Pakeha feminism. I examine the lack of theoretical analysis on bi/multi racial women and I provide a rationale for this research. I utilise Irwin [1992] and Moreton-Robinson's [2000] ideas in these efforts. The third section 'Introduction to the Research' briefly elaborates on the scope of the research and grounds the questions and research methodology that underpin this thesis. Middleton [1993] and Anthias and Yuval-Davis [1989] support me in this. The final section 'Chapter Descriptions' introduces the chapters outlined in this thesis.

'Authenticity', 'Assimilation' or 'Dual/Multiple Subjectivity'

In New Zealand, the 'Maori' population represents 14.7 percent of the total population while Pakeha represent 80 percent. Self reported 'Maori' ethnicity is rapidly increasing [*Statistics New Zealand*, 2001a]. For example, according to the *New Zealand Census* 2001, *Maori Population Dwellings* statistical analysis, in 1858 the Maori population registered 56,049 while in 1896 it had declined rapidly to 42,113 members. However, by 1936 the population had

increased to 94,353. Less than ten years later in 1945 the numbers had risen to 115,646. Perhaps what is most noticeable are the increased numbers of individuals electing to identify ethnically as Maori, attributing to the increase in Maori ethnic statistics during the 1991 [511, 278] and 2001 [604,110] census statistics. For the first time, in 1991, people of Maori descent could elect to self identify as a member of a 'Maori Ethnic Group' as opposed to an identification based on racial quantification, which had been the case previous to 1971. Maori were asked to identify their 'origin' in the 1971 census which then changed to 'ethnic origin' until 1986. In the 2001 census results, the category 'Maori' also includes people of Maori descent who do not identify themselves as Maori, despite the fact that they specify their Maori ancestry. Also clustered within these Maori statistics are many Maori who are offspring from inter-racial relations. These individuals could elect to identify with one of their other ethnicities but choose to identify as Maori. In 1981 6 percent of individuals with Maori ancestry identified themselves as Maori *[New Zealand Census Vol. 8a, Maori Population Dwellings*] and this increased to 12.9 percent in 1991 *[New Zealand Official Year Book 1994*] which shows an increase of 3.9 percent in only ten years. The *Maori Population Dwellings Census, 2001* results show that the increase in 'Maori Ethnic Group' statistics taken in 1999 and those taken in 2001 have grown close to one hundred thousand in only ten years. Measuring Maori identity in these terms is not evidenced upon race/whakapapa but on the individual's ability to determine their cultural identity in a self determining effort. I briefly describe New Zealand's historical empirical measurements to show how Maori identity has been the subject of intense scrutiny and debate in New Zealand since the first mixed racial union took place [Sorrenson, 1986].

New Zealand has a history of categorising Maori via blood quantification. Early mixed racial unions produced children of mixed whakapapa which gave rise to the term half-caste Maori, which then became reconfigured to quarter-caste, eighth-caste and sixteenth-caste during the 1900s [Sorrenson, 1986]. The term half-caste appeared in the Native Land Act of 1865, however, technically all peoples with Maori descent were classed as *native* despite their levels of Pakeha genealogical quantification. In 1870, Maori became officially recognised as 'an aboriginal inhabitant' but still retained the metaphoric blood quantification labelling. Again, in 1893, a new Electoral Act classed Maori as an aboriginal of New Zealand but included under its umbrella *all* Maori of mixed ancestry. In 1894, exact classification of them proved to be a challenge resulting in Maori being included under the definition of an "aboriginal native of New Zealand" or born of "half-castes and their descendants" [Sorrenson,

1986]. In 1956, a National Government, in an attempt to protect its marginal seats, prohibited Maori enrolment in European electorates. Maori [other than half-castes] did not qualify to register in any European electoral districts. Earlier, in 1867, temporary Maori seats were created, but Maori men were still able to enrol on the general roll, having gained the right to vote in 1853 [Rei, 1993]. However, this was subject to criteria associated with property ownership [Walker, 1990]. Maori women gained the vote in 1963, along with other New Zealand women. Categorising Maori on the basis of blood quantification continued until 1974, when the Maori Affairs Amendment Act, supported by the Labour Government, declared that the term 'Maori' was no longer testable. People of Maori ancestry could now choose to identify politically as 'Maori'; the spirit of this was embodied in the 1975 Electoral Amendment Act which allowed individuals the right to define themselves [Sorrenson, 1986]. This choice was extended to all New Zealanders in the 1996 electoral rolls, education systems and government departments where individuals could register themselves, among other things, as New Zealand Maori and Descendant of a New Zealand Maori [Walker, 1990].

For tangata whenua, a 'Maori' cultural subjectivity reflects a legacy of disenfranchisement, cultural alienation and assimilation rooted in a history of colonisation and ongoing forms of colonialism [Awatere, 1984; Smith, 1992, 1998; Te Awekotuku, 1978, 1988; Walker, 1987, 1990]. Bi/multi racial women, referred to in this thesis as Pakeha/Other, are the descendants of white colonial settlers and possibly white immigrants, who have been privileged through the ideological, epistemological violence levied against Maori. Conflated within the term Other I include immigrants who are considered non-white such as African Americans, Indians, and Chinese but this may also include those who position themselves as culturally different through their religious affiliations. As such, a Jewish or Muslim person would be defined within the category 'Other'. Pakeha, also commonly referred to as European New Zealanders, Anglo Europeans and Kiwis, constitute approximately eighty percent of the nation's population. I argue in this thesis that bi/multi racial women learn to negotiate their dual positionality and conflicted subjectivities in opposition to dominant essentialist driven articulations of Maori subjectivity or its binary opposite, a pure Pakeha/Other subjectivity.

Representations of Maori identity located within humanist assumptions of a unitary 'I' suggest that a singular, stable and innate construction of Maori women's subjectivity is inadequate to theorise the bi/multi racial subject [Young, 1990]. The bi/multi racial's dual cultural positioning speaks against essentialist arguments, embedded within articulations of a singular Maori

subjectivity, in favour of a second or third cultural 'self' [Young, 1990]. This has implications for those of us positioned as bi/multi racial in bicultural New Zealand. In short, the concept of biculturalism refers to the political arrangement between Maori and Pakeha whereby a renewed commitment on behalf of the Crown towards Maori resulted in the shift from monocultural nationalism to biculturalism during the 1980s. 'Biculturalism' refers to a state of national identity which recognises the Crown's obligations towards its indigenous cultural population as well as its dominant majority culture. But to state that the bicultural nation, or a bicultural nationalism, exists is not to mean that a bicultural society has been achieved. Rather, it recognises that the spirit of the Maori Pakeha partnership has been formally accepted although only partially interpreted politically through policy and practice [Mohanram, 1999]. As such, the term has been highly contested as to its meaning and practical dissemination [Meridith, 1999a; Meridith, 1999b; Mulgan, 1989; Sharp, 1990]. In this sense, the references to 'bicultural' phrases throughout this thesis are both real, imagined and desired. Nonetheless, I argue that the presence of biculturalism, invoked in its binary distinctions embedded within representations of Maori and Pakeha cultural ethnicity, has repercussions for the inclusion of bi/multi racial women within dominant articulations of Maori women's subjectivity. Within the bicultural nation, they are faced with a choice; they can claim a single cultural subjectivity and identify as either Maori or Pakeha/Other or they can negotiate a life on the cultural borderlands, oscillating somewhere between Maori or Pakeha cultural subject positions and their accompanying subjectivities.

The popular construction of Maori women as 'traditional' is relative to the way in which Maori women are thought of and valued as an ethnic group. I argue here that this construction is contextualised within a broader desire to represent *all* Maori in essentialist terms. This is evidenced in Witi Ihimaera's [1998] book *Growing up Maori* whereby he includes 36 narrative experiences from Maori contributors. Each person narrates themselves via an identity that privileges their Maori whakapapa and their cultural identification as Maori. Maori identity is represented as homogeneous, innate and unchanging. I introduce this text to illustrate how popular conceptions of a traditional Maori identity continue to operate in the bicultural nation despite the contributors' obvious racial and cultural duality. Many of these stories bear witness to the confusion, pain and joy of being positioned within two cultural worlds. These voices also give expression to the experience of growing up in colonial New Zealand and they illustrate how their sense of cultural and racial differences is subsumed beneath a singular Maori subjectivity. Ihimaera [1998: 13-14] claims

that *Growing up Maori* is "a truly epic story of survival, of resilience, of maintaining a sense of - if not the semblance of - tribal and personal sovereignty, and Maori identity, in the twentieth century." *Growing up Maori* is a narrative account of how Maori identity continues to be "constructed from the past *and* the present" and he reminds the reader that the notion of Maori identity is problematic - there are no 'full-blooded' Maori alive today to quantify authenticity. Ihimaera [1998: 14-15] states:

> There is no racial or full-blood definition, and many of the contributors in *Growing up Maori* can claim as much Pakeha ancestry as they can Maori ancestry or, at least, Pakeha influence in their years of growing up. Much of our identity has to do with whakapapa, with memory based not only on the bloodlines and physical landscapes we live in but also the emotional landscapes constructed by loving grandparents or whanau with aroha, manaakitanga and whanaungatanga.
>
> ... [A]ll the contributors are here because *they* identify themselves as being Maori. All have made a sovereignty choice, based on genealogy, belonging, upbringing, pride, politics, or downright stubbornness that links them with the mana of our Maori forbears - the ancestors in front and we behind. Some of the contributors have grown up Maori because their cultural context was Maori. Others have grown up Maori because although their context was Pakeha, there was a grandparent or parent who hooked them back into Maori identity. Yet others have grown up Maori because, well, they didn't want to be Pakeha. Still others have grown up Maori out of a sense of loss - and as we all know, a sense of loss is often the place from which one begins the journey to find one's self and one's tribe.

Patricia Grace's [1998: 47-57] account of growing up Maori in her article *Two Worlds* is included here for its ability to highlight the way in which a quintessential Maori identity is favoured over a dual cultural subjectivity. I also include it for its ability to point to the way race operates to mark her as different from Pakeha. Grace [1998] says that she was born in 1937 and she indicates that she is of mixed Maori descent: Ngati Toa, Ngati Raukawa and Te Atiawa and on her Pakeha side, she identifies her Shetland Islands, French Canadian and Irish ancestry. Grace [1998: 49] had a sense of her difference via her skin colour by the time she was at school. She states:

> It was when I started school that I learned that I was 'different'. Yet in saying that I realise that I was already aware that I was 'like' my father, 'like' my aunties [my father's sisters], 'not like' my mother or her sisters and their children, apart from having their blue eyes. This was something that both my families were interested in and positive about.

Grace [1998: 49]contextualises her difference within a narrative of race/phenotypes when she remembers being affectionately called 'black nigger' by an uncle. She writes:

> ... used to lay special claim to me by calling me 'black nigger', and I thought it great fun to hide and have him going through the house saying, 'Where's this black nigger?' Another uncle... used to challenge me to 'brownness' competitions. He'd call me to him, rolling up his sleeve so that I could match arms to see who had most colour. Others would enjoy this and join in.

Being different from Pakeha was a 'shock' to her; she explains, "It meant that I was questioned, out of curiosity by some children, as to why I was brown. By others, I was accused of brownness and being a Maori" [Grace, 1998, p. 49]. Clearly, Grace, recalls the sense of confusion associated with brownness and despite the fact that her mother reassured her that 'brown' was a "good thing to be" she soon realised that being brown held negative consequences socially. Grace [1998: 49-50] states, "I found that being 'different' meant that you could be blamed - for a toy gun being stolen then thrown into a drain, for neighbourhood children swearing, for writing appearing on walls, for a grassy bank being set on fire". Grace [1998: 51] claims that there were fewer expectations for her to achieve, she disliked being told she was "dirty" and that she "needed a good scrub" and she didn't enjoy the verbal and physical attacks that accompanied her brownness. However, despite Grace's difficulties with her racial [brown] corporeality she ends with a story about her privilege:

> I don't want to give a distorted picture of my childhood. Looking back, I know I was privileged in many ways. I had a full, vigorous childhood. I had freedom, security and safety in two family environments among people who listened to me, indulged me, encouraged me, believed in me, and trusted that whatever I wanted to do I would be able to do.

On the one hand Grace was constructed as Maori through her racial corporeality which signified her as Maori through the brownness of her skin. But, in reality Grace's [1998: 48] sense of identity reflected her experience of being both: "I grew amid two families, having close, continuous and frequent contact with each. These were two different worlds - the contrasting worlds of my mother's and father's families". Grace [1998: 57] concludes by acknowledging her attempt to map her "contrasting worlds" when she states:

> ... There was contrast in all aspects of the contrasting worlds - in the way people related to one another, in food and in the cooking of it, in clothing, in values, attitudes, organisation, money, self-perceptions, group perceptions, language - 'contrast' but not 'conflict' for me as a child.

What Grace's story highlights is the way that *we,* as Maori, continue to construct ourselves as having a singular cultural identity despite the presence of

our dual/multiple racial and cultural subjectivities and the confusion our ambiguous corporeal difference creates. Interestingly, the second to last paragraph asserts that Grace's cultural duality brought her an early life of 'contrast' and not of 'conflict'. The last paragraph affirms her solid sense of a Maori identity which she attributes to growing up in a family where a strong, positive identity was given by her father's family, supported by her non Maori mother's family. This combination she claims was essential to her survival.

Some issues are raised by narratives which seek to locate Maori within a primary/singular cultural subjectivity. For example, why is it that despite Grace's childhood being rich in two cultures, she only cites her Maori subjectivity as informing her sense of cultural identity? Further, Grace points out that her cultural identities were *contrasted* with each other and that they 'complemented' each other. However, she lacks an analysis of the racist violence embedded in her cultural juxtaposition and the part her racial corporeality played in this. In thinking about Grace's self-representation through a bi/multi racial lens the following questions emerge which will be addressed in the second part of this thesis. How it is possible for women of colour to be positioned as anything other than Maori/Other in a nation whose very bedrock is fashioned from racism, a stubborn legacy of modernity and a central component in the colonial relationship? Concerning the presence of racism, how do some subjects remain culturally unconflicted despite overt attacks of racism? Is it possible to identify with a non-white subjectivity if the nation's culture meter symbolically measures even a hint of brown? If it is possible, how would bi/multi racial women accommodate the ambivalence of being symbolically both brown and white?

Another question that emerges concerns the role of the family/whanau in reflecting identity and nurturing Maori subjectivity. Grace insists that the loving relationships and the support she received from her respective families created a sense of Maori identity for her. What would happen if the bi/multi racial subject's Maori family were either absent or did not provide the nurture and support required to enculturate a Maori identity? Would this compromise the subject's ability to identify with a sole cultural identity as Maori and what other variables could be operating to locate/position the subject as Maori? For example, what do race, landscape and opportunity have to do with the acquisition of either a Maori or Pakeha/Other subjectivity? Why is it that so many Maori, despite having positive experiences with Pakeha parents, grandparents, tupuna and within society, refuse to be positioned as Pakeha/Other as well as Maori? Why are so many Maori unwilling to talk about the cultural overlaps and disjunctures between our worlds? Finally, what

is at risk if we position ourselves as having dual Maori/ Pakeha subjectivities and what could our situated and partial knowledge tell us about the conflict and confusion, as well as the joys, of embracing more than one cultural identity?

The self-representations of those voices heard in *Growing up Maori* portray their experiences in a way which shows that they learned their Maoriness/difference in contrast to Pakeha/Other. As Ihimaera [1998: 14] states, the qualifying criteria to being included in the book is that the authors must *recognise* and *identify* themselves as Maori despite the overwhelming evidence to suggest that they have also been enculturated with other cultural influences and non-Maori ancestry. These stories show strength and pride in being Maori despite the difficulties the authors may have faced. Despite Ihimaera's assertion that what Maori identity has meant and means today are not necessarily the same thing and that identity is a fluid and changing phenomenon, the reader is left with the feeling that Maori identity is certain and fixed in some way. My concern is with showing how bi/multi racial women refuse a single primary cultural identity in favour of an identity that is flexible enough to accommodate the unique gendered, cultural and racial differences embodied by the subject. In essence, I claim that a new subject position is created through the subject's gender and her dual/multiple racial and cultural differences, which socially construct the bi/multi racial women differently from other Maori women or Pakeha/other women. Bi/multi racial subjects, I suggest, live with multiple identities that are conflicted, unstable and always under contestation. At this point, I want to look at how bi/multi racial Maori have been perceived in the New Zealand nation and how this may contributed to their unwillingness to identify culturally as anything other than Maori.

Assimilated Maori

In New Zealand, a new wave of intelligentsia represented the concerns expressed within the Maori renaissance movement during the 1970s and 1980s. In order to argue for their rights as New Zealand's First Nation's Peoples in an attempt to gain Maori sovereignty, a reconstruction of Maori as traditional [for example, unchanged by time, colonialism and assimilation] was elaborated through with Awatere's [1984] deconstruction of New Zealand history in her text *Maori Sovereignty*. Within her critique of New Zealand colonialism, she questioned a history of Western domination and control over Maori by Pakeha. That critique split the nation into two racial groups, Maori and Pakeha/Other. She assigned each a colour marker to signify specific cultural values and

characteristics. Awatere strategically used metaphor to construct Maori as the unmarked subject by linking brownness to land and constructed the Pakeha as the marked subject in that they were metaphorically marked with whiteness which was linked to their landless state. Through this cultural dichotomy Awatere contextualised the assimilated subject's cultural impurity within a narrative of Western/Pakeha contamination. She theorised assimilated Maori as culture-less, having lost their cultural heritage and tikanga through inter-racial marriage and the impact of assimilationist practices embedded within ethnocentric discourses during the 1800-1900s. In this way, Awatere [1984] metaphorically constructed assimilated subjects with whiteness. Assimilated Maori were viewed by Awatere as privileged, educated and middle class which she characterised as symbolic markers of white/Pakeha cultural identity. However, despite her contempt for assimilated Maori she did suggest that they made useful handmaidens in counter nationalist struggles and she encouraged non-assimilated Maori to engage their services in anti-colonial agendas. She states [1984: 86]:

> Most young professionals, intelligentsia, those academically successful, have a white parent. They succeed in the white world, not because they are more intelligent than our children, but because the privileges of white culture are opened up to them through their white parent. To these children white culture is normal.

Awatere's [1984] assimilated Maori were only useful insofar as they supported brown, poor and uneducated Maori to gain a foothold over Pakeha economic and political infrastructures in Maori renaissance struggles. It becomes clear that Awatere's acceptance of cultural plurality is predicated upon the subject's ability to relinquish their Pakeha identity and to align with taha Maori. Radhika Mohanram [1999] in *Black Body* critiques Awatere's ideas in her chapter *The memory of place: Maori nationalism and feminism in Aotearoa/New Zealand* in which she contextualises Awatere's [1984] ideas within a framework of Maori nationalism. Mohanram claims that Awatere upholds the conditions of New Zealand's peace treaty between iwi and the Crown by invoking Maori sovereignty. Within this move she strategically collectivises Maori into a homogenous group irrespective of iwi differences.

Awatere's assimilated subject resembles the colonised native described by Albert Memmi [1990] in *The Colonizer and the Colonized* where he looks at the mythical portrait of the colonised. The colonised becomes a traitor to his essential self and his people as he reaps the fruit of this betrayal by the gifts bestowed upon him by the colonisers. Memmi [1990: 186-188] states that there are two solutions for the colonised:

> The two historically possible solutions are then tried in succession or simultaneously. He attempts either to become different or to reconquer all the dimensions which colonization tore away from him. The first attempt of the colonized is to change his condition by changing his skin. There is a tempting model very close at hand - the colonizer. The latter suffers from none of his deficiencies, has all rights, enjoys every possession and benefits from every prestige. He is, moreover, the other part of the comparison, the one that crushes the colonized and keeps him in servitude. The first ambition of the colonized is to become equal to that splendid model and to resemble him to the point of disappearing in him. ... This fit of passion for the colonizer's values would not be so suspect, however, if it did not involve such a negative side. The colonized does not seek merely to enrich himself with the colonizer's virtues. In the name of what he hopes to become, he sets his mind on impoverishing himself, tearing himself away from his true self. The crushing of the colonized is included among the colonizer's values. As soon as the colonized adopts those values, he similarly adopts his own condemnation. In order to free himself... he agrees to destroy himself.

Liam O'Dowd [1990: 40] writes in the introduction to *The Colonizer and The Colonized* that Memmi's descriptions of the coloniser and colonised are "... linked together in a reciprocal but mutually destructive relationship within which the identity of each is forged and once forged, is frozen". According to Memmi the colonised subject has only two options once colonised. Colonised subjects can either assimilate to the cultural ways of the coloniser or they can revolt. In Awatere's reading of Maori counter nationalist struggles, assimilated Maori surrender their true essential identity to the epistemological and ideological values embedded within colonialism, and by extension, Pakeha culture. Maori descendants were faced with a choice; they could conform to Pakeha cultural norms and give up their Maori subjectivity or take on a traditional identity, join the Maori renaissance objectives and 'revolt'. In both Awatere's and Memmi's readings, the colonised subject surrenders to the dominant cultural identity as pressure to assimilate subordinates the subject's essential identity. Assimilated Maori are theorised without agency and marked with suspicion, jealousy and ridicule. Awatere's and Memmi's colonised subject shares a similarity with Bhabha's [1994a] mimic men in his article *Of Mimicry and Man*. That is, they are devoid of gender and agency as they perform themselves in relation to the colonial authority.

According to Young in his summary of Bhabha's work *Of Mimicry and Man*:

> Mimicry offers Bhabha a new term for the construction of the colonial Other in certain forms of stereotyping - a colonial subject who will be recognizably the same as the colonizer but still different: 'not quite/not white' [OMM 132]... Bhabha gives as his example the Indian, educated in English, who works in the Indian civil service and mediates between the imperial power and the colonized people. If it is in some sense reassuring for the colonizers that Indians become in certain respects 'English', the production of mimic Englishmen also becomes disturbing, for

> 'mimicry' is at once resemblance and menace [OMM 127]. The mimic man, insofar as he is not entirely like the colonizer, white but not quite, constitutes only a partial representation of him: far from being reassured, the colonizer sees a grotesquely displaced image of himself. Thus the familiar, transported to distant parts, becomes uncannily transformed, the imitation subverts the identity of that which is being represented, and the relation of power, if not altogether reversed, certainly begins to vacillate:
>
> [It is] a process by which the look of surveillance returns as the displacing gaze of the disciplined, where the observer becomes the observed and the 'partial' representation rearticulates the whole notion of *identity* and alienates it from essence.

With further reference to Bhabha's theory on mimicry Young states that Bhabha claims that "[t]he surveilling eye is suddenly confronted with a returning gaze of otherness and finds that its mastery, its sameness, is undone". But Young [1995: 148] points out that Bhabha's mimicry is flawed in that it "... becomes a kind of agency without a subject, a form of representation which produces effects, a sameness which slips into otherness...". Young [1995: 148] maintains that compared with ambivalence [the process of identification and disavowal] mimicry "... implies an even greater loss of control for the colonizer, of inevitable processes of counter-domination produced by a miming of the very operation of domination, with the result that the identity of colonizer and colonized becomes curiously elided... Mimicry is not... a form of resistance as such, but describes a process in the construction of power which works instead more like the unconscious... and could perhaps even be described... as 'the colonial unconscious'".

Theorising bi/multi racial Maori women through either a lens of assimilation, an agency-less identity steeped in mimicry or a colonised identity condemned to 'revolt' shows a blind-spot in thinking about the way Maori subjectivity is constructed within the New Zealand colonial relationship. To begin with, these theories presuppose a lack of agency on behalf of the native; their only choice is to submit to the dominant subjectivity provided in a colonial construction of a Pakeha/white identity or to its binary opposite, a Maori/non-white/ identity. What I am proposing is that another option is available to the bi/multi racial subject. This research will show that cultural subjectivity is negotiated by the bi/multi racial and is dependant upon their ability to mediate two cultural subject positions. By 'mediate', I refer to the bi/multi racial woman's ability to effectively manage the various and, at times, conflicting cultural subjectivities she lives with. This reflects Bhabha's [1994a] views on ambivalence in the post colonial subject where the bi/multi racial can reject an imposed [colonised identity] by creating a new identity from the original [native identity] and the newly imposed [colonial] identity. I now want

to look at what this *new* conceptualisation of Maori identity would look like in the New Zealand context.

Cultural Hybridity

The question of Maori authenticity surfaced with a new twist during the late 1990s with Paul Meridith's [1999, 1999a, 1999b] publications on cultural hybridity. Meridith's [1999a] tongue in cheek self-presentation of himself as 'half-caste' in his article *Don't You Like Kina Bey? Et, You're Not a Real Maori* in *Tu Mai [June, 1999],* presents an opportunity to see Meridith deconstruct his identity in an effort to challenge Maori to rethink the limitations of a tuturu Maori identity. In this article he questions what *makes* a Maori a 'Maori', after a friend provoked him by calling his Maori identity into question over his diastase for kina. Meridith says that the origins of Maori identity reside in the historical relationship with 'Tauiwi' or white colonial settlers. He reminds the reader that the term 'Maori' was used to define the tribal descendants of New Zealand and sufficed as a shorthand for the 'ordinary' or 'normal' people of the land. Prior to this, the notion of Maoriness did not exist. Meridith states that the conceptual cultural category *Maori* has taken on a new meaning in the wake of the "colonial experience":

> ... of land alienation, political disenfranchisement and social dislocation [and that] these indigenous inhabitants have sought solidarity in political, social, religious and cultural movements constructed around common ethnicity and a notion of pan-Maori identity or Maoriness. Today we have 'Maori stereotypes', 'Maori food', 'Maori tradition' and 'the Maori way of doing things'.

Meridith highlights the anomaly between the Maori communities that have formed as a result of colonialism when he states:

> ... [I]t is important to understand that 'Maori' today, like most other peoples, are not all the same in their experiences or in their aspirations. They are instead a diverse group where both the individual and the collective are constantly negotiating a wide range of influences that find expression in their own particular sense of Maoriness. These include biological make-up, socio-economic status, religious and sexual orientation, tribal affiliation, geographical location, political goals and language ability to name a few.

Meridith asserts that Maori society, like other societies, is forever changing and adapting and that Maori identity also changes with time. He cautions against stereotyping Maori and categorising them to conform to strict criterion, claiming that "...this is dangerous because it fails to account for that diversity and adaptability of Maoriness". He also recognises that it sets up hierarchies

within Maoridom; for example, it questions who the real Maori are between those who dive for kina or those who purchase kina from a convenience store. Meridith is careful to point out the usefulness of universalising a notion of 'Maori' for their social and political leverage. He reminds the reader about the formation of Maori nationalist groups such as the Maori Battalion and the Maori Women's Welfare League. But Meridith cautions that universalising claims should be made for strategic purposes and not to set Maori apart from other Maori.

Meridith [1999b] spoke of his unique dual subjectivity again when he wrote *Being 'Half-Caste': Cultural Schizo or Cultural Lubricant*? in *Tu Mai* [July, 1999]. Meridith opens by stating that he was accused of having an 'identity crisis' following the publication of his previous article. He also recalled that prior to this event a Maori doctor had "facetiously diagnosed [him] as a 'cultural schizo'". In his response Meridith portrays a frank account of his cultural and genealogical origins. When he introduces himself through mihimihi Meridith refers to himself as "... a half-caste, ara ko te hawhe-kaihe e tu ake nei kei mua i a koutou ko so and so" to the laughter of those listening. But for Meridith, the mihimihi is not intended to be humorous, but rather to portray his genealogy and cultural identification. He states, "I am just articulating an identity whose up-bringing, whose world-view is literally one of both Maori and Pakeha."

Through the use of personal anecdotes Meridith [1999a, 1999b], engages his audience to consider the concept of Maori hybridity as a more realistic alternative to an authentic Maori subjectivity. He calls into question the idea of a fixed and stable Maori subjectivity by recalling some of the cultural contradictions and nuances embraced by those who live on the borderlands between a Maori and Pakeha subjectivity and bicultural positionality. He refuses a label of assimilated by opting to respect the two dominant cultural heritages he identifies with. Meridith [1999b] illustrates his cultural duality when he recalls a "typical" Christmas day as a "half-caste". He states, "When we talk about the typical 'Kiwi Christmas Day' that meant for me helping put the hangi down with the Maori relations, shooting up to Gran's to have Christmas lunch with the Pakeha relations and then back down to Nan's to pull up the hangi for Christmas dinner." His play on ambiguity challenges the reader to rethink the idea of a singular cultural subjectivity by providing an insight into the "cultural vacillation" and "cultural schizophrenia" of the hybrid. Meredith writes: [1999b]

> ... [W]hen I say, being 'half-caste', what I am really expressing is not being part Maori or part Pakeha but being **both Maori and Pakeha**. Of course there have been contradictions and tensions between these identities as there have been with other identities that I have adopted. However these have been overcome through an effort of negotiation and mediation based on the principles of pragmatism and compromise.

He goes on to say that he does not expect "... Maori, Pakeha or whomever to deny those of us the privilege of adopting an identity that is both Maori and Pakeha nor proclaim us as disloyal or unMaori/un-Pakeha...We must avoid being caught up in this propensity to think around being either this or that. I think this is one of the pitfalls of 'biculturalism'. It seems to promote a mode of thought where so much is either Maori or Pakeha. We need to shift to a 'both/and' framework, that is, the possibility of some things both Maori and Pakeha." He cautions us not to exaggerate the differences between cultures and to spend time examining the affinities. Meridith finishes by stating:

> Here I believe self proclaimed 'half-castes' or 'cultural lubricants' have the potential to make an important contribution. S/he has the advantage of intentionally straddling both cultures with the ability to lubricate, that is, to translate, negotiate and mediate affinities and difference in a dynamic of exchange and inclusion. Let us not dismiss this potentiality as a mere crisis of identity...

Meridith's views provide a refreshing contribution to the question of Maori identity and dual subjectivity. However, despite his insights into his reconfigured Maori identity and ability to laugh at accusations over his cultural schizophrenia, his analysis falls short of theorising why his half-caste identity provokes such deep fear and resentment in those who desire to identify him solely as Maori. Meridith's concession to duality becomes constructed as pathological in that other Maori not only see him as inauthentic but pathologise him as having an 'identity crisis' and of being a 'cultural psycho'. This occlusion of Meridith's bi/multi raciality informs my inquiry into the way culture is constructed in the bicultural nation to violently exclude the dual and multiple cultural subject and also raises the question of what informs Maori desire to subjugate the bi/multi racial. Is the desire to subjugate the bi/multi racial's partial knowledge/s limited only to Maori or is this extended to Pakeha? Further, does the gendered corporeality of the bi/multi racial subject have anything to do with this exclusion? Is the experience of racism for bi/multi racial women different for women who identify solely as Maori and who position themselves solely as Maori and who signify corporeally as Maori?

Kathie Irwin [1992: 2] in her essay *Towards Theories of Maori Feminisms* in *Feminist Voices* states:

> The life experiences of Maori women and men are not the same. Maori women's health, education, family structure and support, employment and unemployment statistics are significantly different from Maori men. Our women earn less, are left alone to raise children, take subjects at school which prepare them for the lowest paid, least secure sectors of the labour market, and have health problems which lead the world in negative indices in some areas such as smoking and related health problems... People should not feel the need to discuss the plight of Maori always in general terms, without highlighting the specific needs and concerns of our women and girls.

I extend Irwin's ideas to suggest that gender operates differently for bi/multi racial Maori women in contrast to bi/multi racial Maori men, Maori women and Pakeha/Other women and men. In terms of Meridith's experiences, what part does his 'half-caste' gender play in those subjects whose anxiety is provoked by his bi/multi racial presence? Despite the fact that Meridith did not situate his partial knowledge within a gendered account of his half-caste identity his narrative points to his masculinised cultural duality in his recollection of a typical 'Kiwi Christmas Day' - "helping put the hangi down with the Maori relations... back down to Nan's to pull up the hangi for Christmas dinner". Clearly, Meridith positions himself as a typical Maori bloke [cooking the hangi] but it would be interesting to discover whether his Maori masculinity is contested within a Maori landscape or whether his Pakeha masculinity is contested in a Pakeha one. Is it more acceptable for Maori men to vacillate cross culturally than for Maori women? What is at risk and what are the ways in which the gendered subject is pathologised and punished as a result of her non Maori or Pakeha conformity? When race and gender combine within the bi/multi racial subject, how does this affect their ability to vacillate cross culturally? For example, is it easier for a dark skinned Maori to take up the position of the hybrid and be situated in a Pakeha landscape than it is for a light skinned subject? Conversely, does the ability of the subject to vacillate become easier or harder if the subject wishes to negotiate a traditional Maori landscape and the subject is white? Finally, how do race and gender intersect in the bi/multi racial subject to temper or enhance her ability to socially and economically advance herself within the bicultural nation? I now contextualise these questions within a framework of New Zealand feminism to determine how feminists accommodate bi/multi racial women's difference.

New Zealand Feminism: 1970s - 2000s

In the New Zealand context, two forms of cultural feminisms are dominant; Maori and Pakeha. A New Zealand oriented 'Pakeha feminism' was formed

when Maori feminists asserted their cultural and preferential differences based on their anti-colonialist agendas [Larner, 1996]. Pakeha feminists developed an awareness of themselves as different from British, American and Maori feminists and forged a specifically New Zealand feminist politics and practice. Wendy Larner [1996: 165], in her article *Gender and Ethnicity* in *Nga Patai,* states that many Pakeha feminists were unable to understand how arguments associated with Maori sovereignty [Maori nationalism] were of relevance to their versions of feminism. The release of Awatere's [1984] text encouraged some Pakeha feminists to debate the political issues and implications raised by Maori feminists while others retreated altogether . [Pakeha feminists have focused on raising the life chances and life experiences of New Zealand women in general, while Maori feminists have concentrated on the life chances and experiences of Maori women only. For example, the literature to emerge out of New Zealand feminism over the past twenty years has focused on making Maori women visible within the nation, challenging existing racisms and celebrating Maori women's contributions within a Maori narrative of Maori history and mainstream New Zealand history. For example, Ngahuia Te Awekotuku [1988] provided an insight into why Maori girls were failing in the education system during the 1980s when she posed the title question *He Whare Tangata; He Whare Kura? What's Happening to Our Maori Girls,* in *Women and Education in Aotearoa.* Also, the publication of *Te Timatanga Tatou Tatou* in 1993 records the early stories of the Maori Women's Welfare League while the publication of *Toi Wahine* two years later celebrated the mana of Maori women, their writing, painting, ideas, stories and diversity. There has also been a growing interest in gaining equality for Maori women in comparison to non-Maori, via a discourse of oppositional politics. For example, Liz McKinley's [1995] article *Maori Women in Educational Policy, 1960-91: A Discourse Analysis* in *Toi Wahine* looks at the position of Maori girls and women within the New Zealand education system during the 1990s. Mckinley [1995: 117] argues for Maori women's inclusion within education policies when she asserts:

> The differences between Maori and Pakeha, men and women, have caused Maori women to become invisible and ignored in policy documents. The reports and policies that address Maori and women have yet to find a place for those of us who fall in between. To say that we are the same as Maori men is to lack understanding of Maori society and to deny us our position within it. To say we are the same as Pakeha women is to deny us our identity. We are both and we are neither. We are Maori women.

In general, New Zealand feminism has focused on equalising the quality of Maori womens' and girls' health, education, domestic welfare, employment opportunities, and economic and political status to that of Pakeha. Part of this work involves recognising what differentiates and disadvantages the female Maori subject in comparison with non-Maori and Maori males. Irwin [1992] argues that a focus on women and girls is central to identifying where Maori females' experiences differ from those of Maori men and boys. She asserts that it is important to reclaim Maori women's stories in order to render visible the value of Maori women by writing them into history. Feminism then is involved in the production of knowledge on Maori women by contributing to a positive reconfiguration of their identity as Maori women.

More than twenty years later Maori and Pakeha feminists are still locked into a binary relationship which supports their relative cultural positions and specific feminist agendas. Neither have looked to the knowledge embodied by the female bi/multi racial subject which illuminates a 'difference' capable of disrupting the binary arrangement of white neo colonial dominance imposed by white Pakeha social scientists [including Pakeha feminists] and accommodated by Maori nationalists [including Maori feminists]. In general, feminist representations of Maori women's experiences invariably involve an underlying assumption of what constitutes Maori women's identity. Articulations which theorise identity solely from within the Maori part of the Maori/Pakeha binary tell only a partial story about women of Maori ancestry.

Attempts at decolonisation flounder when they fail to honour the unique differences and cultural experiences of bi/multi racial women and the new forms of emancipation that they are embracing. With this in mind, this thesis is a response to Irwin's [1992: 2] suggestion that it is essential to develop Maori feminist theories in which Maori society and culture are central components in a gendered analysis. She claims that the production of knowledge pertaining to Maori women is informed by monocultural and patriarchal norms which necessarily exclude an alternative voice. Irwin [1992, 1] states:

> Throughout our story as a people, Maori women have been successful innovators and leaders. Our work and deeds have had a significant impact on Maori culture and society, breaking new ground, often in radical ways. And yet, our women, and their stories, have been buried deeper and deeper in the annals of time by the processes of oppression that seek to render us invisible and keep us out of the records.

In staking a claim for heterogeneity, Irwin acknowledges that 1980s discussions around authenticity had a particular focus on identifying those Maori women who were considered "not Maori enough" and who were not

approved as "real" and "acceptable" Maori. She adds that feminist debates over the ideologically correct Maori woman had proven futile and wasted feminists' time. The challenge, Irwin claims, lies in the development of new feminist theories within women's and Maori movements, and with those who are concerned with the improvement of the life styles and life chances of Maori women. In claiming that new theories are pivotal for improving the lives of Maori women, she insists that this work is not an "academic luxury" but a tool of "empowerment and liberation" [Irwin, 1992, 4]. The development of Maori feminist theories is central to advancing Maori development in that it serves to contextualise Maori women within the environment they inhabit. Irwin [1992: 5] states:

> With the right theory as a tool we can take the right to our tino rangatiratanga, our sovereignty as Maori women, to be in control of making sense of our world and our future, ourselves. We can and must design new tools - Maori feminist theories, to ensure that we have control over making sense of our world and our future. This is a feminist position in which the artificial creation, inflation, and maintenance of male power over women is unacceptable.

New Zealand feminist initiatives continue to challenge Maori women's 'invisibility' by recognising that Maori women's contributions are essential resources in the production and reproduction of the New Zealand nation and its citizens. As such, a feminist analysis of bi/multi racial women recognises that women are central interlocutors in the formation and maintenance of the nation. Anthias and Yuval-Davis [1989: 7] in *Woman-Nation-State* claim that women have specific roles within the nation. They reproduce the citizens of the nation and, through this, demarcate the ethnic boundaries between cultural groups. Women also participate in the ideological reproduction of collective transmitters of culture/nation in that they mark ethnic and national differences between groups. They also contribute to cultural differences being 'reproduced' in the members of the ethnic/national groups they signify. Finally, as participants, they play a role in the economic, political and military struggles of the nation. These functions are further affected by the feminine subject's race. According to Jan Pettman [1992: 15-16] in *Living in the Margins*:

> Where women are in the collectivities of nation, race and ethnic group includes interrogating their relations with men of their group/s, and with women both within and across the boundaries. The task involves analysing multiple oppression, and identifying women's experiences of difference, while also retaining sight of the structures and power relations in which the politics of difference are played.

New Zealand feminists recognise that the Maori woman is positioned twice within the nation and performs a dual function; she performs the same functions as the Pakeha woman within the nation but she also represents the national Maori community's needs as well. This raises questions for the bi/multi racial woman. Do her dual and multi racial identities situate her ambivalently in the national community and in the national Maori community in contrast to women who clearly identify with either a Pakeha or Maori subjectivity? Is the bi/multi racial subject able to simply function in the nation in the ways noted by Anthias and Yuval-Davis [1989] or does her bi/multi raciality blur the clear ethnic/national boundaries, ideologies and cultural/national transmitters which desire pure cultural subjects? Women who fall outside a traditional identity face the anxiety associated with a national requirement to conform to cultural and gendered specificities contained within bicultural rhetoric. The regulation and control of cultural identity is both oppressive and controlling, necessitating a feminist inquiry. How can feminists begin to think more laterally about the social construction of women positioned with both Maori and Pakeha/Other ancestry? I turn to this question next.

Rethinking Maori Women's Identity

In order to understand the unique subjectivity and life experiences of bi/multi racial Maori women, a theoretical framework must make sense of their multiple identities and their culturally contradictory status in the nation. I suggest that theorising Maori identity through a post modern lens destabilises the binary inherent in the construction of an authentic [tuturu] Maori identity versus an inauthentic [assimilated] identity and frees up a space to include other Maori women's voices and experiences as the newly excluded raced subject. Theorising the bi/multi racial woman through a post modernist and post colonial lens enables a richer feminist framework for investigating the *specificities* of the bi/multi racial subject in the bicultural nation. Aileen Moreton-Robinson [2000: 63] in *Talkin' Up To The White Woman*, positions herself as an Australian Geonpul woman. She points out:

> An engagement with a politics of difference as multiple standpoints, oppressions, subjectivities, subject positions, identities and locations provides us with a way of understanding the heterogeneous and heteronomous representations of gender, sexuality, ethnicity, race, class and nationality. However, the effect of such theorising is to make a politics of difference in practice colour blind in terms of whiteness and power evasive in that all differences are rendered equally significant. There appears to be no scope for fixity in power relations between women, yet feminists argue that statistically and corporeally men have more power than women do in the world. For white feminists, there appear to be no limits to differences that

> constitute subjectivity and no limits to the degree to which they can be invented and overcome.

The history of New Zealand feminism shows how a politics of difference emerged and allowed a space to *manage* 'difference/race' by allowing the voices of others to sit alongside the dominant Pakeha/white voice. But a politics of difference theorises subjects in terms of hierarchical differences *between* unified groups of peoples and does not look at the gendered, racial and cultural specificities *within* women, nor the way these specificities inform how bi/multi racial women become located or positioned in the nation. Moreton-Robinson [2000:56] points out that 'difference' is located solely around homogenous categories like race, gender and class, and does not provide scope to deal with the complexities of differences that operate within each category. She states that"... the closure of identity politics does not allow for fluid and multiple identities" Moreton-Robinson [2000: 71] continues:

> As subjects and socially situated knowers, all women are enmeshed in racialised power relations that have been historically constituted through discourses and the material conditions that furnished and sustain them.

A post modernist conception of multiple subjectivity challenges identity politics for its blindness to the way in which identities are multiply and discursively produced. I rely on Moreton-Robinson's [2000: xvii] concept of post modern identity where she describes the 'subject position' as that which denotes "... a socially constructed position whereby one's behaviour is significantly shaped by what is expected of that position rather than by conscious intention". This subjectivity and socially constructed spatial position is associated with gender as much as it is with race. Further, Linda McDowell [1999: 22] in *Gender, Identity and Place*, positions the gendered subject within a spatialisation narrative when she suggests the feminine subject has been retheorised as "relational and contingent"; "[t]he subject... rather than being a fixed and stable entity which enters into social relations with its gender in place, is always fluid and provisional, in the process of becoming. Gender is constructed and maintained through discourse and everyday actions". McDowell [1999: 215] states:

> Instead of the identities of 'oppositional' or 'minority' groups being constructed as different from a 'norm', it is now asserted that all identities are a fluid amalgam of memories of places and origins, constructed by and through fragments and nuances, journeys and rests, of movements between. Thus, the 'in-between' is itself a process or a dynamic, not just a stage on the way to a more final identity.

Rethinking Maori identity in terms of the cultural vacillation and creative interplay between different genealogies and their respective cultures offers the possibility to open up new spaces to theorise Maori women's life styles and life chances within the contemporary nation. A reconfiguration of Maori women's subjectivity which reflects an understanding and respect of the way that gender, race and culture operate to situate the subject with a dual/multiple subjectivity, as opposed to either a traditional or assimilated identity, allows a new reading of decolonisation, with an emphasis on agency, to emerge. Moreton-Robinson [2000: xxii] draws from Anna Yeatman's [1991: 17] ideas when she states:

> Representations are more than mere symbols. They are a means by which we come to know, embody and perform reality. Our different representations of reality arise "out of differences in the position of knowing subjects in relation to the historicity of interconnected relationships of domination and contestation".

But in order for representations of bi/multi racial women to be inclusive of difference, a feminist analysis must also take into account her racial corporeality. What place does *race* have in the exclusion of Maori bi/multi racial women's difference within the bicultural nation? By race, I refer to the way colourism is used to define one cultural group of peoples in relation to another. For example, in the New Zealand situation, I refer to the category of brownness associated with Maori and the category of whiteness associated with Pakeha. Paul Spoonley [1993: 2] in *Racism and Ethnicity* writes:

> 'Race' assumes that the phenotype, or group of physical characteristics, is an appropriate way of classifying people into social groupings, and that differences in the phenotype are synonymous with variations in intellect and abilities. From this basis, it has been argued that it is possible to rank 'races' according to their superiority and inferiority. Traditionally, Europeans [or Aryans, or Caucasians] were held to be superior to others, and the remaining 'races' were ranked according to how they fared in comparison with Europeans. Scientific theories were developed to explain and expand upon this understanding although such approaches have now been discredited.

I am using the term 'race' throughout this thesis to highlight that a racial imperative still operates in New Zealand to symbolically mark brown and white bodies with what Spoonley terms 'vices' or 'virtues'. At a 'commonsense level' he states that race is "intuitively associated" with these socially constructed attributes which influence how brown and white bodies are treated in the nation and become located in particular ways. This, I suggest, continues to have consequences for who becomes privileged or disadvantaged within the nation today. I suggest that bi/multi racial women live with the legacy of Social Darwinism which placed people hierarchically, thus ranking groups in terms of

their racial phenotypes/colour [Gilman, 1985; 1992]. The discourse of nationalism, I argue, has been responsible for the perpetuation of Maori and Pakeha differences and acts as a perpetrator of racism against bi/multi racial Maori women. Ann Stoler [1995: 8] in *Race and the Education of Desire* states:

> Nationalist discourse drew on and gave force to a wider politics of exclusion. This version was not concerned solely with the visual markers of difference, but with the relationship between visible characteristics and invisible properties, outer form and inner essence. Assessment of these untraceable identity markers could seal economic, political, and social fates. Imperial discourses that divided colonizer from colonized, metropolitan observers from colonial agents, and bourgeois colonizers from their subaltern compatriots designated certain cultural competencies, sexual proclivities, psychological dispositions, and cultivated habits. These in turn defined the hidden fault lines - both fixed and fluid - along which gendered assessments of class and racial membership were drawn.

Racial Corporeality - Colourism

One of the objectives of this thesis is to identify how the bi/multi racial woman is situated within racialised power relations and to analyse what has historically constructed them as 'Other' and what sustains this position today. Moreton-Robinson [2000: xviii-xix] writes:

> ... [D]espite - or perhaps because of - feminism's commitment to a politics of difference, thinking and writing about whiteness has not yet had widespread impact on theorising difference. Whiteness remains the invisible omnipresent norm. As long as whiteness remains invisible in analyses "race" is the prison reserved for the "Other".

My research will necessarily engage with the concept of 'whiteness', the presence of whiteness in the bi/multi racial subject and the privilege and/or disadvantage this affords her. Moreton-Robinson [2000: 133] argues that an "... absence of an interrogation of whiteness as cultural difference..." within Australian feminism contributes to the subjugation and oppression of Australian indigenous women. Likewise, in the New Zealand feminist context, a wider interrogation into 'whiteness as cultural difference' can enrich an understanding of bi/multi racial women's excluded position within the nation. Awatere [1984: 86] recognised that *whiteness* had something to do with assimilated Maori's social privilege in relation to unassimilated Maori; however, she was unable to identify the ramifications of this for white bi/multi racial Maori women. Racial corporeality, like gender, are represented in cultural terms which often exclude the specificities of individual women [Mohanram, 1999]. Accurate cultural representation is important if the meaning

perpetuated through the discourses of language is to reflect how bi/multi racial Maori women make sense of their worlds. Accurate representations also influence the way humans express complex thoughts about people and things and communicate about them via a system of language in a way which other people understand [Hall, 1997].

Stuart Hall [1997a: 16] in *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* states that representation is "the production of meaning through language". He extends this by giving two definitions contained in *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary of Meaning*:

> 1 To represent something is to describe or depict it, to call it up in the mind by description or portrayal or imagination; to place a likeness of it before us in our mind or in the senses; as, for example, in the sentence, 'This picture represents the murder of Abel by Cain.'
>
> 2 To represent also means to symbolize, stand for, to be a specimen of, or to substitute for; as in the sentence, 'In Christianity, the cross represents the suffering and crucifixion of Christ.'

In *Course in General Linguistics*, the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure's ideas on semiotics point out that everything is recognised and understood within a signifying chain of meaning which is culturally determined [Hall, 1997a]. With this in mind, I reflect that Maori and Pakeha are culturally positioned in a relationship of difference which is founded upon difference/colour. In short, I argue in this thesis that Maori and Pakeha identity each gain meaning from their relationship with each other within a signifying chain of meaning which is located within a specific form of New Zealand nationalism. Within this signifying chain of meaning the presence of colour [brownness] is symbolically associated with Maori corporeality while the absence of colour [whiteness] is symbolically associated to Pakeha corporeality. Further, colour is associated on a scale black to white with white located at the top of the colourism ladder and black at the bottom [Gilman, 1985; 1992]. This association of colour with cultural/national identity can be extended; Asians are associated with yellowness, African Americans are associated with blackness and some darker races are associated with blueness. Because some bi/multi racial women may present with either white or brown skin/colour toning, their material presence may signify as either white/Pakeha or brown/Maori . But their corporeality may also include a curious mixture of both whiteness and brownness thus affording the bi/multi racial woman a space to be perceived as either Maori or Pakeha because whiteness and brownness function as metaphors for Pakeha and Maori cultural subjectivity. In the New

Zealand context, to be considered an authentic Pakeha one must conform to the specificities of whiteness contained within notions of Pakehaness. Likewise, to be an authentic Maori, the subject must conform to the specificities of race/brownness that are contained within notions of Maoriness. A politics of representation would suggest that culture imbues meaning into objects [including people] and individuals respond by adopting the signifiers associated with the concept signified. Hall [1997a: 37] states:

> In the semiotic approach, not only words and images but objects themselves can function as signifiers in the production of meaning. Clothes, for example, may have a simple physical function... But clothes also double up as signs. They construct a meaning and carry a message... These signs enable clothes to convey meaning and to function like language....

The occlusion of an analysis of whiteness has been problematic for a feminist examination of the bi/multi racial subject. In this sense, occlusion refers to the way in which New Zealand feminism in general has not looked at whiteness as a culturally specific identity category in terms of how it privileges some subjects [white/Pakeha] over others who are brown [Maori]. In essence, *whiteness* is not seen as difference. Apart from Awatere's [1984] work in this area, it remains largely invisible and untheorised in the New Zealand context. For example, if the bi/multi racial subject identifies as Maori she would be theorised within an existing framework of identity politics which locates her 'difference' in juxtaposition to Pakeha women. Similarly, if the bi/multi racial assimilated her Maori identity beneath a Pakeha identity, feminist theory would focus on her gender difference and not her cultural difference. In this way, I argue that the dual/multiple racial and cultural identity of the bi/multi racial woman creates a dilemma for feminism. She is neither white nor brown, but both. Like Moreton-Robinson [2000], I claim that whiteness dominates from a position of power and privilege. To date, this remains invisible and unchallenged in New Zealand. A preferred reading of bi/multi racial Maori women's subjectivity will incorporate a reading of racial corporeality [Chapter Seven].

There is something about the presence of brownness and whiteness together that creates a conflict within feminist analysis on Maori women. Karen Brodkin [2000: xii] reflects on Moreton-Robinson's ideas in *Talkin' Up To The White Woman* when she asserts that race as a category applies only to non whites and that "... white feminists in the academy are still unable or unwilling to interrogate the power and privileges of whiteness or its status as the measure of the normal and the desired". Brodkin [2000] adds that the Moreton-Robinson

challenge is to introduce inter-subjectivity within feminism, that is, "... the ability to examine an issue from a number of perspectives - to develop academic and social relationships of white feminists with Indigenous people where the power of whiteness is not institutionally defended, where white freedom to imagine "others" is challenged and resisted by Indigenous people". Brodkin [2000, xii] favours an approach of inter-subjectivity which she claims is the:

> ... importance of whites seeing themselves and Indigenous people through Indigenous eyes - as a way station to developing less partial knowledges. Such knowledges would make visible to whites their everyday participation in practices of racial domination, alternative ways of acting and knowing, as well as making possible feminisms that recognise the importance of Indigenous women's priorities.

A bi/multi racial woman's voice is neither positioned solely with the white/Pakeha voice or its opposite, a brown/Maori voice. If whiteness is the difference which measures Maoriness and un-Maoriness then how does this difference mark the bi/multi racial subject in ways that marginalise her within the nation? Her story will offer feminism an opportunity to develop an inter-subjectivity as described by Moreton-Robinson. Until Maori and Pakeha feminists interrogate their own respective position as white and brown subjects and until they interrogate the subjectivities that accompany these racial subject positions, the bi/multi racial subject will continue to be occluded within narratives of New Zealand women and narratives of New Zealand Maori.

Theorising the bi/multi racial woman provides an opportunity to see how whiteness works in the construction of identity and, by extension, how within a bicultural nation brownness functions in the construction of a specific Maori identity. Brodkin [2000: xi] believes that Moreton-Robinson [2000] recognises that understanding, perception and knowledge contribute towards a standpoint reflecting their partial knowledge when she states that "... the standpoint or subject position of whiteness in general and white feminism in particular is also partial despite its dominance and self-representation as universal truth". Yet the raced body remains occluded in feminist research. Somewhere between a Pakeha feminist standpoint and a Maori feminist standpoint the bi/multi racial subject is erased. This thesis is concerned with identifying the conditions that inform this erasure. A study of the bi/multi racial subject makes visible the way whiteness and brownness operate within feminism and within the bicultural nation. It is in this spirit that I argue for the inclusion of the bi/multi racial within articulations of Maori subjectivity.

Introduction to the Research

A theoretical reading of the bi/multi racial subject will reflect her gendered experience as Maori and as Other. The bi/multi racial woman cannot be included within articulations of a primordial Maori subjectivity. Simply, the cultural and gendered differences between Maori and Pakeha/Other, male and female, preclude her ability to identify solely with one cultural identity. Given her unique positioning and dual racial miscegenation, the bi/multi racial woman does not necessarily resonate with solely Maori cultural or phenotypical stereotypes. This, however, does not prevent her from having Maori whakapapa or from accessing a subject position which is Maori or from developing a rich Maori subjectivity. Her bi/multi raciality does not preclude her status as Maori but rather complicates it. It is this conflicted position that makes her narrative worthy of examination. The social and political ramifications of being ambivalently positioned as male/female, us/them, subject/other, colonised/coloniser, native/colonial, Maori/Pakeha/Other, brown/white, masculine/feminine and rich/poor require examination.

I argue in this thesis that bi/multi racial women's 'borderlands' knowledge contributes to a discussion on New Zealand race relations and the emergent forms of racism occurring within the bicultural nation. As such, bi/multi racial women's experiences of cultural hybridity are explored in order to determine what their exclusion from dominant narratives of Maori women's identity rests upon. This research looks at the social construction of New Zealand race relations, which I contextualise within the discourse of New Zealand nationalism in order to understand the discursive forces operating to exclude bi/multi racial women. How does the silence of whiteness operate within the nation to privilege or disadvantage bi/multi racial women? How is whiteness and brownness, in both real and metaphoric ways, calling into being those subjects who are white or brown as either Maori or Pakeha, and what happens when the brownness of Maori meets the whiteness of Pakeha/Other? I question how bi/multi racial women negotiate their cultural hybridity and how they hold onto a Maori identity while at the same time acknowledging the other cultures they identify with. I examine the opportunities and disadvantages that are created through the way they utilise their difference to effect emancipation.

What can the bi/multi racial subject tell us about the legacy of *race* and *racism* and its quest for silent dominance in the nation evidenced in the new forms of racism levied against brown and white bi/multi racial women? Does their presence challenge the clear ethnic and national boundaries, ideologies

and cultural/national transmitters encapsulated by Anthias and Yuval-Davis [1989] or does their blurred multiplicity threaten the reproduction of ethnic and cultural subjects and their respective cultures? What can the embodied and partial knowledges of bi/multi racial women tell us about their ability to demark or re-mark themselves in ways to better effect life chances and life experiences? How do they resist the double edge of racism from deep within both Pakeha and Maori cultures and what forms of resistance do they engage in to effect emancipation?

Moreton-Robinson's [2000: xxii] use of the terms 'representation' and 'self-representation' will be employed within this thesis. Representation in this respect reflects Spivak's [1988a, 1988b] descriptive use of the term which Moreton-Robinson explains is divided into two parts:

> One dimension is to perceive representation as "speaking for"; the other is to comprehend representation as involving interpretation. The latter Spivak identifies as re-presentation; thus all representations are based on interpretation... the concept "self-representation" is operationalised to distinguish between how one represents one-self through interpretation as opposed to how one is represented by another.

I contextualise this inquiry within a feminist, Maori, post modernist and post colonial theoretical framework. Feminist theory is useful in that it contextualises the bi/multi racial woman within a narrative of gender, thus helping me to theorise the way that race combines with gender to position the corporeal bi/multi racial woman differently from Maori and Pakeha women. By 'gender' I refer to the social construction of gendered identities [and associated behavioural norms] attached to biologically female and male bodies which has important consequences for social phenomenon like the production of heterosexuality and the gendered division of labour [Butler, 1993a, 1993b; Irwin, 1992; McDowell, 1999; Middleton, 1993, 1996; Pettman, 1992, Tuhiwai Smith, 1998; Yeatman, 1995; Young, 1990]. Post modernist theory provides the tools needed to theorise the bi/multi racial woman's identity as multiply discursively produced as opposed to an identity that reflects a modernist assumption of a universal Maori subject [Foster; 1996, Friedman, 1998; Foucault, 1979; Gibbins & Youngman, 1996].

Post colonial theory enables me to theorise the social construction of bi/multi racial women's cultural hybridity through a lens of New Zealand nationalism, imperialism, colonialism and assimilation [Anzaldua, 1987; Bhabha, 1990, 1994, 1994a, 1994b; Chatterjee, 1989, 1993; Fanon; 1967a, 1967b; Gilman, 1985, 1992; Hall, 1997; Lloyd, 1991, Meridith, 1990, 1999a, 1999b, Mohanram, 1999; Moreton-Robinson, 2000; Werbner, 1997; Williams,

1997]. It also supports an argument for the reconfiguration of Maori women's identity to one of bi/multi raciality by showing how cultural identity is contingent upon dominant narratives of Maori and Pakeha identity emanating from the Maori-Pakeha colonial relationship. Drawing from a Maori theoretical viewpoint enables an indigenous perspective to emerge and highlights the strategic deployment of a traditional Maori subjectivity in arguments of Maori authenticity/traditionalism [Awatere, 1984; Kohu, 1997; Pere, 1991; Spoonley, 1988; 1993; Tai, 1997; Smith, 1998; Walker, 1987, 1992, 1990].

This thesis is presented in two parts which both reflect the separate, yet related, theoretical research methodologies employed in this project. Part One reflects the deconstructive 'textual' methodology that I engaged with under the guidance of Dr Radhika Mohanram, located in the Department of Women's and Gender Studies, in her capacity as Chief Supervisor. For three years, my research was centred on a discourse analysis of bi/multi racial Maori women's exclusion from dominant narratives of Maori women's identity in the New Zealand nation. After Dr Mohanram left to work in the United Kingdom, Professor Sue Middleton [located in the School of Education] took over the role of Chief Supervisor. Professor Middleton supported me to engage in a qualitative methodology in my research. This decision was also supported by Second Supervisor, Associate Professor Ann Sullivan. Originally, this research was undertaken solely using a textual theoretical approach, however it lacked the experiential material needed to support my ideas. How could I discuss issues of bi/multi racial women's cultural juxtaposition and cultural differences, or theorise the new forms of colonialism that discriminate against bi/multi racial women, without their narratives to help me?

I decided to broaden my research to include a qualitative analysis of bi/multi racial women. The qualitative narratives in Part Two, when combined with the discourse analysis undertaken in Part One, have enabled a fuller understanding of bi/multi racial women's exclusion from dominant articulations of Maori women's identity and have also provided an important comment on the new forms of colonialism which operate through the discursive practices of biculturalism.

Hence, I invited several well-known women to be participants. These participants had previously made me aware [through their writing, or singing] that they identified themselves as 'bi/multi racial'. Several women consented to their names being used while others preferred to be anonymous. Hence, pseudonyms have been used to protect their identity. I used a 'snowball' technique to find the remaining participants; these women also acknowledged their bi/multi racial Maori ethnicity. I formalised their involvement with an

introductory letter explaining the research process [Appendix A]. After gaining their written consent [see Appendix B] and using an open ended questionnaire schedule, I interviewed them over a two month period in 2000 [Appendix C]. The research process will be explained in more depth in Chapter Four. At this point I want to highlight that I believe the narrative experiences of bi/multi racial women add a richer dimension to this study and support my theoretical ideas. Their voices contribute to an embodied knowledge and provide the textual, qualitative material needed to complete this research on bi/multi racial women's multiple cultural identities.

I developed a 'Kaupapa Bi/multi Research Methodology' to help me, using interviews with guided, open ended questions. This methodology pays attention to both feminist and Maori approaches and comes together in the form of a life history methodology which is culturally sensitive to Maori cultural safety issues. However, the requirement of research analysis implies an obligation to provide comment, interpretation and critique of the themes and issues that emerge for bi/multi racial women. It is this tension that has to be accommodated, to let the excluded voices of Maori emerge against the backdrop of my own assumptions, life experiences and preconceived ideas about bi/multi raciality. In the words of Sue Middleton in *Doing Qualitative Educational Research in the Mid-1990s* [1996: 19]:

> ...it is useful to make visible in our writings the ways in which the conceptual frames which researchers bring to bear when they ask questions, observe and write are themselves historical, cultural etc products. Making visible the historicity of one's own analyses can lead to better science rather than relativistic chaos.

When researching the participants, I did so with an awareness of my position as a doctoral student and the impact that this might have on the participants' perceptions of the power/status associated with the intellectual production of knowledge 'on' Maori women. I was also aware of my own personal and academic agendas in conducting the research. As a researcher on bi/multi raciality, one of my considerations is that, to a certain degree, this study represents the interests of the academic institution and relevant disciplines I am located within as a feminist studying in a Women's and Gender Studies institutional context. To an extent, I am bound by the relationships that the academic conventions provide through the nature of this research. For example, by way of current New Zealand academic convention, I use Maori words and phrases to emphasise a Maori perspective, but in an effort not to interrupt the text, I have omitted translations. The glossary at the end of this thesis enables a deeper understanding of the meanings of these words and

phrases. Further, by positioning myself in the research as bi/multi racial, I declare my personal interest in the subject of inquiry, the way the topic is researched and analysed and, afterwards, how the information is disseminated. I suggest that New Zealand feminism has been disabled by a Pakeha/Maori cultural dichotomy, resulting in a lack of information about women who *contest* this binary. Positioning myself as a cultural hybrid, I begin the dialogue which will enable Maori and Pakeha feminists to engage with Maori women's multiple identities.

In a decolonising move, this thesis offers an alternative, more inclusive emancipatory narrative of Maori women's identity. I argue that a fresh articulation, which is capable of accommodating the complexities of their dual/multiple racial corporeal materiality and their dual/multiple cultural hybridity, provides a richer and more meaningful analysis of post colonial bi/multi racial Maori women's identity today.

Chapter Descriptions

Undertaken in two parts, Part One of this thesis provides the theoretical landscape needed to explore the exclusion of bi/multi racial women from academic articulations on Maori women's subjectivity. This is achieved through an examination of key texts which look at the formation of New Zealand nationalism. I also look at counter nationalist's attempts to seek distributive justice. By engaging with these exemplary narratives, I am able to determine the discursive processes which underpinned the formation of the New Zealand nation, as well as the shift to biculturalism. Through engaging dominant and influential texts on New Zealand race relations, I am able to show how a specific narrative of Maori women's identity emerged. By extension, I am able to show how bi/multi racial women became excluded from dominant representations of Maori women's identity. I argue that their exclusion from dominant articulations of Maori identity is related to New Zealand nationalism and the construction of a 'bicultural' national identity.

I begin Part Two of this thesis with an 'interlocking' chapter [Chapter Four], that connects the assertions made in Part One to the qualitative experiences of bi/multi racial women in Part Two. Essentially, this inter-connecting chapter lays the theoretical and philosophical foundation for conducting qualitative research on bi/multi racial women. This allows me to engage with the social construction of bi/multi racial women's cultural hybridity by deconstructing the narratives of twenty bi/multi racial women. In researching bi/multi racial women, my aim is to look at the way her

dual/multiple subjectivity and social positioning give her a wider spectrum of 'partial knowledges' in excess of the knowledge gained solely as either Maori *or* Pakeha/Other. Bi/multi racial women's self-representations are explored to develop a deeper understanding and awareness of cultural hybridity. I also look at the corporeal body to determine what part *race* plays in the new forms of subjugations bi/multi racial women experience and I illustrate bi/multi racial women's resistance to that subjugation. By placing the materiality of the raced and gendered body at the scene of bi/multi racial women's cultural identity, I include an otherwise 'detached' and 'suspended' corporeal essence in an *embodied* theoretical rearticulation of Maori women's identity.

Chapter One

This chapter is all that is before and is all that is after this sentence, beginning with the introduction and concluding with the rest of the chapter descriptions below.

Chapter Two

This chapter is descriptive in that it engages with a dominant narrative of the formation of New Zealand nationalism. I demonstrate how the nation, and its national identity, are conceptualised through the invention of an 'imagined community'. I also introduce Maori nationalist counter narratives to show how Maori were excluded in the monocultural nation and how they resisted assimilation. Through engaging with a range of exemplary texts, I highlight how the shift to biculturalism was underpinned by Maori counter nationalists' efforts to construct themselves in essentialist terms through invoking their connection to tribal landscapes. I suggest that re-evoking an image of themselves in these terms led to the exclusion of the cultural specificities of bi/multi racial Maori women.

Chapter Three

This chapter engages with a discussion on the theoretical assumptions embedded within oppositional politics. I explore the ideologies that underpinned Maori counter nationalists' efforts to implement a bicultural polity during the 1970s and 1980s. I

show how Maori were perceived as a disadvantaged social group which led to the development of an oppositional politics. I point out that this standpoint excludes an analysis of race. As such, a discussion on the subjugation of 'racial difference' in the formation of a unified national identity is introduced to demonstrate how racial *difference* was excluded. Finally, I explore how an oppression based politics resulted in a reconfiguration of Maori and Pakeha patriarchal alliances which repositioned Maori women as the 'cornerstone' of Maoridom.

Chapter Four

This chapter links the textual research methodology of the previous chapters, to the qualitative research in Part Two of this thesis. I employ a feminist reading of identity politics to justify the theoretical approach taken in the second section. I introduce a 'Kaupapa Bi/multi Racial Research Methodology' which, I argue, enables me to research Maori bi/multi racial women more effectively. I explain how a *synthesis* of a feminist research approach and a kaupapa Maori research approach is a culturally preferable methodology when researching bi/multi racial women.

Chapter Five

In this chapter I introduce the self-representations of twenty bi/multi racial women. I show how the presence of their cultural hybridity disrupts the narrative of a traditional Maori woman's subjectivity, thereby disrupting the Maori/Pakeha cultural binary. I also show how bi/multi racial women locate themselves across multiple landscapes. Within this effort, I demonstrate how notions of 'home' provide a site of resistance. I introduce a model for visualising bi/multi racial Maori women's difference and I compare this to a 'traditional' model of identity.

Chapter Six

In this chapter I challenge dominant narratives of Maori women's identity perpetuated by nationalists and counter nationalists. As such, I disrupt the colonising narrative of an essentialist Maori subjectivity. Through utilising the narrative experiences of bi/multi racial women, I demonstrate how their cultural hybridity positions them differently from Maori women, who are constructed by counter nationalists and academics as 'traditional'. I examine

the processes that enable bi/multi racial women to shift cultural landscapes and subject positions at will, through deploying the concepts of the third space and diaspora.

Chapter Seven

In this chapter, I discuss racial morphology and the part this plays in the experiences of bi/multi racial women as raced and gendered subjects. As such, I look at how bi/multi racial women's bodies become discursively positioned in the nation and function as either Maori or Pakeha 'landscapes'. From there, I examine the effects of racism for the bi/multi racial woman. I argue that her 'body of knowledge' contributes to an understanding of the new forms of colonialism that operate in the nation today. In particular, I discuss the part corporeal whiteness and brownness play in the bi/multi racial woman's dual/multiple cultural subjectivity and social positioning.

Chapter Eight

In this chapter I search for a dominant narrative that enables bi/multi racial women to understand and mediate their cultural hyrbidity. I explore the role spirituality plays in bi/multi racial women's experiences of cultural hybridity. In essence, I search for a common narrative which I argue anchors bi/multi racial women to the landscape of Aotearoa and contributes to their ability to engage successfully in their multiple life experiences. I argue that an 'enabling' narrative contributes to a sense of resiliency in that it enables bi/multi racial women to make *sense* of their cultural hybridity.

Chapter Nine: Conclusion

In this concluding chapter, I summarise my articulation of bi/multi racial women's discursively produced and multiply constructed cultural identities via Ashton-Warner's [1966] novel *Greenstone.* Here, as in the thesis as a whole, I argue that theorising women who are descendants of New Zealand Maori, in a way that engages with their cultural hybridity, enables a new reading of Maori identity. I argue that theorising identity through a lens of cultural hybridity enables a richer and more meaningful analysis of bi/multi racial women's experiences of being Maori in the nation today. I suggest that a new conceptualisation of Maori identity is needed to address the new forms of racism that are emerging to marginalise women of Maori ancestry. In brief, my thesis is that the raced and gendered body must be considered in post colonial articulations on bi/multi racial Maori women's identity.

Part One

Chapter Two

Race to Identity: New Zealand Nationalism 1800s-2000s:

> First I greet the dead - our foremothers, those from whose wombs we came, through whose energy, pain and awareness we all arrived here. Those principally whose achievements, perceptions, and even being, were cast down by the arrival of an alien missionary and colonialist ethos. This ethos imposed itself upon a preliterate society in which I conjecture the dynamic transition form a matriarchy - women - oriented - culture - to a patriarchal system... [Ngahuia Te Awekotuku, 1978, p. 61].

Racism can be seen operating in the New Zealand nation when women who share both Maori and Pakeha genealogy, and mixed cultural heritage, fail to be represented within dominant articulations of Maori women's identity. Te Awekotuku's observations in *Whakaaro Noa Iho: Some Ideas For Maori Women,* on neo colonialism during the 1970s, are still relevant in Aotearoa during the 2000s. The story of colonisation and colonialism finds its conclusion in the exclusion of bi/multi racial women from dominant articulations of Maori identity. What it means to be 'Maori' *and* 'woman' in the nation today is subsumed beneath dominant articulations of Maori ethnicity that has its roots in Maori counter nationalist objectives. I suggest that a deconstruction of the formation of the New Zealand nation, the shift to biculturalism and an examination of New Zealand race relations will contribute to an understanding of the new forms of colonialism that operate to exclude bi/multi racial women from dominant narratives of Maori women's identity.

In this chapter I argue that bi/multi racial women's exclusion is directly related to the production of the New Zealand nation and its national identity, and the reproduction of Maori and Pakeha cultures as discrete cultural groups. In short, a *deconstruction* of the New Zealand nation, its national identity and New Zealand's race relations is necessary in order to show how bi/multi racial women have been excluded from dominant

representations of Maori women's identity. I approach these assertions systematically by firstly presenting a dominant narrative of the emergence of the New Zealand nation. The influential ideas of New Zealand historian Keith Sinclair, enable me in this task. Drawing from Sinclair's [1986] text *A Destiny Apart*, I show how the New Zealand nation and a 'monocultural' national identity were formed through the expulsion of *difference,* as New Zealander's 'imagined' themselves as a national community.

I follow this with a critique of monocultural New Zealand nationalism by providing a counter narrative that incorporates the dominant ideas of Maori nationalists and New Zealand academics. I offer a summary of the processes of colonisation and colonialism to demonstrate that Maori cultural epistemologies and cultural practices were excluded from dominant ideologies of New Zealand nationalism. By utilising the ideas embedded within Donna Awatere [1984], Jane Kelsey [1984] and Ranginui Waker's [1990] critiques of New Zealand history, I am able to comment on the discursive efforts of Maori nationalists to resist a monocultural nationalism. These authors have been selected for their representative accounts of Maori and Pakeha race relations from a 'Maori counter nationalist perspective'. On the basis of these narratives I show what underpinned the shift to biculturalism. My intent is to show how biculturalism was formed through Maori nationalists strategically positioning themselves as *authentic* in an effort to seek distributive justice from the New Zealand Crown. Through demonstrating Maori counter-nationalist efforts of decolonisation, I show how Maori strategically internalised how they differed from Pakeha and in so doing occluded the specificities of bi/multi racial Maori women.

Presented in three sections, the first, 'Inventing Nations and Imagined Communities', introduces Benedict Anderson's [1991] ideas on nationalism. Utilising those ideas, I demonstrate how nations are formed through certain pre-conditions that enable the heterogeneous population to *imagine* itself as a unified community. Keith Sinclair's historical text is introduced to show how the unification of the nation emerged once certain pre-conditions were in place and how this led to the emergence of a white monocultural nationalism. The second section, 'Maori Counter Nationalism 1800s - 1960s', provides a Maori counter narrative of New Zealand history. It gives a brief summary of iwi and British settler contact and points out how British colonialism, imperialism and mono culturalism ensured the economic, political and cultural dominance of Pakeha over Maori. I engage the analyses of Kelsey [1984], Awatere [1984] and Walker [1990] for their accounts of the historic and contemporary forms that colonialism took to

subjugate Maori. In the third section, 'Shifting Nationalism: Biculturalism 1970s- 1980s', I make use of Awatere [1984], Durie [1993], Mulgan [1989] and Walker's [1990] analyses of the Maori renaissance during the 1980s, in order to demonstrate that a strategic deployment of Maori ethnicity underpinned the shift from nationalism to biculturalism.

Inventing Nations and Imagined Communities

Benedict Anderson's [1991] concept of 'imagined communities', described in his text *Imagined Communities,* provides an analysis of how nations and national identities are established through the intimate associations people have with the landscape they inhabit and identify with. Mohanram [1999: 97] in *Black Body* states:

> There is a long and illustrious tradition of people's attachment to place forming the basis for nationalistic feelings... Anderson associates the primordial sense of identity [of a culture] through place to our perception of the 'primordialness of language' itself... The implications of this are that our sense of cultural identity is intertwined not only with our relationship to and rootedness in the land, but also that our use of our language is, in turn, rooted to particular tracts of land.

Mohanram points out that Anderson's text is useful for understanding how nations come to be *imagined* through ties to landscape. Mohanram recognises that a sense of belonging to the materiality of place informs the social construction of cultural identities through the discursive processes embedded in our use of language.

Nationalist politics, Anderson contends, invoke a sense of nationality and community via the intimate, culturally specific, emotional attachment stemming from a sense of 'belonging' to the geographical nation-space. For example, he suggests that singing the national anthem creates a sense of identity through attachment to land/place. In singing it, people occupying the same tract of land join together in one voice, singing the same words to the same tune, thus invoking a sense of affinity symbolised in the 'national community'. Through this effort, 'difference' is expelled, as individual 'strangers' imagine themselves to be the same as other members of the community.

Anderson claims nations are invented once religion becomes territorialised, coupled with a decline in kingship systems. There is also an emergence of print capitalism, languages-of state, new cultural roots and a reading of time that challenges linear understandings of national formation. He contends that nations "... loom out of an immemorial past and glide into

a limitless future" [Anderson, 1991, pp. 11-12]. Economic change, discoveries and the invention of new communications challenged cosmology and history and eventually led to the birth of nations. Nationalism, Anderson suggests, grows out of a search for an alternative understanding of "linking fraternity, power and time meaningfully together" [1991, p. 36]. To understand nations, he [1991: 4] states that "... we need to consider carefully how they have come into historical being, in what ways their meanings have changed over time, and why today, they command such profound emotional legitimacy." In short, the nation is an 'imagined political community'.

The New Zealand Nation: 1800s - 1970s

At this point, I introduce Keith Sinclair's [1986] views on the formation of the New Zealand nation to show how our pre 1980s national community was founded upon an 'imagined community', a culturally homogeneous community which is consistent with Anderson's ideas. Sinclair provides a dominant narrative of the formation of the New Zealand nation in *A Destiny Apart: New Zealander's Search for National Identity*. As such, Sinclair's text on the formation of New Zealand nationalism is widely accepted by New Zealand academics as exemplary and historical. Peter Gibbons [1998] wrote in *The Oxford History of New Zealand* that Sinclair had a huge influence on historians, students, literary theorists and social scientists in general. With this in mind, I include his narrative as the *bedrock* for theorising New Zealand nationalism. Through summarising the key elements that he claims led to the formation of the nation, I am able to show how the New Zealand nation and its national identity have been theorised as a 'unified' and 'stable' entity. His ideas enable a summary of how New Zealand formed its dominant 'unified 'cultural identity through the repudiation of difference from other peoples and nations living outside its geographical borders. In this section, I introduce Sinclair's narrative in order to highlight the emergence of a monocultural New Zealand nationalism. I wish to point out that the New Zealand nation could not have come into existence until the culturally diverse inhabitants recognised themselves as a community of like minded peoples.

Sinclair's historical narrative suggests that the formation of the New Zealand nation is based on a linear and normative model. This resembles Anderson's model in that national identity is based on a temporal axis where people come to recognise themselves as the same as others, hence the imagined community. Sinclair constructs an argument around national development being consistent with the *natural* evolution of New Zealand's national identity. He points out that

initial attempts to forge a New Zealand identity became fused with Britain but that, by the 1920s, ties to the Motherland had waned and a solid and specific national identity had emerged. Prior to the 1920s, an early national identity was forged through New Zealand's separation from Britain. With the emergence of the first Pakeha New Zealanders [the progeny, born on New Zealand soil, of British immigrants] came a focus on developing a specific national identity. A shift from viewing the nation as an extension of Britain to one separated from Britain, Empire and imperialism occurred, despite many settlers remaining strongly attached to their British parents' birth-place. British New Zealand born children referred to Great Britain as 'home' and felt passionate towards the Motherland [Sinclair, 1986, p. 96].

The nation grew out of cultural systems which Sinclair describes as 'premature nationalisms'· This concept refers to New Zealand's first nationally based organisations and infrastructures which reflected a unique New Zealand identity. Among these, the discourses of literature, communication, travel, sport and war contributed significantly to an ability to communicate with members, who lived outside the local community, through an *imagined* identification with others. A sense of unity, patriotism and sameness prevailed between fellow inhabitants despite geographical differences, ensuring the coherence of an homogenised national identity. These discourses formed pre-conditions which helped to establish New Zealand as a nation distinct from other places and territories through defining it in opposition to those *other* nations and peoples who lived outside its borders. Pre-conditions to nationalism worked to define New Zealand citizens and helped to establish a community through a shared sense of belonging.

New Zealand is comprised of two islands [North and South] and is located in the South Pacific Oceanic region, making it geographically distanced from Britain. New Zealand's landscape differed greatly from Britain and enabled a specific 'Kiwi' identity to emerge. Geographical location, climate and the native flora and fauna were associated with establishing a unique New Zealand identity and designated a sense of difference for its inhabitants. Identification with landscape contributed to a sense of belonging and an identification with the land. New Zealand functioned as a colonial outpost and as such required 'breaking in'. The British descendants were a hard working people who took pride in their achievements. They applied a Christian work ethic and were a God fearing, 'no nonsense' population known for their grimness and vigour. This developed the idea of New Zealanders being hardworking and fearless, and a national identity associated with grit and determination in the desire to tame the 'native' landscape. New Zealand's unique geographical experiences helped to demarcate its citizens as having a separate culture from Britain.

Early literature often depicted landscape imagery and captured, recorded and disseminated an imagined sense of commonalty between the disparate population. Sinclair [1986: 7] states that geography moulds identity and is central to a Creole nationalism when he writes, "It is as though we have been imprinted by the images of our land. So, a new land, a new nation becomes differentiated from the parent nation". Sinclair [1986] indicates that with the first descendants of British colonials, New Zealanders looked to a "rural experience for their roots". Individual identity became predicated upon those experiences with the land. He claims that clearing the bush and breaking in the land were occupations of early settlers, instilling in them a sense of identification and belonging to the land. Also, a sense of pride in a New Zealand identity was forged through the recognition of achievements associated with war and sport, images promoted through print capitalism. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century there was a strengthening and extension of both the foundations and the structure of a national identity through increasingly improved communication and travel networks, contributing to the inhabitants imagining themselves as a unified community. Anderson [1991: 6-7] explains this point:

> It [the nation] is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion... The nation is imagined as limited because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations. No nation imagines itself as coterminous with mankind... It is imagined as sovereign because the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm... It is imagined as a community, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship.

Sinclair maintains that New Zealand's national development was akin to some of the pre-conditions that were occurring in older countries in America and Europe. The development of roads, railways, bridges and telegraph technology resulted in improved communication, aiding the process of imagining New Zealand as a unified community and homogenous nation. Improved communication networks broke down the isolation of the settlements and defied distance. This enabled people to think and act nationally. Provincial governments were removed in 1876, encouraging a trend towards nationalism via advanced communication systems that coincided with individuals beginning to think in national terms. This is illustrated by the large numbers of colony-wide, or national, organisations that were established in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, pre-empting a solid and definite nationalism [Sinclair, 1986, p. 64].

Sinclair claims that 'sport' provided the nation with a space to focus on New Zealand as a unified entity. Sport provided pleasure, competition and international achievement. National identity was enhanced by the international fame and publicity incurred through its sporting heroes. By 1905, rugby was recognised as a national game, with local sport involving the whole community. The popularity and support for rugby, socially and politically, highlighted those elements considered important in the making of a national identity: physical prowess, competition and international success. New Zealand's sporting achievements enabled the country to construct itself as a cultural entity distinct from, and separated from, ts closest neighbour, Australia, and from Britain.

War also functioned as a unifying point and, according to Sinclair, was an important arena for forging a specific New Zealand identity. For example, Sinclair [1986: 141] maintains that the Anglo-Boer war built up feelings of solidarity and unity, contributing to a sense of a national sentiment. War also fostered the establishment of a New Zealand tradition of leadership and comradeship. Success was highlighted by a new sense of solidarity in that war provided the inhabitants with an opportunity to work collectively towards a common goal. This commitment enabled New Zealanders to assert themselves as a group distinct from British and Australian troops. Further to this, he claims that Maori men's contribution to the war effort during World War One was a vital element in the development of a cohesive national identity that continued to solidify during the 1920s. He claims that the Maori and Pakeha combined involvement in combat during that war forged an alliance between the citizens of both races and increased a sense of similarity for all New Zealanders. This reduced a sense of *difference* between Maori and Pakeha as they aligned to fight the common enemy. Similarly, Maori and Pakeha women contributed to the establishment of the nation and its national identity through replacing the labour of their husbands, fathers and sons during this period, and to supporting the war effort at 'home'.

Fighting for the purpose of protecting one's country provided a powerful impetus for sacrificing one's life, family, friends and countrymen. Sinclair maintains that it is the 'unmistakable voices' of New Zealand soldiers which are first recorded as representing a homogenous New Zealand identity. The Anglo-Boer war brought pride and achievement and emphasised separateness from Britain. Death invoked pain and pain was binding. Being bound to each other in death resulted in a sense of commonality that was shared with a like minded community back home on Kiwi soil. The war bound the imagination of individuals into a shared collective identity that went beyond tribal identity and affiliation. 'Self' was sacrificed for the common good of the national community. War, and the suffering it incurred, proved to be a central factor in establishing New Zealand as a distinct nation with

its own particular national identity. Renan [1994: 17] in his essay *Qu'est-ce qu-une nation?* emphasises that nations are formed upon a *common suffering* and that this is:

> ... greater than happiness'. In fact national sorrows are more significant than triumphs because they impose obligations and demand a common effort... It supposes a past, it renews itself especially in the present by a tangible deed: the approval, the desire, clearly expressed, to continue the communal life.

Sinclair [1986] maintains that Maori were adept at sacrificing their individuality for the community and proved to be a valuable national asset during the war. He suggests that the nation could only come into unity once Maori had been accepted and absorbed sufficiently into a mainstream cultural identity. World War Two proved to be the final event for securing Maori complicity and assimilation. Thus, Sinclair contends, the New Zealand nation became a unified identity shortly after the First World War. But, in reality, a specific form of nationalism and national identity, embellished in the popular phrase 'we are one people', was formed upon an imagined community based upon an ideology of 'sameness'. Sinclair's ideas on the formation of the New Zealand nation are useful in that they point to the *imagined* national community and the discursive processes that ensured 'difference' was expelled through the development of a national identity embedded within a sense of commonality and community.

Maori Counter Nationalism 1800s - 1960s

In order to demonstrate how Maori became subjugated in Aotearoa during the colonial epoch, and how their cultural specificities became excluded from dominant articulations of New Zealand nationalism and national identity, I now want to introduce a counter narrative of New Zealand history. I do so to highlight how Maori experienced themselves as disenfranchised and excluded in Aotearoa. I introduce a selection of dominant narratives written by Maori experts and/or counter-nationalists [Awatere, 1984; Kelsey, 1984; Orange, 1987; Walker, 1990] to explain the discursive processes of colonisation and colonialism. My aim is to show that the shift to biculturalism was motivated by Maori efforts to redress a long history of grievances against the Crown and, by extension, the New Zealand Government and Pakeha. The following narrative, which draws upon the authors cited above, asserts that the unequal material relationships between the Pakeha majority culture and the Maori minority culture are rooted in the systematic and structural domination of Maori by the Crown.

The 1980s and 1990s witnessed a wave of Maori and Pakeha intellectual writing on New Zealand race relations. Some of these narratives are presented here to provide a background to Maori counter nationalist efforts at decolonisation. For example, Donna Awatere's [1984] controversial text *Maori Sovereignty* critiques Pakeha monoculturalism and argues for Maori sovereignty. Claudia Orange [1987] wrote in depth on the Treaty of Waitangi and Ranginui Walker [1987, 1990] on New Zealand's race relations and the disenfranchised position of Maori. The emergence of texts like *Tauiwi*, *Nga Patai* and *Nga Take* presented an important collection of essays on New Zealand race relations. The publication of *Tauiwi* featured an article by Jane Kelsey [1984], where she writes of the process of colonisation and the disenfranchisement of Maori through an argument of legal imperialism. I begin this section by summarising her narrative.

The Treaty of Waitangi

According to Kelsey [1984: 22], Aotearoa was first sighted by the white traveller, Abel Tasman, in 1642. This discovery was not to be repeated again until Captain James Cook 'rediscovered' New Zealand in 1769. Initial interest in Aotearoa stemmed from traders, whalers and missionaries. To begin with, iwi enjoyed the economic and social exchanges with foreign whalers and traders. The initial meetings between the tangata whenua and the heterogeneous British led to Aotearoa eventually being annexed as a British colony during the mid 1800s. The British Colonial Office had previously displayed disinterest towards annexation due to recent costly attempts at colonisation elsewhere. However, by the 1820s Maori were freely trading and prospering under new conditions which attracted an increase in British immigrants.

Eventually, inter-racial conflicts developed from misunderstandings emerging through contradictory symbolic meanings over land. Subsequently, in 1839 the Colonial Office provided the sanction required to annex Aotearoa. The Treaty of Waitangi [1840] provided the official documentation needed to sanction the contract. Four versions of the covenant circulated Aotearoa although not all chieftains signed. A fifth version, *Te Tiriti*, was translated into Maori which Walker [1990: 90] claims "matched none of them". This contract was the central determinant in the role the Crown would play in the take-over of the vast majority of Maori lands and fisheries. At the same time, the Crown promised to Maori the continued sovereignty Maori held over their kingdoms and dominions. Of the annexation, Kelsey [1984: 23] states:

> The stated goal of all parties was clear - to establish and promote peaceful white settlement in the name of God, the Queen and their own self-interest. Policy toward the Maori people was officially to be that of 'amalgamation' or more crudely, the conversion of the Maoris into brown-skinned pakehas. Unofficially, many were unconcerned about the fate of the Maoris and several were already publicly advocating their eventual extermination.

Kelsey [1984: 27] identifies two motives for Pakeha seeking the Treaty; the first concerned the "promotion of pakeha settlement" while the other concerned the destruction of the self-sufficiency and cultural integrity of the Maori people". Maori also had reasons for supporting the Treaty; they used it to form an alliance with Tauiwi in order to counter the ceaseless arrival of British settlers. Maori could see material benefits and a way of preserving the bastions of rangatiratanga, tribal mana and the preservation of an authority that Maori had possessed prior to colonisation. Claudia Orange [1987] in *The Treaty of Waitangi* provides an in depth account of the events that led to the peace agreement between iwi and Tauiwi. Orange claims that the *Treaty of Waitangi* guaranteed Maori their rights over their lands, fisheries and natural resources. The documents were signed by William Hobson for the Crown and over five hundred tribal representatives. However, through semantic errors in the translation from Maori to English, embodied in two separate documents [one written in Maori titled *Te Tiriti* and the other in English referred to as *the Treaty]* Maori unknowingly conceded their sovereignty and rights of rangatiratanga to the British Crown. Orange [1987: 33] states:

> The treaty was presented in a manner calculated to secure Maori agreement. The transfer of power to the Crown was thus played down. Maori suspicions were lulled by official recognition of Maori independence, by the confirmation of a degree of that independence under British sovereignty, and by the extension of Crown protection and other rights. Maori were told that the Crown needed their agreement in order to establish effective law and order - primarily for controlling Europeans, or Pakeha as they were called. Finally, the benefits to be gained from the treaty were stressed, rather than the restrictions that would inevitably follow.

The semantic errors between the two versions of the *Treaty of Waitangi*, in which the English version contradicted its promises to Maori, enabled the Crown to legitimately take Maori lands and resources. Kelsey [1984: 31] highlights the discourse of 'legal imperialism' and its deployment in the use of the Treaty of Waitangi when she argues that Crown law was used to legitimise the colonisation of Maori while simultaneously promoting it to be synonymous with British justice. She writes:

> This conversion of colonial political power into intrinsically valid, abstract, legal principles is the basis of 'legal imperialism'. It elevated political legislation to the level of

> the divinely-inspired. It freed judges to seek refuge in the role of mere legal technicians applying pre-ordained rules, bearing no responsibility for the outcome of their deliberations. It reified all things British and implicitly denigrated all things Maori. It shrouded itself in an awe-inspiring mystique and symbolism to intimidate its victims. It presented a facade of majesty, justice and mercy sufficient to convince the detached onlooker of its virtue. And it would continue doing so for so long as its critics remained discredited and powerless.

Crown law enabled British imperial and colonial legislation to undermine Maori Treaty rights. Kelsey [1984: 32] makes the point that this Westminster style of governing belonged to the white male propertied elite who enjoyed hegemonic power. They dominated the economy, the financial sector, the media and commercial discourses and were also responsible for making crucial judicial appointments. Parliament was also monopolised by Tauiwi. The dynamics of political power were to become racialised, genderised and hierachised. Democracy left Maori voiceless as institutions swiftly became monocultural. A regime operated whereby the British sought to 'redeem' Maori and bring them into civilisation. In so doing, Kelsey points out that Maori desire to retain tribal authority was inconsistent with the civilising mission. The colony could not successfully establish itself as a nation if Maori were to remain heathen, barbaric, uneducated and uncivilized.

The Treaty of Waitangi enabled the British authorities to initiate the cultural and political reconstruction of New Zealand's inhabitants during the mid 1800s. The heterogeneous indigenous population and the diverse British population were simultaneously reconstructed overnight into two homogenous cultural groups and made subject to Crown Law. The unification of such a diverse population was an essential ingredient in the formation of the nation. The Treaty enabled laws to be sanctioned which quickly saw the dispossession of Maori lands and resources and enabled assimilative and integrative policies to emerge, ensuring the social, economic, familial, physical and spiritual demise of Maori. During this period, iwi struggled to maintain their traditional integrity and lifestyles, resisting the homogenous categorisation placed upon them by the dominant culture.

Raupatu, Assimilationist Policies and the Colonisation of Maori

Emmigration to New Zealand promised land and new opportunities for colonial settlers. However, the colony was not seen as distinct from, but as an annex of, Britain. It was a home away from home, giving British citizens fresh opportunities and providing a solution to the overcrowding and poverty that was plaguing Britain at that time. Unfortunately, these opportunities came at a price to iwi. Central to the British colonisation during the 1800s was the appropriation of tribal

lands by the Crown, British land companies and British settlers. This would alter Maori infrastructures irrevocably. The British arrived in droves and quickly outnumbered Maori thirty to one [Walker, 1990]. The tangata whenua were legally and illegally manipulated out of most of their tribal lands. Eventually, approximately six million acres of tribal lands were confiscated, stolen, or obtained by the Crown and, by extension, the British settlers. With the increasing immigration of British settlers and the population boom that followed, the acquisition of land and its accompanying development became a necessity, forming the bedrock for colonisation and the move towards creating a monocultural nation. The 'land grab' was to have devastating consequences for Maori [Awatere, 1984]. Awatere verifies the spiritual connection iwi had to the land via genealogical ties and the importance of land for Maori cultural identity and way of life.

The Treaty of Waitangi enabled British dominance and control over legislation, making it possible to appropriate tribal lands. Walker [1990] contends that the law operated as a legal protagonist in the land grab, ensured through the deliberate failure of the Crown to honour its Treaty obligations. Kelsey [1984:21] claims that the Treaty legally paved the way for the onslaught of statutes that had been designed to effect a swift and painful appropriation of the majority of Maori lands and resources. She writes that the Treaty consistently failed Maori:

> At every hurdle, the Treaty has fallen. At the very starting point, the Treaty is on precarious foundations, for it is debatable as to whether sovereignty was passed to the English under the Treaty or had already been seized by them. At the level of its interpretation there is the clear belief that those Maoris who signed the Treaty believed it would cement their own sovereignty, not give it away to the English. In the courts, the Treaty has consistently been treated as irrelevant and unenforceable... In every way, the rights of the Maori people guaranteed under the Treaty of Waitangi have been denied.

Opposition to the theft, confiscation and legal [and illegal] manipulation of Maori tribal lands and resources resulted in an inability to continue to act as self determining tribal entities [Walker, 1990]. British unwillingness to concede to Maori their rightful sovereignty over Aotearoa culminated in the New Zealand Land Wars of the 1860s. Despite the exemplary skills of Maori and their clever and tactical prowess as warriors, historians contend that they could not compete with the sheer volume of British, nor the simultaneous destruction of kinship systems through the seizing of tribal lands [Belich, 1986]. Kelsey [1984: 21-2] argues that 'brute force' was seldom used to colonise and subjugate Maori in the ways of the dominant culture when she points out that "[i]n almost every instance [colonisation] has been promoted or retrospectively sanctioned through one of the most subtle tools of colonization - the 'rule of law'".

Loss of land through a failed Treaty altered primary tribal structures and systems based upon kotahitanga. The economic infrastructures of iwi and hapu were dismantled or altered through the semantic differences encoded in the Treaty that concealed the different symbolic meanings associated with land shared by British and Maori. Prior to colonisation, pre-colonial Maori had no concept of individual property rights. To Maori, the whenua is as important for Maori survival in the same way as the placenta is. Hence, both whenua and placenta have the same name. There could be no sustainable tribal identity without a reciprocal relationship between the land and its peoples. Maori show their reciprocity to the land via their sense of responsibility towards Mother Earth's care and protection. This can be seen in their conceptualisation of themselves as kaitiaki of the land. Conversely, the British viewed land in terms of individual titles and ownership and had no concept of it being intrinsic to their sense of identity as a people.

Once Maori became landless, the indigenous cultural structures began to erode. Ranginui Walker [1990: 176] in *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* claims that "[a]wareness of the progressive alienation of land was accompanied by awareness of cultural erosion and loss of identity". Also discriminatory Acts served to subjugate Maori to the requirements of the Crown and by extension the new nation-state. To be without land left Maori vulnerable to assimilation or extinction. The value of land was synonymous with capitalist agendas: progress, development and expansion, and those material things required in the pursuit of a unified nation. By the 1860s the ratio of Maori to Pakeha population had evened out in numbers [Spoonley, 1993]. During this period, iwi resistance against land confiscation resulted in the New Zealand Land Wars. According to Walker [1990] the combination of foreign diseases and the introduction of muskets used in inter tribal warfare during the 1820s, and again during the New Zealand Land Wars, decimated the indigenous population by 40 per cent and saw the near annihilation of Maori, increasing Tauiwi desire for Maori assimilation.

Maori were colonised as part of the Enlightenment agenda. British immigrants conceptualised Maori within the framework offered in modernist notions of Social Darwinism. New Zealand natives were seen as primitive and, as the term 'native' suggests, were aligned with nature. This reduced Maori to a childlike status which ensured that the 'benevolent' Tauiwi rescue them from their 'barbaric and heathen' ways. In addition, Maori men, like Pakeha men, were entitled to vote if they were property owners and Maori and Pakeha women did not receive the vote until 1893. The British believed that assimilating Maori would enhance the Maori race; they believed Maori to be quite high on the evolutionary scale, featuring slightly below the British [Walker, 1990]. Walker [1990: 86] makes reference to the part Judeo Christianity played in the near destruction of an indigenous understanding of

spiritual epistemologies, claiming that "... conversion to Christianity led to further erosion of Maori culture and power". Missionaries negated Maori forms of knowledge based on conceptions of tapu, polygamy, slavery and tohunga. For example, the introduction of the Tohunga Suppression Act [1907] testified to the suppression of indigenous forms of knowledge, depicting an ethnocentric attitude towards Maori ontology and highlighted the desire of the dominant majority to replace Maori knowledge with their own. This Act signalled a move to assimilate and indoctrinate Maori into the ideologies, belief systems and practices of the dominant culture. The monocultural institution of Christianity was matched by the discursive processes of education which were delivered simultaneously by missionaries during the early 1800s.

At first the native language was employed to indoctrinate Maori to British epistemologies. It was important to colonise Maori symbolism and replace it with a new symbolic order. Initially, education was effected through the use of te reo Maori and was followed in 1827 by literature translated and printed in Maori. Later, the use of Maori symbolism was abolished and English was to take its place [Walker 1990: 85]. Schooling provided a crucial element in assimilating Maori to the ontological norms inherent in British ideologies and practices. Maori epistemologies were constantly overlaid with Western ones. Schools became centres of control, ensuring Maori were indoctrinated into British ways of knowing and being. For the nation to present itself as a united body, Maori difference had to be occluded. Schooling provided a forum where the assimilation of Maori could be achieved. In 1905 the Maori language was prohibited from being utilised as a reading medium in schools. Walker [1990: 147] claims that the suppression of the indigenous language was to last for five decades. Monocultural and ethnocentric ideas were permeated through an education system which sought to create a superior nation. According to Awatere [1984] Maori had no way of imagining the systematic destruction of their lifestyle, loss of land, fisheries, language and familial base. Awatere [1984: 13] states that "Maori as a cultural minority was [sic] forced to adopt the British culture of the dominant group" and that the hegemonic attitudes of the white settlers prevented a bicultural society from existing. The Treaty of Waitangi cemented the end of a true Maori sovereignty. Awatere [1982: 14] claims:

> It signals the beginning of the death of the Maori as a proud Polynesian nation. It signals the swift rise to power of white people who would rule first by the gun, then by the police and prisons and then by their education, church and media.

When it appeared that the tribal population was making a come back after being decimated in numbers around the turn of last century, the need to assimilate Maori

became more urgent. Natives became confined to designated cultural spaces and their cultural differences were marginalised as they were encouraged by the Government to assimilate to a universal New Zealand identity. Being assimilated meant that they would not present as a threat to the nation in its quest for a sense of national unity and universal identity. Methods of integration and assimilation through Christianity, education and the law impacted upon Maori negatively; they quickly became the dispossessed and their disenfranchised position left them little choice but to represent their interests in relation to the dominant majority cultural systems and values. Maori men, having the right to register on the general electoral roll from 1853, and the creation of temporary Maori seats in 1867, did little to represent Maori interests and emancipate them from the ramifications of colonisation and colonialist assimilationist policies.

Counter nationalist attempts at political representation could only occur via the possibilities afforded Maori under colonial rule. In short, British setters became the norm against which Maori represented their concerns. Representation could only occur within a fractured relationship with the dominant colonising authorities and their particular cultural identity and status as the hegemonic culture. Maori responded to their exclusion in a variety of ways. For example, chieftain and tribal leaders initiated the Kingitanga, in an attempt to equalise the fraught political relationship with the British Crown. Similarly, the Kotahitanga was formed as a counter hegemonic political party which was aimed at creating a unified Maori voice capable of speaking back to colonialism and mono culturalism. These two movements were early attempts at biculturalism but failed to be heard in any significant way [Walker, 1990].

World War One brought a slump in development and New Zealand struggled economically up until the 1950s. Post World War One, commonly referred to as the 'depression', impacted negatively upon rural and urban sectors affecting Maori and Pakeha alike. However, significant growth after World War Two laid the foundations for changes to New Zealand nationalism. New economic opportunities emerged with a changing global economy, leading New Zealand into an all time high during the 1950s. There was a decreased emphasis on the exportation of the products of New Zealand's primary dairy industry and an increase in urban capitalist development. New jobs encouraged the mass migration of rural Maori into the urban sectors in their search for manual labour and housing. Without land, Maori had little choice except to migrate to the cities during the 1950s to find work, money and pleasure [Walker, 1990: 198]. The 1950s is recognised historically as the 'Golden Years', emphasised by the 'baby boom' and an increased sense of wealth, health and racial harmony for all New Zealand citizens. Newly formed global connections brought economic expansion and opportunity to

New Zealand, underpinning an air of satisfaction enjoyed by the dominant hegemony. New Zealand's national front depicted an harmonious nation, a land of plenty and a nation that boasted racial equality.

However, in reality Maori did not experience economic equality and political satisfaction. Maori exclusion from the material, economic and political development of the nation increased the gap between Maori and Pakeha. The myth of 'no race relations problems' gave way to a sense of disillusionment and the disappointment gave way to anger. John Rangihau [1992: 187] in *Te Ao Hurihuri* summarises the invisibility of Maori within the nation when he comments on the continued sense of racism that prevailed post World War Two:

> ... [W]e came back into a situation which had not changed in any way, where we were still treated as second-class citizens, where we were still not allowed to purchase alcohol and where we had to get Polynesians or Indians to do this for us. Suddenly, there was an annoying thing at the pit of our stomach about having gone away to free this beautiful land and yet still be treated like aliens in our own country.

According to Awatere, cultural imperialism and white nationalism were responsible for racial discrimination against Maori [Awatere, 1984: 14]. The so called racial harmony encoded in the catchcry 'we are all one people' was subsumed beneath policies that subjugated Maori differences and needs beneath those of the ruling Pakeha elite. The ongoing impact of colonialism and mono culturalism became increasingly embedded within the discourses of the nation state and continued to repress Maori socially, economically and politically.

British cultural norms, now firmly encoded within the dominant Pakeha culture, discriminated against Maori and resulted in a reconfiguration of Maori relationships to land that bore a direct correlation to a loss of cultural identity. For example, Awatere points out that an altered concept of time impacted upon Maori identity. For the community oriented Maori, 'the past is the present is the future', which has a bearing on contemporary identity predicated as it is upon links to land, whakapapa and traditional lifestyles. Maori difference became firmly subordinated and subsumed beneath a white monocultural nationalism. Equality and citizenship eluded Maori. This meant that traditional ties to land and family were interfered with, since all spiritual meaning derives from land. Despite the distinguished efforts of the Maori Battalion during World War Two, genuine inclusion/citizenship in the nation remained elusive; Maori difference was still subsumed beneath monocultural nationalism. The British desire to achieve racial harmony through assimilation took its toll on Maori communalism.

By the 1900s Maori became assimilated into the cultural, religious, economic and political ways of the colonialists, and by the 1970s the indigenous population's

economic infrastructures were virtually non existent. Colonialism and its accompanying policies of assimilation and integration ensured that Maori difference was subjugated beneath white monoculturalism. According to Awatere [1984: 14] it was hoped that Maori would "sink into the white potato and no longer exist as a race". Maori had to live by foreign rules embedded within modernist and capitalist structures that oppressed their communal way of life and affected their quality of life and their life chances. For Rangihau [1992: 189], monoculturalism is about the untenable requirement of Maori subjugation to a national order and the ambivalence of being situated within the nation as an exotic icon while simultaneously being positioned as the marginalised native. He writes:

> You see, when Pakeha say we are all one people, they seem to mean that you're brown and a unique feature of the indigenous scene. But they want you to act as European provided you can still retain the ability to poke out your tongue, gestulate to your Maori dances. That is Maori culture.

Iwi managed to maintain a high level of cultural autonomy despite laws and policies infringing on traditional cultural values and practices. Despite every effort to assimilate Maori through a variety of discourses including education, Christianity, health and the various arms of Crown law, iwi were able maintain, to varying degrees, their distinctive tribal differences, customs, and lore. Likewise, the heterogeneous settler population, although unified through the Treaty of Waitangi, also maintained to various degrees their own unique cultural differences. However, many of these differences would eventually meld into a specific 'kiwi' experience of being a New Zealander. The majority of British descendants would no longer be able to claim any connections to lands, families, customs and cultural differences that were directly associated with their foreign forebears. A New Zealand national identity replaced an identity that was enmeshed in Britain. At this time, new national imagery associated 'kiwiness' with rugby, the silver fern, horse racing, consumption of beer, the native kiwi bird and home grown ingenuity. New Zealanders developed a reputation for pride, in their pioneering 'do it yourself' spirit.

Shifting Nationalism: Biculturalism 1970s – 1980s

Maori have always understood and pursued biculturalism [Walker, 1990]. Why then, 150 years after the Treaty, did the New Zealand nation-state introduce a shift to biculturalism that would have as part of its core philosophy the inclusion of Maori within the reconfiguration of nationalism? Further, what did this have to do with the exclusion of bi/multi racial women's difference from dominant articulations

of Maori identity? This question is answered through looking at the social and political climate that precipitated the shift to biculturalism. In this section I provide an overview of the major socio-political events that constituted certain preconditions for biculturalism to emerge. This is followed by a brief overview of the political shift to biculturalism.

According to David Pearson [1996: 249] in *Nga Patai,* "Multiculturalism also often refers more specifically to recent state immigration policies that herald a move away from assimilation towards an acceptance of some recognition of the worth of cultural diversity". During the 1960s, and up until the 1970s, multiculturalism was favoured, with an emphasis on cultural diversity and equal opportunity. However, Maori soon recognised their status as tangata whenua would be jeopardised under such a polity; they feared they would be viewed as just one minority group amongst many without any recognition for their rangatiratanga status. A dilemma ensued. How could Maori gain fair representation and equality under either a monocultural or multicultural nationalism? How could Maori recognise their cultural superiority and positionality as the indigenous peoples? Despite the signing of the Treaty in 1840, the constitutional position of the tangata whenua was undefined [Walker, 1990].

Maori still lacked equality in the nation politically, economically and socially under a multicultural driven nationalism. During this period they were endangered by a changing world economy that negatively impacted upon their socio-economic position. This saw Maori, as a group, situated progressively less favourably within the nation in comparison with Pakeha, as a group. As the nation's economic boundaries were being contested internationally, Maori voiced their dissatisfaction over their position within the nation [Walker, 1990]. Tenuous cultural relations challenged the nation's homogenous 'we are one people' national identity. The 1970s saw the emergence of widely publicised cultural unrest which began to destabilise the cohesion of the nation. National identity had to be reconfigured in a way that could return the stability of the nation. New boundaries had to be created and new exclusions formed. By staking a claim on their unique position as tangata whenua Maori asserted their political authority over Aotearoa and actively pursued a bicultural polity through claims to Maori sovereignty via the resurrection of the Treaty of Waitangi. Maori resistance to mainstream nationalism was achieved through reactivating an indigenous cultural renaissance that mobilised old Maori nationalisms and invented new ones.

Pearson [1996: 261] articulates that the initiatives of educated Maori underpinned the emergence of counter hegemonic nationalisms. He maintains:

> Co-optation is a dangerous game for power holders, for the relatively powerless have a habit of using the very tools used to control them to fashion the means of their own empowerment.

Maori resistance was situated within a changing national and international political climate. Maori moves towards national politicisation were strengthened by their post-war urbanisation, their mass entry into the capitalist economy and their growing status as the nation's underclass. The expansion of the post World War Two economy and subsequent shortage of manual labour encouraged Maori to migrate to the cities. They were seduced by opportunities for work and a contemporary lifestyle, and answered the call for unskilled labour, supported by an increased Pacific Islander population during the 1960s. This migratory group produced the first generation of Maori ethnic intelligentsia. For the first time Maori had the financial means and geographical location to support their children through Teachers' College and University. There was now state funding of higher education which meant there were no University fees and Teachers' College students were paid to train. Consequently, during the 1970s Maori enjoyed a larger middle class base and a growing ethnic intelligentsia within both public and private sectors. According to Pearson, intelligentsia represented standpoints that became polarised around creating a homogenous nation and invoking Maori sovereignty. Melbourne's [1995] analysis in *Maori Sovereignty: The Maori Perspective* suggests that Maori sovereignty is a rhetoric that informs tribal drives. These include the desire to save Maoridom from complete annihilation, to re-validate the Maori race, to provide a basis for the agenda of tino rangatiratanga, to enrich Maori culture, to accommodate tribal authority, to legitimate a space for Maori to be guardians of the land and to assist Maori development. Maori initiatives to politically mobilise around agendas based upon Maori sovereignty were consistent with other counter hegemonic attempts such as the post 1950s international civil rights movements, colonial independence initiatives and indigenous peoples emancipation strategies.

Ranginui Walker's [1987] text *Nga Tau Tohetohe* highlights the neo-Maori activism of the 1970s and 1980s. Among other actions, he cites the student group Nga Tamatoa's high public profile as they engaged in pro-Maori activism campaigns. This was followed by a 'hikoi' from the top of the North Island to Parliament Buildings in 1975. The Bastion Point occupation [1977] protested at the Government subdivision of confiscated tribal lands. This occupation lasted 506 days and ended after six hundred policemen cleared the area of protesters. This was followed by various action groups such as Waitangi Action Committee [WAC], He Taua, Maori People's Liberation Movement of Aotearoa and the

Black women's movements. WAC was responsible for continuing in Tamatoa's footsteps and protested the Waitangi Day celebrations, thus causing a yearly public sensation. The 'Haka Party Incident" led by He Taua also provided a public forum for cultural unrest. A group of Maori youths [He Taua - the raiding party] confronted racist engineering students of Auckland University as they were preparing for an annual mock haka display. The media sensationalised the event, branding the Maori avengers as gang members. Further, the play *Maranga Mai* challenged the myth of racial harmony, bringing about an overt reaction from central government and local bodies. By 1979 the protest was taken up by Labour Party MP Matiu Rata in his publicised resignation which he claimed was due to the disenchantment he felt towards Pakeha politics. He rejected the idea of there being a 'one people, one nation' nationalism. Dissatisfaction over Maori invisibility, and their low socio-economic position, climaxed in the 1970s and provoked national questions over desires embedded in land, identity and belonging. Walker recalls the 1970s as "angry years" whereby both overt and covert counter resistance were employed by Maori in a bid to resist institutionalised racism and to argue for political and economic equality. The 'Spring Bok' South African rugby tour of 1981 and the highly publicised protests of Maori against institutionalised racism were also important factors in determining the future plight of New Zealand race relations. Racial tensions flared and Maori protests at their unequal economic and political status of Maori received high media profile.

Maori initiatives to have historical grievances acknowledged through a polity that recognised indigenous nationalisms, coupled with a changing global economy, were to have political significance over the reconfiguration of New Zealand's national identity. It was within this context that Awatere [1984], well known for her appraisal of the post colonial plight of Maori, published her contentious text *Maori Sovereignty*. A radical activist and feminist in her own right, Awatere shocked the nation with her ideas on New Zealand race relations and Maori positionality. Awatere's [re]invocation of Maori sovereignty within appeals to biculturalism was targeted to challenge the ethnocentrism and mono culturalism deeply embedded within the ideologies, structures and practices of the nation-state. For Awatere, the grievances of the past could not be separated from an alienating white mono culturalism. She argued that the threat to Maori development resided in an altered identity structure stemming from an historical disconnection from land, spirituality and traditional infrastructure. Further to this, she posited that Pakeha epistemological violence was inherent in the way Maori become positioned at the bottom of the social heap. She suggested that Maori were born into a racist economy where they embodied the mark of colonisation.

Awatere [1984: 57] suggested that Maori acted out their colonisation through high unemployment rates, high incidences of suicide, increased crime indices and poor mental and physical health. She sought to redress this underclass positionality through a deliberate reconstruction of Maori as tangata whenua via their ties to tribal lands. By extension, she argued for Maori sovereignty and a shift in nationalism to biculturalism. By invoking Maori sovereignty as a legal right guaranteed Maori through the bicultural document *Te Tiriti,* she legitimated Maori as the primary political partners alongside co-operative Pakeha. Awatere argued for a reconfiguration of nationalism through constructing Maori as the primary and authentic cultural inhabitants, justified through links to land, spirituality and genealogy. Simultaneously, she deconstructed the patriarchal dominance of Pakeha by suggesting that their power base resided in the exploitation of women and land. By extension, she went on to claim Pakeha to be inauthentic and landless, and therefore culture-less.

Awatere was outspoken when she clearly cast Maori and Pakeha into the dichotomous relationship of the 'landowner' and 'landless'. She reversed the cultural binary in favour of Maori through establishing Maori cultural supremacy and rights to the land via her deployment of an essentialist identity politics. In this way, Maori were constructed as having an authentic primordial identity, unchanged since colonisation and colonialism through their association to the land which was accessed through whakapapa links. This type of essentialist rhetoric was commonly invoked by counter hegemonic nationalists in an attempt to reconfigure Maori identity as unified and universal. With these arguments firmly in place, Maori could invoke the Treaty of Waitangi as the nation's founding document and argue for biculturalism and an equal political partnership with the dominant cultural majority.

Identity politics relied upon specific criteria to validate authenticity and win the shift to a bicultural polity. In addition to them being associated with land and whakapapa, Maori were also essentialised via te reo Maori, tikanga, wairuatanga, whanaungatanga and other cultural markers. In response to Awatere's assertion that Pakeha were landless and therefore 'culture-less', the cultural category 'Pakeha' also became scrutinised by New Zealanders. The move to biculturalism ensured that Pakeha were also conceptualised as indigenous through their relationship to their British forebears and the Treaty of Waitangi which also protected their rights. Richard Mulgan [1989: 28] in his text *Maori Pakeha and Democracy* explains:

> Biculturalism is the public recognition of the importance of two cultures, Maori and Pakeha, as central to the life of Aotearoa - New Zealand. It implies special protection for the Maori people as the beleaguered minority whose culture is particularly vulnerable.

> At the same time, it recognizes the status of Pakeha culture as a second indigenous culture and the rights of individual Pakeha to full citizenship rights in their own country. It is because much of the language of biculturalism seems to threaten the rights of Pakeha citizens and the authenticity of their culture that so many Pakeha are opposed to it. The only way for them to protect their own sense of security and national self-esteem seems to be to resist the separate recognition of the Maori people and to take refuge in a 'One New Zealand' view.

The influence of international and national geopolitical human rights issues also informed Maori desire for self determination. Maori wanted their land grievances recognised by the New Zealand Government and sought political avenues to ensure that the Crown not only recognised the losses sustained by Maori but also compensated them by either returning their lands or by financially renumerating iwi for lands confiscated by the Crown during the colonial epoch. The 1980s was an era that emphasised liberal ideas and a move away from previously popular assimilation practices, as Maori mobilised in counter nationalist attempts to seek reparation [Pearson, 1996]. Coupled with the growing racial tension and media sensationalism over Maori activism and New Zealand race relations dating back to the 1970s, further questions concerning citizenship, democracy and liberalism emerged. Mulgan [1989: 9] argues that conversations around equality and democracy were hotly debated as people struggled to come to terms with a definition of biculturalism. He states that "[b]iculturalism is the demand that Maori people should be able to feel equally at home and be equally influential in their own country and its institutions".

For Mulgan, [1989: 122], the heart of biculturalism resides in the principle of democracy where all citizens should be accorded equal human rights. An expectation that Maori and Pakeha should be officially recognised and public institutions should be bicultural emerged. These issues were spurred by neo-liberal economic philosophies which influenced political thinking during the late 1980s. Repercussions arising from Britain entering the European Economic Community influenced some Pakeha to assert that New Zealand should reconfigure its national identity to reflect its Pacific geographical location. The melding of European and Polynesian identities took on heightened significance with the growing discussion around issues pertaining to the Treaty of Waitangi. During this period the Labour Government performed a radical restructuring of the public sector, introducing biculturalism which focused on 'partnership'. Mulgan [1989: 7] insists upon the equal importance of two primary cultures:

> 'Bicultural', meaning literally 'having two cultures', is favoured by those who want to stress the unique position of the Maori. It picks up the concept of partnership between the Maori people and the British Crown entered into in the Treaty of Waitangi. It singles out the Pakeha and the Maori as the two peoples living in New Zealand and draws attention to the need to recognize the equal rights of the Maori alongside the Pakeha.

Mason Durie [1993: 4] in his essay *Maori and the State: Professional and Ethical Implications for a Bicultural Public Service* maintains that the Government made initial attempts to include a bicultural stance within the Public Services following the efforts of the Maori Battalion and the Maori War Effort Organisations' support to mobilise Maori during World War Two. However, these efforts were tokenistic. For example, Durie states that the new Department of Maori Affairs was responsible for liaisons between the Public Service and Maori communities and that this proved to be an effective entry point for Maori in the Public Service. The introduction of Maori staff into the Native Department and the inclusion of some Maori ideals and values were preliminary, but inadequate, moves to include Maori.

In the 1970s bicultural policies were implemented as a partial strategy for "... the state regulation and institutionalisation of ethnic minorities" [Pearson, 1996: 250]. However, initial moves to implement biculturalism were superficial and were used mainly to placate cultural tensions within the nation and to provide a safe and non-threatening environment for Maori to air their grievances. Nonetheless, the development of the Waitangi Tribunal is hailed as being the first bicultural institution in that it tries to accommodate both cultures' points of view and observes a legal procedure while it works within the parameters dictated by the Treaty of Waitangi. The Third Labour Government established the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975. In 1984 the Fourth Labour Government declared claimants could lodge claims back to 1840. The State was unknowingly complicit in opening what Pearson [1996: 262] describes as a " Pandora's box". A metamorphosis took place in which the Tribunal became its own beast and surpassed the Government's hold over the Tribunal's desires and aspirations. These debates impacted not only on the material and symbolic place of the indigenous in this post-settler society but the meaning of sovereignty in New Zealand became a highly publicised and emotive issue. The building of the nation-state took center stage and attempts were, and still are, being made to refocus the nation and state on bicultural lines. In short, the erection of the Waitangi Tribunal was thought of as a positive example of a bicultural institution in that it included both Maori and Pakeha, combining both Maori tikanga and Pakeha law and Maori and settler versions of our history; it also contained both Maori and Pakeha versions of what justice meant to each culture.

Biculturalism 1980s - 1990s

The shift in nationalism saw the emergence of a bicultural partnership between Maori and Pakeha. This occurred after three local events surfaced. Durie [1993:

4-5] claims the first of these refers to the release of the report *Puao-Te-Ata-Tu*, which employed the Treaty of Waitangi as the covenant upon which the New Zealand society and economy rested upon. Invoked to critique institutional racism inherent in the unfair practices and polices towards Maori children, the Department of Social Welfare was attacked for its prejudice and insensitive policies towards Maori. Recommended remedial action suggested a bicultural solution. This report was consistent with the political climate in which the government was attempting to give greater importance to the revived Treaty of Waitangi. Durie claims the report was an embarrassment to the Government and an attempt to restructure the Department of Social Welfare under bicultural lines was initiated. Secondly, a Cabinet minute in 1986 called for a re-examination of the policies and practices of Government departments. It was decided that all future legislation be referred to Cabinet at the policy stages to meet approval under the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. Departments were under an obligation to consult with appropriate Maori consultants on significant aspects which could infringe upon Maori rights under the Treaty. Thirdly, the focus in the publication of *Te-Urupare Rangipu* in 1988 was concerned with departmental responsiveness to Maori needs and traditions, cementing the idea that major changes were required in the public service sector. As a result of these events, the Labour Government performed a radical restructuring of the public sector and introduced biculturalism as official state policy. Hence, by the mid 1980s bicultural initiatives were reflected in a new focus on Maori economics and the development of a bicultural partnership between Maori, iwi and the Crown. Nearly a decade later, Durie [1993: 1] would argue that Maori ability to participate in the nation as full citizens should be extended to the economy and the education system. He demonstrates this point in his model of a 'bicultural continuum' designed to assist the implementation of biculturalism at the level of Public Services. The education system embraced the spirit of the *Treaty of Waitangi,* resulting in the introduction of bicultural policies into school charters. The 1980s and 1990s saw the implementation of practical 'bicultural initiatives' as schools and educators tried to accommodate Maori cultural values and practices. As such, te reo Maori programmes were offered as extra curricula options for students. Bilingual units and total immersion units were also included in existing schools. Kura kaupapa units were also introduced and in some cases entire schools were pedagogically run on a Maori philosophy of education. Taught exclusively in te reo Maori, these programmes were a radical departure from the monocultural education previously available.

Within the context of globalisation the Government restructured its State Owned Enterprises polices and introduced a new policy of devolution. This meant a transfer of responsibilities from government to iwi authorities. According to

Pearson [1996], New Zealand remains oriented to capitalism and British legal traditions while the state understands Maori self-determination as self-management within existing political and judicial structures, not separate statehood. Maori, having built a rapport with central Government, were faced with the task of developing new connections with regional and local authorities, while they simultaneously had to formalise their own tribal structures for social and economic development. Durie argues that, prior to this, Central Government encouraged Maori dependency on the state and became more controlling of Maori interests in order to counter moves for greater political autonomy. Embedded within the concept of devolution was the opportunity for Maori to play a "more positive role for re-organised tribal structures even if there were a risk of reduced support from the state" [Durie, 1993, p.4]. At this point Maori expected to play a more active role in determining their own autonomy and had to relinquish dependency upon the state for tribal and Maori affairs. A move towards iwi capitalism had been generated. Within this 'move', counter nationalists constructed iwi as 'traditional' in order to resurrect the Treaty of Waitangi's promises to Maori. Reparative justice rested upon iwi defining themselves as tangata whenua. As such, iwi [and,by extension, its members] were represented as primordial, essentially unchanged by the processes of colonialism and assimilation.

Essential Strategies

The discursive processes of colonialism and nationalism have been, and continue to be, responsible for determining the production and reproduction of specific Maori and Pakeha cultural identities. The term 'traditional' is used in this thesis as a descriptive term which indicates the strategic re-invocation of an *essentialist* Maori identity promoted by counter nationalists and perpetuated by dominant academic articulations of Maori identity. As such, it suggests that the *essence* of Maori remains the same as it was at the time the *Treaty of Waitangi* was signed. Maori are re-represented as primordial, unchanged by time and the colonial processes of assimilation, which is achieved through associating Maori with their tribal lands. Mohanram [1999: 98] suggests that:

> ... Maori deliberately reconstruct and re-evoke their native identity through their relationship with their land, a relationship dictated by Western settlers. By deliberately mimicking the identity demanded of them by Pakeha, Maori aim to achieve specific political goals.

Since the 1980s, both Maori and Pakeha ethnic and cultural criteria have been employed in the political drive concerning a cultural identity geared towards

biculturalism. In an era where demography reminds us of the steady increase of the Maori population, the notion of biculturalism has certain appeal. However, this appeal is clouded by an understanding of Maori and Pakeha identities as discrete, stable and unified. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, Maori statistics include a large number of inter-racial [Maori/Pakeha/Other] New Zealanders, but the unique social construction of this identity remains unexamined. While bi/multi racial women are statistically categorised with Maori, rather than Pakeha, people who are born to parents/families who reflect more than one cultural identity may embody a psyche and lifestyle which reflects a dual or multiple cultural identity. For this reason there is a problem in thinking in terms of two discrete cultural identities. A concept of identity that is constructed as singular, unified and stable has political and social implications for bi/multi racial Maori women's identity and representation.

A new theoretical approach is required to reconceptualise Maori women's identity in a way that deconstructs the immutable nature of Maori and Pakeha identities, while simultaneously speaking to the experience of her own unique history and mixed racial ancestry. Essentialist narratives conceal the duality of a Maori Pakeha racial and cultural subjectivity. An examination of post colonial Maori women's subjectivity needs to include a reading of race and the individual life experiences of women who claim a dual/multiple racial and cultural identity. Conceptions of Maori identity located solely in cultural constructions are problematic in that they ignore other variables that inform subjectivity. For example, the complexities of race and gender remain untheorised within New Zealand identity politics in favour of economic determinist arguments based upon liberal notions of equality. I return to this point in the next chapter.

Conclusion

On the basis of my engagement with dominant articulations of New Zealand nationalism and counter historical narratives, I summarised the formation of the New Zealand nation utilising Sinclair's [1986] influential ideas. This enabled me to show how the nation was formed upon a notion of 'sameness'. I indicated that certain historical processes acted as preconditions which led to the idea of a homogeneous national community. The formation of the nation, I argued, was intimately tied to the development of a monocultural nationalism resting upon a dishonoured Treaty and the subsequent loss of the majority of Maori lands. An examination of colonialism, the formation of nationalism and the emergence of a specific national identity highlighted how British monocultural nationalism functioned as the dominant culture which determined the nations included and

excluded citizens. As such, Maori were literally turned into a disenfranchised people overnight. Over the following decades the dishonouring of the Treaty of Waitangi ensured that the British and their descendants would come to dominate in number and power.

I disrupted Sinclair's [1986] dominant narrative of the 'imagined' New Zealand community by introducing various counter nationalists' narratives to provide an alternative reading of New Zealand history. These 'collective' narratives reflected the disenfranchised position of Maori to allow me to show how counter nationalist dissatisfaction prompted the Maori renaissance during the 1970s, leading to the shift from nationalism to biculturalism. Influential Maori spokespeople like Awatere [1980] and Walker [1987, 1990] suggested that the discursive practices of colonialism and monoculturalism resulted in Maori becoming subjugated to the political, economic, religious and cultural social structures of the dominant majority. The subjugation of Maori, their cultural differences and their lore were essential to the formation of the nation and the social, economic and political superiority and dominance of Pakeha. By deploying the popular narratives of Maori counter nationalists, I showed how the need for national unity required the subjugation of iwi cultural differences which were regulated and controlled through the discursive practices and policies of assimilation and integration.

Post World War Two brought positive economic changes for the nation and saw the mass migration of rural Maori into urban sectors in search of manual labour. But the shift to the nuclear family and city lifestyles altered Maori systems and infrastructures. When New Zealand was hit by global market changes, Maori quickly became unemployed and this further affected their already tenuous position within the nation. Colonialism continued to impact on the social, spiritual, material, political and economic infrastructures traditionally held by Maori. To be without land and to be indoctrinated into an assimilated national order is suggestive of Maori being robbed of their cultural identity.

I highlighted that the 1970s saw a new form of political Maori activism emerging with a middle class Maori elite. Activists challenged the 'one big happy family' narrative operating within national rhetoric. Counter nationalists reinvoked the concept of Maori sovereignty via their efforts to resurrect the *Treaty of Waitangi.* Following charges that monoculturalism was embedded within the nation state's policies and practices, a shift to a bicultural polity was implemented during the 1980s. However, Maori sovereignty has only partially been achieved with this initiative. Contained within biculturalism are cultural representations of Maori identity which are based upon images of authenticity and traditionalism. The promotion of a quintessential Maori identity invokes particular essences that are primarily associated with Maori lands, te reo Maori and indigenous cultural

values and practices. Essentialist narratives were strategically used in counter hegemonic arguments, which repositioned iwi along a temporal axis through invoking historic connections to landscape and whakapapa. Within arguments for biculturalism, both Pakeha and Maori identities are reflected as unified and discrete categories that exist in binary opposition to each other. Maori deliberately constructed themselves in terms that Pakeha would expect of them, and embrace.

The exclusion of bi/multi racial women within mainstream representations of national identity, can be traced to the historical development and maintenance of the New Zealand nation and its adaptation to global and economic changes. A quintessential Maori identity advanced within appeals to biculturalism, excludes the life experiences of women who identify as having both Maori and Pakeha/Other racial and cultural genealogies. Essentialist narratives deny women of bi/multi racial Maori ancestry access to fair visibility within the nation and within dominant academic representations of Maori identity. I suggest that the bi/multi racial woman is the repudiated body against which the bicultural nation forms its newly reconfigured identity. In the following chapter, I engage a post modern and post colonial analysis of the subjugation of bi/multi racial women within appeals to Maori nationalism. My desire is to show how bi/multi racial Maori women's unique cultural specificities are occluded within a reconfiguration of a new Maori and Pakeha patriarchal alliance.

Chapter Three

The Colour of Amnesia: Repudiating Difference 1970s-2000s

> The humiliation and depression continues unabated as in this century, the words of Te Kooti's wairua, "Apopo te iwi Maori kei roto i te moana" ring true. Soon the Maori people will be pushed into the sea by the foreign invaders... *All* immigrants to this country are guests of the tangata whenua, rude visitors who have by force and corruption imposed the visitor's rules upon the Maori. It matters not what generation born New Zealanders they are. Every white is an intruder who remains only by dint of force. *This country is Maori land* [Awatere, 1984, pp. 34-5].

Nearly twenty years into biculturalism, the establishment of a stable national identity continues to be an issue for the continued partnership between Maori and Pakeha and their ongoing positive cultural and ethnic relations. Social scientists indicate that cultural relations are influenced by New Zealand's political climate and continue to be shaped by what Pearson [1996: 263] terms the 'power dynamics' between the legacy of British settlers, their descendants and tangata whenua. Yet biculturalism is still hailed as the most viable solution in resolving cultural issues arising from discrimination embedded within colonial ideologies and practices. The bicultural partnership between Maori and Pakeha continues to provide counter nationalists with a structural tool to gain an economic foothold within the nation [Sharp, 1991]. In addition, biculturalism functions to reduce the racial tensions in the nation by forming a Maori and Pakeha political alliance thus benefiting the nation in general. Problems over who becomes included and excluded within narratives of essentialist oriented articulations of Maori identity are problematised by the reproduction of the bicultural nation and its culturally pure citizens. Given the recent shift in nationalism towards a bicultural nationalism and national identity, how is Maori identity being produced and reproduced today? Do oppositional politics fail to be useful when the essentialist criteria used to represent Maori women fail to be inclusive of *all* Maori women and does this contribute to the creation of new subalterns [Spivak, 1988a].

This chapter aims to examine the discursive processes of colonialism more closely by identifying and questioning what underpins bi/multi racial women's exclusion from dominant representations of Maori women's identity. How are their diverse cultural specificities subjugated beneath articulations of a traditional Maori subjectivity and what supports this? What does race have to do with this? In order to answer these questions it is useful to examine the counter nationalist strategies that led to the shift to biculturalism. For example, I question the use of an essentialist identity as a viable

strategy to emancipate Maori bi/multi racial women. My objective is to examine how biculturalism works to occlude them from being represented within dominant articulations of Maori identity.

This chapter is divided into four sections. The first section 'New Zealand Identity Politics 1970s-2000s' looks at what underpinned Maori nationalist efforts to engage a bicultural politics. I show how the logic of 'equality' produces representations of nationalism and national identity that are supported by a logic of 'the same', resulting in the creation of new exclusions. The second section 'Inclusions - Exclusion: Liberal Justice' looks at some of the issues associated with New Zealand identity politics. In particular, I examine what underpins and constitutes *Maori* exclusion within the nation. The third section 'Race Under Representation: Occluded Bodies' looks at Lloyd's [1991] ideas to highlight the part race/colour plays in the subjugation of Maori difference. In the fourth section 'Traditional Maori Women's Subjectivity' I examine [using Chatterjee's [1989, 1993] ideas on women and nationalism] how the construction of a Maori counter nationalism made the shift to biculturalism possible. Within this, I look at the way in which Maori women are constructed as the traditional cornerstone of Maoridom.

New Zealand Identity Politics 1970s –2000s

In this section my aim is to show how counter nationalist articulations of Maori subjectivity are located within arguments based upon their economic disadvantage in relation to Pakeha. Counter nationalist attempts at emancipation have rested on the desire for Maori sovereignty and have been underpinned by a traditional Maori identity. The shift to biculturalism can partly be attributed to the efforts of Maori nationalists to strategically construct themselves in a new way, in order to accommodate the economic/material demands placed upon them by colonialism [Mohanram, 1999]. Attempts at creating a unified Maori community were supported by an oppositional politics concerned with equalising the material relationships between Maori and Pakeha. The deployment of an essentialist driven identity politics re-invokes the cultural dichotomies Maori and Pakeha and within this move creates a slip where those who straddle both Maori and Pakeha racial and cultural genealogies become occluded. How do counter nationalist attempts at including Maori more fully within the nation incur a slippage that fails to represent those subjects who do not fit within the 'traditional' cultural specificities prescribed within bicultural rhetoric? In the following section, I look at the theories that informed challenges to mono cultural nationalism in New Zealand and eventuated in a shift to biculturalism. My intention is to highlight how advocates of anti colonial nationalism deployed an identity politics to

assert Maori difference in relation to Pakeha, thereby providing a space to argue for Maori Sovereignty.

Anti Colonial Mobilisation: Identity Politics

Anna Yeatman's [1995] essay *Interlocking Oppressions*, in *Transitions: New Australian Feminisms,* enables me to formulate a paradigmatic example of a 'Maori' counter nationalist discourse which led to the shift in nationalism to biculturalism and the construction of Maori as a unified cultural group. Coinciding with the shift to biculturalism came a shift in the nation's political direction that saw a move away from the liberal left, with its investment in democracy and equal opportunity, to right wing libertarianism and its competitive market focused agendas. Initiatives to accommodate Maori within this changing terrain relied upon a structural politics that worked to place Maori in a competitive market oriented environment alongside Pakeha. Contained within this rhetoric is an ideal of democracy, complete with its focus on justice and an individual's right to compete equally alongside other citizens. Central to libertarian philosophies is the idea that a 'level playing field' will somehow eradicate racism from deep within the national body.

In order to understand a politics of identity it is necessary to foreground its genealogical origins. Yeatman claims that oppression only exists when a universalistic and egalitarian conception of a social order is operative and where the dominant subject [for example, Pakeha] positions itself as the instantiation of the universalistic ideal of a particular type of egalitarian social order. She makes reference to the importance of John Locke's treatise, written during the 17th century, whereby he indicates that the dominant rational subject who led civilisation was also the head of their own private household. Central to arguments that appeal to conceptions of equality is the ability to reason. A modern conception of *equality* rests on the ability of human subjects to exercise reason. Locke's *Second Treatise Of Government* [1980: 346, para. 54] on modern equality and freedom highlights those elements which underpin the human universal:

> To understand Political Power right, and derive it from its Original, we must consider what State all Men are naturally in, and that is, *a State of perfect Freedom* to order their Actions and dispose of their Possessions, and Persons, as they think fit, within the bounds of the Law of Nature, without asking leave, or depending upon the Will of any other Man.
>
> A State also of Equality, wherein all the Power and Jurisdiction is reciprocal, no one having more than another: there being nothing more evident, than that Creatures of the same species and ranks promiscuously born to all the same advantages of Nature, and the use of the same faculties, should also be equal one amongst another without Subordination or Subjection, unless the Lord and Master of them all, should by any manifest Declaration of his Will set one above another, and confer on him by an evident and clear appointment an undoubted Right to Dominion and Sovereignty.

Yeatman [1995: 47] claims this passage indicates that the core truth of these values lies in the inclusiveness of the human condition "... Creatures of the same species... born to all the advantages of nature, and the use of the same faculties...[are] all elements which underpin notions of rationality, reason and freedom". However, she states that 'reason' is not innate in the way Locke stresses and proposes that the ability to reason is suggestive of 'social' rather than 'natural' processes. Notions of 'equality' underpin who gets to be included and excluded within notions of citizenship, democracy and social advantage. For example, within the colonising epoch, tangata whenua were interpellated as less equal to Pakeha, but they were thought of as being capable of gaining the 'capacity to reason' and of becoming, like Pakeha, 'fully human' [Walker, 1990]. Rationality was measured, in terms of Maori status, as 'uneducated', determined through their collective ownership of property [Yeatman, 1995]. Having property in common meant Maori subjects were represented as under developed. It was thought that Maori had not achieved a high level of individualisation which would naturally manifest itself with the conversion of common property into private property. Laws were enforced which constructed iwi as incapable of land improvements through their own individual labour efforts. Individual labouring efforts were required if subjects were to attain a high level of production and wealth. Prosperity, then, was rationalised as the end product and reward of *rationality*. Yeatman maintains that to be interpellated as *potentially*, but not *fully,* human held a contradictory status. Admission to the rights of the rational human being was made only if the subject could overthrow their lesser development.

In an attempt to demonstrate that they were capable of rationality and corporate development, Maori nationalists invoked a politicised ideology for themselves. However, this ideology could only be upheld by a strong foundation of an identity that was located in a quintessential articulation of Maoriness. Maori nationalists' efforts [embraced in their iwi collectivity] saw the construction of a pan Maori national identity which assumed those 'particular' features recognised and accepted by the colonial authority . Gibbins and Youngman [1996: 21] in their article *The Nature of Ideologies* in *Mindscapes* state:

> Ideologies provide us with frameworks for thinking about the political world, a vocabulary for political debate and a means for evaluating leaders, parties, groups and ideas. At times, they may go further by providing a significant part of our personal identity. Ideologies offer costumes to wear as we present ourselves to the world... In short, ideologies shape more than what we believe; they also shape how we see ourselves, and how we position ourselves within the social world.

Gibbins and Youngman offer two related definitions of ideology. The first, conceptualised by Terence Ball and Richard Dagger in *Political Ideologies and the*

Democratic Ideal, claims that "[a]n ideology is a fairly coherent and comprehensive set of ideas that explains and evaluates social conditions, helps people understand their place in society and provides a program for social and political action." The second, by Kenneth Minogue [1985: 37-38] in *Alien Power,* states that "[i]deology is a form of social analysis which discovers that human beings are the victims of an oppressive system, and that the business of life is liberation. This view may be held at any level of sophistication from densely academic treatises to graffiti... ".

Through deploying a politically charged Maori ethnicity, Maori reconstructed themselves as corporate entities and re-positioned iwi in developmental terms. Hence, the 1970s and 1980s renaissance witnessed the establishment of Maori cultural *differences* grounded in tribal/collective connections to land, language, genealogy, spirituality and traditionalism; at the same time they promoted iwi as universal 'developing' subjects. In this way, New Zealand cultural politics were informed by a desire to economically re-evaluate Maori subjects in relation to Pakeha, thus informing a modern enunciation of freedom and equality. Modern democratic discourse calls into being the contestatory subjects whose struggles are directed against the exclusions of their discourse in the name of equality. People under colonial rule expose those social barriers that are unfair. In reference to Maori, Yeatman [1995: 49] states that this is the significance of the Waitangi Tribunal, which hears Maori tribal claims to lands expropriated by the Crown. She contends that the modern property order is being reconstituted so as to recognise the validity of collective-tribal rather than individualising ownership. She also states that counter hegemonic "struggles against exclusion have to assume features which take up and respond to the specificity of their exclusion...". In other words, Maori have to show that the *collectivism* of their culture does not prevent them from being effective commercial entrepreneurs.

Texts like *Maori Sovereignty* [Awatere, 1984] *and Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* [Walker, 1990] highlight the emergence of a Maori based nationalism and identify the emergence of a new oppression based politics. Contained within narratives of Maori identity is a subjectivity that has its roots in the ideologies embedded within political transformations and counter nationalist adaptations to economic and social changes. Gibbins and Youngman [1996: 1] point out that ideology plays an important role in the production of political and personal identities. They maintain that individual subjectivities shift in accordance with the shifting ideologies that accompany oppression based politics. They state:

> It is not surprising, then, that "ideology" is one of the truly big words in the social sciences. It brings into play a multitude of conventional "isims" - communism, conservatism, fascism, liberalism, and socialism, to name but a few - along with a growing number of emergent "isms", including environmentalism, feminism and populism.

However, equality driven politics are problematic in that it assumes that racism is located in unequal relations of power placed solely within the uneven distribution of material resources. It fails to explore how and why raced subjects become placed, to begin with, in certain geographical, social and cultural landscapes, and contexts.

Oppression based politics works from an assumption that a normative position exists which Maori can aspire to. Within this structure, 'Pakeha' functions as 'normal' in an economy of advantage and disadvantage. This is problematic in that this structure operates through an economy of 'the same' where Maori are subject to Pakeha normality. The problem with this approach concerns the way that Maori inevitably are positioned and represented, yet again, through their subordinate relationship to Pakeha in the same way that their difference was subsumed beneath monocultural nationalism and its overarching assimilating agendas. Maori can only come into representation within articulations of equality [contained within notions of citizenship and democracy] as long as they are the *same* as Pakeha. Pakeha culture becomes the norm upon which Maori regulate and control themselves and their emancipatory attempts. Consequently, there are problems with a politics founded upon equality/sameness.

Equal opportunity approaches are often adopted as a result of oppositional politics which, while they may reduce some old forms of discrimination, are also capable of instigating new subjugations [Yeatman, 1995]. For Yeatman [1995: 46] oppositional values are located within an "... historically specific economy of inclusions and exclusions. These necessarily contradict the inclusive metaphysic of equality, and in so doing provide the basis on which those who are constituted as excluded subjects may proceed to contest their exclusion." Moves to mobilise politically under the banner of oppression first require that Maori be recognised as a 'formal universal', or an homogeneous category, complete with specific cultural values. However, Yeatman contends that the very terms of this value oriented 'inclusion' politics worked to exclude those who fell outside the cultural markers that designate its parameters. She [1995: 45] claims:

> If is impossible to instantiate formal universals in ways which are all-inclusive - if, that is, their specification must produce new forms of exclusion - these exclusions are then contested in the name of the formal, empty and metaphysical category of equality...

On the basis of Yeatman's comments, it can be argued that the equality driven initiatives implicit in bicultural initiatives of reparative justice do not reflect equal representation, or an inclusive Maori sovereignty. These attempts offer little opportunity for Maori to define their subjectivity outside the prescriptive cultural binary entrapment. Biculturalism, implemented as an 'equal opportunity' initiative to redress Maori disadvantage, fails because the logic contained within its own identity

insists upon a repetition of Pakeha dominance. Because Maori are discursively positioned by such as race, gender, sexuality, class, age, geographical position, there is an opportunity for multiple ideological inscriptions to contribute to the formation of multiple identities because the subject is oppressed on a number of different levels. Gibbins and Youngman [1996: 14] state that "[i]deological orientations do not intersect neatly like lines on a graph; they overlap and jostle about in the same attitudinal space." Gibbins and Youngman [1996: 21] cite William Bloom's work [1990: pp. 25-6] where he states, "Insomuch as every identification is made with an external social actor, identification is... a social act as much as a private psychological one"... They add:

> Therefore, our personal identities can be seen, at least in part, as ideological constructs...To the degree that ideological elements are used, we can ask ourselves how much they contribute to the construction of multilayered personal identities. To what extent and under what circumstances do people use ideological costumes to present an identity to the external world? One individual, for example, might weave together various, and not necessarily logically compatible, elements of environmentalism, nationalism and liberalism... Another individual might slip on the cloak of feminism when talking to co-workers and then shift to an emphasis on nationalism while travelling abroad.

Political and personal identities become enmeshed in each other. To this extent, a definition of Maori identity during the 2000s will reflect the current ideological beliefs and practices embedded within counter nationalist attempts to gain an economic and political foothold in New Zealand.

Representation and the Place of Essentialism

As stated earlier, one of the problems associated with equality inspired initiatives is that, in the process of representing Maori via their economic disadvantage, they become locked into a social category attached to an identity that is immutable, fixed and innate. Given that counter nationalists [academics, political activists, politicians, kaumatua] represent the interest of Maori as a social group/underclass, Pierre Bourdieu's [1984] ideas on human spatial hierarchy are useful here. Traditional Marxist analyses indicate that the origins of social positionality are defined by the social position occupied by the individual within the nation. As such, a reconfigured concept of Maori identity has been the bi-product of a counter nationalist initiative, which has constructed Maori as 'traditional' on the basis of differentiation and Othering. This is clear in counter nationalist oppositional politics where there has been an insistence that Maori are different from Pakeha; Maori wear the mark of the 'other' as evidenced in their colonised/disadvantaged social position as the nation's under class. Following counter nationalist initiatives to decolonise Maori [based on their

disadvantage as a social group] New Zealand academics have also conceptualised and theorised Maori difference in essentialist terms. According to Bourdieu, social positions correlate to structured spaces that presuppose hierarchies, spaces/positions which can only be occupied one at a time. For example, an individual cannot occupy/be located in two different places at once. In this way, Maori identity is linked to a disadvantaged class status while Pakeha become the free floating agents of the middle class. Concealed within this binary are those Maori who occupy a middle class status and those Pakeha who occupy a working class/underclass status.

In New Zealand, counter nationalist struggles for equality echo the sentiments of Marxist analysis where all Maori are categorised as colonized peoples and are theorised as belonging to one impoverished class in relation to Pakeha. For example, Andrew Sharp [1991: 5], in *Justice and the Maori* states:

> [Maori] urbanization since the 1950s and the increasingly strained economy of the country since the mid 1970s have left the Maori considerably worse off than the Pakeha on most uncontroversial counts of social well-being. They have suffered from what the sociologists call relative deprivation.

Bourdieu points to the difficulties inherent within Marxist conceptions of class analysis. He points out that a difference exists between a *class* that is mobilised to fight oppression and a *class* that is practised in reality. The conflation of theoretical class and actual class contests an oppositional politics. The *class* promoted within oppositional Maori politics is an imagined one, based upon an imagined community in which all Maori are unified into an impoverished group. A disjuncture between the two positions creates problems for accurate analysis and raises issues over fair representation. There are problems with theorising Maori as an actual class based upon their economic impoverishment in relation to Pakeha. In reality, the diverse economic, social, political and cultural heterogeneity of Maori testifies to the levels of difference and the refusal to act as a unified and coherent social group under the category specified within class based agendas. To be succinct, a class analysis breaks down in the bicultural nation when some Maori subjects [individuals who have cultural capital or those who are in a position to reap the benefits of the former] are being privileged, while others are being relegated to the economic periphery.

According to Bourdieu the distinction between the *theoretical* construction of class and the practice of *real* class is concealed by those intellectual subjects [subjects with cultural capital] who, by the nature of their privileged social position, get to represent the members of the underclass. He maintains that the problem with intellectuals is that their cultural capital positions them in particular ways to give them a degree of power to re/produce social groups. He cautions that these subjects are situated on the lowest rung of the social hierarchy, aligning them with those who are associated as not having

cultural capital - the powerless. As well, Bourdieu states that the intellectual/experts representatives [for the powerless] actually upholds the interests of the dominant group because they have an invested interest in maintaining the status quo. Intellectual experts consciously assume to represent the disenfranchised, but a slippage occurs when they unconsciously end up contributing to the reproduction of the represented social group.

On the basis of Bourdieu's ideas, it can be argued that New Zealand counter nationalists assume the role of speaking on behalf of its members, those unable to represent themselves. However, in this move to represent the community interests, information becomes re-presented through the speaking subject and their respective subjective experiences informing their world view. This view does not always correlate with the interests of the community or its individual subjects. Not all Maori subjects are victims of economic and material disadvantage. Not all Maori subscribe to one racial and cultural genealogy and their trajectories, which does not always represent adequately the power dynamics that work to subordinate some members of the group in particular ways. Bourdieu indicates that a shift occurs within the space of representing and re-presenting. In their dominant position to name reality, classify people and fulfil the requirements of the law that governs their authority to represent others, those with cultural capital perceive themselves as rational, untouched by power, objective and set apart from the structures of domination that exist through their ability to voice concerns on behalf of the community. Bourdieu maintains that intellectuals are unaware of their contribution to reproducing hegemonic knowledge and power relations. They regard their position as transparent and fail to recognise that the very conditions of their ability to speak are implicated within the power relations of those discourses that permit them to speak in the first place. Of concern, is the way those with cultural capital have the power/authority to designate what constitutes a legitimate Maori subjectivity and then somehow 'freeze' that particular identity in time.

The intellectual subject occupies the place of authority, justice and reason, and from this privileged position articulates what constitutes an authentic Maori subject. This has serious repercussions, occluding those Maori who do not comply with the essentialist criteria that authenticate common sense understandings of what it means to be Maori. There are instant consequences for subjects being able to identify as Maori and underscores a sense of *belonging* to a Maori community. For those subjects who do not share in the representative's sense/experience of being Maori, their inability to *imagine* themselves as Maori and feel part of a unified Maori community will be tempered by their heterogeneous experiences and understanding of what Maori means for them. Their own unique subjectivity as a descendant of Maori will be in excess of that offered within notions of a traditional identity. Essentialist representations could

even contribute to a sense of un-Maoriness and of not belonging to the Maori community. Essentialist representations of Maori identity do not operate out of thin air. In the following section, I show how they are informed by liberal democratic notions of citizenship, democracy and freedom, all elements specified in the bicultural initiative to redress Maori disadvantage.

Inclusions –Exclusions: Liberal Justice

At this point I enlarge upon the idea that essentialist representations of Maori subjectivity, which underscore biculturalism, contribute to new inclusions and exclusions within Maoridom. It is my assertion that biculturalism breaks down when it fails to deliver its promise of equality to *every* Maori subject, because the essentialist criteria it deploys in its 'naming' do not extend to all. The cultural signifier *Maori* conceals that a homogeneous subjectivity is an imagined one and that the collective anti colonial national identity is also a fictitious community. A particular form of Maori ethnicity promoted within Maori nationalist narratives is represented in the form of a unified 'traditional' entity. Essentialist criteria function as Maori/iwi cultural capital within the Maori national community and designates what qualities function to authenticate Maori. A problem exists in that the unique cultural specificities of bi/multi racial women are excluded from essentialist representations of Maori ethnicity. Metaphorically speaking, the notion of an homogeneous Maori community breaks down when women of Maori and Pakeha/Other ancestry call into question the universal nature of a traditional Maori ethnicity. If only *parts* of the whole become sanctioned to reap the economic and material rewards offered under biculturalism, its *other* parts are subsequently abandoned to the peripheries. Under these terms, biculturalism fails to eliminate racism and at some levels perpetuates it by subsuming Maori identity within the dominant national identity. Spivak [1988] in *Can The Subaltern Speak?* points out that essentialist strategies are useful in political mobilisation of disparate communities because they bring a certain unity and cohesiveness to the decolonising mission. She also points out, however, that mobilising around essentialist strategies is only useful for a certain period of time. Identity politics becomes problematic when it creates new exclusions. In order to show how attempts at justice based on notions of essentialism fail to emancipate all Maori subjects, I turn to the Waipareira Trust's initiatives to seek reparative justice.

Te Whanau O Waipareira was incorporated as a Charitable Trust in 1984 and has grown into its present configuration through the disparate efforts, since 1955, of many urban based Maori groups. It was established to accommodate the specific needs of Auckland's diasporic people [*Te Whanau*, 2001]. Chief Executive Officer from 1990-1999 John Tamahere points out that, in 1956, 76 per cent of Maori lived in rural areas

but that, by the mid 1970s, 78 per cent lived in urban sectors. Without their traditional structures, disciplines and mores, the fabric of the once cohesive whanau began to erode. Social conditions mixed with their displacement resulted in a difficult transition for Maori. In response to Maori needs, Tamahere [2001:11] states, "Te Whanau O Waipareira evolved to defend the right of Maori in a new environment, to shape a new destiny and to conquer a never-ending frontier of what it is to be Maori in urban Auckland, New Zealand". He attributes Waipareira's success in being Maori to the richness and diversity of the different tribal groups within it. In short, Waipareira is a pan tribal organisation that has many different social functions [health, welfare, education and justice facilities] which pivot around its hub, the Hoani Waititi [urban] Marae. The Waipareira Trust's responsibility is to manage the corporate affairs of the iwi. In 1989, the Runanga a Iwi Act was passed which focused on setting up a treaty for tribal Maori but "[i]n effect it was the disenfranchised versus those who were lucky enough to be franchised" [*Te Whanau*, 2001, 50]. In 1998 the Waipareira Trust won Rangatiratanga status from the Waitangi Tribunal and was recognised as an iwi in its own right alongside rural iwi. Previously, in 1994, the Trust met with difficulties when its efforts to share in a Fisheries Settlement were rebuffed by the Crown. The Waipareira Trust challenged the Government, through the auspices of the Waitangi Tribunal, to recognise Te Whanau O Waipareira as an urban-based iwi with the same rights as rural iwi. In 1995, the Waipareira Trust again challenged the Government, along with the Maori Fisheries Commission, at the High Court and failed. However, the Waipareira Trust, later successfully won a landmark Court of Appeal decision in 1996 that meant they could share in the Fisheries Settlement. A difficulty arose because the Treaty of Waitangi had been contracted with 'traditional' iwi and not a reconfigured post colonial 'iwi'. Aligning on cultural differences, via a pan-tribal Maori identity, resulted in some difficulties when the urban iwi wanted to access resources set aside for rural iwi. This was despite the fact that many of its members had lost connection to tribal roots that no longer sustained them economically, emotionally, culturally, socially, or spiritually [*Te Whanau,* 2001].

I introduced the Waipareira Trust example in order to highlight New Zealand cultural politics at work. Yeatman [1995] reminds us that the shift to biculturalism promised to liberate those subjects previously disadvantaged. Maori positionality as the underprivileged was finally recognised as worthy of specialised attention. Within a liberal framework, this notion of 'specialised attention' was underpinned by Maori inability and lack of agency to access their own resources and establish an economic base. The Waitangi Tribunal, informed by a liberal desire to reposition Maori favourably within the mainstream and Maori nation, situates Maori disadvantage in a structural domination reflected in an inability to perform adequately in the market economy. The Tribunal reflects liberal notions of citizenship whereby attempts at

justice are seen in the removal of structural barriers which will ensure a move towards economic independence and parity between Maori and Pakeha. However, within this logic, Maori will be able to access the same means of advantage experienced by the dominant culture. The Tribunal functions to support the fundamental ideals embedded within bicultural nationalism by unconsciously reproducing the structures of domination it seeks to overcome. Within the Tribunal's ability to designate [and privilege] those who belong to a 'traditional' community, they inadvertently create new exclusions/subalterns.

Essentialist notions of Maori subjectivity function within liberal discourse to exclude those subjects that fall outside its parameters. I suggest here that seeking Maori sovereignty via links to essentialism ceases to be a useful option for Maori oppositional theorists and practitioners. Given that biculturalism is built upon the notion that there are two distinct cultural identities that posit Maori and Pakeha into a dichotomous relationship, it is clear that biculturalism is inadequate to represent and accommodate those subjects whose subjectivities are in excess of those prescribed within essentialist representations of cultural authenticity. In short, the move towards a liberal market oriented society actually undermines the goals of tangata whenua and their desire to gain equality for *every* member of the Maori community. Iwi corporations are now faced with 'decolonising' Maori through market oriented competition for resources. This strategy is intimately connected with the production of an essentialist identity which by its nature excludes those who do not have the necessary cultural capital required to compete.

The tribal versus iwi example clearly shows the intersections between biculturalism's interest in maintaining discrete cultural groups, the economic development of iwi communities and the construction of an essentialist traditional/tribal identity. This narrative provides an example of how these discourses intersect at a national level to form the newly included and excluded subjects within the configuration of an accepted national Maori identity. However, the possession of essentialist/cultural capital is not only limited to national endeavours but also operates within smaller communities. For example, there is a growing trend among iwi to register its members. The desire to access tribal resources by way of gaining a scholarship or grant for the individual subject or their community requires the individual to formally register. However, eligibility rests on the subject possessing enough cultural capital to 'pass' as a member of the community. Knowledge of whakapapa and the validation of this by kaumatua is the key to acceptance and belonging. Kaumatua are respected elders whose knowledge is sanctioned by the community and may not necessarily possess the cultural capital belonging to the dominant nation state. They are recognised as representing the interests of the community. The kaumatua subject epitomises the acquisition of cultural capital within

the Maori community; they function as the 'native' in all its antiquity and play an important role in re-presenting Maori subjects and their interests within decolonising initiatives.

As I suggested earlier, the collective corporation of iwi, through their counter nationalist attempts at decolonisation, is more concerned with situating Maori competitively in today's market. This rhetoric suggests that successful competition will see Maori placed more effectively in the market, meaning that Maori will enjoy greater economic parity with Pakeha once they mobilise/develop their own economic base and generate their own wealth. As the urban versus iwi argument shows, this rhetoric works through the deployment of initiatives such as a fiscal envelope and subsequent Treaty settlements, where it is argued Maori will be elevated to a status of rational individuals via their iwi's corporate status. Once achieved, this rhetoric suggests that the successful conclusion of Maori initiatives to develop their own tribal infrastructures will contribute to the nation's production and wealth. The outcome of this achievement will be evidenced in the advanced social and material positionality of its subjects. Not only will Maori subjects enjoy equal citizenship to Pakeha, but racism will finally be eradicated.

In the 2000s, Maori emancipation continues to reside in initiatives to position Maori competitively alongside Pakeha within the liberal market place. The concern with these initiatives resides in the fact that they are built upon liberal assumptions of justice. Oppositional initiatives are underpinned by a politics of identity that requires that Maori difference is invoked with reference to the Pakeha subject. Attaining citizenship under these terms is reliant on the individual Maori subject's ability to compete alongside Pakeha, to be as productive as Pakeha, to come into sameness with Pakeha [Yeatman, 1995]. Within this logic, Maori can only ever be represented through the discourses implemented and sanctioned by the dominant culture. To summarise, Maori can only ever represent themselves via dominant articulations of Maori identity reliant on an essentialist articulation of subjectivity. Within this move Maori become re-inscribed within a binary relationship with Pakeha. Further, the deployment of a traditional identity excludes those Maori who fall outside the identity specificities promoted within biculturalism. Maori will continue to function as the *other* as long as the pure cultural categories 'Pakeha' and 'Maori' are reproduced unproblematically. Within this binary relationship Pakeha functions as the dominant signifier. As long as Maori representation continues to be predicated upon the terms specified under a bicultural contract that continues to privilege Pakeha, Maori identity will only make sense in relation to Pakeha identity. The authentic Maori subject is only represented as Maori as long as they are permitted within the bicultural arrangement that privileges Pakeha dominance. Counter nationalist representations are forced to invoke those criteria made permissible by Pakeha criteria which serve to incarcerate

Maori within an essentialist definition of subjectivity that necessarily excludes those who fall outside its specifications. This leads to the following question. Why do some Maori fall outside the requirements of a traditional subjectivity at the same point in which other Maori come into representation?

Under bicultural nationalism, the trajectory of libertarian logic finds counter nationalists faced with a dilemma. They can elect to represent Maori subjectivity as authentic and ensure that some members reap the material benefits that this representation brings, or they can refuse to conform to an assimilated version of Maori subjectivity and therefore fail to be represented. The excluded will naturally suffer the consequences of this refusal economically, socially and politically; their deviance from the authorised subject position will ensure that they continue to be positioned as the disadvantaged, irrational and abnormal subject. Failure and success under these terms are solely attributed to the ability of Maori to compete equally in the nation. Biculturalism conceals how an identity politics, indebted to liberal democratic ideals of individualism, contributes to the continued subjugation of Maori. The refusal to take on an essentialist subjectivity and come into representation results in the excluded subject's inability to participate fully in the national move to equality.

Race Under Representation: Occluded Bodies

Why is it that racial difference fails to be accommodated within representations of Maori identity? Exactly how do counter nationalist initiatives unconsciously contribute to the formation of new inclusions and exclusions, and what part does the subjugation of racial difference play in the creation of the nation's newest subalterns? In summary, I suggested earlier that counter hegemonic representations of Maori identity invariably inscribe Maori subjects with an essentialist identity underpinned by liberal democratic notions of equality. In order for Maori to come into representation, they must represent themselves in relation to Pakeha, the dominant cultural group. Invariably, it is this requirement to assimilate to the norms embedded within a liberal notion of democracy that contributes to the occlusion of corporeal *race/difference*. Hence, the social construction of race and its erasure within biculturalism. In this section I argue that despite the shift to biculturalism, Maori difference/race continues to be subsumed beneath a dominant monocultural/white identity that excludes racial difference.

David Lloyd's [1991] post colonial text *Race Under Representation* explains why race/corporeal difference is excluded from achieving representation. Lloyd suggests that the unequal social positioning of the raced subject finds its roots in eighteenth century European theories on human development and social evolution underpinned by a sense of individual progress. His ideas are consistent with Yeatman's [1995]

understanding of the rational subject and their ability to access rationality, liberty and freedom and thus developing the capacity to reason. Similarly, Lloyd argues that successful progress was ensured by the subject's ability to be rational and this had consequences for citizenship. Certain 'criteria', that became the norm, functioned to qualify some subjects with the highest ideals and standards embedded within notions of citizenship. Dominant/successful subjects became associated with superior development. The rational subject and their normative cultural standards functioned as the benchmarks which informed other less developed subjects' desire to also develop normatively. For Lloyd, the designated 'criteria' that qualified rationality, resided in the way *cultural aesthetics* functioned to determine dominant culture. Rooted in notions of individualism, the subject's entry into rationality and disembodiment prefigured their ability to judge that which they considered to be aesthetically desirable. The rational European subject literally defined what qualified as acceptable culture and what did not. Lloyd maintains that the individual became recognised as the universal subject and was associated with *whiteness*. Whiteness functioned as a signifier of high culture and epitomised the ultimate in cultural development. Conversely *black* signified as less developed. Defining *desire* became the property of the white subject/high culture. Desiring that which was deemed desirable became the occupation of the *black* subject/ lower cultures. In this way, he points to the unmarking of white subjects and marking of black subjects. The white subject becomes the universal subject or the subject without 'properties'. As such, they are inscribed with freedom from embodiment and become associated with rationality and the ability to judge/reason.

Colonisation and colonialism provided a space where the aesthetically developed/universal subject met the racialised/undeveloped subject. Given that the developed/rational subject represented rationality and progress, assimilation into the dominant culture became at once a *necessary* and *desirable* requirement. Lloyd [1991: 72-3] points to the metaphorical nature inherent within assimilation that requires the subordination of one element to the other:

> The constitution of any metaphor involves the bringing together of two elements into identity in such a manner that their differences are suppressed. Just so, the process of assimilation, whether in bringing two distinct but equivalent elements into identity or in absorbing a lower into higher element as by metastasis, requires that which defines the difference between the elements to remain over as residue. Hence although it is possible to conceive formally of an equable process of assimilation in which the original elements are entirely equivalent, the product of assimilation will always necessarily be in an hierarchical relation to the residual, whether this be defined as, variously, the primitive, the local or the merely contingent.

Lloyd observes that racialised difference is occluded in the rendering of an assimilated identity. Here, those elements held in common remain to signify the primary

assimilated identity while those elements that contest this compatibility become the excluded. The assimilated identity speaks of a shared commonality/sameness with the dominant elements in the metaphorical equation. However, a new identity is formed from its newly repudiated bodies. It is that which remains in excess of the dominant element, contained within the assimilative metaphor.

His text is useful because he contributes to an understanding of the colonial situation in New Zealand and the subjugation of Maori difference contained within the assimilating narrative of the national monocultural community. The British, and their Pakeha off-spring, were synonymous with development, individualism and rationality. Pakeha functioned as the' subject without properties' through their association with an emergent middle class. The *universal* status of the 'unmarked' colonial settler was associated with whiteness. As Yeatman [1995] reminded us earlier, Maori were associated with collectivism, and shared property, and were therefore considered less developed in contrast to the British. Their particularistic status as other became conflated with racial difference, marking them as the subject with 'properties'. In essence, difference became the property of Maori while lack of difference became the property of Pakeha. It was this difference which became excluded in the assimilating agendas of nationalism and rose to challenge mono culturalism during the 1970s.

Real Maori and E-raced Subjects

Lloyd's [1991] analysis can be applied to the colonial situation to describe how Maori difference/race came to be erased in the race to national identity. Within the desire for nationalism and its accompanying objectives to assimilate Maori, the settler colonial subject functioned as the subject without properties and dominated the metaphoric quest to find cultural salience in the discourses of assimilation. Assimilation was achieved only when Maori conceded their difference to that identity prescribed within colonial discourse. Maori difference was forfeited in their efforts to gain legal representation through that identity prescribed within colonialism. However, this residue exists to disrupt the unity of the assimilated identity. Counter hegemonic claims of racism reflect the uneasy disavowal of that which stands outside the homogenous universal subject's sense of an autonomous rational being. In this, 'race' functions as the residual difference capable of contesting the unified sense of identity inherent within biculturalism. However, as the earlier parts of this chapter described, representation can only be gleaned through notions of sameness offered through the sanctioned subjectivity that is legitimised within and by bicultural law. Within a desire to enunciate that which is different, from the logic of representation that requires Maori to come into subjectivity only via those laws which sanction/privilege identities that are referenced to the universal subject, Maori become split. The Maori subject's

racial residue does not permit their full entry into an assimilated identity. Attempts to represent the Maori subject with a precolonial identity fails to accommodate the contamination of Westernisation within their subjective experience. The Maori subject can only gain representation through the liberal discourses offered which are underpinned by a universal sense of whiteness. It is from this point that counter nationalists contest racisms. Maori can never completely come into representation because their difference marks them and is always subordinated to representations that are based upon universal notion of identity legitimated within national identity and entry into citizenship. In this way, Maori can never achieve equality because they are always in a perpetual state of development. Biculturalism subsumes Maori within its metaphor of homogeneity, where represented Maori come into subjectivity within the metaphor of bicultural identity. Thus represented through assimilative norms embedded within biculturalism, Maori strive to compete alongside Pakeha. This assimilative effort requires new subalterns to function as difference in order to demarcate the nation's boundaries and secure the sense of a unified white rational national identity. Difference is relegated to the nation's peripheries and includes all those subjects who are excluded from representation.

Meanwhile, full representation of Maori is not satisfied under the dominant culture's metaphorical requirement of a reconstituted nationalism. In summary, Lloyd points to the subjugation of race through assimilating moves to privilege whiteness over that which functions as difference [non-white/race]. The result of this lies in the ambivalent positionality of Maori subjectivity. In order to come into representation Maori are required to assimilate the dominant cultural requirements of the universal subject that functions as Pakeha in the post colonial terrain. Within this assimilating move, race/difference must be subjugated to effect a 'sameness' that exists in the culturally dominant element contained within the assimilative metaphor. However, Maori difference, although excluded, continues to exist in those subjects who fall outside bicultural representation. The newly excluded subject becomes judged within the nation's ability to define its new identity, one that continues to produce whiteness. Those who carry the mark of race become identified as partial citizens and are excluded from belonging *fully* to a national identity. Race precludes entry into the privileged space of mobility, rationality, reason, aesthetic judgement and universal membership in notions of a *unified* imagined community. Race functions as the residue that limits Maori from coming into representation as f*ull citizens* within the bicultural national community. Only those subjects who successfully subordinate their indigenous cultural difference and take on an authentic [traditional] subjectivity gain partial representation within the bicultural nation.

Lloyd suggests that the presence of whiteness is a central interlocutor in the ability of the unmarked [e/raced] subject to achieve representation. By extension, the

corporeally raced [marked] subject is unable to achieve full representation and come into identity/whiteness because their racial signification/difference cannot be assimilated/absorbed into whiteness/identity. Given this, in this section I assert that the bi/multi racial woman is situated ambivalently in the nation because her racial corporeality may not necessarily correspond to the singular ethnic categories reserved for white and brown bodies in the New Zealand nation. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to address these assertions in depth, but they are discussed further in Chapter Seven where I look at bi/multi racial women's corporeal experiences of multiple subjectivity.

Lloyd's ideas on the subjugation of cultural difference, which he claims are tied to the subjugation of racial difference within articulations of white/mono cultural national identity, are useful in a discussion on the exclusion of the female bi/multi racial subject. He [1991: 86] states:

> Just as it is impossible for the colonised individual to escape the social neurosis of colonialism by passing over into identity or "whiteness", so it is impossible for the racialised individual to enter the domain of representation except as that subject which negates difference.

To come into representation as New Zealand citizens, bi/multi racial Maori women must forgo their specific cultural differences and join the *imagined* national community based upon the authority of the normative unmarked/white/Pakeha subject. As I have already pointed out, an imagined *Maori* national community emerged strongly during the 1980s and formed the other half of the bicultural national dualism. Hence the Maori national community theoretically parallels the white mono cultural national community, thus creating the bicultural binary. Within this arrangement Maori are positioned with *two* imagined national communities. Firstly, they belong to an *imagined* New Zealand national community and secondly they belong to an *imagined* Maori community. The bi/multi racial woman is situated ambivalently in the bicultural nation because her dual/multiple racial and cultural difference/s position her within *both* communities as Maori and as Pakeha. However, a paradox exists in that her racial signification may not correspond neatly to the imagined cultural communities that she belongs to and identifies culturally with.

On the one hand, the corporeal *brown* bi/multi racial woman cannot assimilate *fully* into the imagined national community because her racial signification prevents her from being identified as white/Pakeha. As Lloyd states, assimilation is never complete for racialised individuals as the mark of racial difference prevents these subjects from assimilating into 'identity' or 'whiteness'. Further, it is the presence of the *conscious* and *unconscious* expression of bi/multi racial Maori women's cultural difference that permits the act of racism when the normative white/Pakeha/Other subject is

confronted with her difference. The event of racism signals when bi/multi racial woman's Maori cultural difference fails to be assimilated within the white national community. On the other hand, the brown bi/multi racial woman may not fit neatly into a Maori national community either because her Other [white/Pakeha, Irish, English, Scottish, American, Canadian, German, Swiss, French...] and/or her [black/brown, Asian, Indian, African, Pacific Island...] corporeality and ethnicity may intrude upon her ability to identify ethnically as solely Maori and thereby be represented [albeit partially] as Maori. The paradox continues. For the corporeal white bi/multi racial woman, her white corporeality means she *can* assimilate *corporeally* into the dominant culture thereby coming into representation as Pakeha/white [unlike her brown Maori bi/multi racial sister who is excluded on the basis of her brownness]. However, her Maori *cultural specificities* will mean that she is positioned ambivalently, because her Maori cultural difference functions as a racial residue which contradicts her white/Pakeha subjectivity. Further, she is situated ambivalently in the Maori national community because her *whiteness* marks her as Pakeha/white/Other and her Pakeha/Other cultural difference is occluded within appeals to a homogeneous traditional Maori subjectivity.

In short, bi/multi racial women carry the residue of Maori cultural difference that may [or may not be] located in her racial corporeality depending on whether she signifies corporeally as either brown or white. If the bi/multi racial woman has brown skin her racial corporeality will metaphorically signify her in New Zealand as Maori, and conversely, if she has white skin her de/raced corporeality will metaphorically signify her as Pakeha, ignoring the overlaps and contradictions *between* these two cultural subjectivities. The bi/multi racial woman's *Maori* cultural differences are subjugated within academic representations of a universal national subject regardless of whether she signifies as corporeally brown or white. In other words, her dual/multiple cultural differences are occluded in the narrative of either a Maori or Pakeha cultural ethnicity. Simply put, there is no space/place for her in either world. Her excess identity is subjugated in favour of culturally constructed authentic ethnic Maori and Pakeha citizens.

However, a third space permits the emergence of an excess cultural identity referred to as hybridity. Hybridity exists in the in-between spaces between the colonised and colonial culture. Bhabha [1994] argues that the third space holds the possibility of emancipation for the colonised subject in that this liminal space can provide room for the hybrid to act outside the Law/colonial authority to effect their own emancipation by turning the colonial gaze back to the coloniser. In this space, it is possible for bi/multi racial Maori women to perform their excess difference in ways that are unrecognised by the Law or which operate outside the specificities of the Law. When the Law/authority functions as 'bicultural nationalist politics', the bi/multi

racial woman usurps the bicultural imperative for pure Maori and Pakeha subjects. The bi/multi racial woman *is* the excess that exceeds the colonial relationship. It is time to examine her dual/multiple racial and cultural identity within mainstream New Zealand oppositional politics.

Traditional Maori Women's Subjectivity

There have been some advances for Maori women since the shift to biculturalism. For example, Maori girls and women are improving in the education sector and made the highest gains in 1990 in tertiary enrolments in proportion to the rest of the population. In 1999, Maori women were more likely to be enrolled in tertiary education than any other group [*Ministry of Women's Affairs*, 2001]. However these victories are diminished by statistics that indicate high numbers of Maori women continue to be clustered among the largest group of this nation's fringe dwellers. For example, in the executive summary in *Maori Women: Mapping Inequalities & Pointing Ways Forward* the Ministry of Women's Affairs [2001: 3] it states that during the 1990s Maori women had the highest unemployment rate of all groups in New Zealand; as well, their participation rates and employment rates had been lower than Maori men's over the past 15 years despite a slight increase in participation. Young Maori women's fertility rate is over four times higher and young Maori women are more likely to die from suicide or self-inflicted injury than young non-Maori women. Also, adult mortality rates through lung cancer, heart disease and cervical cancer are 'considerably higher' for Maori women [*Ministry of Women's Affairs*, 2001, 4]. Maori women are more likely to live in rental accommodation rather than a self owned dwelling or to have temporary housing or over crowded accommodation. Further, Maori women are over represented as victims of domestic violence and often suffer repeated attacks of violence. Consequently, Maori women are 'heavy users of women's refuge services' [*Maori Women's Affairs*, 2001, 6]. It is little wonder, as the above report indicates, that Maori women make up over 60 per cent of the total number of women sentenced and imprisoned in Aotearoa. What these statistics point to is the way in which Maori women are represented as a homogenous cultural group whose individual disparities are rooted in social and economic inequalities.

In this section I look at the way race and gender work in tandem to privilege the masculine Maori subject and repudiate the feminine Maori subject within narratives of Maori cultural homogeneity. As mentioned earlier, 'inauthentic' Maori subjects are excluded from coming into representation. What are the terms of this representation and what do counter nationalist struggles have to do with the repudiation of gender difference within articulations of authentic Maori subjectivity? The point has just been made that racism operates insidiously in the bicultural nation to position people who

wear the marks of race in particular ways. Hence, the subject with properties [Maori] is prone to negative social positioning informed through their difference to the subject without properties [Pakeha]. These racial differences are concealed beneath a newly resurrected rhetoric of 'we are one people'. As already stated, what this reconfiguration of national identity points to is the way in which bicultural identity is underpinned by the subjugation of Maori racial difference. Where is the place of gender difference in the perpetuation of an authentic Maori subjectivity? In this section my aim is to show that the occlusion of racial difference extends to gender. The intersection between race, gender and the requirement of an assimilated identity has consequences for Maori women's subjectivity and positionality.

Traditional Maori cultural structures have historically accorded women and men equal mana and status within the tribe. Since colonisation and colonialism these cultural structures have been either tampered with, or replaced by new values and structures that are contaminated with Western gender asymmetry. Contemporary intelligentsia increasingly makes decisions on behalf of women and children without the consensus of the whole community. This alerts me to the recent formation of new patriarchal alliances through hegemonic relationships between Maori and Pakeha, creating a new masculine elite. I assert here that women are unlikely to be positioned with the necessary cultural capital to represent the community because unequal gender relation limits access to the qualifications required to represent the interests of Maori. The shift in global and economic climates over the past thirty years signals changing gender relations within Maoridom. Within the shift to a market oriented nationalism, Maori men enter the market place and take up their masculine positions in a shared space with Pakeha men. Within biculturalism's assimilative requirement, Maori males forge new cultural alliances with Pakeha, and in so doing become temporarily associated with rationality and whiteness. Assimilative efforts reward masculine subjects. Any representation made on behalf of the community is advantaged through this new found assimilated subjectivity and positionality.

Masculine subjects can only represent the interests of the Maori community and engage in local and global modes of material production, economic development and political evolution if their cultural difference and rise to the symbolic position *as the subject without properties* does not threaten the idea of an imagined Maori community. At a fundamental level, the shift to biculturalism required the presence of a native subject against which the universal subject could juxtapose their status as the subject without properties. The masculine Maori subject's ability to move between these two subject positions [that of the subject with properties and that of the subject without properties] is contingent upon the construction and reproduction of a Maori community and its authentic subjects. I argue here that it is Maori women's racial and

gendered difference that underscores a traditional Maori subjectivity and supports the notion of a homogenous Maori community.

Material Versus Spiritual Identities

I draw upon Partha Chatterjee's [1989] essay *The Nationalist Resolution of the Women's Question* to suggest that Maori counter narratives of nationalism, a changing economic climate and compounding social and political factors have influenced the reconfiguration of nationalism, serving to re-invent the cultural domination inherent in mainstream nationalism. Within this, I argue that a rearticulation of Maori as traditional has consequences for the way in which bi/multi racial women are excluded from articulations of Maori women's identity. Also, Chatterjee's [1993] text, *The Nation And Its Fragments* is useful in helping me highlight how counter nationalisms are built upon notions of difference. Chatterjee's study of post colonial Indian nationalism challenges the idea that *all* nationalisms are built upon notions of cultural sameness and the repudiation of cultural difference. He claims that anti colonial nationalisms are refigured along the lines of difference that lie in direct opposition to Anderson's [1991] assertion that nations are formed through sameness [discussed in Chapter Two]. He maintains that the model of nationalism Anderson proposes resides in print capitalism and the creation of an *imagined* community. Difference in these terms is imagined through a sense of expulsion of difference and thus confirming a demarcating of borders in order to achieve a sense of national identity. Difference is externalised, whereas, in an indigenous construction of identity in Chatterjee's model it is proposed that identity is derived from the difference that emanates from *within* the national community. Chatterjee's [1989] essay provides an examination of Indian nationalist struggles and the shifting roles of women within indigenous efforts to emancipate themselves from British colonial rule. He claims that the Indian/Eastern desire for independence from the West permanently reconfigured Indian culture. Contact with the West, he argues, availed Indian subjects of new opportunities to advance and compete materially in the world, but it also came at the cost of an altered sense of identity and a new patriarchal society. Indian subjects became contaminated with Western values that infiltrated traditional Indian culture through contact in the marketplace. Contamination led to loss of traditional identity and instilled in subjects the desire to return to a traditional past in search of a national identity. The development of a separate and unified nation required the construction of an identity that could stand firmly in opposition to Western nationalism and national identity.

Chatterjee relates a distinction between the West and the East. Nations that developed in the colonial West, he states, are built upon notions of cultural sameness/homogeneity. Post colonial nationalisms are derived through their cultural

difference from the West. This notion of difference becomes imbued with a desire to return to an 'innate' identity. Articulations of Indian traditionalism, and the need for an Indian nationalism that reflects their innate cultural qualities as Indians, are disseminated by educated middle class subjects. Their efforts contribute to the development of a sense of separateness from the West, thereby usurping the need for sameness required in Western formations. These subjects straddle precarious ground as they negotiate the terms of difference between the West and East. Situated in the middle space affords them the privilege of producing and articulating a critique of colonial nationalism; positioned in this way, they are located as double agents. Their objective is to dismantle the West's authority over the East, while simultaneously constructing new forms of nationalism and national identity.

Furthermore, Chatterjee [1993] argues that fundamental to post colonial attempts at gaining independence from the West is the development of an indigenous sovereignty. This requires a new sense of cultural identity to emerge in opposition to that colonial identity from which the newly emergent post colonial nation is trying to disengage itself. In his earlier work he argues that post colonial nations employ a material versus spiritual dichotomy in an attempt to inscribe the post colonial nation with difference. Chatterjee [1989: 239] states:

> The material/spiritual dichotomy, to which the terms 'world' and 'home' corresponded, had acquired... a very special significance in the nationalist mind. The world was where the European power had challenged the non-European peoples, and by virtue of its superior material culture, had subjugated them. But it had failed to colonize the inner essential identity of the East which lay in its distinctive, and superior, culture. That is where the East was undominated, sovereign, master of its own fate. For a colonized people, the world was a distressing constraint forced upon it by the fact of its material weakness. It was a place of oppression and daily humiliation, a place where the norms of the colonizer had perforce to be accepted.

The material/spiritual dichotomy requires that the world is split into two hemispheres, that of the material world [West] and that of the spiritual world [East]. In this way, the post colonial national identity becomes imbued with timelessness and a tradition of spiritual superiority over the West. He points out that this material/spiritual split is gender determined. In short, Indian men construct the indigenous [material oriented] nation while Indian women reflect Indian identity and Indian nationalism as homogenous, unchanging and uncontaminated with Westernism. The juxtaposition of these qualities gives the post colonial nation a platform on which to argue their difference and authority, and advances their claim to a separate national identity. The terrain in-between these two spaces is managed by those subjects with a vested interest in the development of the post colonial nation, namely the middle class elite. Chatterjee [1993] asserts that post colonial nationalisms emerge through the post colonial subject's cultural difference with the West and are not subsumed beneath the

latter's homogeneous and assimilating agendas. 'Home' is preserved as a traditional reserve by women, enabling Indian men to forge political and economic contact with the West/material realm. In this way the Indian nation is protected, preserved and strengthened by its inner core spiritual/traditional/home [Chatterjee, 1989].

Chatterjee suggests that a reconfiguration of nationalism reconstructs ethnic and gender identities to re-create a new middle class elite and gender hierarchies. The ambivalence of mediating the post colonial nation is contained through privileging traditional aspects of indigenous culture and through the subordination of difference. He claims that resistance movements contain within them new politics of nationalism that exalt the history and traditions of the indigenous population while perpetuating the hierarchical gendered domination of the colonial ruling elite. For example, Bengal women maintained the spiritual purity of the Indian nation while Bengal men negotiated with Western civilisation. It was the women's role to take up a traditional subjectivity and in so doing give authenticity to anti colonial claims to a separate and superior spiritual identity. According to Chatterjee [1989, 248] Bengal women had the responsibility to compensate for the changes their Bengal men had to make in order to successfully negotiate with the West/materialism. He claims that "[t]he need to adjust to the new conditions outside the home had forced upon men a whole series of changes in their dress, food habits, religious observances and social relations." Chatterjee [1989: 248] contends:

> Each of these capitulations now had to be compensated by an assertion of spiritual purity on the part of women. They must not eat, drink or smoke in the same way as men; they must continue the observance of religious rituals which men were finding difficult to carry out; they must observe the cohesiveness of family life and the solidarity to the kin which men could not now devote much attention.

I further argue that a similar move operates with Maori nationalism where the Maori woman is constructed as the 'cornerstone' of Maoridom and is associated with traditionalism/spirituality. When Maori men traverse the post colonial space of the local and global economic markets, they are entitled to give up their sense of difference to come into representation as the rational subject. The shift in nationalism relies upon the unchanged role of Maori women and that within this they achieve little emancipation. Mohanram [1999: 107-8] states:

> The implications of the production of such a binary of outer and inner are obvious and superimposed on the construction of gender as well. The man participates in the profanity of the outer whereas the woman represents the inner, functioning as caretaker and guardian of the traditional and the indigenous. Though the woman may participate in the outer world, she is reinscribed within a new form of patriarchy, different to the patriarchy of indigenous tradition in that it is inflected with colonialism as well as nationalism.

I argue here that the bicultural 'partnership' brought with it the emergence of a construction of gender specificity for Maori men and women. Maori men get to participate in the corporate world of heterogenous iwi negotiating in the material economy alongside Pakeha/Other men while Maori women are relegated to the space of the traditional emphasised in their spiritual capacity to uphold the purity of the homogenous Maori nation. This new patriarchal alliance has implications for a universal representation of Maori women. Yeatman's [1995] ideas support Chatterjee's assertion that post colonial national identities are built upon traditional cultural differences with dominant cultures. But, at the same time post colonial nations are required to compete effectively in the global economy. This then becomes the occupation of Chatterjee's [1993] middle class elite and New Zealand's counter nationalist intelligentsia. They are required to occupy the uncomfortable oppositional cultural spaces of the middle ground in pursuit of economic development, while simultaneously they are obliged to reinvent the idea of a homogenous Maori community.

Maori women are represented as the cornerstones of Maoridom and are seen to reproduce the much needed authentic Maori community. In his metaphorical alliance with the Pakeha masculine subject the Maori male epitomises rationality, and disembodiment. Within this alliance, his difference has to be subjugated by the assimilative and normative agendas embedded within bicultural national identity. Under bicultural nationalism, the promotion of a genuine Maori authenticity sets up hierarchies within Maoridom and between men and women. The nation becomes reconfigured through a new gender axis that has repercussions for new inclusions and exclusions. As Maori men enter the economic sphere and shift subject positions to occupy e/raced spaces alongside Pakeha men, Maori women continue to repeat the traditional and function as the raced body/difference. Maori women come to bear the mark of difference and function to fulfil the needs of the counter nationalist desire to construct itself within the terms specified by the authority of the dominant nation. Maori woman can only come into representation via this subject position. It is the only sanctioned identity available to her within a national identity that seeks to reinvent itself through the Other. To depart from a traditional Maori subjectivity is to be in excess of that which can be absorbed. This raises issues for accurate representation of Maori women's subjectivity.

Biculturalism is the nation's attempt at being non racist, yet contained within its politics of difference is the clue to Maori women's inability to achieve adequate representation. Remembering that nationalism is invested with whiteness and that race/difference is subjugated by a requirement for non whiteness, what are the repercussions for those Maori women who fall outside a traditional identity? How is their difference recognised? How is their racial residue regulated and controlled

within a national identity that desires whiteness? Race becomes the residue of an excluded identity – it is the conclusion of assimilation. In order for raced subjects to come into an assimilated subjectivity and receive the privileges of the universal subject, they must forgo their difference. According to Lloyd's [1991] narrative, Maori women who contest the ideal bicultural subject will carry the mark of race/difference and will never fully achieve the status of the universal subject. This means that an identity that stands in opposition to that posited traditional subjectivity articulated within biculturalism can never come into representation. Assimilation leaves an excess, a difference that is in a hierarchical relationship with the dominant discourse of sameness. Yeatman [1995] points out that a politics of difference, inherent in bicultural nationalism, continually sets up new contestations and counter representations. In short, there will always be the newly excluded.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has been concerned with the way in which a traditional Maori subjectivity is promoted within biculturalism while Others remain subjugated. I argue that the shift to biculturalism, despite it being represented as a coequal partnership between Maori and Pakeha that offers some socio-economic opportunities for Maori, is a disguised move to recolonise Maori through a prescribed prerequisite for Maori subjectivity. This prerequisite is founded upon an identity politics that operates through the promotion of an essentialised subjectivity that gets narrated within anti colonial representations of a universal Maori subjectivity. New exclusions are formed. Essentially then, this chapter foregrounds the repudiation of multiple subjectivities that differ from those authentic constructions of Maori subjectivity promoted within nationalism.

The repudiation of this difference interests me and pre-empted the questions central to this chapter. How is Maori subjectivity socially constructed within a unified bicultural national identity and what are the premises upon which some subjects are included while other subjects become excluded? The answers were found in Lloyd's assertion that race/difference is repudiated and displaced onto those subjects who fall outside an assimilated identity. This raises new questions for discussion that will be covered in subsequent chapters. What does a non traditional Maori ethnicity look like and how do women who position themselves as Maori and Pakeha/Other recognise their cultural heterogeneity/difference? What part does the bi/multi racial woman's dual/multiple cultural subjectivity play in her ability to effect her own emancipation? Further, what has the raced body to do with the way the bi/multi racial woman is positioned in the nation today and how does she speak back to an ongoing legacy of colonial racism that continues to prevail? In essence, what makes her resilient?

Essentialist representations of Maori women's subjectivity exclude the experiences of bi/multi racial women. In the 2000s, narratives of Maori authenticity fail to accurately describe the daily realities of those women who identify as Maori and Pakeha/Other. 'Traditional' articulations of Maori women's identity do not explain how dominant modes of power work discursively to socially construct 'authentic' and 'inauthentic' subjects. These narratives also occlude an analysis of the corporeal body and the part it plays in the social construction and social positioning of the subject. What does the bi/multi racial woman's *excess* identity look like and how is it performed? In an attempt to explore an alternative voice, and to make sense of bi/multi racial women's realities, the following chapters address these questions in more depth.

Part Two

Chapter Four

Researching Bi/multi Racial Women

> We need to actively honour, to celebrate the contributions, and affirm the mana of Maori women: those tupuna wahine who have gone before us; those wahine toa who give strength to our culture and people today; and those kotiro and mokopuna who are being born now, and who will be born in the future, to fulfil our dreams. These words restate a basic tenet of feminist theory: that as women we have a right to our herstories [Kathie Irwin, 1992, p. 1].

Essentially, this chapter is an *adjoining* chapter that enables the theoretical arguments made in Part One to sit alongside the qualitative material presented in the second half of this thesis. Functioning as a 'bridge' between these two research methodologies, this chapter introduces the theoretical philosophies and ideas that underpin the qualitative research employed in Part Two of this thesis. The experiences of bi/multi racial women will enable me to explore the assumptions and theoretical persuasions outlined in the previous chapters. Further, bi/multi racial women's narratives provide a richness of experiential material that allows a deeper and more insightful reading of bi/multi raciality to emerge. In the earlier chapters I argued that bi/multi racial Maori women fall outside the specificities contained in representations of an authentic *traditional* Maori identity. As such, bi/multi racial women are positioned in the nation as less authentic and therefore *less* Maori. Interviewing bi/multi racial women will help me to determine the validity of these ideas and explore other issues they raise. For example, an analysis of their narratives has highlighted four major themes upon which the following chapters are based. Chapter Five outlines the self-representations of twenty bi/multi racial women that point to their eclectic and non-traditional Maori subjectivities. Chapter Six engages with their experience of cultural hybridity and pays particular attention to their awareness and facilitation of this process. Chapter Seven looks at the raced and e/raced corporeal body and their experience of being bi/multi racial in the bicultural nation. Finally, Chapter Eight looks at the forms of resilience bi/multi racial women engage with to effect their own emancipation.

First, in order to introduce the self representations of bi/multi racial women in the following chapter, I introduce the theoretical persuasions that underpin Part Two and also the research methodology employed in this effort. In short, a feminist oriented kaupapa bi/multi racial research approach on bi/multi racial women is introduced. This chapter is divided into three sections. In the first section 'Feminism and Identity Politics' I outline the elements underpinning a kaupapa Maori research process and I explain *why* a kaupapa Maori research philosophy and practice is not a suitable methodology for researching bi/multi racial women. A *synthesis* of a feminist research approach and a kaupapa Maori research approach is introduced in the second section 'Kaupapa Bi/Multi Racial Research Methodology'. At this point I theorise a research methodology suitable for researching bi/multi racial women. As such, a life history research methodology is introduced for its merits when researching bi/multi racial women. The third section 'Bi/multi Racial Women's Voices' supports the inclusion of bi/multi racial women's voices. At this point I highlight how identities are formed through discursive processes that can be illuminated in the self-representations of the participants' stories. In addition, I also look at the role the feminist researcher plays in this process.

Feminism and Identity Politics

One of the problems with a politics of identity, based as it is upon multiple oppressions, is that these 'oppression' based identities are in a hierarchical relationship with each other and compete for attention. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Yeatman [1993: 243] in her essay *Interlocking Oppressions* in *Transitions: New Australian Feminism* theorises the difficulty inherent in oppression based Identity Politics when she claims that feminism is capable of interrogating difference and of identifying which form of oppression is dominant at any given time. To date, the intersections of race, gender, ethnicity and class within 'mainstream' academia and within early feminism have tended to be theorised in isolation from each other . Political and academic representations of Maori women's identity have largely focused on her minority status as Maori/colonised and have failed to take into account the intersection of other identity categories. In fact, race, ethnicity, gender and class have often been theorised as mutually exclusive of each other. As such these identities are posited as 'innate' and 'natural' and their immutability goes unquestioned. Concealed beneath these taken-for-granted truisms is the socially constructed nature of race, gender and class. Jan Pettman [1992: vii] in *Living in The Margins* states:

> Minority women are frequently subject to 'normalised absence/pathological presence' treatment... They are rendered largely invisible within academic studies for example; or where they are represented it is often as problems or victims, in ways that deny them agency

> and purport to explain their experiences within culturalist frames. These representations can also contain them within racialised or ethnic categories in such a way as to disguise their other identities and interests, as workers, welfare consumers, mothers and so on, and so disguise connections that women and others may have across the boundaries.

Certainly within the New Zealand context, feminist analyses of Maori woman's identity have often situated her within a framework of colonisation, colonialism, assimilation and urban migration, and she is duly accorded the variety of 'isms' that accompany such an historical trajectory. My observation of feminist literature is that it revolves around the dichotomy highlighted by Pettman [1992] as "normalised absence and pathological presence". Under biculturalism, Maori women are represented academically as either natural [which translates as authentic/traditional] or she is pathologised as lacking her natural state [which becomes a pathologised presence] through her historic cultural alienation, assimilation and her disadvantaged social position [Brookes and Tennant, 1992]. Judith Binney [1992: 14-15] in her article *Some Observations on the Status of Maori Women* in *Women in History states:*

> ... [I]n the literature about modern New Zealand society, a new generalisation about Maori women has developed: that they are the most marginalised of all 'categories' of people in the society. It is said to be axiomatic that indigenous women living in a society that is structured by a numerically pre-eminent European culture, itself based on male gender dominance, will inevitably form the most oppressed stratum in that society.

For example, the Maori woman who has mental health issues or who is involved in criminal activity would be considered to be disconnected from her natural state. This tension creates a literal and figurative dis-ease whereby the woman becomes pathological and is now recognised as victim. The experience of colonisation and neo colonialism goes some way to explaining why Maori women are treated as a 'special needs' category. These narratives also run the risk of locking Maori women into polarised, colonised versus decolonised, subject positions. They do not adequately represent the presence or absence of both these identities within one subject thus refusing her agency and denying any possibility that she freely oscillates between these two cultural positions.

As Pettman [1992: viii] articulates, the 'big' categories of nation, race, gender, ethnicity and class "disguise differences within the categories and commonalities across their boundaries". Given that colonialism, assimilation and inter-cultural contacts have resulted in increasing numbers of interracial marriages between Maori and Pakeha, I want to know how bi/multi racial women currently experience neo colonial forms of oppression within the bicultural nation. Further questions are raised which concern the way racism, sexism and class *combine* to marginalise bi/multi racial women. In particular what are the new forms of racism that

discriminate against them? Racist discourses and practices are mutually constitutive and are embedded within institutional structures and practices [Pettman 1992: 56]. How then, do racist discourses contribute to the marginalisation of bi/multi racial women in the New Zealand nation?

Pettman [1992: 55] offers an explanation of racism. She claims it is multifaceted and is often used to express individual attitudes and behaviours levied towards those who are deemed Other or different from the dominant ethnic or national group, or country of origin. This definition extends to open abuse that encompasses variants of physical and verbal abuse and extends to stereotypes about others based on negative portrayals that are misrepresentative and dangerous to the group in question. The perpetrator of these stereotypes and abusive acts is sustained within a broader racist culture. For this type of racism, education, tolerance [and anti discrimination legislation] are advocated to redress the problems associated with this abuse. However, as Pettman [1992: 56] points out, the prejudice model conceals the fact that:

> ... [r]acism is an ideology and a whole set of social relations which are historically generated and materially based, and which reinforce or deny rights and social interests. The particular structure of race power in a society locates everyone, those who are privileged as well as those who are penalised by their socially allocated race.

Further, Pettman [1992: 56] claims that in this understanding racism is both a "discourse - language" [with] images and explanations about race and cultural difference - and material relations between people who are socially constructed as different". Ideology plays an important role in the perpetuation of racist stereotypes in that it reflects, rationalises and contributes to the organisation of particular social interests. Racist ideology provides a vocabulary about racial and cultural difference and contributes to an understanding about who 'we' are and what is normal. She continues to say that the Other is constructed in essentialist ways, in opposition to those who are the 'we'. Drawing from Pettman's ideas, Maori women can be theorised within feminist discourse as the Other who are not male, are not white, are not Pakeha, is not middle class.

A feminist re-reading of Maori women's subjectivity to include a narrative of bi/multi racial women's subjectivity will go some way towards the dismantling of inappropriate language used to categorise, label and place Maori women in specific ways within the nation. It aims to develop a deeper understanding of what the signifier 'Maori woman' means today. Central to any discussion on Maori women, the *signified* [Maori woman] is interpreted and analysed and then re-presented as the *signifier*. The meaning produced within these textual representations contributes to the way in which the identity 'Maori woman' is understood. Within

these structural and systemic arrangements, the Maori woman/Other becomes a knowable and therefore reproducible category of difference, requiring special attention. If Maori women are constructed along stereotypical lines [as traditional] with this construction then reproduced in academic, social and political institutions, then women of Maori ancestry are denied the right to define their own self determination and of accessing an alternative identity.

New Zealand feminism is enmeshed in the production of knowledge that necessarily involves looking at the social positioning of Maori and Pakeha women and girls. As such, both cultural groups are theorised with specific cultural meaning and are loosely categorised accordingly [Irwin, 1992]. Irwin also notes that New Zealand feminism has not escaped internal debates over what constitutes Maori identity. Inquiry into the social position and oppression of Maori women should take into consideration the unique racial and cultural affiliations the contemporary bi/multi racial woman grapples with which add new dimensions to her identity. For example, as the bi/multi racial Maori woman's identity becomes increasingly more complex does she become more vulnerable to racism? Is she subjected to new modes of oppression? Given that the Maori female subject may carry visual markers contradicting her status as a Maori woman, both racism and sexism can act insidiously to discriminate against her. Feminist inquiry has an obligation to develop theories that represent the multifarious voices of all women, including all those who claim Maori descent. Under the auspices of tino rangatiratanga, protected within the bicultural configurations of the Treaty of Waitangi, it is the prerogative of Maori to determine their own destiny, to define themselves and their identities and to activate their own agency to promote survival. On the basis of whakapapa links, all descendants are eligible to claim a Maori/tangata whenua identity, regardless of how many other racial and cultural counterparts exist simultaneously within the individual. There is no such thing as 'diluting' whakapapa; one has whakapapa or one does not. Notwithstanding other racial and cultural variables existent within the bi/multi racial, it is her right, as a descendent of the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa, to have her unique difference represented within academic doctrine.

According to Yeatman [1993] the marginalised subject has the ability to identify the forms of oppression that operate to subjugate them. Within this, she articulates that the minority have the skills to represent themselves. Indigenous Australian, Moreton-Robinson [2000: 61] comments on Yeatman's views when she states:

> Yeatman argues that it is the specifics of the context that will determine which oppression is dominant and the subject should identify this. In recognition of the fact that some women will experience different forms of oppression because of their race, ethnicity, age, disability or sexuality, she states that an emancipatory project is one whereby the custodians of feminism make space available for marginalised women to have a voice.

It is within this context that I claim a space to bring bi/multi racial Maori women into visibility. The bi/multi racial identity reflects a synthesis of multiple oppressions based upon, at the very least, her exclusion from dominant articulations of Maori identity and her gender. Within a construction of Maori women's subjectivity as 'authentic/traditional' the bi/multi racial subject is excluded from representation. She can only come into representation through the subject position defined for her in the post colonial encounter. Her difference to a 'prescripted' authentic identity is expelled, her experience as Maori is denied and her bi/multi racial knowledge subjugated. Her 'multilayered personal identities' are denied her. I suggest that it is no longer useful to categorise Maori women under a singular identity category, for many women who identify as Maori through whakapapa may not experience themselves as solely Maori/traditional. Also, despite the fact that she is a descendant of Maori and as such will have a cultural history that reflects the ramifications of colonisation, colonialism and assimilation, coupled with a mixed racial and cultural genealogy, the bi/multi racial woman may not identify herself as a victim of her history. As the nation continues to reproduce the idea of an authentic Maori subject, in order to fulfil its own desires for the reproduction of cultural and national purity, what happens to those women who fall outside the specificities of the call? How do they survive the racist contradictions of being Maori, yet not Maori enough? What is their cultural and gendered experience of dislocation and alienation? What has the nation's need for pure Maori feminine subjects have to do with the marginalised bi/multi racial woman and what is her understanding of this new form of racism/oppression?

Maori, Feminism and Research

Identifying who bi/multi racial women are and where they are located in the New Zealand nation, and within indigenous nations, requires a methodological approach sensitive to the specificities of bi/multi racial women. Because there is a recognition that bi/multi racial women, as non fixed subjects, are potentially vulnerable as Maori citizens and as women, the task is to undertake research that is capable of speaking to the multiple identities and positions bi/multi racial women occupy. Research methodology must take into consideration the experiential component, meeting the challenge of analysing the multiple oppressions these women live with in order to understand their experience of difference and to acknowledge and accommodate the specific relationships they have with men of kinship origin and those men who are culturally and nationally different [Pettman, 1992; Yeatman, 1993]. It also should provide an opportunity to examine their relationships with women of kinship origin and

women who belong to ethnic groups other than theirs. In undertaking an examination of bi/multi raciality and the experiences that accompany it, feminist scholarship is required to provide research methodology that not only facilitates the collection of information/text/data that reflects the value and knowledge of the female subject but, at the same time, has a responsibility to engage with the exchange of knowledge between the parties involved. In essence, effective research will articulate the heterogeneity of difference within and between bi/multi racial women.

Irwin [1992: 2-3] reminds us that Maori women are not a homogenous group when she highlights the factors that continue to influence Maori women's development. She writes of:

> ... [T]ribal affiliation, social class, sexual preference, knowledge of traditional Maori tikanga, knowledge of the Maori language, rural or urban location, identification on the political spectrum from radical to traditional, place in the family, the level of formal schooling and educational attainments to name but a few.

Irwin's explanation points out that an underlying assumption of a universal and normative female Maori subject position and subjectivity exists prior to the influence of external variables. By contrasting the feminine Maori subject with Pakeha and Maori males, the idea of a quintessential feminine subject is constructed. The subject's ability to progress [develop normatively] is either compromised or realised by the interplay of external variables that create a myriad of heterogeneous experiences and opportunities. Emancipation is limited to progress based upon the improvement of external variables while the Maori subject passively waits to be acted upon. Somehow, a reading of Maori subjectivity that assumes a *prior* identity runs the risk of incarcerating Maori women within an essentialist framework and locating her emancipation in the ability of the nation to provide equality. In holding onto the normative Maori subject, the focus is on redressing the unequal social and political variables that work to discriminate against Maori women. In this move, alternative ways of thinking about Maori women's subjectivity are occluded. In contrast to the quintessential subject, theorising the bi/multi racial subject's dual subjectivity positions her differently from those who are theorised as having a singular cultural subjectivity and, by extension, a predictable set of external experiences available to them. In contrast, rethinking a feminist analysis of Maori subjectivity to include a post modern articulation of identity as multiple, variable and unstable could open up new cultural spaces and opportunities for Maori subjects.

Decolonising Maori Women

In order to address thoughtfully the question of Maori Pakeha bi/multi raciality, the research methodology must be able to speak to the gendered experiences of those women who live on the cultural margins between Maori and Pakeha. The desire is to hear the voices of bi/multi racial women, previously silenced and invisible. Pettman [1992: 142] states it is the marginalised impulse:

> ... [t]o tell their stories, to provide positive images, to explain [to themselves as well as to others] how it might have come to this – these are personally and socially significant. And it is an irony that while many oppressed people are now asserting their status as subject, the very notion of the subject is under attack, especially in literary and cultural theory.

The research methodology must be capable of gaining insight into the bi/multi racial woman's marginal experiences while at the same time interrogating the discourses that inform the maintenance of a traditional Maori identity. In other words, the research methodology must be able to generate enough experiential information to support an examination of the regulation and control of bodies of difference. What does her body of knowledge contribute to a discussion on Maori women's identity and emancipation? The research methodology also has to absorb bi/multi racial women's resistance to forms of neo colonialism which prescript a 'traditional' oriented gender - specific subjectivity for Maori. Irwin explains that researching Maori women requires a careful approach. She makes the point that Maori do not require non - Maori to develop these theoretical tools and that this power to research Maori resides with Maori. Doing so will "contribute to our empowerment as Maori women, moving forward in our struggles for our people, our lands, our world, ourselves" [Irwin, 1992, 5]. Irwin lists four sources as primary when rewriting Maori women into history, identifying these components as Maori society [te ao tawhito, te ao hou; past and present] te reo Maori [Maori language] Maori women's herstories and tikanga Maori [Maori cultural practices].

The first component, 'Maori society', Irwin continues, acknowledges the importance of an historical analysis in the formation of Maori feminist theory. A critical analysis of the development of our society must include everything that has had an impact on Aotearoa from the time of creation to now, and should take into account plans for the future claims through the Waitangi Tribunal [Irwin, 1992, 6]. She also argues for iwi based analysis to accommodate the different gender roles between the Maori and Pakeha cultures. The second source, 'Te reo Maori', refers to both oral and written sources and should be consulted when researching Maori. She writes of the oral archives as an "authentic and authoritative Maori data base" with which to study the "...role and status of Maori women and Maori feminisms" [Irwin, 1992, p. 7]. The

third source, 'Maori Women's Herstories', validates the necessity for Maori women to undertake research on Maori women. Finally, the fourth source, 'Tikanga Maori', speaks to the reclamation of traditional Maori cultural practices and a deconstruction of those which have been altered since colonial contact. This is important for reclaiming the role and status of Maori women and needs to be achieved through a feminist analysis. To neglect these four elements in feminist research, she suggests, creates misunderstanding and ignorance about the value of Maori women within society. In the following section on bi/multi racial research methodology, I problematise the research elements outlined by Irwin by pointing to the difficulties inherent when researching bi/multi racial women.

Kaupapa Bi/Multi Racial Research Methodology

> 'We know we are dying', someone said, 'but tell me why we are living?' 'Our health will not improve unless we address the fact that we have no sovereignty', 'We're sick of hearing what's wrong with us, tell us something good for a change', or, 'Why do they always think by looking at us they will find the answers to our problems, why don't they look at themselves?' The same questions were being asked of education and of justice. I too wanted to know why it was that community concerns were always reframed around standard research problems. How can research ever address our needs as indigenous peoples if our questions are never taken seriously? It was as if the community's questions were never heard, simply passed over, silenced [Linda Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 198].

Linda Tuhiwai Smith [1999] in *Decolonizing Methodologies* raises some interesting points concerning scientific research on Maori. Within the process of naming, appropriating and understanding the social and cultural position of Maori, the specificity of the community is silenced. The above quotation points to the hunger Maori have for research that speaks to the experience of Maori lives, survival, health, education and justice. There is a desire to identify the good and positive things about Maori and to initiate research that is Maori centred, community oriented. Researching Maori must be culturally sensitive and aware of a long history of scientific empiricism and imperialist appropriation of Maori that has privileged Pakeha and pathologised Maori. Maori have been Othered by the discursive requirements of the nation to produce knowledge that underpins history. Smith [1999: 29-30] claims that indigenous people have "mounted a critique of the way history is told from the perspective of the colonizers" but who simultaneously recognise that "history is important for understanding the present and that reclaiming history is a critical and essential aspect of decolonization". Indigenous people, Smith adds, view Western history as a modernist project "which has developed alongside imperial beliefs about the Other". Smith [1999: 30-1] cites nine key 'interconnected' ideas that define the colonising nature of Western history. Her first claim is that history is a *totalizing* discourse and that, secondly, the idea of a *universal* history exists. The third idea she

posits is that history is *one large chronology* while the fourth concerns the fact that history is about *development.* The fifth idea Smith puts forward is that history is about a *self-actualizing human subject* and the sixth is that the story of history can be told in *one coherent narrative.* The seventh idea is that history as a discipline is *innocent* and the eighth is that history is constructed around *binary categories.* The ninth and final idea she offers is that history is *patriarchal.*

Smith's ideas suggest the presence of a heterogenous Maori history; Maori communally and individually now share similar world views to non-Maori, due to ongoing colonial processes that have increased cultural overlaps. Further, Maori epistemologies and processes are now informed by normative developmental models laid down in Pakeha history, as Maori deploy their own agency to compete alongside Pakeha in the corporate world. Maori communities are complicit in participating in new forms of imperialist progress objectives, as iwi are obliged to compete in the market place. There is a need to develop normatively for fear of their communities being left behind, economically disadvantaged and viewed as developmentally backward. Because Maori tribal accounts of history do not constitute a linear narrative of history and are viewed as unimportant and invisible [and tribal records have a different time sequence to Pakeha/Western society] Maori history is ignored and invalidated, but this does not mean that it does not exist. The fabrication of scientific knowledge by Western social scientists and historians is perceived as unprejudiced truth while the irrational Maori ways of knowing are viewed as untruths. Given that a narrative of history that supports the binary truisms embedded within the idea of discrete cultural identities exists, Maori continue to fit into the barbaric/immoral/uncivilised/irrational category as Pakeha's Other while Pakeha function as the developed, moral and rational human subject. Also, if history is patriarchal then men [including Maori men] are considered more self-actualised than women, resulting in the current subjugated position of New Zealand women, including Maori women [Smith, 1999].

Researching bi/multi racial Maori women requires a careful approach and methodology because it must take into account the way Maori knowledge has been historically marginalised and subjugated in colonial processes embedded in the development of the normative, white masculine nation and national identity, and also in the name of science. A bi/multi racial kaupapa Maori research approach may not necessarily adhere to the culturally specific guidelines highlighted by Irwin [1992] or Smith [1999] by virtue of the researchers' and the participants' inability to engage with a kaupapa Maori research practice. Rather, this research will use a feminist oriented approach that will incorporate some elements described in a kaupapa Maori approach but will be tempered by the researcher's and the research participant's ability to engage in research at such an indepth cultural level. In his article *Freeing Ourselves From*

Neo-Colonial Domination In Research: A Maori Approach To Creating Knowledge

Bishop [1998, 201] claims that a kaupapa Maori research involves a number of significant dimensions that set it apart from traditional research:

> One main focus of a Kaupapa Maori approach to research is the operationalization of self-determination [tino Rangatiriatanga] by Maori people... Such an approach challenges the locus of power and control over the research issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimization, and accountability... with the latter being located in another cultural frame of reference/world-view. Kaupapa Maori is, therefore, challenging the dominance of traditional, individualistic research which primarily, at least in its present form, benefits the researchers and their agenda. In contrast, Kaupapa Maori research is collectivistic and is oriented toward benefiting all the research participants and their collectively determined agendas, defining and acknowledging Maori aspirations for research, while developing and implementing Maori theoretical and methodological preferences and practices for research.

To research the bi/multi racial subject using a kaupapa Maori research methodology and analysis could be confusing and Othering to the bi/multi racial participant. Locating the bi/multi racial subject within a kaupapa Maori context could jeopardise their embodied knowledge as dual cultural subjects because the landscape of the interviewing process permits the presence of particular subjectivities to the exclusion of others. Further, the bi/multi racial subject, while honouring and valuing a Maori subjectivity, may not necessarily relate to things Maori or to an indepth knowledge of Maori practices inherent in good Maori research as described by Bishop. Not to pay attention to the cultural variables at play within bi/multi racial research to enhance the knowledge and experience of the research participant/s will invariably invoke neo-colonial domination of research practices highlighted by Bishop [1998: 200] when he states:

> ... [T]raditional research has misrepresented Maori understandings and ways of knowing by simplifying, conglomerating, and commodifying Maori knowledge for "consumption" by the colonizers. These processes have consequently misrepresented Maori experiences, thereby denying Maori authenticity and voice. Such research has displaced Maori lived experiences and the meanings that these experiences have with the "authoritative" voice of the methodological "expert". Moreover, many misconstrued Maori cultural practices and meanings are now part of our everyday myths of Aotearoa/New Zealand, believed by Maori and non-Maori alike...

Despite the inability of this research to undertake a kaupapa Maori study of the life experiences of the dual cultural subject, the research style will incorporate the spirit of such a research approach while holding in tension the reality that the bi/multi racial researcher and the participants may not possess the cultural resources to make a kaupapa Maori methodology viable.

Kaupapa Bi/multi Racial Research and the Life-History Approach

In this section my aim is to develop a research approach that is both feminist in orientation and is respectful of bi/multi racial Maori women's difference/hybridity. In addition, the research must be flexible enough to accommodate the cultural specificities, incongruencies, cultural overlaps and disjunctures of the participants by accommodating their unique cultural experiences within the research process. This methodology extends that of Irwin[1992] and Smith's [1999] ideas in that bi/multi racial research has to work with the tensions created when researching a subject that is neither Maori nor Pakeha, but both. Successful research will point to the cracks and crevices within the colonial relationship and will illuminate the gaps where new knowledge is formed. Therefore, it must provide a framework that can contain the academic requirements and scope while, at the same time, caring for and respecting the bi/multi racial subject within the context of their unique Maori/Pakeha subjectivities and the cultural variables at play within the research process. This requires an approach that is flexible, as the research methodology must be fluid enough to cope with any cultural ambiguities that arise [Reinharz, 1992].

In order to accommodate the various cultural strengths that reflect the research participants' embodied cultural knowledge, this thesis employs a feminist perspective that utilises a life history research methodology as an approach [Middleton, 1993, 1996]. This technique is capable of providing an exploration into the lives of women who refuse to be conceptualised as the colonised/victim or defined as decolonised/traditional. The research seeks to understand how bi/multi racial women utilise their dual and multiple racial and cultural essences to seek emancipation/decolonisation. Therefore, what is their *experience* of marginalisation and resistance within the bicultural nation today? At this point a feminist research approach is introduced as an appropriate tool in the investigation of bi/multi racial women's life experiences.

In explanation of a broad based feminist perspective, Shulamit Reinharz' [1992: 241] views in *Feminist Methods in Social Research* highlight the nature of this research inquiry:

> The fact that there are multiple definitions of feminism means that there are multiple feminist perspectives on social research methods. One shared radical tenet underlying feminist research is that women's lives are important. Feminist researchers do not cynically "put" women into their scholarship so as to avoid appearing sexist. Rather, for feminist researchers females are worth examining as individuals and as people whose experience is interwoven with other women. In other words, feminists are interested in women as individuals and as a social category.

A feminist perspective incorporates a qualitative approach that provides a scope for the bi/multi racial subject to incorporate as much or as little of her Maori or Pakeha/Other cultural world view as is appropriate and comfortable for her, the researcher and the research process. The research must be a supportive, positive experience for both people in order to be productive. Qualitative research, in the form of a life history methodology, is a legitimate form of gathering narratives pertaining to the lived experiences of women and is a widely used approach to an inquiry that is centred on subjective knowledges and self-representations of women. According to Reinharz a feminist qualitative research approach provides a critical research technique in that it centres on 'difference' of identity between the subjective experiences of women and men. Qualitative research is a process that enables individual women to express their own experiential viewpoint.

The research methodology and analysis must be flexible enough to accommodate the cultural ambiguities, partial knowledges and safety of the bi/multi racial subject. At the same time it must seek to enrich the lives of the participants by reflecting the meaning and value inherent in minority subject positions, dual/multiple subjectivities and the knowledge that living on the borderlands generates. This may require some dialogue and support from the researcher as experiences are confronted, analysed and reconstructed to make sense for the participant.

Life History Methodology

Pettman [1992: 142] claims that part of the reason marginalised women write is so that other women will recognise themselves in the stories of the women interviewed and will gain a measure of confidence and reassurance that their difference, to some degree, is shared by others. It is also about breaking silence over the minority status we have within the nation and within our own communities because we are not Maori enough, not brown enough, not exotic enough, or we are not Pakeha enough, not white enough, not quintessentially Ango-European enough. Pettman states:

> Women exchanging experiences and reflecting on their feelings may be delighted and immensely relieved to discover that other women have similar experiences. This knowledge can form the basis for understanding the problem as systemic or social, rather than as evidence of personal failure or misadventure. Women can then find new ways to name their concerns, to politicise their experiences and enable them to make connections with other women.

I explore the life history methodology as an appropriate research approach because I argue that it is capable of providing an exploration into the experiences of women who resist being conceptualised as a 'colonized victim' or defined as

decolonised/traditional. In doing so, I am aware of my own presence in the research process, the questions asked and the conversations shared. This viewpoint holds salience with Sue Middleton's [1993] PhD research, where she outlines some of the methodological concerns embedded in social science research. Middleton [1993: 65] in *Educating Feminists* states:

> The methodology was grounded in my experiences with these women - our friendships. It was for me a natural thing to ask other women - other feminist teachers of my age group - to talk about their lives. We often talked this way with one another. Such sharing of stories had been the method of making knowledge of the consciousness-raising groups of the 1970s.

Like Middleton, my interest in researching bi/multi racial women came naturally to me. The question of Maori identity often surfaced with women who neither fitted within a traditional Maori identity stereotype nor a Pakeha/Other stereotype. The majority of women interviewed either approached me to be a part of the study or willingly agreed, out of support for the research and of myself as a Maori woman. The research was undertaken with the knowledge that the methodology must be capable of asking and handling some 'big' questions. For example, I wanted to know who these bicultural women were who defiantly claimed their dual and multiple racial and cultural identities as opposed to a prescriptive traditional/pathologised identity. What was their experience of being bi/multi racial? What did they think informed a bi/multi racial subjectivity and how did they mediate this? What could their hybrid knowledge reveal about the forms of power that sought to oppress them? To an extent, the research was concerned with an exploration into the truths bi/multi racial women hold about themselves, their identities and their place within the Maori and Pakeha cultural worlds. According to Middleton [1993: 66], feminists have challenged the idea that a scientifically detached observer exists when she claims that there has been a focus on the production of truth within the social sciences. Middleton cites Foucault's [1980a: 58] ideas of the place of confession in interrogating the production of truth claims. She draws upon Foucault again [1980a: 61] when she says:

> For Foucault, the confession, like the sociological research interview, is "a ritual of discourse in which the speaking subject is also the subject of the statement...". Such a form of encounter is "also a ritual that unfolds within a power relationship".

Middleton also makes the point that for knowledge to become authorised as 'truth' it has to be subjected to a relationship process in which the truth is validated within the confessional. She again cites Foucault [1988: 66]:

> ... The work of producing the truth was obliged to pass through this relationship if it was to be scientifically validated. The truth did not rely solely in the subject who, by confession, would reveal it wholly framed. It was constituted in two stages: present but incomplete, blind

> to itself, in the one who spoke, it could only reach completion in the one who assimilated and recorded it. It was the latter's function to verify this obscure truth: the revelation of confession had to be coupled with the decipherment of what it said.

The qualitative research I undertook is an attempt at defining a woman centred approach to researching bi/multi racial women. Their knowledge has been appropriated on at least two levels. The first is the way women have been written about within research through masculinised and androcentric practices that have occluded their experiences; the second is, by the nature of their race. Smith [1999] points out that Maori ways of 'knowing' and 'being' have been appropriated by orthodox scientific observers. The bi/multi racial woman has been the subject of the male ethnocentric gaze. This research is an attempt to accommodate the experiences of bi/multi racial women in a way that honours our reality, our ways of knowing.

The form the life history research takes is one of a semi-structured interview where specific questions guide the research but do not limit the process by controlling where the conversation needs to go. A kaupapa bi/multi racial research approach informs an adapted Maori technique used in the collective conversations of Maori as evidenced in hui. During whanau meetings an issue is presented to the community in order to precipitate dialogue that generates conversational flexibility. Dialogue is free to travel in a variety of directions until it rests with a conclusion commonly understood and agreed upon by the people present [Walker, 1992]. This process is understood as kotahitanga, or consensus achieved through unity [Ritchie, 1992]. In drawing from this example the aim, however tenuous, is to create a space where the bi/multi racial subject can make sense of her life experiences as bi/multi racial. Pettman [1992: 141] writes:

> Those who become aware of their own speaking position/s, and of the absence or silence of the objects of study, may seek to allow 'them' to speak for themselves. Strategies here include inviting visiting speakers, using oral history sources and non-academic writings, for example, autobiographies and political or popular tracts as text. Films, interviews and video productions may also provide opportunities to speak to those formerly excluded from social discourse.

The notion of 'experience' is problematic within feminist theory as post modern theorists challenge the idea of a universal truth [Haraway, 1988]. An ideology prevails which suggests that subjective narratives [storytelling, truth-telling narratives and autobiographical material] is unfashionable in contemporary literary and cultural studies, and is a questionable form of research. However it holds appeal for an examination of bi/multi racial women in that it provides an

opportunity to understand how the bi/multi racial subject makes sense of her cultural ambiguity [Pettman, 1992]. Pettman [1992: 142] states:

> Meaning is constructed by position and relationship, rather than by what 'really' happened. This is not to say that memory is not true or accurate; rather that it is a reconstruction which speaks to where the person is now, and to the social setting within which that person now stands. Celebrating identities which up to now have been stigmatised is a political act, but celebrating them without situating them within the politics of difference and the power relations within which they are constructed simply encourages a cultural relativist position. It also infuses identity politics with a kind of moralism...

Bi/Multi Racial Women's Voices

Narratives are personal recollections that provide interpretations of life events, processes and responses. At times these stories indicate that events are sequentially linked across time and are discursively constructed. Alice Morgan [2000: 5] explains:

> As humans, we are interpreting beings. We all have daily experiences of events that we seek to make meaningful. The stories we have about our lives are created through linking certain events together in particular sequence across a time period, and finding a way of explaining or making sense of them. This meaning forms the plot of the story. We give meanings to our experiences constantly as we live our lives. A narrative is like a thread that weaves the events together, forming a story.

The voices of twenty women who identify as occupying a dual cultural subjectivity are included in the scope of this research to show how both Maori and Pakeha cultures contain the imprints of the other and that sexism, racism and colonial desire prevail in both, to marginalise the bi/multi racial within the bicultural nation. Their narratives are employed to determine how their subjective experiences of bi/multi racialism reflect the colonial processes embedded within New Zealand nationalism.

This is our story, spoken from our own life-perspective and experience of engaging with a marginalised cultural subject position. Our histories, despite their heterogeneity, share some common insights about our subjugated knowledges, life experiences and differences to Maori women and to Pakeha/Other women. We are defining ourselves not in opposition to dominant narratives of Maori women's subjectivity, or of dominant articulations of Pakeha/Other subjectivity, but as a synthesis of both. Our voices speak about the way we shape and reshape ourselves in the nation to enhance our survival rate and our opportunities for health, happiness and success as we speak about the contributions our bi/multi racial knowledge give to our local and global ethnic groups, communities and nations. Moreton-Robinson [2000: 3] states:

> Indigenous women's life writings are testimony to colonial processes that shaped subjectivity and they illuminate the pain and loss of dispossession in its many forms. The

life writings also reveal various creative strategies developed and deployed for survival and resistance.

Bi/multi racial women's stories provide the foundation upon which an analysis of cultural hybridity can be formed. These narratives also point to the discursive processes that call bi/multi racial women into being as 'Maori'. Judith Butler [1993] in *Gender is Burning* in *Bodies that Matter* elaborates the call to identity and highlights what this rests upon. She employs Althusser's ideas to describe how the process of *naming* the subject and *calling* the subject into *existence* occurs within a process of power that inscribes the subject in specific ways. According to Butler, the Law functions as the authority that interpellates the subject into particular subject positions, holding implications for the social construction of gender. Within the 'naming' process the subject turns to answer the call and in this moment is 'subjectivated' and becomes the 'subject'. For example, in the New Zealand context the discursive processes associated with biculturalism [for example, the Waitangi Tribunal] employ 'whakapapa' to subjectivate the Maori subject with a 'traditional' Maori identity [Te Whanau, 2001]. In practical terms the call to authenticity [through identification with whakapapa] functions to subjectivate the subject with the accompanying ideologies and cultural obligations that give this identity its current meaning and value. This process occurs within the gendered subject and is reliant upon the repudiation of corporeal gendered difference.

Butler states that gender is subsumed beneath the requirement of the erasure of difference as specific discourses call the subject into being. She claims, when the subject answers the call an excess of difference operates which functions outside the Law. Butler [1993, 122] writes that "interpellation thus loses its status as a simple performative, an act of discourse with the power to create that which it refers, and creates more than it ever meant to, signifying in excess of any intended referent." The Law emanates from the disinterested unmarked universal subject. It is the Law that desires, and within this desire, subsumes Maori in its quest to satisfy its desire. Whatever the universal subject desires and deems desirable is intimately tied to capitalism, progress and development. As a totalising operation of power, it must subsume all difference in pursuit of its desire. Within this, the colonised subject also becomes the desiring subject. In answering the interpellation, and being subjectivated into the subject position and subjectivity prescribed by the Law, Maori become inscribed with the ideological desires encoded in the subjectivity provided. The desired feminine Maori subject is one that complies with the interpellation as she meets the needs of the normative aesthetic embedded within colonialist discourses [biculturalism] to reproduce itself and its normative white subject. She is desired only so long as she fulfils the nation's desire of her as primordial and traditional, the point Chatterjee

[1989] made when he looked at the gendered 'spiritual' versus 'material' dichotomy in India. Within this subject position she is fixed and innate, and her 'authentic/traditional' subjectivity is symbolically 'freeze-framed', untouched by colonisation, the practices of colonialism and the effects of both. The Maori woman is in flux; she is constructed through a desire for her difference that demarcates the cultural boundary between Maori and Pakeha. Yet at the point she comes into representation as the 'traditional' she becomes inscribed with the desires, values and standards of the normalised Western/Pakeha subject.

The Maori woman's difference is both upheld and denied. On the one hand, the subjectivity available to her within the discursive processes embedded within bicultural politics reflects the needs of the post colonial nation to legitimise itself through the reproduction of itself as knowable, timeless and stable. The Maori woman's corporeal body signifies the difference that is needed to uphold the 'difference' of the Maori nation as it comes into relationship with the normative white Pakeha subject/nation. This patriarchal relationship requires that she become the conduit for the 'post' colonial nation's reinvention of itself. The processes of colonialism require the assimilation of the 'difference' that cannot be absorbed. At once, the difference contained in the feminine Maori subject, and employed in the pursuit of a Maori Pakeha political and economic alliance, is denied. Given that Maori difference is carried by Maori women, she can only come into representation through the inscription of a traditional subjectivity encoded in the Maori nation. In that moment when she comes into representation the specificities of her cultural differences are occluded.

I suggest here that the bi/multi racial subject embodies a contradiction in the conflicting sense of acceptance [of difference] and disavowal [of difference] contained within her narrative experience of bi/multi raciality. In claiming an oppositional subjectivity she becomes inauthentic and contaminated. To be accepted as 'authentic' and come back into representation, she must abide by the rules specified in the bicultural contract. Maori subjectivity is only permissible in so far as it reflects a Pakeha subjectivity, thus reinstating the Pakeha subject's legitimacy and access to New Zealand [Spoonley, 1993]. The subject who refuses the call to a singular cultural subjectivity is excluded from representation despite the fact that she may personally and politically identify as Maori. The bi/multi racial woman is excluded from dominant articulations of Maori identity because her difference, as the subject who occupies more than one cultural subjectivity, precludes her acceptance as authentic. The bi/multi racial woman is now conceived of as an excess of identity prescribed in the Maori/Pakeha colonial relationship. Qualitative research allows an examination of the processes of subjectivication. Bi/multi racial women's narratives will highlight how the call to a highly politicised Maori subjectivity excludes the specificities of her Other cultural differences.

The Bi/multi Racial Researcher

Pettman [1992: 130-1] claims that the intellectual politics of feminism differ from mainstream disciplines in that:

> ... feminism began as an engaged and oppositional discourse... While the links between feminist academics and the women's movement are problematic, feminist academics recognise that they have a personal interest in revealing gender issues in power and knowledge structures... Their identity and right to speak as 'women' has come under attack from outside academia, including from other feminists, but a claim to an impartial position vis a vis teaching or researching about women is impossible within feminist discourse... They work and politic in different ways and with varying energy, but within an understanding that they do have social interests as women in feminism.

Pettman pre-empts my interest and involvement in the social interests and position of bi/multi racial women. As such, I wish to make explicit my personal experiences as a bi/multi racial woman marginalised within the post colonial nation, as well as those of other women. I recognise that the research must be capable of understanding and making explicit the cultural differences and specificities that bi/multi women grapple with daily, while at the same time catering for those differences in a culturally sensitive way. Bishop [1998: 200] recognises and speaks back to forms of research that have sought to recolonise Maori. He states:

> Researchers in Aotearoa/New Zealand have developed a tradition of research that has perpetuated colonial values, thereby undervaluing and belittling Maori knowledge and learning practices and processes in order to enhance those of the colonizers and adherents of neo-colonial paradigms. There has developed a social pathology research approach in Aotearoa/New Zealand that has implied, in all phases of the research process, the "inability" of Maori culture to cope with human problems and proposed that Maori culture was and is inferior to that of the colonizers in human terms. Such practices have perpetuated an ideology of cultural superiority that precludes the development of power-sharing processes and the legitimization of diverse cultural epistemologies and cosmologies.

It is my belief that feminist research on bi/multi racial women must be undertaken by women of Maori ancestry who have an awareness of the issues that bi/multi racial women face as culturally transient and fragmented subjects. By positioning myself in the research as bi/multi racial, I declare my personal interest in the subject of inquiry, the way the topic is researched and analysed, and how the information is later disseminated. Pettman [1992: 141] supports the minority's right to theorise themselves with Spivak's [1987: 253] statement when she asks:

> ... [C]an men theorize feminism, can whites theorize racism, can the bourgeois theorize revolution, and so on? It is when *only* the former groups theorize that the situation is politically intolerable. Therefore, it is crucial that members of these groups are kept vigilant about their assigned subject positions.

Further, Middleton [1996: 3] states, "The ways we think, research, and write are always outcomes of the possibilities and constraints of our historical, material, cultural, political, institutional and biographical circumstances." The researcher must also be capable of shifting cultural landscapes from Maori to non Maori environments, be comfortable with both Maori and non Maori cultures, embrace both te reo and English and have some understanding and appreciation of the issues facing bi/multi racial subjects, as well as possessing the ability to show empathy for the issues that may arise. Reinharz [1992: 24] states that "[a] woman listening with care and caution enables another woman to develop ideas, construct meaning, and use words that say what she means." Moreton-Robinson [2000: 179] celebrates the contribution feminists who occupy the borderlands make to the emancipation of indigenous women when she cites Espen [1995: 135]:

> [W]omen of color who are feminist live on "the borderlands". We know more than one world and "travel" between different "worlds". In doing so, we develop new experiences, new territories and new languages not known by those who inhabit only one world or speak in only one language. We know possibilities unknown by others. We can develop those possibilities to the enrichment of everyone, but only if we are *subjects*, known and respected as equals in the task of building a new world for all women. If we continue to be treated as *objects* when acknowledged at all, we will never be known by others and perhaps not even fully by ourselves. The richness and knowledge we could offer the feminist movement in general... will be forever lost. I believe that all of us... can play a role in steering the feminist movement in this most enriching direction. We are all, together, the subjects and the owners of this movement.

Conclusion

It is no longer useful to categorise Maori women strictly in terms of a traditional, assimilated or pathologised Maori identity in binary opposition to Pakeha identity. I have suggested that bi/multi racial Maori women are culturally subjectivated as Maori as well as Pakeha and live with the cultural ambiguity contained in their dual and/or multiple cultural positioning as Maori Pakeha/Other subject. I have also suggested that New Zealand academics, Maori experts and feminists need to recognise and theoretically acknowledge the presence of bi/multi racial women in both the *imagined* national community and the *imagined* Maori community. Further, articulations of Maori women's ethnicity, based upon traditional, assimilated or pathologised subjectivities, are limiting in that they act as prescriptive cultural identity categories. The promotion of such stereotyping, ultimately influences how members of society think about and behave towards Maori women. To ignore the fact that many women of Maori ancestry are identified within representations of Maori identity as solely Maori is to ignore the fact that some Maori women also live with *dual* and *multiple* cultural subjectivities. Ignoring Maori women's hybridity contributes to the

perpetuation of an essentialist Maori ethnicity. Further, reproducing Maori women as culturally homogeneous contributes to the reproduction of a white/normative notion of identity encapsulated in the social construction of a white/Pakeha ethnicity and, by extension, its opposite, a brown/Maori ethnicity. As such, essentialist narratives also ignore the place of *race* in the social construction of Maori and Pakeha cultural subjectivities in the bicultural nation.

The dual/multiple racial/cultural histories, life-styles, inter-cultural relationships and lived experience of bi/multi racial women sets them apart from traditional Maori and Pakeha/Other women. As such, I have suggested that a feminist inspired bi/multi racial kaupapa research approach needed to be formulated. I have argued that this methodology should take into account some fundamental feminist research principles as well as paying attention to a Maori cultural research philosophy and its associated values. Appropriate methodology and practice should be capable of gathering narrative information on bi/multi racial women's experiential narratives of bi/multi raciality, while holding in tension the cultural overlaps, disjuncture and nuances raised in research on bi/multi racial [hybrid] women. I have presented a life-history methodology, coupled with a bi/multi racial kaupapa Maori approach as a culturally sensitive research approach. I have argued that a 'Kaupapa Bi/Multi Racial Research Methodology' has to be capable of accommodating experiences that are possibly rooted in structural and systemic discrimination, a methodology that could reveal multiple discriminations.

Finally, the research methodology must be flexible enough to accommodate bi/multi racial women's unique cultural specificities which will be reflected in their heterogenous stories. These narratives will illustrate how they emancipate themselves by forging new identities and new ways of operating in the world. What exactly do their dual/multiple subjectivities look like and are there consequences to being positioned as a Maori and Pakeha/Other woman? How do racism and sexism operate within the nation to discriminate against the new Maori 'Other'. Do sexism and racism operate the same within different cultural landscapes and has bi/multi racial women's racial corporeality got something to do with this? I address these questions in the following chapters.

Chapter Five

Speaking Back: Hybrid Voices

> Most Maoris can identify upwards of two hundred relatives either by name or as offspring of named relatives. In other words, they have a large kinship universe... In addition to having many children, they, they like to trace their kinship 'a long way out', recognizing their own and their parents' cousins up to the fourth degree and further, and accepting as kin anyone who can demonstrate relationship to one of their known kinsmen... Many Maoris live in rural communities where their forebears lived for generations, with the result that they are related to most other residents. Relatives living in the same or adjoining districts naturally see a lot of each other, visiting each other's homes and helping each other from day to day in many ways [Joan Metge, 1967, pp. 121-2].

Joan Metge's [1967] article *Kinship* in *The Maoris of New Zealand*, is focused on urban Maori during the mid 1960s. She portrays a deeply rich, intertwined community existence, despite the recent migration to cities in search of employment. In the 2000s, bi/multi racial Maori women may not share the *same* intimate contact with members of their whanau in the same way as those Maori described by Metge [1967]. Nearly forty years later many bi/multi racial Maori women's experiences reflect a wide variety of contact with a *community* of people from a multiplicity of cultural backgrounds, who are located in different social contexts and diverse cultural landscapes. This chapter looks at how Maori women see themselves today, and how they position their identity within the bicultural nation It introduces the narratives of twenty Maori Pakeha/Other New Zealand women whose self-representations position them as bi/multi racial. The objective is to determine whether they challenge the idea of an authentic Maori identity by providing 'experiential' evidence of their dual or multiple cultural subjectivities. As such, it is an attempt to refute the lack of information about the bi/multi racial woman and to make her absence visible in New Zealand academic writing. Do bi/multi racial women contest the assumed truths about Maori women as traditional and primordial? As the subject of her own gaze, does the bi/multi racial woman provide a narrative which speaks back to her occlusion? Further, do bi/multi racial women hold onto a sense of meaning of themselves as Maori, while engaging in the meanings of Other dominant discourses which inscribe Maori women with a traditional subjectivity? Is the Maori woman merely a victim of new forms of colonialism or has she found a way to resist being confined to a homogenous traditional subjectivity? In short, what can a bi/multi racial woman's narrative tell us about her difference as a multiply inscribed cultural subject?

This chapter is divided into three parts. The first section, 'No Hea Koe? Ko Wai Koe? Bi/multi Racial Hybridity', introduces the self-representations of twenty women who recognise themselves as bi/multi racial. As such it is narratively descriptive in its content. The second section, 'Unidentified Essence: Identity in Flux', looks at the cultural contradictions experienced by bi/multi racial women. The third part, 'Coherence of Identity', discusses bi/multi racial women's experiences of hybridity from a theoretical perspective, offering a re-reading of Maori identity by highlighting the relationship between cultural hybridity and multiple bi/multi racial subjectivities.

No hea koe? Ko wai Koe? Bi/Multi Racial Hybridity

In this section the narratives of bi/multi racial women are introduced to situate the question of bi/multi racial subjectivity within their experiential knowledge. Maori Pakeha/Other self-representations of identity show how articulations of Maori authenticity are recognised, understood and reconfigured through a complex web of inter-relationships and discursive processes. The invitation to identify [in whatever form was comfortable to the participant] gave the participant autonomy to respond in a way appropriate to her. Bi/multi racial women may not necessarily have knowledge pertaining to Maori greeting formalities. Within traditional Maori society a familiar greeting does not focus upon the individual's identity but is designed to identify the individual via the hapu/iwi they are affiliated to and, by extension, the region the individual comes from. A typical greeting would be "No hea koe?" or "Where are you from?" which is contrasted with "Ko Wai Koe?" or "Who are you?" as is performed in secular egalitarian Western identification processes. In the traditional greeting, whakapapa and landscape provide a sense of identity and of belonging. Once placed, relationship connections are recognised and the individual is greeted appropriately in accordance to their whakapapa and their place/status within the relationship between manuhiri and tangata whenua [Walker, 1990].

Given that bi/multi racial women may not have access to whakapapa or rohe knowledge, they may not necessarily identify in a traditional way. The participants involved in this research project do not position themselves solely as Maori and may not subscribe to a traditional Maori subjectivity. In fact, they may claim that the subject position accompanied by the sign 'Maori' may not be the dominant narrative of identity that best describes them. To avoid calling the subject into being in way that culturally appropriates or alienates the participant's choice to self identify in what ever way reflects their sense of who they are, the opening research question simply asked, "Could you describe for me who you are?". The responses were varied. Some of these are recorded here to highlight the themes which dominated self representations of identity.

Relationships and Subjectivity

A common theme to emerge in self-representations of identity is the way that a personal subjectivity is constructed and presented in association with relationships that are meaningful and valuable to the participant. Previously, white feminists have been challenged by women of colour for placing the locus of women's oppression within narratives of impoverishment associated with women's subordination [hooks, 1990, 1990a]. Conversely, women of colour speak about the value of family and they argue that the family is often a site of strength which provides a place of sanctuary against racism. Home, in these terms, becomes a place of regrouping and re-energising. African-American bell hooks [1990a: 49] expresses this sentiment in *Homeplace: a site of Resistance* in *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics* when she claims that home is "... a space where we return for renewal and self-recovery, where we can heal our wounds and become whole." hooks demonstrates that women who live with the complexities of colonialism and racial, sexual and class oppression, seek home as a place of sanctuary. She [1990a: 42] states:

> Historically, African-American people believed that the construction of a homeplace, however fragile and tenuous [the slave hut, the wooden shack], had a radical political dimension. Despite the brutal reality of racial apartheid, of domination, one's homeplace was the one site where one could freely confront the issue of humanization, where one could resist.

I suggest here that 'home' has specific meaning also for bi/multi racial Maori women in that 'home' functions metonymically to mean the place where whanau/family meet. Notwithstanding the fact that many Maori women experience 'home' as a site of physical, verbal, sexual, mental and spiritual abuse, for many others 'home' is the landscape which provides a place of belonging, of finding one's sense of self reflected among whanau in the exchange of inter-personal relationships that emanate from within the homespace. For example, one participant described herself as a 'Mum' and a 'Grandmother' and defined herself in terms of her love for people when she stated, "I believe I'm lucky because I've got the best of both worlds, having a loving and caring family." Another woman said that when Maori get together "we do not sit around talking about ourselves as Maori; when we get together we laugh, argue, cry, eat, work and play together." Where the subject identifies herself as having a "loving" or "closely knit family", her identity will reflect a subjectivity related to her position within the family regardless of whether it is Maori or Pakeha/Other. Other women positioned themselves within a sense of family identity and belonging in which culture acted as one component, while others acknowledged their unique personality traits.

One participant, Abbie, simply said, "I'm Maori and I'm Pakeha. I'm a sixteen year old female with a head of a twenty-five year old." Then she immediately followed that with this metaphorical statement:

> I don't play my instrument, I am my instrument. I play the guitar. I am my music. I am my family, and my sisters are me, and my parents are me, and I am my parents. I am extremely family oriented. I'm really stubborn. I'm really hard-headed, really strong-headed and I'm not manipulative, I'm assertive. There's a difference!

The subject does not privilege her identity as either Maori or Pakeha. Instead, her identity is understood via the subject position she occupies as daughter, sister, musician, assertive woman and the inter-relationships between herself and family. Closely related to an identity understood within the context of family and relationships were the roles that women occupied within their families. The following statement is made by a kuia, Joyce, who positions herself, her identity and sense of belonging in relation to her family, and the responsibilities these bring her as grandparent and worker of the land. It also highlights the impact on rural Maori women's esteem when their identities are confronted with a changing status, as the sanctioned roles previously provided within traditional family structures are eroded through urbanisation and capitalism's need for labour.

> I am sixty-seven years old, part Maori, part Pakeha. Mostly Maori, but until recently I never really sort of gave that part much thought. I'm a grandmother, and at that stage of my life where I wonder actually what I'm about because I'm not doing much on the farm any more; the grandchildren are hardly ever here; I kind of feel lost.

Joyce's subjectivity is imbued with her identity as grandmother. She contrasts her lack of interest in her 'Maori' identity to that of her identity as 'Nana'. She shows a sense of her identity being weakened by her inability to perform the obligations as worker and grandmother. Clearly, for Joyce, being culturally identified with Maori or Pakeha are not as important as her lived reality as worker and grandparent, seen in the performance of her daily life. So, to an extent, narratives show that the roles people play or the subject positions they occupy give a sense of subjectivity/identity and of belonging. Joyce's sentiment is echoed in Leslie's narrative when she describes herself as "... a worker. I love to think that I am a good person and I am also a writer." For Leslie, her primary sense of identity resides in her identification of herself as a good person, a worker and a writer.

Some of the women pointed to the fluidity of identity in that their narratives suggested their identities responded to changes and new information. As such, identity is always under contestation. The following example shows a process of developing or 'coming into a Maori subjectivity', of taking up a Maori subject position and Maori

ethnicity. Jill's narrative points to her reconfigured identity. She was adopted at birth by a Pakeha family and had, until recently, recognised herself as 'Pakeha'. As an adult she learned that her biological father was Maori which meant she would also have Maori ancestry. Her dialogue shows her developing awareness of the new subjectivity available to her. Jill states:

> I'm Jill and I'm a New Zealander, first and foremost. However, now I identify myself as a New Zealand Maori Pakeha. So, I was born in this country, and I've come back to this country, so who am I? A woman who loves people, who feels comfortable with most people, but somehow [I] feel special when mixing in Maori communities.

Clearly, Jill had begun a process of reconfiguring her identity to include another cultural subjectivity. She spent time looking for her genealogical whanau/iwi to no avail. However, during her journey a Maori whanau has recognised her as Maori and offered to whangai her. In the absence of her corporeal and genealogical family she has been loved and accepted by other Maori as she takes up her place as one of the members of that community.

Subjectivication and Ideological Identities

Judith Butler [1993] points out in *Gender is Burning* that the one who names the subject and calls her into being/representation functions as the Law/Authority. Within this subjectivating act, the subject once subjectivated with a Maori subjectivity develops a 'conscience' of themselves as Maori, informing the way they think and behave in culturally specific ways. Foucault [1980b: 212] identifies two meanings to the term 'subject' where the subject is firstly "subject to someone else by control and dependence", and secondly is "tied to his own identity by a conscience or self knowledge." Both meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to. Bi/multi racial Maori women deny the possibility of being culturally subjectivated only once. The notion of bi/multi raciality exists in the possibility of a dual inscription where the subject is subjectivated with more than one dominant cultural script/actions. Once called into being by her difference as Maori and her difference as Pakeha [difference in relation to Maori] or her difference as Greek, Jewish, Indian or Australian, she becomes the subject of these individual cultural connections through her own conscious participation and maintenance of her cultural differences.

Her difference as a 'multiply culturally subjectivated' subject does not preclude her entry into a Maori subjectivity, but rather her subjectivication into a Maori subjectivity precludes the possibility of other subjectivities. Dominant narratives of Maori authenticity, located in the discursive processes embedded within bicultural nationalist

politics, acts as a form of power which subjugates and makes the bi/multi racial woman 'subject to' the one who names the subject and call her into being [via bicultural nationalism and its discursive processes]. This positions the subject in a matrix of interconnected relationships which deny her the possibility of being represented with a dual cultural subjectivity. The bi/multi racial woman is called into question because she cannot perform the cultural specificities required in a pedagogical/national Maori identity. These excluded women are among the nation's newest subalterns, yet an ideology prevails within the bicultural nation to erase the non-traditional woman's subjective experiences by marginalising her as 'colonised' and contaminated with Westernism/Pakeha-ism [Awatere, 1984]. What is the experience of those Maori women who cannot, or choose not to, conform to the singular cultural specificities embedded within the new 'traditional' subjectivity of the Maori woman?

The disruption of a quintessential Maori identity is important for challenging notions of authenticity which seek to regulate and control Maori women. In this section the experiences of being Maori Pakeha/Other are located within the women's narratives in order to provide a counter narrative to a prescriptive traditional subjectivity. The bi/multi racial woman challenges an image of Maori identity that can be conceived of as innate, singular, stable and fixed. Rather, their narratives point to the cultural overlaps and disjuncture which make explicit the way an excess of identity produces a subject that falls outside a dichotomous Maori/Pakeha subjectivity. A dominant discourse of Maori identity prevails in spite of the recognition that Maori make up a heterogenous community. In reality, women of Maori ancestry have a different experience of subjectivity to that offered within bicultural rhetoric. Foucault [1980b: 216] states:

> Maybe the target nowadays is not to discover what we are, but to refuse what we are. We have to imagine and to build up what we could be to get rid of this kind of political "doublebind", which is the simultaneous individualization and totalization of modern power structures.

The ideological assumptions embodied within a narrative of a traditional Maori identity is enmeshed in the call to Maori ethnicity/identity. As explained in Chapter Four, in the individual's answering of the call she is subjectivated with the highly specific ideologies embedded within a newly configurated Maori ethnicity. Gibbins and Youngman [1996: 21-22] claim that:

> The intensity of "ideological identities" may vary considerably from one individual to the next. For one person, feminism may provide an all-encompassing world-view, in which case personal identity is likely to be deeply rooted in her ideological affinity with feminism.
>
> ... [As well] "liberation ideologies" such as black liberation, gay activism and some forms of feminism may be very deeply embedded in personal identities. For another person, feminism

> may be activated only in particular situations... This also suggests that one can assume multiple identities, particularly if these identities are situationally specific.

The articulation of a traditional Maori subjectivity, as mentioned previously, has its origins in the political aspirations of bicultural nationalism to reinvent itself as homogenous and culturally stable. In so doing, the nation accepted a counter nationalist reinvention of Maori in politicised ethnic terms [Spoonley, 1993]. Consequently, Maori are being subjectivated with a specific *Maori* subjectivity which is imbued with its own ideological desires to reproduce an ethnically pure Maori subject/community for its own political purposes. Gibbins and Youngman [1996: 23] state that "[a] key role played by ideologies with respect to personal identities is not so much in their creation as in their politization."

> For example, an individual may feel a strong patriotic attachment to Canada or the United States, but it is the ideology of nationalism that politicizes that identification and suggests that it is an appropriate criterion by which to make political choices... In short, we adjust our identities in response to changes in the social and political environments... [T]he process of adopting and adapting identities is not always conscious. Rarely do we get up in the morning and think, "From now on, I am defined by my union membership/gender/religion." Rather, the process is typically subtle as we begin to see the world differently... As the ideological currents to which we are exposed slowly alter the ways in which we think, we begin to see the world in different ways and adjust our identities accordingly.

Jill's narrative points to the role her subjectivication played in her reconfigured identity during the 1980s. Without access to the textual documentation the nation-state made available to Jill about her adoption, she would still identify as Pakeha today. When provided with evidence which verified Jill's Maori genealogy [but failed to record her father's tribal affiliations] Jill reconfigured her identity to include a sense of Maori ethnicity. The information Jill received immediately called her into being as a Maori, resulting in her search for her Maori birth parent/s. Essentially speaking, Jill was called into ethnic 'difference' by the nature of her indigenous genealogy. Her racial residue [whakapapa] was to result in a complete rethinking of her cultural identity and position within the nation as woman and as Pakeha. In answering the call, she takes up a specific sort of Maoriness, inscripted with a highly politicised Maori identity offered within articulations of Maori ethnicity. Without whakapapa [the essential ingredient in legitimating the subject as Maori] adopted bi/multi racial women, and women who are denied information about their whakapapa, identify as Maori but cannot participate in their Maori whanau/community or have an association with their tribal landscape. They lack an emotionally and spiritually significant place to belong to and call home, a turangawaewae. Hence, the Maori whanau that called Jill to be its 'whangai' also interpellated her into a Maori community which understands itself and its members [in part] by the ideological truisms embedded within notions of an 'imagined Maori

community'. Jill's sense of Maoriness is evident when she claims she feels 'special' in Maori communities; a sense of belonging and of a shared understanding and mutuality is expressed. It is with Pakeha's Other that Jill shares an affinity through cultural difference, as a recognition of Maori cultural values and practices come to signify that she is home. Jill did not give up her Pakeha cultural identity to take up a Maori cultural identity. She lives with the ambivalence of both cultural subjectivities and works with the tensions provided by these conflictual positionalities since her Maori subjectivication.

Bell also points to her subjectivication as Maori when she recalls she developed a sense of herself as Maori when she was seven years old. Her narrative records the discursive process of counting Maori students within the education system which resulted in her subjectivication into Maori subjectivity. Bell takes up the subject position 'Maori' after she recognises that she is the 'subject' of her own racist jokes. She states:

> Being Maori for me is largely [about] 'cultural values' and how I conduct myself in things that I do day to day. And I guess that in some cases this is difficult for me because I didn't even realise that I was a Maori until I was about seven when they used to take the statistics at Primary School, as to how many Maori kids were in the class. And I saw all the other brown kids putting up their hands and sort of thought well why are they doing that? And then one day the teacher looked at me and sort of just stared at me and I thought 'Oh well, I'd better put my hand up'. And I went home and asked Mum and she said 'Yes, you are Maori.' And I went 'Oh well what's that?' because I didn't see that we were different, you know. Some of us had brown skin and some had white skin but I didn't know that we were different people... and I thought 'Oh my God, I'm a Maori'. And you know all those jokes about 'dirty Maoris' and things like that, [they] stopped pretty quickly because I realised that that's who I was.

For women like Bell, being 'called into being' as Maori threatened to subsume her sense of identity as non-Maori by providing her with an alternative set of 'cultural values' and behaviours. However, this subjectivication did not subsume her prior identity beneath an acquired identity in the same way that some would argue happens when a Pakeha subjectivity is imposed on the Maori subject. Rather, her story shows the way that identities can be synthesised within the one corporeal body, informing a new sense of self/identity which becomes meaningful, valuable and enriching. For Maori women who work with the contradictions embedded within their dual cultural subjectivities, it is not a matter of choosing one or the other ethnic identity or of subordinating one identity to the other but rather it involves coping with an uneasy gait caused by dancing with a dual identity.

What Bell's story also points to is the role the education system played when it constructed itself as the authority that subjectivated Bell into recognising herself as Maori. Her narrative points to the way in which gathering statistical evidence of Maori attendance informed her sense of self and the cultural behaviours [actions] and values she would come to identify with. The Law/Nation-State, via the discursive processes

of subjectivication embedded within education, played a role in calling the subject into being as different from Pakeha. The teacher in this instance became an interlocutor in the process of Bell's subjectivication as ethnic/different. This difference was signified in the term 'Maori' and was practised in the performance of ethnicity; Bell stopped making racist jokes and she became Maori through adopting the ethnic values and practices of Maori. Once subjectivated with a sense of 'difference', Bell developed her own conscience about being Maori. Foucault [1980b: 220] states:

> In effect, what defines a relationship of power is that it is a mode of action which does not act directly and immediately on others. Instead, it acts upon their actions: an action upon an action, on existing actions or on those which may arise in the present or the future.

Landscape and Reconfigured Identities

Debates on the relationship between landscape and subjectivity has seen the re-emergence of terms like diaspora and hybridity [Mitchell, 1997]. It could be argued that the bi/multi racial woman is predisposed to being diasporic given the historical shift in geographical positioning from rural dweller to a predominantly urban dweller. In the day to day movement between cultural spaces and shifting landscapes, her cultural subjectivity can reflect the psyche of the diasporic. Diaspora refers to a sense of geographical and psychological displacement but it is also is theorised as a site of resistance [Bhabha, 1990, 1994]. The bi/multi racial woman's spatial ambivalence offers the subject an opportunity to develop partial if not multiple knowledges. Several participants included a narrative of identity which made reference to landscapes which they believed shaped and influenced their sense of identity. Mitchel [1997] states:

> In the past, the invocation of diaspora has related most specifically to the situation of a people living outside of their traditional homeland. Historically, for example, the general dispersion of scattering of a 'diasporic' people has been identified most closely with the dispersion of the Jews among the' Gentile' nations. In contemporary usage in much of cultural theory, however, the term has come to signify a more general sense of displacement, as well as a challenge to the limits of existing boundaries. The tighter definitions have signified groups as diasporic, or which followed an ideal-type model. Significant diasporas have, by and large, given way to broader conceptualizations of travel, displacement, dislocation, and divided loyalties.

Helena spoke about her Maori identity as culturally fractured through living in an Australian landscape for a long period of time. For Helena, this experience did not only add a new knowledge about herself; it marked her with an Australian accent which has reconfigured her cultural identity to include another construction of her identity as Australian. She states, "I'd describe myself as Maori/Pakeha/New Zealander, but I've spent twenty years in Melbourne, across the Tasman, and this has

an influence on who I am." One woman, Keri, a New Zealand born writer spoke about her identity in a profoundly meaningful way when she recited her genealogical relationships to relatives, the occupations they engaged in and the landscapes they were linked to through various whakapapa [Scottish, English, Orkney Islands, New Zealand/tribal] and their respective kinship/tribal landscapes. She states, "I think the South is an extraordinarily beautiful island; [it] is also part of who I am, in a most literal way. I think you eat off the ground; you draw your nourishment from it." For Keri, the parts of herself which emanate from the places tied to her parents and grandparents provide a sense of movement across the world where home becomes everywhere, residing in the metonymy of the land as mother.

For many Maori, we have become geographically and psychologically displaced. Connection to the land has lost a deeply significant meaning in a traditional Maori sense. Many women do not know where their tribal lands are situated. However, for some, a connection to whanau land exists through an imagined relationship to the land. Identity is derived through that imagined relationship to an imagined landscape. In this way, a sense of belonging to the land is achieved when Keri speaks about 'home' as if it is some maternal mother waiting to welcome her long lost child home. Maori, like other First Nation Peoples have been pathologised according to disconnection from land. Malkki [1992: 24] in *National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialisation of National Identity Among Scholars and Refugees* states:

> There is an awareness today of a global social fact that, now more than perhaps ever before, people are chronically mobile and displaced, and invent homes and homelands in the absence of territorial, national bases - not in situ, but through memories of, and claims on places they can or will no longer corporeally inhabit.

When the bi/multi racial woman doesn't have access to whakapapa there is a reconfiguration of whanau land that is applied to non-Maori family lands and supports the identity and sense of belonging for the individual. For Jill, part of her new sense of her identity as Maori has resulted in a reconceptualisation of her Pakeha family land in a way which she understands via her newly configured Maori identity. Jill explains:

> So whanau land is [now] that European construction of the nuclear family with its own 'quarter acre section, pavlova paradise'. So whanau land is something that not only belongs to those who identify as Maori [and] actually have a whakapapa... I don't have a whakapapa.

In the absence of knowledge of whakapapa and the 'real' physical landscapes associated with genealogy [land, Marae, urupa, rivers, mountains and sacred sites] the subject imagines her whanau lands in symbolic terms. In this way, bi/multi racial women can, in spite of an absence of a real relationship to their tupuna land, create an imagined landscape/tupuna/whanau which functions to give them a sense of belonging

to the Maori community. This connection to landscape is made again when Jill states, "Who I am is linked very much to the environment, and particularly to my passion for the sea and being out in a boat... I might have a fishing rod in my hand, but I can sit and look at the waves and listen to the birds, and listen to the wind and that's when I really know who I am." The sea becomes an important anchor of identity in a way which is profoundly meaningful to Jill as she reconstructs her identity via her newly reconfigured sense of ethnicity, shown in her relationship to landscape.

One participant began a conversation about her identity with a lengthy discourse on the significance of space and the role it played throughout her childhood and adult life. "I would describe myself... as a person who likes their space, probably more so than what's good for me. And I've always been like that. I've always had a tendency towards that direction." Clearly, space became a meaningful landscape where the subject understood herself, recognised herself. Other subjective experiences of her identity were told only after the importance of this 'landscape' conversation had been received. This was followed by a definition of her cultural identity when she stated, "Even though I identify quite strongly as 'Maori' I cannot ignore the fact that there's a lot of Pakeha in me as well."

Clearly, self-representations of identity are complex, interwoven stories that involve the dynamics of space and competing cultural ethnicities. For Lee, her turangawaewae was strongest within her own geographical psychological space. The order of importance in the subject's life, in terms of which identity narrative dominates, is reflected in the conditions that call the subject into being at any given time. This same woman, if situated within a Maori context [for example, a tangihanga] would no doubt privilege her Maori ethnic identity over her Pakeha identity; the importance of 'space' in this context would probably remain outside the dominant subject position and relevant subjectivity operating at the time.

Strong Maori Identity Supported by other Cultural Identities

Among the participants in this research are those who see their primary identity as Maori but also incorporate a second [third or fourth] cultural subjectivity that is non-Maori. These women represent themselves in a similar way to the authors in Ihimaera's [1998] narratives in *Growing up Maori* in that they conceptualise their ethnic identity within a primary narrative of being Maori. Faith explains her identity in the following way: "I was born [name]. I'm Tuhoe, Scottish and Irish ancestry. I'm a mixed bag. I'm a true New Zealander... I'm basically a product I suppose of both lineages. Having said that, I am much more than that you know...." What is interesting about Faith's story is that, despite identifying herself in ethnic terms, at no time did she limit her identity to these categorisations. Another kuia conducted her entire interview

in te reo Maori thus indicating that her strongest 'self' was associated with her sense of *being* Maori. She spoke of her whakapapa and her migration within her geographical rohe, and of the interconnectedness between her identities. Clearly, although her non Maori genealogy and its influence were respected and given their place in her whakapapa, they were not excluded in her declaration of identity. Rather, being enmeshed in her unique history enriched her sense of self, shown in the knowledge she had of both histories.

Bi/multi racial women presented with primary identities, supported by other identities which featured strong influences such as spirituality, age, sexuality, class and geographical location. Bell states, "I'd say that I was... a young Maori woman in my late twenties, from a working class background currently living in Wellington... and aspiring to move from working class to middle class. I would probably... recognise myself as lesbian". Some women indicated that they had both Maori and Pakeha/Other cultural backgrounds but favoured their Maori identity over a Pakeha identity. Several women identified in strongly traditional/authentic terms. However, having strong Maori ancestry did not preclude them from acknowledging their Pakeha ancestry and its influence upon their subjectivity. For these women, their identity was strongly linked to their sense of place within their Maori family and community. For some, identifying as Maori has occurred later in life through choice and self development, and as a show of Maori political solidarity and belonging. One kuia says:

> ...[I'm] identifying really as an older Maori woman. I'm well aware of course, that I have Pakeha Scottish ancestry as well, but now I've chosen. I did [choose] some time back to actually identify with Maori. I find it less complicated in terms of, you know, halving oneself so to speak... I feel more comfortable in this way, although I'm not a fluent speaker, but nevertheless I don't think [this] is the criteria.

Mihi grew up in rural New Zealand with the responsibilities and obligations handed down to her by her elders. For Mihi, the Pakeha subjectivity that she acknowledges does not stem from her Pakeha/Other family as they were unknown to her, but rather functioned for her in the subectivating arms of the state through education.

> I had a very privileged upbringing. My father was very aware of who he was and I grew up in that atmosphere of being secure in the fact that... I was Maori. I knew who I was and I knew that I was loved. I had two parents who were very good parents; for Maori of my generation my upbringing was very privileged. The academic Pakeha world I was good at, so that made it very easy to live in the Pakeha world and to deal in it, but at the same time being raised with a sense of pride in being Maori...It gives you a sense of belonging, and pride in who you are.

Unidentified Essence: Identity in Flux

For some bi/multi racial women the question of hybrid identity provoked anxiety. For Bhabha [1994b] in his essay *Signs Taken for Wonders* the hybrid is uncontainable because it problematises the symmetry and duality of notions of self/other and inside/outside. The hybrid straddles the cultural borderlands between Maori and Pakeha and the physical borderlands of Maori cultural spaces and Pakeha/non-Maori cultural space. These cultural borderlands do not only refer to the physical spaces allocated Maori and Pakeha but are present whenever Maori and Pakeha meet. Gloria Anzaldua [1987] writes of this in her article *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza* in her theorisation of difference which she locates in the utopian reading of the Spanish/ Mexican hybrid:

> The actual physical borderland that I'm dealing with in this book is the Texas-U. S. Southwest/Mexican border. The psychological borderlands, the sexual borderlands and the spiritual borderlands are not particular to the Southwest. In fact, the borderlands are physically present whenever two or more cultures edge each other, where people of different races occupy the same territory, where under, lower, middle and upperclasses touch, where the space between two individuals shrinks with intimacy.

As noted above, Anzaldua's hybrid is theorised as a synthesis of Spanish, Mexican and American, a surplus of the three cultural and racial groups. In her reconfiguration of identity, Anzaluda posits a new identity which has no resemblance to its benefactors and is not implicated in the colonial relationship of power and domination between white/black, American/Spanish, American/Mexican and Spanish/Mexican. As such, she sees the hybrid as greater than the sum of its parts when she explains:

> We call ourselves Mexican-American to signify we are neither Mexican or American... we don't identify with the Anglo American cultural values and we don't totally identify with the Mexican cultural values. We are a synergy of two cultures with various degrees of Mexicanness or Angloness [Anzaldua, 1990: i].

In the New Zealand context bi/multi racial participants represented themselves as having distinctive cultural subjectivities as opposed to a synergy of two cultural identities in the way Anzaldua describes. The participants did not identify themselves as a 'third' subject or describe their identities as a 'synthesis' of Maori and Pakeha genetic pooling. They did not claim that they had superior racial genetics which produced in them an excess identity, superior to that of their parents' groups. The bi/multi racial women preferred to talk about themselves in a way which honoured both their Maori whakapapa and culture and also their Pakeha/Other cultures. Their narratives pointed out that their borderland's identity is in flux precisely because they were shifting physical and psychological landscapes constantly, and not because their

identity was an excess of these. At no time did their narratives suggest that they had developed an identity separated from their respective Maori and Pakeha/Other subjectivities. An anxiety from living between the Maori Pakeha/Other cultural borderlands became evident as they moved between one psychological or physical cultural space to another. The opportunity to represent oneself in a unified way raised questions of ambiguity, inconsistency and disruption. Gibbins and Youngman [1996: 22] state:

> [I]t is possible to have a number of pairs of glasses, and to switch depending upon the conditions - different lenses work for reading, driving and the sun. The tough part comes if different and potentially conflicting identities are brought into play in the same situation, or if one identity is so "imperialistic" that it intrudes into all aspects of a person's life and crowds out other forms of identity. It may be the case, for example, that someone sees the world exclusively through the lens of environmentalism or feminism, and that other "optics" are employed only to the extent that they can be incorporated within the dominant perspective.

Roberta's story depicts life on the borderlands. She points to an identity in flux in that she resists the call to Maorism, lesbianism, feminism or any other form of identity which she fears will name her and contain her in particular ways. Roberta could not conclusively define who she was, what she had been or what would become; she clearly had great difficulty answering the question. She indicated that she did not want to define herself in terms of a normative and developmental history when she stated, "I do feel like I can't see myself when I look back at my life history." When confronted with the various subject positions available to Maori women [radical woman, mother, grandmother, aunty, member of whanau, worker, lesbian, kuia] she claimed, "None of those things are me; I have been all those things, but the *essence* of who I really am isn't just those single things." She went on to state that she has been in a long term gay relationship, has been a health professional and is now a business woman; these things, although part of her, are not her 'total'. Roberta clarifies this in her own way. "When I think about who I am it's like I'm a lot of things. I'm a longing; I'm a need. I'm very happy to be me... [I]t's funny 'cos you're asking me a question and I can't really answer it." She points to her search to find meaning:

> I spent a lot of my earlier life longing to know where I fitted in, 'cos I never seemed to fit anywhere. I never felt right wherever I was, and that's what it felt like in the Maori world, what it felt like in the Pakeha world, I never felt right... wherever... whatever situation I was in.

For Roberta, her dilemma was not a matter of having an 'identity crisis' which could be easily be resolved by increased contact with her 'taha Maori'. Rather, her cultural dislocation was present in her childhood and continues to function as a dominant dislocated identity. Neither does her narrative suggest that she identifies

herself in some utopian way as a surplus of all that is valuable in both Maori and Pakeha cultures. Rather, Roberta recognises that she, as a 'totality', is made up of cultural contradictions which position her differently from family members who identify as Maori. Her story reflects the reality of her daily life which is lived outside dominant constructions of either a Maori or Pakeha woman's identity, but this 'outside' is not conceived of in a way which would suggest her identity has been constructed outside/in excess of the colonial relationship. Roberta's self-representation would suggest that her identity is in flux because she straddles the cultural margin which defines and demarcates the boundaries of the colonial relationship. In the shifting landscapes of her identity she requires 'multiple pairs of glasses' which, as Gibbins and Youngman suggest, get switched depending upon the conditions. At times this results in difficulties. For example, this can be evidenced when conflicting identities are brought into play at the same time, or when one identity dominates others. Roberta's refusal to privilege any one subjectivity highlights the art of balancing multiple [and conflicting] identities.

Another participant, Mahinarangi, defined herself in terms of her name which held within it the cultural and racial contradictions of her family history. A well-known New Zealand Maori singer/songwriter, Mahinarangi narrated her dual cultural subjectivity via her mother's whakapapa and her father's Jewish ethnicity. "So, I'm Maori on my mother's side and Jewish and Scottish on my father's side." The subject of dual cultural heritage has had such a profound effect on this participant's life that she has written and released a song about the conflict of being positioned within a Maori-Jewish-Scottish subjectivity.

Coherence of Identity

These bi/multi racial women's narratives point to the way in which Maori ethnicity is an important component of identity but is by no means the dominant cultural identity in all subjects at all times. A Maori essence is more likely to show through in the gendered and cultural specificities evidenced in the way women perform in relation to their roles as mothers, grandmothers and workers, and as members of whanau, family and communities. When the subject is doubly inscripted with two sets of cultural ideologies, values and practices, then she will reflect a dual cultural identity. She may also articulate a primary identity as located in her class or sexuality as opposed to culture. Butler [1993: 121] claims that the subjectivication process is not one of control and domination. Rather it works to initiate the subject into complying with becoming the subject:

> The reprimand does not merely repress or control the subject, but forms a crucial part of the juridical and social formation of the subject. The call is formative, if not performative, precisely because it initiates the individual into the subjected status of the subject.

The subject is not only constituted with a politically and socially defined discursive space [as in bicultural nationalist politics] but is regulated and controlled within this psychic space [Butler, 1993]. Both the Maori national community and Pakeha national community function to regulate and control the subject via their inscripted subjectivity. For these women, the discursive influences which subjectivate them as cultural subjects are two-fold. The bi/multi racial answers the call to Maori subjectivity as well as a non-Maori subjectivity, where the latter refers to the construction of a cultural identity predicated upon the normative white Pakeha subject. But once subjectivated, what operates to maintain a sense of subjectivity?

Colonialism is implicated in a subject's re-subjectivication of themselves through surveillance of themselves as the 'cultural' subject. Foucault [1979] in his chapter *Panopticon* in *Discipline and Punish* elaborates on the birth of the prison using Jeremy Bentham's architectural metaphor of the Panopticon [prison and centrally located guard house] forming a structure of surveillance where the prisoners are surveiled by the guard. The guardhouse is encircled by a ring of cells. From this position the guard has a clear view/surveillance of the prisoners. However, the prisoners/colonised, in recognising themselves as the surveiled [the means to see the guard in the guard house are denied them due to the architectural protection/structure afforded the guard] regulate and normalise their behaviour on the expectation embedded within the authority/Law symbolised by the presence of the guard. Foucault's ideas become useful here when he claims that power does not simply operate in a Hegelian master/slave dialect but through other, more subtle means. For Foucault, surveillance is more than discipline in that it operates in the name of serving prisoners, treating patients, instructing school children, confining the insane, supervising workers and ensuring that the unemployed work. Surveillance, Foucault suggests [1979: 205] is more than a disciplinary function:

> It is a type of location of bodies in space, of distribution of individuals in relation to one another, of hierarchical organization, of disposition, of centres and channels of power, which can be implemented in hospitals, workshops, schools and prisons.

The power of the Panopticon is at work in the prisoners' expectation of being observed by the guard. The guard's gaze, although not seen directly by the prisoner, functions as an imagined surveillance. In this way, the formation and function of the Panopticon induces a state of self consciousness in the inmate. Foucault [1979: 201] writes that "a state of consciousness and permanent visibility that assures the automatic

functioning of power" occurs in the Panopticon/colonial surveillance process. In this way, the inmates and the subjects of other discursive processes located within the systems of education, hospitals and other state institutions, are controlled by the regulations of the gaze of these authorities where they come to function as the Law. The subject monitors the self in relation to the surveillance and expectation of subjectivity held within the gaze of the Law. Foucault's ideas can be related to the colonised/surveyed and the coloniser/discursive colonial processes.

For the bi/multi racial woman, this surveillance is disrupted by the presence of a second [and possible third or fourth] cultural subjectivity which reflects the gaze differently. For example, if the 'Maori' guard employed in the Law/Authority of Maori nationalism surveyed the Maori subject but saw the Pakeha subject, what would they actually see? What could this reversed gaze see in its partiality? What possibilities could this open up for their own opportunity for emancipation? Conversely, if the surveyor was Pakeha surveilling a Pakeha/Other subjectivity, but instead confronted the Maori subject, what would they see and what opportunities would it offer a politics of difference? Self surveillance holds both disabling and enabling opportunities in that the bi/multi racial woman is confronted with her internal difference, but within this dual psychological space is the possibility of new awarenesses of the Other. The modes of power that operate to marginalise and oppress Maori are then exposed. Again, this is Bhabha's [1994] point in that hybrids turn the gaze back onto the dominant authority. Both identity/psychological spaces are real. Both cultural subjectivities hold compromise and promise. Her corporeal body holds the tensions between the different, yet inter-related, ways of knowing and of being Maori and Pakeha in the world. She is a split subject but within this split can offer a new reading of Maori women's identity and the way power works within the bicultural nation to subjugate the raced/Maori and gendered/female subject.

To those women who recall their subjectivication into a Maori identity, their sense of Maoriness appears to be no less real or valuable than to those women who were born into a family who called the subject into being as Maori from birth. However, this does not mean to say that a variation of Maori-ness or degree of ethnicity exists. Rather, what it can raise is the question of 'how' the subject is enculturated into a Maori subjectivity and the relationship this subjectivication has to the subject's experience of Maori subjectivity. My point is that a Maori subjectivity is highly specific depending upon the historicity of the subject and the way that Maori identity is being constructed at the time of the subject's acquisition of identity. Future chapters will highlight Maori identity as a highly politicised identity category imbued with counter nationalist resistance objectives. There are also many other variables at play in the determination of Maori difference, of which race/ morphology plays a significant role. Nevertheless, despite the heterogeneity within individual subjects, and between

Maori subjects, what is important is that there is a recognition and identification with a culture that is different from the normative Pakeha culture.

What these narratives do not claim is that a Maori identity is subsumed *beneath* a Pakeha identity. It exists *alongside* a Pakeha/Other identity and, like those other identities, it only functions as dominant depending upon context and need. The primary difference between either a Maori or Pakeha subjectivity and a dual Maori Pakeha/Other subjectivity is that the latter contains the Subject/Other, coloniser/colonised, Pakeha/Maori within the same corporeal body. For Maori who identify Pakeha as the perpetrator and beneficiary of colonisation, and for Pakeha who identify Maori as the modern perpetrator and beneficiary of the nation's resources [for example, via lump sum payments to iwi] the perpetrator is clearly identified. But the bi/multi racial woman doesn't have the luxury of being positioned in this way. The ambiguity of racial tension is always present. She is at once both coloniser and colonised, and perceived as victim and perpetrator. Since colonisation the social construction of Maori has been doubly infused with the ideologies, values and practices of the Pakeha/Other; there is no authentic Maori identity outside that prescribed in the colonial relationship. Pania McArdell [1992: 84] in her essay *Whanaupani* in *Feminist Voices* says:

> In learning to read and write, Maori people also learned Pakeha beliefs, values and social habits entrenched in Pakeha teachings of Christianity. Maori girls learned the Judeo-Christian attitudes to women, which eventually meant a re-evaluation of their place in their own society based on these new beliefs.

Compromises need to be made to accommodate a dual positioning. Roberta's narrative [referred to earlier in reference to her culturally conflicted childhood identity and her dislocated cultural subjectivity as an adult] clearly points to life on the borderlands, located somewhere between a Maori and Pakeha subjectivity, complete with the gendered responsibilities and prescribed roles that accompany her dual/multiple subjectification as Maori, Pakeha/Other and as female. But, despite the incongruence and inconsistencies within and between subjectivities, she indicated that her identity was stable in its disjuncture. For Roberta, her identity is stabilised outside a subjectivity associated with a subject position steeped in either a Maori or Pakeha authenticity. To elaborate on her story further, Roberta makes sense of herself and her identity within an essentialist narrative located outside Western and Maori history. In short, she reconfigures herself within an Eastern spiritual philosophy, a philosophy which understands identity primarily as spiritual. Roberta lives on the borderlands between a Maori and Pakeha subjectivity and between an identity that was prescripted as the role of mother, grandmother, midwife and business woman. But she claims her identity is stabilised outside authentic narratives located in Maori or Pakeha identity.

She searched for a 'meaningful' identity *essence* located outside history and racial/cultural narratives of subjectivity. The point here is that participants, although recognising their partiality and cultural incongruencies, and the overlaps and disjuncture they bring to their lives, still manage to hold a sense of their identity as stable, whole and unified. This is mediated by consciously shifting subject positions which give the subjects a sense of agency and power over their fragmentation.

Identity Containment

There was an overwhelming sense of identity containment in the subjects despite narratives which speak of cultural contradictions and dislocations, and discrimination which stemmed from their unique difference as *both* Maori *and* Pakeha/Other. It interesting to note that some women defined themselves with reference to blood quantification. Terms like 'half-caste' and 'part-Maori' occurred alongside other narratives of identity, but did not seem to impose upon the subjects' sense of their identities being secure. Some of the older participants described themselves in terms of blood quantum, a legacy of New Zealand's colonial discourse on race management, while younger participants spoke of themselves as 'part Maori', a way of honouring their whakapapa despite their Pakeha/Other racial and cultural origins. These narratives point to how Maori-ness and Pakeha-ness [or Jewish-ness, Indian-ness, Irish-ness] lie in their participation in culturally specific daily activities. It is how individuals come together in culturally specific ways in the name of family, community and nation which holds specific meaning for the subject and provides a sense of identification with the cultural grouping they identify with.

The hybrid woman merely acknowledges the dual/multiple narratives of cultural/family values and practices available to her. She is not simply located in either one or the other but is a containment of both. These narratives point to their resiliency when it comes to making sense of their differences in relation to a discrete Maori tuturu and Pakeha/Other identity. The bi/multi racial woman has an ability to think beyond the dichotomous cultural identities imposed upon her and to create a third space that serves her interests within her whanau, family, community and nation/s. Hybrid women exhibit an ability to speak about the parts of themselves [different cultural subjectivities] that make up a sense of wholeness described by Rangimarie Pere's [1991] concept of Maori holistic well-being *Te Wheke: A Celebration of Infinite Wisdom.* Pere defines Maori health via a holistic model based on the ancient teachings of her people which she symbolises in the form of *Te Wheke* [the octopus]. She uses a metaphorical description and analysis of Te Wheke and the relationship each tentacle has to a holistic dimension of Maori. Pere [1991: 3] states:

> The head represents the child/family. Each tentacle represents a dimension that requires and needs certain things to help give sustenance to the whole. The suckers on each tentacle represent the many facets that exist within each dimension. The tentacles move out in an infinite direction for sustenance when the octopus moves laterally. The tentacles can also be intertwined so that there is a mergence, with no clear boundaries. The dimensions need to be understood in relation to each other, and within the context of the whole.

Te Wheke represents the totality of the Maori individual encapsulated within the well-being of the individual which is connected to whanau, community and environment. For example, among some of the dimensions Pere identifies as central for Maori wholeness and well-being includes the care of the hinengaro, tinana and wairua in relation to whanau, community and environment.

To extend Pere's metaphor, the bi/multi racial Te Wheke consists of a number of bodies and tentacles which include Maori cultural symbolic structures and Pakeha/Other symbolic structures as well. Imagine that these [cultural] octopuses overlay each other. The Bi/multi Racial Te Wheke is made up of separate octopuses representing themselves with different colours and names. Imagine that the Maori Te Wheke is coloured red and the Pakeha equivalent of Te Wheke is overlaid in blue. Now imagine what happens when the cultural contradictions and inter-play of power between the two are invoked and these cultural-coloured tentacles begin to agitate and turn against each other. Imagine how they interconnect and speak to each other in their kaleidoscope of pink, crimson, fuchsia, magenta, mauve, lavender, violet and purplish hues. The coloured tentacles of cultural difference come into play in the bi/multi racial's life, touching, merging, sharing, overlapping, seeping, bleeding, spilling, covering, concealing, hiding, revealing, sliding, crossing, weaving and spreading into and out of each other's Other. In this plethora of difference, dislocation and inter-connectedness a wholeness exists. Although fractured and disrupted by the disjuncture caused through the movement of its parts, the Bi/multi/ Racial Te Wheke compensates for its lack of cultural depth in some areas by substituting and supporting itself in other areas. As some cultural tentacles are in movement, others lie dormant, waiting to come back into performance. The tentacles are always in play despite some being temporarily hidden from sight. Others are visibly more dominant at particular moments in time.

Now, imagine a Jewish cultural coloured Te Wheke overlays the red Maori Te Wheke which is lain over the blue Bi/multi Racial Te Wheke. If the Jewish Te Wheke's culturally symbolic ways of knowing and being well/whole in the world are metaphorically represented as golden, what a beautiful and confusing merging of inside and outside will occur in the subject. How do flashes of fiery red tentacle tinged with a golden hue speak to a brilliant purple tentacle whose edge is dipped in an amber light fading into a colour unrecognisable to the human eye? Imagine a colour-culture that is

an excess of all three, that defies description, is beyond naming, and exists beyond an identifiable border. The point I make is that the bi/multi racial subject's unique cultural difference shows a sense of resiliency in her ability to honour their dual/multiple cultural identities and the roles and obligations that these bring with them. This woman resists the pedagogical call to either a Maori, Pakeha or Other ethnicity, preferring to live with the complexities that her cultural and other differences [age, class, sexual orientation, occupation, family role] bring to bear. Her meaning is constructed through her difference. Her identity is honoured and valued in its multiplicity of ambiguity. The bi/multi racial subject's cultural boundaries merge and blur and come into focus time and time again in ways which enable the subject to maintain her unique cultural difference.

Conclusion

By way of summary, ambiguity is informed by the dual/multiple cultural inscriptions created through the ideological practice of subjectivation. In this process the bi/multi racial woman is called into highly specific and politicised cultural subjectivities. The contradictory cultural inscription creates an ambivalence in the subject that does not produce a third identity but rather produces a dual or multiple dislocated cultural subjectivity. Given that the colonial relationship has brought about inter-racial marriages/partnerships between Maori and Pakeha/Other, the result is bi and multi cultural subjects. When brought together through the assimilationist and integrationist policies of the last century and a half, the notion of a singular authentic Maori identity is problematic. Bi/multi racial women's cultural self representations point to a variety of Maori women's experiences. It also reflects generational changes in what constitutes Maori identity. Maori mokopuna reconfigure themselves in relation to new political and economic climates, newly formed cultural landscapes and newly acquired cultural inscriptions, as they are called into being in particular ways for particular purposes. In so doing, the specific [performative] experience of individual subjects challenges the idea that a Maori subjectivity reflects a singular subjectivication into an authentic 'Maori' identity which is highly specific in its ideological politicisation. That this authentic identity is threatened by the presence of the bi/multi racial woman's cultural impurity will be further discussed in subsequent chapters.

Bi/multi racial women's narratives point to the variances of identity consistent with different discursive journeys and the specific political subjectivities they bring. Each woman claims a Maori ancestry [if not actual whakapapa] and an identity as Maori; for these women, being Maori is like being a little bit pregnant - you either are or you aren't. Bi/multi raciality does not compromise the existence of an identification with a Maori subjectivity, nor the value this holds for the subject. Nor does it exclude the

subject on the basis of their Maori-ness, nor the degree of Maori subjectivity they have been enculturated with. The pregnancy metaphor suggests that the subject is pregnant with their own embodiment of Maori-ness, where the 'ness' refers to the degree of cultural difference that metaphorically lives in the corporeal blood and guts of the subject. In this sense, 'ness' symbolises the degree of 'traditionality' the subject identifies themselves with as 'traditional'. But this does not preclude the presence of another cultural twin or triplet sharing a corporeal and psychological space with the Maori baby/embodiment. But how does the bi/multi racial woman consciously and unconsciously mediate her twin/triplet selves? The following chapter shows how she straddles a dual Maori Pakeha dual cultural space. I show how she negotiates a life on the bicultural borderlands, located in the conflictual corporeal and cultural interface of the Maori Pakeha/Other.

Chapter Six

The Essential F/Acts

> Practices of representation always implicate the positions from which we speak or write - the positions of *enunciation*. What recent theories of enunciation suggest is that, though we speak, so to say 'in our own name', of ourselves and from our own experience, nevertheless who speaks, and the subject who is spoken of, are never identical, never exactly in the same place. Identity is not as transparent or unproblematic as we think. Perhaps instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished fact, which the new cultural practices then represent, we should think, instead, of identity as a 'production', which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation. This view problematises the very authority and authenticity to which the term, 'cultural identity', lays claim [Stuart Hall, 1997b, pp. 231-2].

> ... [T]he anti-essentialist crusade against the allegedly reactionary implications of the term acts as if essentialism had an essence of its own. Following these analyses, it is important to de-essentialize essentialism as a problem area in feminist inquiry [Diana Fuss, 1992, p.77].

The bi/multi racial woman reflects a subjectivity that cannot be contained by a singular cultural/racial narrative of identity or the gendered requirements that accompany it. Therefore, her experiential knowledge is different from that of other Maori women and from that of Pakeha women. Stuart Hall's [1997b] essay *Cultural Identity and Diaspora* in *Undoing Place?* is concerned with the new post colonial subject of the West and the *new* cultural forms and practices of representation that are emerging which have the black as their center thus "putting the issue of cultural identity in question." Drawing from Hall, this chapter is an attempt to investigate the process of bi/multi racial women's racial identity, social construction and maintenance in order to make it more "transparent and less problematic". Do bi/multi racial women's stories highlight their conflicted cultural, social, economic and political relationships and, if so, how do they grapple with these issues as bi/multi racial Maori and Pakeha/Other? Do their stories contain evidence of the contradictions, conflicting histories and cultural truths which inform the experience of bi/multi raciality?

My aim in this chapter is to challenge dominant narratives of Maori women's identity perpetuated by nationalist and counter nationalist objectives, as a way of disrupting the colonising narrative of an essentialist authentic Maori identity. I seek to find points of bi/multi racial homogeneity and commonality while holding in tension the reality that the heterogeneous specificities of individual women necessarily problematise this objective. Bi/multi racial women's stories exemplify the new forms of power operating in the bicultural nation, enabling a discussion on the ways race,

gender and class operate as the new perpetrators of colonialism within the landscape of New Zealand. I employ Linda McDowell's [1999] ideas, in her text *Gender, Identity and Place*, on the social construction of identity and multiple positionality in relation to place/home and notions of belonging in order to address some of the questions outlined here. I also look at how bi/multi racial women utilise their dual cultural subjectivity and positionality as a form of resistance. As the subjects of their own/our gaze, the experiences of being doubly positioned as centre and margin are examined. In the act of telling their stories bi/multi racial women's silence becomes audible. Their differences from Maori and Pakeha and also from each other are highlighted. Their narratives also point to the heterogeneous variance between bi/multi racial women's experiences.

The chapter is divided into two sections. The first section 'Social Construction of Bi/multi Racial Subjectivity' looks at the social construction and experience of bi/multi racial women's hybridity. The experiences that accompany this double cultural positioning will be examined. The second section 'Movement: Multiple Subjectivity as Resistance' looks at how hybrid women resist racial stereotypes by positioning themselves in other locations, with other cultural identities. I show how this is a form of resiliency. The third section 'Bi/multi Racial Women's Hybridity and Ambivalence' points to the ambiguities that arise for the shifting self in relation to the nation's requirements of cultural authenticity.

Social Construction of Bi/multi Racial Women's Subjectivity

This section connects the theory of bi/multi racial subjectivity with the practice of bi/multi racial women's subjectivity. It brings the concept of hybridity together with the embodied and gendered experiences of their hybridity. The bi/multi racial woman epitomises movements to and from places; she lives in the contradictory spaces located inbetween Maori and Pakeha cultures/landscapes. The bi/multi racial woman contains a plethora of memories, of landscapes, peoples and events that highlight her life in the spaces between. Unlike Gloria Anzaldua [1987: 80] who rejects the either/or dichotomy of hybridity, arguing for something that exceeds dualistic thinking, the Maori Pakeha/Other hybrid lives the daily contradiction of being positioned as indigenous as well as variant of the Pakeha/Other. For Anzaldua [1987] the *metiza* has a consciousness which occurs through "being on both shores at once"; she suggests that the metiza consciousness is the "... massive uprooting of dualistic thinking in the individual and collective consciousness [which] is the beginning of the long struggle, but one that could, in our best hopes, bring us to the end of rape, of violence, or war." I argue in this chapter that the bi/multi racial woman lives with the ambiguity created in her dual cultural positioning in a way which exceeds the Maori Pakeha/Other divide,

thus producing not a 'superior' identity but, rather, an identity that constantly negotiates itself in relation to her historical circumstances as native/colonial, colonised/coloniser and Maori/Pakeha-Other.

Despite the fact that Young [1995] cautions theorists about using the term 'hybridity' because of the negative historical associations it has with a politics of eugenics, which saw the Enlightenment period discriminate against people of mixed racial heritage/miscegenation, the term holds appeal for Maori hybrids [Meridith, 1999a; 1999b]. McDowell [1999: 213] states that Young has argued "that the term hybridity should not be used at all as it carries with it the racist baggage of inferiority and miscegenation. Hybrid animals, for example the mule, are sterile and it used to be assumed that cross-racial unions had similar results". But as half-caste, Meridith [1999] signals in his essay *Hybridity in the Third Space: Rethinking Bi-Cultural Politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand* in *He Pukenga Korero Ngahuru*, the bi/multi racial subject is situated within the "broader context of a politics of cultural difference, and within this Maori Pakeha/Other hybridity and the third space". He cites Bhabha's [1994] ideas on cultural hybridity as:

> ... the process by which the colonial governing authority undertakes to translate the identity of the colonised [the Other] within a singular universal framework, but then fails producing something familiar but new... a new hybrid identity or subject-position emerges from the interweaving of elements of the coloniser and colonised challenging the validity and authenticity of any essentialist cultural identity.

Meridith insists that hybridity is positioned as the "antidote to essentialism", or "the belief in invariable and fixed properties which define 'whatness' of a given entity". In drawing from Bhabha [1994] he suggests:

> This new mutation replaces the established pattern with a 'mutual and mutable'... representation of cultural difference that is positioned in between the coloniser and colonised. As such, hybridity is a highly specific albeit heterogenous articulation of difference, one which transgresses spatial areas reserved for particular unmarked bodies.

Hybridity then, as a theory which is capable of explaining the unique social construction and position of bi/multi racial women in New Zealand, holds some appeal. Bhabha [1990: 211] explains hybridity this way:

> ... [T]he importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original movements from which the third emerges, rather hybridity... is the 'third space' which enables other positions to emerge. This third space displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives, which are inadequately understood through received wisdom... The process of cultural hybridity gives rise to a something different, something new and unrecognisable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation.

On one level, the concept of hybridity is liberating because it opens up a space to think about the way New Zealand colonial culture creates unequal subjects. The concept of hybridity is hugely emancipatory in that its existence [construction and performance] liberates the subject from a sense of unbelonging, dislocation and alienation, and a partial participation/location within the culture/s of origin. It provides an explanation for the bi/multi racial women's ability to straddle two different and opposing cultures, providing some understanding of the chameleon-like changes necessary for a hybrid. The 'third space' afforded the subject, who straddles the Maori/Pakeha/Other divide, allows herself insight and wisdom. Without being too utopian, she has an advantage integral to reading/making sense of her cultural differences and ambiguities within the post colonial nation, and the challenges she faces. In short, the hybrid opens up a new category of cultural location. Bhabha [1994] contends that hybridity is inclusive in that it "initiates new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration and contestation." Meridith [1999] asserts:

> The hybrid identity is positioned within this third space, as 'lubricant'.... in the conjunction of cultures. The hybrid's potential is with their innate knowledge of 'transculturation'..., their ability to transverse both cultures and to translate, negotiate and mediate affinity and difference within a dynamic of exchange and inclusion. They have encoded within them a counter-hegemonic agency. At the point at which the coloniser presents a normalising, hegemonic practice, the hybrid strategically opens up a third space of/for rearticulation of negotiation and meaning.

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, bi/multi racial women self identify in a variety of different ways; invariably their cultural subjectivity reflects an identity incorporating at least one other cultural subjectivity besides Maori. Given that many Maori women elect to privilege an essentialist indigenous cultural subjectivity despite the existence of other genealogical and cultural influences, why is it that hybrid women choose to live with the ambiguities of a conflicted Maori Pakeha/Other cultural subjectivity? What informs the hybrid's choice to position herself as culturally *different* from those women who identity solely as Maori? How is she resisting being a passive victim to colonial subjectivication which call her to take up a fixed and singular Maori identity, and what has the cultivation of other cultural subjectivities got to do with seeking better life chances and opportunities for herself and her whanau? If she does strategically invoke other cultural subjectivities and positions, how is this achieved and what is at stake? The social construction of bi/multi racial women's subjectivity is a complex and heterogeneous interplay of historical and contemporary relationships which invariably position the woman with two or more cultural identities. The women do not passively reflect their dual inscripted life experiences but actively engage/nurture their dual/multiple identities for specific purposes, such as quality of life and basic survival. Their narratives indicate that an identification with both Maori

and Pakeha/Other subjectivities does not necessarily reflect an even weighting of the respective identities in terms of time spent as either *Maori* or *Pakeha/Other* within the respective cultural landscapes, nor does it reflect the emotional value the subjects accord each identity. The question then arises concerning which subjectivity is active at any given time and for what purposes?

A variety of influences prevent bi/multi racial women from accessing a strong Maori identity during their formative years. The impact of colonisation, assimilation and ongoing forms of colonialism have been at the centre of discussions pertaining to the alienation of the subject from their tribal roots, their whakapapa and their associated cultural norms/values [Awatere, 1982; Smith, 1999; Walker, 1992]. Several of the women interviewed also stated that adoption by Pakeha/Other parents/families had hampered their ability to access a Maori subjectivity during their early life. Separation and divorce also creates an environment in which access to a Maori subjectivity via the Maori parent/whanau is often denied. However, being denied access to Maori people and Maori culture does not prevent them from being subjectivated with a Maori subjectivity, nor of having the opportunity to adopt a Maori ethnicity at some stage in their life [Collins, 1999]. Bell recalls that the first time she met her Maori whanau happened spontaneously when she was visiting the geographical area of her people and a Pakeha relative initiated contact:

> My [Pakeha] aunty said, "Have you been to visit your family?" And I sort of [at sixteen or seventeen] went "No". And she looked up the number in the phone book and she rang them and gave me the phone and so I said, "My name is [birthname]" and they were very... ecstatic about this because they had wanted me from the time that I was born because my mother was very young. So they had this lost grandchild for some seventeen years. So, they came out and picked me up; they were there within twenty minutes and I had my bag packed and I was 'round at their house and they had rung my father and he was on his way to come and get me. And I felt, in essence, like a four or five year old... I sort of felt quite comfortable and safe that I was with my grandmother and grandfather.

Bi/multi racial women may recognise themselves as Maori despite lack of contact with members of their whanau or other Maori communities. It is not uncommon for Maori men and women to adopt a Maori ethnicity in adulthood, thus identifying the need to return to their roots and to reconnect with an 'innate' identity [Collins, 1999]. Taking on a Maori subjectivity may mean that other subjectivities do however become reconfigured in relation to this new sense of self. Within this reconfigured landscape their *chameleon*-like hybridity enables a critical examination of Pakeha/Other from the position of the colonised. For example, Jill's enculturation into a Pakeha/Other identity was reconfigured when she was 'called into being' as Maori during her early thirties. She now enunciates from the position of the minority as she gazes at Pakeha culture. From this position Jill elaborates:

> They see me as a very well educated individual who went to the right schools. I can speak properly when I want to. I might be very tanned but I can speak their language... I can put on those social trappings. I can be part of them... therefore it is just well, yes you must be European... but I can be like a chameleon. I mean I spent all my life in it.

The hybrid, by virtue of this in-betweeness, is capable of disrupting the binary arrangement of coloniser and colonised [Bhabha, 1994]. As the hybrid enunciates from the third space [an excess of the sum of its two parts] the subject displaces the colonial requirement of the coloniser to perform as the colonised. For Bhabha this new form of translation opens up new spaces of cultural interrogation and negotiation, allowing new dialogues of difference to emerge. In exceeding the pre-existing cultural arrangements the politically transformative presence of the bi/multi racial woman contests the neat borders, muddying them up with her cross-over cultural performances and chameleon-like translations. For example, a destabilising of cultural boundaries exists when the bi/multi racial woman's racial residue enunciates from within the geographical spaces of the Pakeha/colonialist. No longer is the native confined to her place, for her difference permeates every cultural crevice reserved for non Maori within white landscapes.

For those women whose formative years provided access to both Maori and Pakeha/Other genealogies and cultural experiences, a sense of cultural duality was present from infancy. Learning the cultural semantics embedded within two opposing yet inter-related cultures, enriched lives and provided a template of subjectivity which reflected the ability to live in both worlds and to make sense of both worlds. Mahinarangi states:

> We were lucky that both Mum and Dad are teachers of Maori and Mum being a fluent first [language] speaker and also being a full Maori is pretty cool. My Dad being Jewish and Scottish is pretty cool and the fact that he's got this marvellous respect from my mother's people... a lot of people think he's Maori too because of how he is.

Rose Foster [1996], in her essay *The Bilingual Self. Duet in Two Voices* in *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, explores the phenomenon of experiential and psychological duality of the bilingual, and the subsequently different representations of 'self' that are organised around these languages, as well as the semantics at the core of the two respective cultures. Of the bilingual, Foster [1996] writes:

> We possess dual templates through which we shape and organize our world, as well as two sets of verbal symbols that codify our experiences and give voice to their expression. We are efficient and quite expert at changing perspective or shifting octave, as the situation may demand. Sometimes this ability makes us feel special, a little magical, in possession of a kind of "second sight" or "third ear". Sometimes this ability can make us feel crazy and split apart.

Tiri confirms the value of being subjectivated with two cultural subjectivities when she claims she is "very blessed, very blessed indeed. I believe I've been given a balance. I also feel that I can, [it] sounds silly but, have a foot in each camp, and understand both points of view." Rachael also confirms the importance of honouring dual cultural histories with her comment:

> I think that everybody has their own beliefs, and skin colour shouldn't really enter into it. But on the other hand if you're Maori then you should know your ties, your land and whanau and who your brother is. That's the same for everybody. Everybody should know where they come from, the land they come from, the family, the generations behind them. I think *everyone* should know where they come from.

The person enculturated at birth into a dual cultural template knows themselves via their double inscription from childhood. This well-established sense of their difference results in a multiplicity of symbolic codes. They have two languages and two language codes which means they are able to think about themselves in two languages. Foster [1996, 100] states:

> ... [T]hey can think about themselves, be themselves, express ideas, and interact with the people in their lives... each language is unique in evoking the relational experiences and social contextual environment at the time of original acquisition and early usage... [C]ondensed within each language are both the verbal symbols and the other that offered those symbols. *Alive* within each symbol is its semantic meaning and the interiorized versions of the self, that other who mutually shared and negotiated common experiences and gave them a name.

It is well recognised that not all people claiming Maori ancestry have mastery over te reo Maori and therefore cannot strictly be defined as 'bilingual' in the sense that Foster [1996] uses. However, I suggest that children who are raised with parents/families who enculturate them with a dual Maori and Pakeha/Other cultural lifestyle [and the relationship and cultural experiences accompanying this] also become subjectivated with the culturally sensitive semantics of their respective cultures. The importance resides in the acquisition of culturally specific semantics which differentiate one cultural way of seeing, thinking, hearing, behaving and *being* as opposed to another. For many women, their ability to speak and understand the written and oral native language may be compromised, but the spirit of the language is carried in the cultural experiences and related symbolic understanding of the culture which was invested in the psyche often from birth. This dual language inscription into the symbolic/semantic nuances of both Maori and Pakeha/Other cultures is what distinguishes the hybrid. Hence the bilingual hybrid has, according to Foster [1996: 109]:

> ... two language codes, not only dual sets of symbols for referring to internal states and the external world, but also two different sets of signifying chains of meaning - producing self-object interactions and developmental contexts.

Foster [1996: 100] draws from psychoanalysis to understand the social construction of the bilingual/bi/multi racial women. She states that contemporary psychoanalysis posits that the 'self' is formed through the early interpersonal experiences: varied interactions with others, active patterns of experiences and behaviour organised around particular points of view, a way of being, and a sense of oneself. Foster [1996: 101] argues that there is a unique outcome from the early object relations and the specific language in which they were coded, resulting in a complex and variegated mix of self-representations. The languages embody/reflect/illustrate the relationships to important others and within this the contextual/cultural world is also imprinted on the psyche of the subject. The contextual/cultural world also provides particular 'verbal symbols' which shape the external and internal experiences of self. Foster [1996: 101] also states that the bilingual bi/multi racial woman has two "language-bounded experiential systems" within one mind, so that two different symbolic worlds must "coexist, cooperate, and probably compete to ultimately form the illusion of a harmonized bilingual self".

Perhaps what is not so well understood are the reasons *why* bi/multi racial women consciously nurture their Pakeha/Other cultural subjectivities and their related subject positions [as well as a Maori one] despite the recent politicization of Maori ethnicity which calls those with Maori whakapapa to forego their Other identities in favour of a single Maori subjectivity [Grace, 1997]. McDowell's [1999] idea on human movement *between* cultural spaces holds some salience for hybrid women. She claims that the notion of 'hybridity' has been used in association with images that suggest an identity is formed when it moves between two or more competing worlds. This concept refers to those who live on the *borders* or in the *margins* and also the *betweeness* of borderlands, as in the case of Gloria Anzaldua [1987]. But she also states that hybridity can be used to refer to a 'third' identity that replaces the two that construct the hybridity. Here the terms border crossing, betweeness or third space are also sometimes used to imply the same concept. In fact, she claims the terms are not very different from each other, as the concept of living in the margins or betweeness is not meant to imply marginality but rather the transcendence of identities.

McDowell [1999: 212] also indicates that scholars like Spivak [1987: 1988] have celebrated the conceptualisation of the hybrid with her articulation of the subaltern. Hall [1997b] prefers the term 'translation' to explain hybrid culture whereby post colonial identities are formed as a translation of their prior historicity and circumstances and act as an excess of the original identity. In this sense, hybridity or

translation is seen as a positive political identity choice in that it is more inclusive of what it means to be a Maori Pakeha/other New Zealander. Within this, Pakeha and Maori are free to withdraw into an inclusive and conservative reassertion of their 'roots' and celebrate their cultural origins. But some bi/multi racial women indicated that they became locked into one cultural landscape for a significant period of time, showing that 'translations' are dependent upon not only temporal and spatial factors, but that they also require opportunity. For example, some women commented that the opportunities to mix with Maori were reduced once they shifted into the urban sector. Lesley stated "When I was a teenager and left [place name] I never mixed with Maori. It's probably why, all my adult life, I've mixed with Pakeha". This, indicates one reason why some Maori women develop alternative cultural subjectivities; it is a case of social and economic survival in an ever increasingly developing capitalist nation.

Some of the bi/multi racial women interviewed also commented that their early positioning as Maori was accompanied by unattractive cultural stereotypes which often matched their negative experiences of *being* Maori. For example, one kuia recalled the difficulty associated with her whanau's poverty, which she connected to her childhood hunger, lack of clothing and inadequate shelter. She stated "I don't like to think about those days and times. I *am* Maori but I don't like to be a part of all this family stuff because it reminds me of my childhood". This type of situation precipitated their choice to adopt other cultural subjectivities as a way of escaping the racism and sexism inherent to being Maori and female. Marked by her position as the colonised, the Maori woman seeks better life opportunities for herself and her whanau by attempting to 'unmark' herself or to distance herself from cultural stereotypes. Butler [1990: 59] states:

> The culturally dominated undergo a paradoxical oppression, in that they are both marked out by stereotypes and at the same time rendered invisible. As remarkable, deviant beings, the culturally imperialized are stamped with an essence. The stereotypes confine them to a nature which is often attached in some way to their bodies, and which cannot easily be denied. These stereotypes so permeate the society that they are not noticed as contestable. Just as everyone knows the earth goes around the sun, so everyone knows that gay people are promiscuous, that Indians are alcoholics, and that women are good with children. White males, on the other hand, insofar as they escape group marking, can be individuals.

Further, the bi/multi racial women woman develops a sense of herself as both inside and outside Maori culture, while simultaneously containing a sense of herself as both inside and outside Pakeha culture. This 'double consciousness' is indicative of her dual cultural positionality and is produces anxiety. Iris Marion Young [1990: 59-60] writes:

> Those living under cultural imperialism find themselves defined from the outside, positioned, placed, by a network of dominant meanings they experience as arising from elsewhere, from

> those with whom they do not identify, and who do not identify with them. Consequently, the dominant culture's stereotyped and inferiorized images of the group must be internalized by group members at least to the extent that they are forced to react to behavior of others influenced by those images. This creates for the culturally oppressed the experience that W. E. B. Du Bois called "double consciousness" - "this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity".... Double consciousness arises when the oppressed subject refuses to coincide with these devalued, objectified, stereotyped visions of herself or himself. While the subject desires recognition as human, capable of activity, full of hope and possibility, she receives from the dominant culture only the judgement that she is different, marked, or inferior.

By way of avoiding the 'oppression' which often accompanies a negative social position as 'Maori' within the nation [and a consciousness of themselves as the stereotyped, colonised and oppressed] bi/multi racial women often seek other cultural landscapes and opportunities in an attempt to reduce the judgement on them as inferior and different. Among other things, these bi/multi racial women associate the negative experiences of domestic violence, incest, emotional/mental abuse, neglect, crime, substance and alcohol abuse, gambling addiction, poverty and gender asymmetry with a negative Maori ethnicity. When these stereotypes are consistent with their experiential reality, bi/multi racial women are more likely to develop other non Maori subjectivities. For example, Leslie acknowledges that "family land doesn't mean much because it was never a happy place for me growing up". In short, for some bi/multi racial women, being physically located in Pakeha urban landscapes and developing a Pakeha subjectivity was easier to access because they had little desire to return to a landscape fraught with real and/or imagined negative images of Maori culture. The bi/multi racial woman is particularly vulnerable to being inscripted with a 'triple' consciousness. Iris Young [1990: 60] states:

> The group defined by the dominant culture as deviant, as a stereotyped Other, *is* culturally different from the dominant group, because the status of Otherness creates specific experiences not shared by the dominant group, and because culturally oppressed groups also are often socially segregated and occupy specific positions in the social division of labor. Members of such groups express their specific group experiences and interpretations of the world to one another, developing and perpetuating their own culture. Double consciousness, then, occurs because one finds one's being defined by two cultures: a dominant and a subordinate culture. Because they can affirm and recognize one another as sharing similar experiences and perspectives on social life, people in culturally imperialized groups can often maintain a sense of positive subjectivity.

But not only is the bi/multi racial woman situated in such a way that she identities 'with' the marginal group culture, and in so doing develops a consciousness of herself as defined by the dominant culture, but she also is 'inside' the dominant culture and experiences herself as Pakeha/Other as well. In essence, it is this tripartite insight that differentiates her from 'other' or 'authentic' Maori women. Positioned as the 'minority'

differentiates her from other Pakeha/Other women. She is located in the cultural spheres of the minority and majority simultaneously.

Bi/multi Racial Women: Hybridity and the Education System

Bi/multi racial hybridity is a preferred choice of identity in that it reflects the reality of many women's lives, as increasingly more women are born into families who live with more than one cultural identity and lifestyle. This does not preclude them from participating in the minority culture, but they are unlikely to stay in that subject position and live through that subjectivity given their other identifications. Marginality is a choice in that it is a space which is deliberately occupied by the hybrid subject at will. In doing so, the hybrid disrupts the neatness of the cultural binaries epitomised in cultural stereotypes and contained in the triple consciousness of the bi/multi racial female subject. The third space emanates from such positioning. The bi/multi racial woman's dual/multiple racial genealogies and cultural identities, which position her with a 'triple' consciousness, extend Bhabha's theory on hybridity where he identifies that a 'double consciousness' exists in the psyche of colonised peoples. For Bhabha [1990, 1990a, 1990b] all forms of culture are continually in a process of hybridity. Hybridity for Bhabha *is* the third space which enables other subject positions to emerge through displacing old structures and histories and setting up new structures of authority and new political initiatives. The process of cultural hybridity produces something new, different and unrecognisable. It does not conform to the specificities of its old *form*. Consequently, hybridity brings with it a new negotiation and meaning and representation.

Young bi/multi racial women indicated that their identities were inconsistent with Maori and Pakeha cultural stereotypes. Their stories showed that they resisted aligning with a politicised Maori ethnicity because it did not match their experience of being Maori. They situated their disillusion with contemporary Maori ethnicity within the bicultural education system. Maori women's foresight and leadership led to the emergence of the kohanga reo movement during the late 1970s which encourages a Maori oriented pre-school education. Mckinley [1995: 118] makes the point that it is only in the last twenty years that the New Zealand education system has shouldered the responsibility of Maori failure within it. Prior to this, she says, "the [Maori] home has been blamed continually for Maori children's failure at school". In contrast to the earlier educational policies which focused on Maori assimilation and integration, the new polices to emerge in the 1980s contained a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi. Previously, a Maori perspective on New Zealand history was absent, as were other narratives pertaining to a Maori worldview. As recently as 1976, Mckinley [1995: 120] claims, the Department of Education favoured a multicultural educational

approach but stopped short of specifically addressing iwi. However, in the educational review report *The Curriculum Review* [1987], the importance of Maori cultural values was recognised for its contribution towards a more positive education for Maori children. Again, in 1989, the Picot Report *Administering For Excellence* recognised that Maori needed some autonomy within the education sector if they were to improve their life chances as a people. The Report recommended the drawing up of charters in consultation with schools and the local community to effect the much needed, culturally sensitive changes [Mckinley, 1995, p. 121]. Within this report was an 'option-out' clause which gave groups [whose needs were not being met] the option of developing a separate learning institution [Mckinley, 1995: 121]. This has led to the development of bicultural policies within school charters, providing scope for the inclusion of Maori cultural values and practices. The material effects of this initiative saw the introduction of te reo Maori programs, kapa haka groups, bilingual units and total immersion units within mainstream schooling. In addition, some schools [kura kaupapa] are based entirely on Maori cultural values and practices and are taught exclusively in te reo Maori.

Also, educational literature embodying the semantics of the Treaty of Waitangi are currently used as texts, presenting New Zealand's history from a non racist perspective. For example, *The Story of New Zealand* which was first printed in 1985 provides a history of the New Zealand nation which includes an introduction to The Treaty of Waitangi. Further, another resource manual for primary schools *Te Mana o Te Tiriti* highlights the presence and reality of the Treaty for Maori and Pakeha alike. The Waitangi Tribunal recommended this should be used by all primary schools and was a part of a package, *Treaty of Waitangi: Past and Present*, issued to all primary schools, with a similar one being sent to secondary schools. Altogether, the movement towards making the education system more inclusive of Maori can be seen in the favourable increase in Maori girl's education achievements [*Maori Women's Affairs,* 2001]. However, there has been some scepticism over the value of 'treatyism' for all Maori [Christie, 1999].

Both Rachael and Abbie's stories about their education in the 1990s and are suggest that the move towards a positive discrimination is not always effective for Maori. In fact, the encouragement of a 'double consciousness' gained through the education system's positive discrimination towards Maori dissuaded these young Maori women from identifying with a sole Maori identity. Abbie maintains that a biculturally focused education programme reinforces a learned helplessness in Maori students. Abbie states:

> I was at a hui about Maori education; all the Maori students at the school attended. And [Maori students] are just complaining like, you know, the education system's not up to where it should be. There's not enough opportunities, enough staff and there *are* problems at

> school. Like wagging and, you know, getting expelled and that sort of thing. And I said, "Well nothing's going to be handed to you on a silver plate; no-one's going to say to you, "Yep, you can smoke at school, you can wag when you like, and these classes are optional, you know because *we're Maori!."* But then they would still complain because there's this bloody controversial thing... They want special treatment, then they complain that they're not being treated equal as Pakeha. Oh man, that pisses me off, eh! I was speaking out and saying, "'It's up to you guys; if you don't do anything then nothing's going to happen, nothing's going to be handed to you guys."

McDowell's [1999] text, *Gender, Identity and Place,* indicates that the education system acts as a regulatory force in determining the social norms that inform the social construction of corporeal feminine and masculine bodies. As such, she argues that education is critical in spatially placing students in particular ways according to their gender. Abbie's story illustrates that a highly politicised Maori ethnicity is calling young Maori women into being as 'victims' of colonialism, impacting upon Maori students' sense of confidence and resiliency within the landscape of education and then reinforced by policies as well as individual teachers. Abbie claims that being Maori has changed over time. Maori identity today, she claims, has a negative connotation to it "because there's been this big controversial thing with cultural safety; all that sort of thing has come in now. Maori are so *special."* She believes that a "victim-culture" exists in the education system and Maori students have learned to be a "bunch of complaining Maori". Abbie states:

> I've been in the classroom for four to five years and that's all I see. It's that they can't be bothered. They say, "The teachers pick on me; I don't know how to learn in Maori; we want bilingual classes." You know, they don't even go to Maori class; they wag all the time!

Further, Rachael [fair skin, green eyes, long honey-blond hair] recalls being the subject of derision from Maori intermediate level students.

> This is an episode of when I was younger. I'd be about twelve years old. I remember this as I'm quite sensitive about this sort of thing. I was in a school hall and it was choir practice and I think it was the first day of choir, and I was standing in the front and there were girls standing behind me and they were from the kaupapa Maori class and they were teasing me. They were throwing stuff in front of me and one was poking me in the back or something. I just turned around and said, "What do you think you're doing?" and then one of them saw that I had my greenstone pendant on and she said, "Are you part Maori?" and I said, "Yes" and they just started talking to me... and then we became friends.

These comments highlight that a politicised identity is evidently at work within the education system, and within the nation, which excludes Maori students who *do not* identify with a subjectivity that contains a them/us, victim/rescuer binary entrapment. Their narratives point to their refusal to identify with a colonised/victim subjectivity, thus refusing the call to an identity laden with a sense of powerlessness, oppression and disenfranshisement. Their stories pin-point their difference from other young

Maori women as they illustrate how their identities exceed the them/us dichotomy. Bi/multi racial women engage with other cultures and subjectivities in an effort to honour their dual cultural experiences, but it is also an attempt to free themselves from the trap of colonialism by developing other identities and opportunities.

Movement: Multiple Subjectivity as Resistance

Bi/multi racial women's narratives also indicate that the formation and maintenance of Pakeha/Other subjectivities are rooted in Maori women's resistance to the negative social position Maori continue to occupy within New Zealand. The development of an identity which is capable of oscillating between a Maori and a Pakeha landscape is often a response to their positionality as the colonised under-class and their over determined status as New Zealand's largest *pathologised* cultural group. This raises issues of cultural authenticity for Maori bi/multi racial women. Given that Maori identity is intimately linked with notions of sameness/community, whereas Pakeha/Other identities may be more individualist/egalitarian focused, those women who choose an alternative cultural identity and become located in non Maori landscapes are often labelled negatively by Maori as assimilated/Pakehafied Maori. Rachael witnessed this at secondary school:

> I remember a girl from school when I was in fourth form... in the bilingual unit. She was Maori and she was in the main stream and she was doing speeches, and she was very good at speeches. But I remember girls in my class sort of saying "Oh yeah, she's really *white* now... she's a real *Jaffa",* that's a colloquial term for Maori people who are black on the outside, but white on the inside - cos she wasn't in kapa haka, our Maori cultural group, or anything!

Simultaneously, dominant homogenising discourses [such as education, Christianity, sports, politics, popular culture, media, music and health] operate as a precursor in the bi/multi racial subject's subjectivication into a Pakeha/Other subjectivity, as race/culture/difference is erased in the name of community/sameness. For example, Faith expresses her enculturation into Pakeha culture and her acquisition of a hybrid subjectivity when she recalls the influence of Christianity on the development of her Pakehafied identity:

> I meditate every morning and I always put my [spiritual] shield up... It just comes so naturally now; I just shift gears; I'm shifting gears all the time. I think I attribute that to my upbringing...I was brought up in the church; there was a lot of Pakeha and there was a lot of Maori, Pentecostal, Evangelical. So that says a lot. You know, when you've been brought up amongst happy positive people... and it's such a loving environment... sitting at Pakeha tables. You know, there was always a welcome mat. All the young people would go to Mrs So and So, the old Pakeha [woman] down the road and we'd have lunch there. Yeah, so I grew up sitting at the table with Pakeha, good food; In a church you have brothers and sisters, there is no Maori, there is no Pakeha; you are one.

Learning to *shift gears* and *cross spaces* enables bi/multi racial women to mentally, physically and spiritually cope with the cultural transitions necessary in the performance of hybridity. Hall [1990: 223] states, "The diaspora experience... is defined, not by its essence or purity, but by the recognition of a necessary heterogeneity and diversity by a conception of 'identity' which lives with and through, not despite, difference by hybridity." McDowell [1999: 212] suggests that Hall's idea of the diasporic experience/hybridity includes "both movement and change". Given that bi/multi racial women [like other Maori today] are often dislocated from tribal landscapes, they are often located spatially within Pakeha environments. As such, their [diasporic] experience may reflect their sense of cultural dislocation and in-betweeness. In the search for a meaningful place to stand [turangawaewae] the bi/multi racial woman constructs *other* places of meaning and of belonging [perhaps non traditional] thus symbolising their unique individual genealogical and cultural historiographies as the hybrid. For Liz, a sense of a place to belong, is symbolised in her whanau urupa, the resting place of her tupuna.

> The urupa... it's a place where I will go to [by] myself. It's a place to *return* to. We have an urupa; it's the place where I will get buried.... I've actually decided that already... It's the place where you belong and get accepted without question. And I guess in the end it's knowing that you've got a good place, you are going to be looked after well, so that you won't be forgotten and they'll be looking out for you. Because there will always be someone there looking after the place and it's nice to know that the whole sort of caring...place will continue on. And it doesn't matter who you are, but the fact that you belong to the whanau... You have the right to be there and you have a right to that sort of care.

A sense of home and of belonging is important for bi/multi racial women in that it functions as a place of refuge, not only from oppression but a place which symbolically gathers together the disparate parts that make up the sense of her wholeness. For her, home is a place which accepts her difference, her cultural disjuntures and contradictions. But given that the bi/multi racial hybrid is diasporic in nature 'home' is not always predictable. Home is not always symbolized in traditional ways or in traditional spaces. McDowell [1999: 2] states:

> It is often assumed that the net result of the increasing scale of global interconnections and movement is a decline in the significance of 'the local' - in the amount of time people spend in a restricted geographical area, in the number of friends and family in the environs, and in the control that might be exercised at the local level, whether over political decisions and actions or in the economic consequences of the actions of capital. The corollary is assumed to be the end of a sense of local attachment, of belonging to a place with all its local idiosyncrasies and cultural forms.

McDowell [1999: 3] questions:

> While the 'localization' of most of everyday life is indisputable, a perhaps more interesting question to ask is how have the enormous changes of the twentieth century impacted on the

> notion and existence of a 'sense of place'? Do people any longer feel a part of and a responsibility to their local area? And has the loss and stability, or perhaps more accurately the immobility, that once rooted peoples to a particular place for the whole of their lifetime and for generations of the same families meant the decline of locally based customs and practices, of those local mores that created the particularity of one place and distinguished it from others?

In response to her questions, these diasporic bi/multi racial women may not necessarily have a significant relationship with their 'landscape of origin'. However, other spatial areas function metonymically as home thus serving the need and purpose of a sense of belonging and connection. Bi/multi racial women live with the ramifications of colonisation and colonialism in much the same way as women who identify themselves as Maori. But unlike those who identify and live a lifestyle located more in Maori cultural landscapes, the bi/multi racial women may not necessarily share the same sense of belonging, connection, participation and responsibility towards Maori customs and practices located within traditional constructions of home/place. Therefore, 'home' is conceptualised in individual and heterogenous ways. For Roberta, 'home' symbolically resides within her body in a sense of 'self' which she describes as:

> ... a longing for reality, not reality of the world, [but] my reality, like my reality inside and it's wonderful because I know a place to go to that is home. I mean that's what it feels like to me. It's like a place where I can rest, it's a place where I can be happy, where I can feel joy or I can feel awe or I can feel peace... I feel like there's a joy machine in there!

At this point, I employ McDowell's ideas of 'home' to extend bell hooks [1990, 1997, 1997a] ideas of 'home' as a site of renewal and resistance for black women. McDowell [1999: 71] speaks of the significance of 'home' and suggests that the 'reality' and the symbolic meaning of the home combine to produce the construction of a particular version of a home in different ways in different societies. In defining 'home' she suggests that Heidegger's construction of home as "a key location in which a spiritual unity is found between humans and things" is useful. McDowell refers to Heidegger's quotation where he asserts that home is:

> ...[t]he self-sufficiency of the power to let earth and heaven, divinities and mortals enter in simple oneness into things ordered the house. It places the farm on a wind-sheltered mountain slope looking south, among the meadows close to the spring. It gave it the wide overhanging shingle roof whose proper slope bears up under the burden of snow, and which, reaching deep down, shields the chambers against the storms of the long winter nights. It did not forget the alter corner behind the community table; it made room in its chamber for the hallowed places of childbed and the 'tree of the dead' - for that is what they call a coffin there - and in this way it designed for the different generations under one roof the character of their journey through time. A craft which, itself sprung from dwelling, still uses its tools and frames as things, built the farmhouse [quoted by Harvey, 1996, p. 300 in McDowell, 1999, p.71].

McDowell [1999: 72] also makes reference to Bachelard's [1969] notion of home as a "key element in the development of people's sense of themselves as belonging to a place." From this, she asserts that there is a "parallel between home and the body as memory stores." She says that power is "attributed by theorists to the house and dwelling, with its connotations of shelter, security, of pleasure, and as a storehouse of memories." McDowell [1999: 93] states:

> The meaning of the home, the nature of a house and the consequences of homelessness across space and time in different societies and regions are now growing areas of cross-disciplinary investigation. And although the house and the home is one of the most strongly gendered spatial locations, it is important not to take the associations for granted, nor to see them as permanent and unchanging.

As stated earlier, hook's [1990] ideas, emphasised in the previous chapter, pointed out that 'home' functions as a refuge and a form of resistance. But, for hooks, 'home' is conceptualised in singular and material terms. Drawing from the above quotation, 'home' for the bi/multi racial woman may not necessarily reflect a 'singular' place within an actual *physical* space but may include metaphysical notions of home and ***belonging.*** 'Home' may also involve other forms of identification McDowell [1999: 88] points out that there is a distinction between home as a haven and/or prison. The bi/multi racial woman demands the freedom to identify 'home' in non-conforming ways, which is indicative of her resistance to being confined and contained in real and stereotypical ways by her 'colonised' identity. She seeks both real and symbolic 'homes' in ways which serve her unique difference as the Maori Pakeha hybrid. She may in fact have 'homes' or places of belonging in multiple environments, consistent with the subjectivity she occupies at any one time. The bi/multi racial woman may feel just as 'at home' within a wharenui as she does within a Jewish synagogue, for example. Locating themselves within other landscapes allows bi/multi racial women to shrug off the stereotype of themselves as the colonised native.

For the hybrid, being able to vacillate cross-culturally results in advantages for herself and others within the bicultural nation. For example, Tiri states:

> With my nursing, I believe I can relate to all people, not just Maori and Pakeha. I lived in Wellington... It was amazing because the cosmopolitan population means you've got to learn different ways and cultures... so to me it was a privilege. I've been given a good grounding basically, as to how people are. A lot of us [Maori] are the same as other people, like the Chinese... very demonstrative and loving and caring, like what I'm used to on my Maori side. In nursing, having both [Maori Pakeha/Other] aspects means I can relate to both sides and in particular, Maori. Maybe not in the language... I can understand [the language] but I feel you don't have to speak the language to look after people. You can feel it, you can feel what they're feeling... pain. You can see by their body, how their body language is...their eyes. I don't know how, but you can.

Living and working in non Maori cultural landscapes, and embracing a Pakeha/Other subjectivity while in these spaces, does not preclude the bi/multi racial woman from moving in and out of Maori cultural landscapes and environments. Conversely, being able to vacillate across cultures often contributes to bi/multi racial women's bicultural flexibility, thus increasing employment and recreational based opportunities. Bi/multi racial women positively acknowledge their Maori subjectivity and related cultural positioning and the experiences these afford. One participant, Helena, on returning to New Zealand after an absence of twenty years, is now working as a kai awhina for her iwi. She says that she feels:

> ... absolutely privileged! I constantly thank everyone, my tupuna, my whanau members, for the opportunity because I know it's an absolutely privileged opportunity, and there are not many that look like me, and that are used to working in a Western environment. So it's giving thanks for that experience, because it's awesome. It's absolutely amazing.

But bi/multi racial women's raciality is not a utopian experience. Rather, it is one which acknowledges the social and material effects colonisation and colonialism have contributed to bi/multi racial women's positioning within the nation and is contextualised within iwi and whanau historiography. Bi/multi racial women merely develop strategies within other cultural landscapes to enhance their life chances, in an effort to equalise the social, political and economic unevenness between Maori and Pakeha/Other. Helena states that she uses her Westernised professional skills to empower her iwi. In so doing, her income earned in the Pakeha work space is used to financially fulfil her whanau commitments and responsibilities to support her people, many of whom are impoverished, uneducated and unskilled. As such, bi/multi racial women creatively manage their dual cultural ethnicity in a variety of interesting and imaginative ways despite the disjuncture and alienation it can bring. For example, Liz claims that her hybridity enabled her to do well in the mainstream Pakeha world but resulted in her being singled out as the token successful Maori woman. She elaborates:

> I went up on stage in the sixth form and got a prize for something and this woman found me afterwards and said, "Oh, you are a credit to your race!" and I was thinking, "What's going on here?" I remember going into a fish and chip shop one day and being told by the woman behind the counter, "Oh, I wish more people of your race would actually speak like you do." These remarks came out of the blue. People don't think they're saying anything that's really bad; I mean, they're not seen as blatant racisims. I mean, they didn't affect my life, but they're the sort of fucking comments that just keep coming out of the blue all the time. And you think, "Well, am I going to do something about my life here?" Or, do I take a stance and tell these people what shitty remarks they're saying or whatever?

Dana's perfect enunciation of the English language helped her to fit into a Pakeha middle class work environment. She is now able to financially contribute to her

family's income thus raising their standard of living and quality of life. But vacillating across cultures can cause either minor or major ambiguities and tensions for the bi/multi racial woman. Dana's story points to the minor disjuncture caused when her husband's whanau assumed that her perfect enunciation of the English language meant that she had a middle class up bringing. This was highlighted the first time she took her husband to visit her whanau. Her husband's family, on looking at their holiday pictures, expressed some confusion over Dana's working-class upbringing which they had previously perceived to be middle-class. Dana states:

> They must have thought that I was from some snot nosed private school background. They were just so surprised that I'd come from a run-down home with snotty-nosed kids and things like that. I said, "Well, did I give that impression, because no one ever asked me?"

For Dana, being located in Pakeha spaces and developing a Pakeha subjectivity "comes down to pride". She recognises that Maori women can be uneducated and come from working class backgrounds but this does not prevent the individual from having a sense of pride in themselves and increasing their own, and their family's, quality of life through honouring their Pakeha /Other genealogy and learning Other cultural codes of behaviour. Clearly Dana strategically engages a middle class subject position to enhance her family's life chances. In her private life however, she vacillates culturally towards her Maori subjectivity and related cultural obligations. When the need arises she shifts cultural spaces to take up Pakeha/Other subjectivities and to advance herself and her family socially and materially in the nation.

Blending, Passing and Participation

Both Liz and Dana's narratives suggest that bi/multi racial women possess a conscious awareness of their cultural vacillation. Bi/multi racial women's stories reflect that they prepare themselves to move in and out of their respective cultural environments, including dressing their bodies in particular ways, wearing particular pieces of jewellery or of donning certain colours for specific occasions. Liz talks about a 'mental shift' that occurs which enables her to vacillate across cultural spaces. She says:

> Sometimes it's a mental shift more than anything. And definitely a shift in terms of moral boundaries, in terms of what guides the behaviours and the things that are done and said and stuff. So there's a shift *to* that, in your *mind*. That's... knowing what covers acceptable [cultural norms] within the text of where it is that you are.

This 'mind shift' may also involve positioning the body in particular ways to authenticate it. This indicates that bi/multi racial women have agency over the

cultural spaces they occupy and subjectivities they take up. They are not victims of their historical circumstances but creatively seek emancipation [albeit partial] in sometimes unfamiliar spaces and places. However, for others obligations play a role in determining the landscapes and cultural contexts traversed. For example, Dana states, "I need to be prepared to go into a Pakeha environment and do things. Whereas, if I've got to do things as a Maori, I just go." Shifting cultural landscapes includes a heightened sensitivity to the surroundings and context, and the requirements these make on the subject's ability to participate in that specific landscape. When Dana moves into a Pakeha landscape, she states:

> I prepare myself by what type of environment it is... Why am I going there? How are they going to be dressing? How are they going to be speaking? So I would prepare myself to blend in and not stand out so much.

Dana uses the term 'blending' as opposed to 'passing' as a requirement of her ability to enter and exit Pakeha cultural spaces. In this sense blending' indicates anonymity whereas 'passing' denotes being fully accepted by the majority group '. A conscious effort is required to 'pass' and to 'blend'. Blending means to not stand out, to be there but not there, silent. Passing denotes actively wanting to be perceived as one of the group, the same as, perhaps unsilent, enunciating in the way the dominant group does. Blending connotes slipping in and slipping out, non active participation, a way of being present but not being overtly responsible, accountable, engaged. When the cultural landscape is reversed, 'blending' can be perceived by Maori as irresponsible, unaccountable, disengaged and fundamentally opposed to the terms underlying the political semantics embodied by a new, biculturally influenced, Maori styled ethnicity. Helena confirms that her preparation to move from a Western to an iwi environment is a transitional one, an actual shifting of cultural landscapes that requires a shift in the emotional, mental and behavioural state of the subject. She states:

> There is quite a preparation in terms of a mental and emotional preparation. That gets less as I become more familiar and so can do the transition and make the transition much easier. It's more of an emotional transition, so for instance when I am driving up to [place name] *I then put on that hat* and think to myself, "Okay, when I walk in the door I'm not saying things like 'Good morning', I'm saying 'Kia ora'." Because I'm in a Maori environment now, and because all my colleges and clients are Maori... in terms of just the way the buildings are decorated with Maori carvings and all the literature around that's written in both Maori and English, all those sorts of thoughts happen as I walk through the door.

Like those who subvert heterosexual binaries by dressing in 'drag', the bi/multi racial woman also cross-dresses to authenticate herself. Blending, passing and participating require attention to detail. The act of hybridity takes skill. Learning the respective gendered nuances of the cultures she visits and performing the identity relative to that landscape enables her to exit and enter freely. In doing so, she becomes

subversive [like the drag queen] challenging the normal heterosexual divisions between cultures. Butler [1990a, 1993] situates her feminist inquiry on women's subjectivity within a narrative of 'gender performance'. McDowell [1999: 23] suggests that Butler's [1990a] theory indicates that:

> ... this identification and its maintenance over time is constructed through what she terms a gender performance, in which the regulatory fiction of heterosexuality constrains most of us to perform within the hegemonic norms that define bipolar feminine and masculine norms in specific societal contexts... [T]he discursive or taken-for-granted construction of bipolar gender may be challenged through subversive performances, and identifies drag as a key subversive act.

Special clothing is worn when bi/multi racial subjects wish to position themselves within a Maori environment which is also a gendered landscape. But, as Joyce and Bell point out, clothing and accessories cost money that Maori don't often have. Joyce states, "I wear what I've got in my wardrobe; it does for everything. And it's nearly always what other people have given me. I'm very lucky that what I've got co-ordinates." On the other hand Faith pays attention to the culturally specific items of clothing she wears to authenticate her 'belonging' to the community to the context she is located in at a particular time. She consciously dresses to participate in traditional Maori landscapes:

> I have a lot of beliefs... about myself as a Maori; it shows a 'belonging'. I do wear those [clothes and jewellery]. Like, if I go to tangi or a Maori hui, I have clothing... Like when I go to kapa haka... I've got kapa haka skirts and those sorts of things that clearly identify [sic] me as part of a group, as part of a Maori group.

McDowell [1999: 54] claims that "[t]heorizing the body and the self as fluid and changeable has led to an understanding that physical characteristics of the body and its gender performance need not necessarily be congruent." Butler's [1990a: 140] concept of performative gender suggests that a societal requirement of repetitive acts/performances are carried out within a social environment which enforces compulsory heterosexuality. Faith's narrative points to the fluidity and flexibility of the bi/multi racial women to find her own lifestyle which challenges stereotypical assumptions of what it is to be a Maori woman. For example, at other times Faith's dress code is Europeanised and 'fairly eclectic'. She claims, "I can't walk past anything with tassels and Aztec patterns and I have a collection of hats." For Faith, it is not a matter of 'blending', or of 'passing', but of participating in her opposing cultures in ways which *are* congruent with her needs as a hybrid woman in Aotearoa. Participating means that the subject can take up a cultural subject position and be fully integrated in that position, not defined by her difference in any obvious way.

Bi/multi racial women's participation in Maori cultural locations can be jeopardised through cultural ignorance which itself acts as a form of disruption. The bi/multi racial woman contains the possibility of disrupting normal heterosexual stereotypes underpinned by heterosexual/gendered dress code norms. Butler [1990b: 338] argues that what we assume to be 'natural' about our gender identity is almost non-existent and so gender identities may be disrupted or overturned by transgressive acts that reveal "the regularly fiction of heterosexual coherence." For example, incorrect dress codes and cultural behaviours can cause cultural conflicts which are often created due to a lack of information about the landscape being transgressed and the requirements these specify. Joyce remembers when she says:

> I was asked to go to the Turangawaewae Marae for my daughter's presentation of her scholarship. I didn't understand what it was; I just knew that she was being presented with her scholarship. Of course, I thought maybe I should dress a little bit better than usual, so I put on a very colourful suit, and arrived. And much to my horror there were hundreds and hundreds of people - I should say over a thousand. And everybody dressed in black or dark grey or dark blue, in very sombre colours. And it dawned on me that I should have perhaps dressed like that too, because we were going onto this marae.

Transgressive breaches of gendered behaviour cause conflict when the Maori body is displaced in some way by the presence of whiteness/Westernism. One participant points out that ignorance of Maori cultural matters caused her to breach a Maori behavioural code. She explains:

> I went to a funeral, to a marae and everybody was in this big huge room. And first of all I was told to wear a scarf on my head and I didn't have one, and I was given one and I said, "What's this for?" I was told, "You've got to cover your hair" and I said "Rubbish". And then I marched in and all these people were in this room. And I went in with high heels on, and I walked straight in, and this person yelled out and told me to "Get those shoes off your feet!" And I thought, "I wonder who they're talking to?" So I kept walking, cos I saw my father and he yelled at me, "Get those shoes off your feet!" And then he told me off afterwards. And I said. "What did you tell me off for?" He said, "You never walk into these places with your shoes on." He said, "Haven't you learnt?" I said, "How am I supposed to learn when I didn't even grow up in this sort of place?"

Clearly, the presence of Westernism, symbolised by her high heeled shoes, created a breach of cultural etiquette. But it is also disruptive in that it symbolically suggests that Pakeha Westernism pervades Maori cultural landscapes and threatens normal heterosexual gendered performances reserved for Maori women. The participant neither wanted to wear a scarf signifying Maori women in mourning, nor did she remove her [aesthetically pleasing] Western shoes to enter into the symbolic womb of the ancestors [wharenui] thus violating a cultural tapu. Symbolically, a 'Pakeha' was in the sacred space of Maori. Her cultural difference by way of her hybrid presence created an anxiety for Maori as they saw the white Maori woman in their midst. What a destabilising effect her marked/unmarked body caused. It would seem that being able

to move across cultures is an art and a skill that requires great detail to specific Maori and Pakeha/Other cultural codes, including attention to current aesthetic trends as well as changing cultural norms and practices. For example, culturally specific foods, etiquette, behavioural norms and well-enunciated Maori and English languages are just some of the defining markers of cultural difference. However, the bi/multi racial woman often involuntarily transgresses these gendered boundaries by performing them *differently* and thus challenges the stereotypes of the Maori woman, the Pakeha woman or the Jewish woman. McDowell, [1999: 41] extends my earlier comments on Bourdieu's [1984] anthropological work by stating that his theory "... has been important in developing an understanding of the social significance of bodies and their physical placing in space". McDowell claims that Bourdieu's work on class distinctions indicated that they operate through "bodily postures, facial expressions and speaking voice" which he summarised as 'hexis'. She states:

> This is the term which describes the relationship between the social world and its inscription on bodies. Thus hexis includes the different ways individuals and groups have of bearing their bodies, presenting them to others, moving or making space for their bodies. Bourdieu argued that 'social distinctions and practices are embedded in the most automatic gestures or the apparently most insignificant techniques of the body - ways of walking or blowing one's nose, ways of eating and talking'.

Dana's hybridity reflects a 'hexis' which has been consciously developed to enable her to enter and exit the unfamiliar and uncomfortable territory of the Pakeha landscape of professional employment. Dana's sense of her hybridity is contingent upon her ability to "move in and out of both worlds" which is definitely rooted in a social world that is spatially divided by class. Dana persists in positioning herself within Pakeha cultural environments to improve her family's social and economic position in society. Consequently, she has learned to engage with the subtle forms of power which can either hinge on privileging or discriminating Maori. For example, she claims that "... just *dressing* to go to the shops in jeans and a tee shirt or track pants won't get you far... when you go in a suit... they are willing to help you."

Whanau commitments and responsibilities do not appear to prevent bi/multi racial women from participating in other cultures; rather, they strengthen the subject's self esteem and resiliency to vacillate cross culturally. Several participants indicated that they play a significant role as kaitiaki in their whanau and as such they have the responsibility to care for family land, resources and assets for future generations. Dana, being the eldest in her whanau was appointed as kuia and/or kaitiaki of the family's whenua after her father's death and is involved with maintaining the whenua as opposed to dividing and selling the lands. She claims that "...the land is precious and it's more that just an asset. It's the handing down of our taonga." In caring for the whenua, Dana and other bi/multi racial women are often positioned within a discourse

of contested land ownership and legal debates over Maori lands and settlement issues. These types of contestations also call the bi/multi racial woman into being as Maori via their whakapapa and the leadership roles they play within their whanau. But they also provide another function in that they subjectivate the Maori woman with a non Maori identity as she becomes inscribed within the landscape, language and cultural norms of Pakeha. In a twist of fate, the Maori woman also becomes subjectivated with a Pakeha cultural subjectivity.

Faith identifies that her ability to move between cultural spaces is informed by a Maori philosophy of whanau, community and of the manaakitanga and aroha that is part of a Maori cultural identity. She explains that Maori are taught how to move in and out of culturally specific roles which carries within it a sense of wholeness and belonging. In her example, she demonstrates Maori familiarity with shifting landscapes as they are called into being as a community. In the transition from urban to rural life a cultural transition occurs which is part of contemporary Maori life.

> When you are Maori, you know, you are part of a bigger whole, [but], with the Pakeha, they have their own little family. You know, it's very hard for them to break outside of those mini structures, or those micro structures that they erect around themselves. You're aware of them in lots of ways, and I think Maori are always, because of the way we are in our interactions with people; you're always thinking of others. You ARE the others. You realise that like when you go to work at the Pa, you do it, not just for yourself but you're doing it for everybody else as well, so you become part of the whole and I know your role as you move in and out of that as being part of the whole. And from a spiritual perspective for me that was easy 'cos I believe that we are all one anyway, and that a lot of the problems that we make for ourselves are because we see ourselves as separate... and I truly believe that you are your bother's keeper and he is mine, that we are actually all one big family. The only race in the world is the Human Race and once we see beyond the colour of our skin, the eyes and all that...

Maori have always been diasporic, visiting and living with other tribes, trading and negotiating for political and economic purposes with other iwi and colonial settlers [Bentley, 1999; Smith, 1999; Walker, 1992]. Faith states:

> I think it's the wairua. I've got a very close family, a whole family. We love each other very much, and we go home a lot. And we always have people bringing friends, so people are very much a part, in and out of our lives. Even in my home, people came; we never questioned where they came from or what they did; they were always accepted for who they were. I think I'm more at home amongst Maori. I find it hard sometimes to understand the new-world Maori, who seem so intent on wanting to get rid of Pakeha this and get rid of Pakeha that. But in saying that, I feel quite safe with Pakeha as well, because I feel that I can hold my own in terms of conversation and anything like that.

Bi/multi Racial Women's Hybridity and Ambivalence

The bi/multi racial woman is a bi-product of her hybridity in that she is often situated ambivalently in the nation. The hybrid's dual cultural inscription challenges the neat stereotypes reserved for the marked subject. Her non comforming presence creates an anxiety in the psyche of the nation. She is often positioned in ways which expose her to criticism, condemnation and judgement. As the bi/multi racial woman disrupts the binary of Maori and Pakeha/Other, she refuses the stereotypes that have been assigned for her in the colonial condition. Sander Gilman [1985: 12] in *Difference and Pathology* claims that:

> ... major categories of stereotypes can be [and regularly have been] freely associated, even when their association demands a suspension of common sense. Stereotypes can assume a life of their own, rooted not in reality but in the myth-making made necessary by our need to control our world... Like many other innate and ungovernable human needs, the need to stereotype has acquired increased catastrophic potential at a pace roughly in step with technological advances in our ability to harm one another... I believe that stereotyping is a universal means of coping with anxieties engendered by our inability to control the world.

The bi/multi racial woman creates a tension and anxiety because she exposes the 'myth' embedded in the fiction of culturally pure subjects. In order to expand on this point Hall's [1990] definition of culture is useful to demonstrate how the social construction of 'culture' holds the key to bi/multi racial women's ambivalence. Hall [1990: 233] claims that cultural identity can be defined in two ways:

> The first position defines 'cultural identity' in terms of one, shared culture, a sort of collective 'one true self', hiding inside the many other, more superficial or artificially imposed 'selves', which people with a shared history and ancestry hold in common. Within the terms of this definition, our cultural identities reflect the common historical experiences and shared cultural codes which provide us, as 'one people', with stable, unchanging and continuous frames of reference and meaning, beneath the shifting divisions and vicissitudes of our actual history. This 'oneness', underlying all the other, more superficial differences, is the truth, the essence... of the black experience. It is this identity which a... black diaspora must discover, excavate, bring to the light and express...

Hall states that the second related view of cultural identity recognises:

> ... as well as the many points of similarity, there are also critical points of deep and significant difference which constitute 'what we really are'; or rather - since history has intervened - 'what we have become'. We cannot speak for very long, with any exactness, about 'one experience, one identity', without acknowledging its other side - the ruptures and discontinuities which constitute, precisely the [diasporic] uniqueness. Cultural identity, in this second sense, is a matter of 'becoming' as well as of 'being'. It belongs to the future as much as to the past. It is not something which already exists, transcending place, time, history and culture. Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But, like everything which is historical, they undergo constant transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to the continuous 'play' of history, culture and power. Far from being grounded in a mere 'recovery' of the past, which is

> waiting to be found, and which, when found, will secure our sense of ourselves into eternity, identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past... It is only from this second position that we can properly understand the traumatic character of 'the colonial experience'. The ways in which black people, black experiences, were positioned and subjected in the dominant regimes of representation were the effects of a critical exercise of cultural power and normalisation.

Hall's analysis of culture suggests that ambivalence is located in the very meaning of the term *culture*. Culture, itself, is ambiguous and fraught with double meanings, disjuntures and uncertainty. Given that the bi/multi racial hybrid is situated across at least two cultures, she contains a mixture of critical points of deep and significant difference which help to constitute whom she has become. Therefore, the bi/multi racial woman "... cannot speak for very long, with any exactness, about 'one experience, one identity', without acknowledging its other side - the ruptures and discontinuities which constitute, precisely the [diasporic] uniqueness" [Hall, 1990, p. 233]. The bi/multi racial woman's identity is always in process. Drawing on Hall, her unique cultural identity is a matter of 'becoming' as well as of 'being'. The 'nature' of identity, as Maori have always recognised, resides in the subject's cultural identity which "belongs to the future as much as to the past" [Hall, 1990, p. 233].

The bi/multi racial hybrid's identity has a history; it does not transcend place but rather gathers its subjectivity from within space and the cultural context she is positioned in at any given time. Bi/multi racial women's identities are in a continual process of transformation. As such, they are unfixed, and unbounded by innate biological essences. Their experiences of their cultural hybridity are rooted in the soil of the nation's construction of itself and its Others and reflects the multiple and contradictory cultural inscriptions she mediates. She is both Maori and Pakeha/Other. In speaking about her hybridity my desire is not to rescue her from a past that is innocently waiting to be found, so that I can position her into eternity [unscathed by the processes of colonialism] but, rather, the task is to problematise her coherence of identity by showing the ways that ambivalence disrupts the idea of essence, timelessness and purity. For, as Hall [1997b] contends, it is only from this second position that we can properly understand the traumatic character of 'the colonial experience'. What exactly is the bi/multi racial hybrid's Other experience? A brief look at the site of ambivalence and the way it marks itself on her contributes to an understanding of the ways in which bi/multi racial women become positioned and subjected to cultural plays of power which seek discrete Maori and Pakeha gendered subjects. In the following example, I show how cultural ambivalence is experienced by bi/multi racial women.

Subjectivated with two cultural subjectivities *can* be a positive experience for the bi/multi racial woman. But, being positioned with more than one cultural identity can

also be a negative experience if a cultural clash ensues between the bi/multi racial woman and those from a different cultural ethnicity. For example, Mahinarangi [Maori, Jewish, Scottish, Pakeha] says that her subjectivity as a musician was enhanced through her multiple cultural experiences. She states "I had music! I had this marvellous language from both of them". Clearly, Mahinarangi relishes her multiple cultural ethnicity and the gifts this brought her. However, her ambivalent positioning [marked cultural identity] was experienced in attacks of racism, where she states, "I used to get things said to me at the Catholic school like 'You killed Jesus. Your father killed Jesus!', and things like that". In this example, Mahinarangi's cultural difference was exacerbated by her triply inscripted cultural subjectivities and symbolic positionality as Maori Pakeha/Other and Jewish, which played havoc with the mind of the unmarked subject. Gilman [1985: 35] writes:

> The association of the images of "blackness" and "Jewishness" is a test case for the interrelationship of images of difference. The black and the Jew [are] associated not merely because they [are] both "outsiders" but because these qualities ascribed to one became the means of defining the difference of the other. The categories of "black" and "Jew" thus became interchangeable at one point in history. The line between the two groups vanished, and each became the definition of the other.

Bi/multi racial women's subjectivities are ambivalent due to the nature of their ambiguous, contradictory cultural identities. At times her 'self' is unknown even to her. It is as if she has to pin her 'self' down in time, place and context to understand herself at all. She searches for meanings and clues to explain her 'self' in transition. What is this identity that produces and enunciates in ways that are in excess of her own conscious awareness and knowledge of self? Mahinarangi illustrates this phenomenon in her expression of herself as a Jewish musician/composer:

> Well, I see a big side of me as Jewish. I see myself having that semantic make-up as well, *definitely*. It think that's the creative side of me; there's a real mixture of the Maori and the Hebrew thing there. I think sometimes about my performances and there's something about the way I write sometimes as Jewish. I don't realise until after I've recorded something and I hear it back and think, "Oh my God, where did that come from? Why did I do that?" And then someone says, "It's the Jewish sound" and I think "Oh is it?" It's like there is something there, something in the breath of our ancestors that comes through, that shows us genetically who we are.

Mahinarangi's narrative also points out that bi/multi racial women live with cultural contradictions because the cultural symbols and values inherent to one culture do not always correlate to the Other culture/s. She uses the example of her "shyness" which she states is "actually okay [and] normal in the Maori world". But, she states that "*in* the Pakeha world if you are really shy... it's the *shyness* that's focused on and you've got to fix it because *it* must be wrong".

To explain the disruption of cultural disjuncture I now turn to the way that different subjectivities compete for salience in the bi/multi racial woman's life and act as a site of antagonism. One woman recalls being doubly positioned as a bright student and as a Maori adolescent female. These two subject positions were clarified for her when a school teacher put her down after she won an academic award and told her not to expect to do any better. Positioned ambivalently as the Maori girl who excelled academically, she pushed the boundary between Maori/irrational/female and Pakeha/rational/male. Later, positioned as a teacher within an academic tertiary environment, she occupied the uneasy terrain of Pakeha/authority and Maori/woman. One woman recalls:

> Maori men have the privilege of sex as opposed to race. And Maori men have formed alliances with Pakeha men and some of those behaviours have slid into Maori contexts if you like, like on maraes and stuff like that. That can also slide into classrooms as well. I've had an incident when I asked a student to get on with [his] work... I got stripped down in front of the class because he had claimed I had trampled on his mana. Because I was the teacher, and I asked him to do some work. He was doing some other work! I felt really trodden on in that sense. He just got up at the end of the class and he just had a go at me... It wasn't a very pleasant circumstance actually... and yet, what I'd asked wasn't unreasonable within the context of the class.

In this example her cultural ambiguity lay in her dual subjectivity. She was simultaneously positioned as a teacher *and* a Maori woman within a white academic institution. A conflict of interest arose when her adult male student resented a Maori woman having authority over him. Clearly this was an issue which involved a colonial form of racial misogyny over the raced and gendered corporeality of a Maori woman/school teacher. Would this aggressive student have harassed her if she had been a white/Pakeha teacher or a Maori man? What gave him the right to usurp her authority as teacher just because she was a teacher in brown skin? Moreton-Robinson [2000] cautions us that the subject positions we occupy are not equal. Power is played out in different ways depending on what subject position is called into being. For example, the bi/multi racial subject can predominantly occupy the subject position of the lesbian, and then switch to occupying the subject position of the Maori or the Pakeha/Other at will. This does not mean to say that the remaining *dormant* subjectivities are unimportant or irrelevant. Rather, unlike the unmoving body of Te Wheke in Chapter Five, they exist within the spatial, economic, political, material and psychological context that calls them into being for particular purposes at particular times within different landscapes.

Ambivalence also exists in the bi/multi racial woman who lacks proof of her cultural identity via links to whakapapa. Jill points out that Maori children who were put up for adoption during the 1950s often had their Maori parents' genealogy recorded as "Italian, Sicilienne, Greek or some sort of dark ancestry that could explain

their colouring". Jill's ambivalence over her Maori Pakeha/Other identity is evident in this statement:

> So who am I? It's really scary [and] because the words "Maori Father" were written on my adoption papers. I don't know the context... why they were written there. It's really scary to think that that might not be true. That is a real fear, because then what do these feelings have... what does this identity... this need, this attraction, this spirituality actually mean? Where does it locate itself? Am I just a sham? Am I just bullshit? Because that's really, really important for me, so that's an absolute. My first response is total fear [that] someone pulls something out of the air and says, "It is correct; actually you are Italian." That is absolutely freaking me out. And at times I'd really like to have it confirmed,... that someone says, "Oh I know your father - he's so and so." And yes, he can then turn around and say, "Yes, I slept with a woman of such and such a name back in those days." That would be really, really neat, but really scary if someone said, "No, there's nothing to tell you." There's a real risk there.

For bi/multi racial women who may not signify as Maori the ambivalence comes from identifying as Maori but not being recognised as such. Having to cite whakapapa is mostly the domain of the white bi/multi racial woman as a form of authenticating the Maori subjectivity of the bi/multi racial woman. Blond, blue eyed Helena declares that she would declare her whakapapa when visiting other tribal landscapes in order to protect herself and other Maori people who may not recognise her visually as Maori. She says, "I would be an alien in that environment... That's basically how it feels for me. I think it would be very strange. I think there would be an internal conflict for me". Helena has experienced incidents within her own iwi agency where Maori clients have "recoiled visibly" on seeing her.

Bi/multi racial women also experience anxiety when they are subjected to discussions over Maori authenticity which appear in urban versus rural identity debates. Some bi/multi racial women, through no fault of their own, are not able to access whakapapa and establish rural tribal connections; their authenticity is called into question. Jill states:

> Well, it makes me very angry when I hear somebody like Tipene O'Regan, whom I knew as Stephen prior to 1984, when he then suddenly changes his name... going on about... the urban maraes and the Waipareira Trust and how, you know, if you don't know your whakapapa then that's your own fault and you are not entitled to any claim for any iwi money, settlement. And I think, "Well, fuck you Tipene O'Regan!" Nothing, *nothing* I can do, can locate me with a whakapapa that is actually... that I can say is genuinely mine. Why? Because of a system, because of racism and because of separation! Now I've been whangaied, but I can't until the rest of that hapu, until the rest of that iwi, actually acknowledges what [name of whangai mother] has done. Her daughters have, one sister has, but her brother has to and the people have to actually say that I'm whangai before I'm going to be seen as being actually of that hapu.

Nowhere is the ambivalence of the double life more evident than in Jill's oscillating between her Pakeha [adopted] family, her biological Pakeha/Other family and her Maori family of whangai creation. Jill is caught between her adopted Pakeha mother's

denial of her Maori identity, her twin sister's exploitation of the economic gains that whakapapa brings some individuals and the honest desire to have contact with her natural mother's Pakeha/Other family as well as her newly found adopted whanau. Jill elaborates:

> She [adopted mother] was very pleased when I went back and said that my [birth] mother was dead and so she thought that was the end of the story, but she doesn't know that I actually have got six half brothers and sisters through my mother, my birth mother. And that my half sister, the oldest one and I are really, really close and that there's one brother that I'm quite close to. So that I live this sort of double life in a sense. My twin sister found out that I was looking and she said, "Oh I don't want to know anything about it." And that, that was fair. You know she had her own dreams, her own aspirations, that sort of thing. And she said, "Oh you know, if you find out that we're Maori that's the only time when you can tell us because that will be really cool because that's when we can get all the different financial aid that goes with that [identity] for our studies." I mean she is a materialistic, money grabbing, hungry, racist bitch, so I'm not going to tell her any of this, no way.

Some bi/multi racial women privilege other forms of non racial cultural identities which invariably clash with cultural requirements and obligations to be authentic in some way. Jill states that she can put on a "proper voice" and "say all the right things" in the white middle class privileged world in which she was raised. However, neither her class or Maori Pakeha/Other cultural identity is the dominant subjectivity she identifies with:

> I can just put on this, you know [name of private college] frightfully proper voice. I can say all the right things you know, "Let's have another pink gin", you know, but I don't mix with that group. I mean I don't go back there. I don't mix with those people now. My sister does, you know. I don't go back to my school reunions. I mean, I'm a lesbian first of all!

Jill is further marginalised and hybridised by her lesbian identity. As lesbian, she takes her lesbianism into cultural spaces infused with heterosexual gendered norms. For the bi/multi racial woman, her lesbian and Maori Pakeha/Other identities destabilise the boundaries between heterosexuality/queerness and the Maori and Pakeha cultural binary. However, when a lesbian subjectivity exists alongside other marginal identities the dislocation experienced by the bi/multi racial woman is further compounded. The lesbian bi/multi racial woman has the difficult task of juggling multiply conflicted identities in order to seek new and creative ways of being and belonging in the world. As lesbian, Anzaldua [1987: 80-1] states:

> I have no country, my homeland casts me out; yet all countries are mine because I am every woman's sister or potential lover. [As lesbian I have no race, my own people disclaim me; but I am all races because there is the queer of me in all races]... I am an act of kneading, of uniting and joining that not only has produced both a creature of darkness and a creature of light, but also a creature that questions the definitions of light and dark and gives them new meanings.

Because some bi/multi racial women do not recognise themselves as having a strong Pakeha/Other cultural subjectivity, they can feel different from non Maori, creating anxiety in the subject. As well, her presence can cause conflict in the workplace as Pakeha/Other are confronted with the bi/multi racial women's Maori difference. Dana had recently repositioned herself in a small agency within a non Maori landscape of employment. After working there for some time she had a baby. She wished to test the cultural boundaries of the non Maori agency by taking her breastfed baby to work with her. Within a short period of time her employers asked her to find child-care for her baby. This was despite the fact that the baby was well adjusted to his environment and the people within the work environment loved his presence. This created an anxiety for Dana. Her cultural mothering norms were regulated by the power of her employers to terminate her administration contract. Dana left soon afterwards. She explains:

> I think it's a wonderful experience to bring my son to work, and to be able to do my work. And to have plenty of interaction with him is very valuable to both me and my son. But it's just a work centre. In the end, it becomes just a work centre.

Dana recognised that a cultural form of racism was operating in the work environment which divided Maori women into worker and mother. Dana claims, "I think there are definitely two different cultures and it just seems where-ever I work or even where I go they just end up clashing. I think Maori are very sensitive to cultural issues and people." Dana explained that she would have to seek employment in a culturally supportive work environment if she wished to have her baby with her. She claims that finding culturally supportive alliances within Pakeha work spaces helped to make the cultural dis/locations easier for bi/multi racial women. Dana recalled the time when she relied on a Maori colleague to provide a sense of safety and cultural reassurance while working in a Pakeha environment. She states:

> Another Maori woman and I were at the agency when an elderly white female employer came in and I can't remember what exactly what it was about now, but she said something really, really racist and I remember looking at Turia and we had a little giggle about it because we knew exactly what was going on.

Conclusion

At the very least, bi/multi racial women's stories show that Maori and Pakeha identity are not fixed, immutable and simple things, but rather are highly specific and disorganised outcomes of relationships of power instigated in the colonial relationship and sealed within nationalism. As the stories highlight, the inter cultural relationships between Maori and Pakeha/Other position certain 'authentic' subjects with cultural

privilege evidenced in the positions of power they hold within bicultural society. However, by extension, the stories also highlight that biculturalism has implications for inauthentic subjects, as women who are located on the bicultural margins struggle to mediate between two conflicted cultural worlds and get caught in the cross fire between. But bi/multi racial women are not merely victims of colonialism, functioning as the nation's pathological native in its obsession to construct its Other. Neither are we relegated to being fixed/incarcerated as the traditional cornerstone of Maoridom and nor are we so colonised that we are merely assimilated victims of a Pakeha/Other subjectivity.

Bi/multi racial women, while retaining a sense of Maori identity, actively engage with a non Maori identity and Other subjectivities to effect better life chances for themselves and their families. As such, they recognise and value their dual Maori Pakeha/Other whakapapa when they consciously take up non Maori [Westernised/Other] subjectivities as a form of resistance to their undesirable social, political and economic positionality in the bicultural nation. Hybrid women resist neo colonial forms of subjugation by refusing to be positioned as the essential Maori woman. They muddy up the clear boundaries of what is considered to be pure Maori and Pakeha signifiers of difference. How strange it seems for a white woman's appearance to resemble a Maori woman's cultural dress/signification code. What a strange sight it is to see a brown woman appear like a middle class white woman. In taking on other cultural subjectivities as a form of resistance to being further oppressed by the questionable *post* colonial bicultural nation, Maori women fall outside representation. However, bi/multi racial women continually find new and unique ways to be *inside* and *outside* Maori identity.

The truths of bi/multi racial women's experiences are not sought by either New Zealand feminists, Maori experts and/or social scientists because our presence does not serve either New Zealand's or Maori nationalists' agendas. While Maori struggle to compete with Pakeha in a market driven economy, the focus is still on the homogenous Maori community and its authentic citizens. Hence, the heterogenous difference of the bi/multi racial woman is ignored, occluded. Simply, our stories are unwanted because they disrupt the idea of the normative Maori and Pakeha/Other subject, and threaten to usurp the development and progress of the unified Maori nation. Why is the bi/multi racial woman so feared/hated? What does her 'difference' risk? What can a more in-depth look at her corporeal *body* of knowledge contribute to a deeper understanding of her marginalisation and positionality within the bicultural nation? I turn to these questions in the next chapter.

Chapter Seven

"My Skin is my Culture": E/raced Bodies and Bi/multi Racial Resistance

> ... [T]he landscape functions as a scribe recording the passage of history of the nation and its people. The emotion attached to the landscape relates to its ability to release memory, allowing the past to exist simultaneously with the present. Thus a metonymic link between bodies, landscape and nation, in that they are all contiguous... function to temporarily replace one another... The landscape which initially unites bodies and creates an identity through place becomes repressed in the formation of the nation. Landscape features or geographical contours always underpin the meaning of a nation and the formation of national boundaries. But in this repression the term 'landscape' becomes meaningless without the mediation of the political construct of the nation. The thews and sinews of the body shaped by our relationship to our specific environment are covered over by the forging of a national identity. In other words, the discourses of nationalism subscribe to a different form of embodiment [as in race/ethnicity] which requires the foregoing of an embodiment mediated through nature: our bodily relationship to our landscape is repressed so that we may come into coherency via the nation. Notions of race are a part of nationalist discourse [Radhika Mohanram, 1999, pp. 5-7].

In this chapter I am concerned with an examination of the new forms of subjugations that operate to oppress and marginalise bi/multi racial Maori women based upon their racial corporeality in the New Zealand nation. What difference does racial morphology play in the experiences these women grapple with in the bicultural nation today? How do bi/multi racial bodies become discursively positioned to function as 'landscape' or 'cultural places/spaces' in the nation and how are bi/multi racial women affected by the discursive practices which run throughout the nation in the ways described by Mohanram in her opening epigraph? In New Zealand, blood quantification operated to define Maori and Pakeha difference until eugenics, as a site of difference, was replaced by a new category of difference theorised and hierachised in cultural terms [Wetherell and Potter, 1992]. No longer was Maori difference from Pakeha located in their flesh and blood. It was now theorised in terms of their *cultural difference* from Pakeha. However, despite the erasure of race, the legacy of Social Darwinism subconsciously exists in the prevailing equation that racial morphology equals its equivalent, cultural identity, hence, one participant's Freudian slip when she exclaimed "My skin is my culture", revealing that a socially constructed identity was determined for her by her 'observable' racial signification. An amnesia operates within the New Zealand nation to conceal the insidious ways the legacy of colonialism continues to discriminate against Maori based on their marked/brown corporeal difference that is juxtaposed against Pakehas' unmarked/white corporeality. Given that

bi/multi racial women may signify as either Maori through their corporeal marking as brown/Maori or alternatively white/Pakeha, what are the ramifications of being positioned along a racial axis that marks and places people in particular ways and what part does biculturalism play in this? Further, how are bi/multi racial women exoticised and how does the experience of an exoticised form of racism impact on them? This chapter recognises the place of the corporeal body in relation to the way bi/multi racial women are treated and positioned spatially within the bicultural nation in terms of race, gender and class. Essentially, what does corporeality/race have to do with new forms of colonialism and what are the repercussions of being the raced/marked/brown or deraced/unmarked/white bi/multi racial subject today?

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section 'Maori Bugs and White Maggots' examines bi/multi racial women through a racial lens. Essentially, what does bi/multi racial corporeality have to do with bi/multi racial racism? How does racism impact on corporeally *brown* bi/multi racial women. The second section 'Whiteness and Bi/multi Racial Women' looks at the way unmarked/white bi/multi racial women experience racism within the bicultural nation. The third section 'Exotic Bi/multi Racial Bodies' examines how bi/multi racial women are constructed as exotic. Being neither brown nor white, but a mixture of both, how does the bi/multi racial woman become the desired object of the post colonial gaze?

"Maori Bugs and White Maggots"

New Zealand, like other modernist societies, witnessed the erasure of 'race' as a category of difference in the latter part of the twentieth century. Diana Fuss [1988] in *Essentially Speaking* states that contemporary biologists advance the idea there is only as much variation genetically between races as there is within races thus challenging outmoded assumptions of racial inferiority and superiority based upon eugenics. She claims that, when social constructionist and essentialist driven debates are taken to their fullest conclusion, they begin to collapse against each other, breaking down, merging into the Other's exterior limitations. In other words, the social construction of the subject is inextricably related to the gendered and racial corporeality of the subject. Fuss points out that a slippage exists between biology and the social construction of identity in that culture attaches specific meanings to race and gender, thus inscribing the corporeal biological body semantically with cultural meaning. In this way, marked and unmarked bodies are encoded within a cultural linguistic chain of meaning, resulting in the cultural signification of raced/marked and deraced/unmarked bodies [Hall, 1997]. Social constructionists, according to Haraway [1988] conceal the fact that the social construction of identity [as a cultural truth] is manufactured from cultural meanings associated with raced and gendered bodies. A focus on cultural

identity conceals the way in which racial and gendered corporeality continues to inform the social construction of identity in the first place. This denial of race can also be seen operating in New Zealand. For example, as soon as the participant [mentioned earlier] exclaimed that her *skin* was her *culture* she immediately tried to retract her statement. The unconscious relationship between her raced/marked body and her socially constructed cultural identity produced anxiety in her. Her slip was clearly threatening. What was so important about this piece of information that its desire to be heard was evidenced by its articulation, its need to express itself? Yet, what was so abhorrent that it immediately had to be denied, taken back? An exploration of this statement shows that despite the shift from thinking about Maori difference in cultural terms, the morphology of race prevails to symbolically mark white and brown individuals in particular ways to privilege and discriminate them according to their racial specificities. How does racism work to discriminate against corporeal brown bodies in the bicultural nation today?

The objective of this section is to look at the corporeal bi/multi racial body in relation to its position in the bicultural nation. Mohanram [1999: 52] in *The Black Body* states:

> In other words, 'black' can only resonate with the meaning that it does when it is considered to be geographically and socially in or out of place. To put it yet another way, 'black' signifies differently in Uganda or South Africa than it does in Oakland, California or Auckland, New Zealand. In each situation the signifier 'black' resonates with the history, culture and power dynamics that are particular to that place. Yet the significance of 'place' is often subsumed under the rubric of 'the politics of location'. Such a term emphasizes history and temporality - its politics - over the sense of place, the influence of its landscape in the construction of identity, and the materiality of place.

Racial identification and discrimination existed the moment Tauiwi and Maori first laid eyes on each Other [Bentley, 1999]. One kuia, Joyce, indicated that racial insults were used as a derogatory form of name calling during her youth in the 1930s. She recalls that "... if the family next door to us in our primary school days were upset with us they would call us *Maori bugs!* and we in turn called them *white maggots!"* 'Maori bugs' refers to an indigenous black beetle for which the colloquial term was 'stink beetle' due to the offensive odour it emitted. The metaphor's humour works because of the racial invocation associated with whiteness [maggots] and brownness/stinkyness [bugs]. When reversed, "Maori maggots" and "Pakeha bugs" fail to contain the same racist, albeit humorous, connotation. Certain physical/racial stereotypes still function metonymically to symbolise Maori and Pakeha culture in the nation today. Faith's narrative points to the assumptions that accompany the raced body. She states:

> Maori say, "Oh, you're working at the bilingual unit?" [or] "You're in the kura kaupapa unit?" I say, "No, actually I work in the English department. I'm Head of the English Department." They say, "Oh, so why aren't you teaching te reo?" and I say "Oh God!

> They've got enough Maori teachers over there. At the end of the day, someone has to teach our children how to speak and write in English... It's the real world out there!" But one lesson I have learned is, you can never tell what someone is. Pakeha *and* Maori fall into the trap of saying, "Oh that's your husband?" My husband looks Pakeha, and they all assume that he's Pakeha. In actual fact he's half Ngai Tahu and half Irish. But I think, never assume anything, because there are some very fair Maoris down the coast, with green and blue eyes.

Simply, race matters. Patricia Williams [1997: 1-2] in *Seeing a Colour-Blind Future: The Paradox of Race* opens with an anecdote on the importance of race. She claims that three teachers at her son's nursery school thought him colour-blind because he could not differentiate colour. An ophthalmologist examination established that he was not colour-blind. On investigating the problem further Williams discovered that her son did not recognise colour because the well-meaning teachers at his predominantly white school had valiantly and repeatedly assured their charges that colour makes no difference. "It doesn't matter," they told the children, "whether you're black or white or red or green or blue." She continues:

> Yet upon further investigation, the very reason that the teachers had felt it necessary to impart this lesson in the first place was that it *did* matter, and in predictably cruel ways: some of the children had been fighting about whether black people could play 'good guys'.

Williams [1997, 2] goes on:

> ... [T]he very notion of blindness about colour constitutes an ideological confusion at best, and denial at its very worst. I recognise, certainly, that the teachers were inspired by a desire to make whole a division in the ranks. But there is much overlooked in the move to undo that which clearly and unfortunately matters just by labelling it that which 'makes no difference'. The dismissiveness, however unintentional, leaves those in my son's position pulled between the clarity of their own experience and the often alienating terms in which they must seek social acceptance.

On the one hand Williams' son was invisible by the nature of his racial morphology, yet on the other hand he was discriminated as a 'bad guy'. In the New Zealand context, brown and white bodies are similarly positioned. New Zealanders officially learn that culture matters and that race makes *no* difference. However, as William's narrative shows, racial corporeality matters insofar as it signifies cultural *difference* hence the collapsing of social constructionist and biological determinist arguments [Fuss, 1988]. The presence of brownness is generally described as the skin colouring which best describes Maori and is often used politically by Maori and Pakeha/Other interchangeably with the sign *black.* Iris Young [1990: 125] in *Justice and the Politics of Identity* writes that "Nineteenth-and early twentieth-century scientific, aesthetic, and moral culture explicitly constructed some groups as ugly or degenerative bodies, in contrast to the purity and respectability of neutral rational subjects." In the early 2000s, brown skin is metonymically linked to Maori cultural identity [and 'ugly bodies']

as is white skin to Pakeha identity [and 'pure bodies']. But in the post colonial era, bi/multi racial women indicate that skin colour no longer equates with cultural subjectivity. In short, the connection between corporeal brownness and whiteness and cultural subjectivity is an arbitrary [and unreliable] signifier of cultural difference. Further, both brownness and whiteness, as signifiers of difference, are over-determined with cultural meaning in that they seek to name and place subjects in particular ways according to their racial morphology. In particular, the raced body is associated with notions of badness, madness, and sickness, derivatives of being 'out of control'. For example, Sander Gilman [1985: 129-130] in *Difference and Pathology* looks at the association of blackness with madness:

> Certainly, no stereotypes have had more horrifying translations into social policy that those of "race." Tied to the prestige of nineteenth-century science, the idea of racial difference in the twentieth century became the means for manipulating and eventually destroying entire groups... [H]ow easily racial stereotypes have been linked with images of pathology, especially psychopathology. In this case the need to create the sense of difference between the self and the Other builds upon the xenophobia inherent in all groups. That which defines one's group is "good," everything else is frighteningly "bad." The cohesiveness of any group depends on a mutually defined sense of identity, usually articulated in categories that reflect the group's history.
>
> Categories such as linguistic unity, perceived identity of skin color, and geographic cohesion have all played their role in defining larger groups ["races"] within the Western tradition. But even more brutally simple categories underlie these. For language implies the correct and meaningful use of language. Any other use is "crazy". Thus one of the inherent definitions of any linguistic group is that it is the norm of sanity. The Other is always "mad." Insanity is not merely a label [any more than is geography or skin color]. It exists in reality. But the Other's "madness" is what defines the sanity of the defining group.
>
> The group is embodied with all of the positive associations of the self. The Other is the antithesis of the self and is thus that which defines the group... the image of the dangerous Other serves both as the focus for the projection of anxiety concerning the self and as the means by which the Other defines itself.

The pathological signification of brownness and blackness finds its repository in the brown Maori body. Skin is not just skin. Symbolically, brown/black human skin is a sign that flashes with neon lights warning the white/unmarked subject that here comes the violent/ugly/insane/bad/irrational and out of control brown body. Proceed with caution. An anomaly occurs when on the one hand New Zealand's race relations are founded upon liberal notions of equality, and yet the very thing that marks some subjects as different from Pakeha/Other is ignored. Young [1990: 122] provides a clue to the violence levied against brown/black bodies when she recognises that cultural imperialism and violence are conditioned by the structures and imperatives of capitalism and function as two forms of violence that inhabit the world of the black subject. Young [1990: 123] indicates that racism, like other group oppressions, should be thought of not as a single structures, but in terms of several forms of oppression that condition the lives of most or all Blacks. She continues:

> Cultural imperialism consists in group's being invisible at the same time that it is marked out and stereotyped. Culturally imperialist groups project their own values, experience, and perspective as normative and universal. Victims of cultural imperialism are thereby rendered invisible as subjects, as persons with their own perspectives and group-specific experience and interests. At the same time they are marked out, frozen into a being marked as Other, deviant in relation to the dominant norm. The dominant groups need not notice their own group being at all; they occupy an unmarked, neutral, apparently universal position. But victims of cultural imperialism cannot forget their group identity because the behavior and reactions of others call them back to it.

Young [1990: 58] also explains that cultural oppression is a form of injustice that finds its mark on bodies of difference when she states that:

> [E]xploitation, marginalization, and powerlessness all refer to the relations of power and oppression that occur by virtue of the social division of labor - who works for whom, who does not work, and how the content of work defines one institutional position relative to others. These three categories refer to structural and institutional relations that delimit people's material lives, including but not restricted to the resources they have access to and the concrete opportunities they have or do not have to develop and exercise their capacities. These kinds of oppression are a matter of concrete power in relation to others - of who benefits from whom, and who is dispensable.

Young [1990: 56] also claims that the "Marxist idea of class is important because it helps reveal the structure of exploitation: that some people have power and wealth because they profit from the labor of others... the labor of most people in the society augments the power of relatively few." Young [1990: 124] goes on to say that:

> ... the habitual and unconscious fears and aversions that continue to define some groups as despised and ugly bodies modulate with anxieties over loss of identity. Our society enacts the oppression of cultural imperialism to a large degree through feelings and reactions, and in that respect oppression is beyond the reach of law and policy to remedy.

Maori, as a social group continues to be marginalised through the uneven distribution of labour and wealth caused through the imperatives of cultural imperialism. Hence, the legacy of racism towards brown bodies prevails into the 2000s. Mohanram [1999: 38] states that:

> ... bodies become visible or invisible only through the vectors of power and economics and the meaning imputed to these within cultural knowledge systems. The visual nature of poverty functions thus: it becomes the underside of an indexical relation through which the bourgeois observer comes into an identity. The negative aspects of embodiment are displaced completely onto the poor body. The poor body's obvious visibility puts it in closer proximity to the 'brute', and to the animal kingdom generally.

Class determines which bodies belong in what spaces. Geographical spaces become designated places and are symbolically linked to corporeal brown and white bodies; particular geographical spaces are synonymous with raced and deraced bodies

[Mohanram, 1999]. In the New Zealand context the brown Maori body is stereotyped as belonging to an underclass and thus creates an anxiety in the psyche of the nation's middle class citizens. For example, the stereotype of the 'poor body' can be clearly seen in the area of housing and employment where stereotypes continue to place Maori women in particular ways depending on the subjects' gendered and racial corporeality. Class becomes curiously implicated in bi/multi racial women's corporeal mobility. Dana recalls the time she wanted to rent a property. On seeing her in the corporeal 'brown' flesh the real estate agent remarked, "Perhaps you'd be better over here", indicating a lower class area in the form of a Government Housing Corporation dwelling. Dana indicated that the house was unsuitable and demanded a house in a 'middle class white area for professional people'. Clearly Dana was the wrong colour for the right street. She states, "I can't understand those assumptions... it's very annoying. There have been times I've said, "Look, I'm Maori so if that's a problem for you I need to know now so I won't waste my time."

Corporeal bodies become synonymous with cultural landscapes and act as material markers of culture and, by extension, class. Race related spatial norms are established at both conscious and unconscious levels, informing the regulation and control of brown women by designating which bodies belong and which bodies are excluded from class/ified spaces. Bell says:

> I think people perceive me... from their actions, as being somewhat staunch or aggressive or someone to be a little bit wary of because of my dreadlocks. It's very interesting when you go to the bank on Lambton Quay as opposed to the bank in Newtown. Up at the marae, well you just fit right in. But standing in the bank people sort of walk up to you and have a look.

Frantz Fanon [1967] made the point in *Black Skin, White Masks* that the West projects its anxiety about the Other which then finds its repository in the blackness of the Other. Further, Gilman [1985: 30] explains:

> [B]lacks are the antithesis of the mirage of whiteness, the ideal of European aesthetic values, strikes the reader as an extension of some "real," perceived difference to which the qualities of "good" and "bad" have been erroneously applied. But the very concept of color is a quality of Otherness, not of reality. For not only are blacks black in this amorphous world of projection, so too are Jews.

Bell also discovered that the brown body is often discriminated against via the material symbols that indicate class positionality. She states:

> When I was driving my old Valiant, I would get stopped two or three times a week, every week by the police and that was [because of] you know [this] short little Maori girl looking through the hole between the steering wheel and the dash, you know, out in this big huge car wearing a cap or with a shaved [head] or with dreadlocks, or whatever, driving around Wellington. You know, I was just pulled over all the time, all the time.

Bell's corporeal body [and her car's body] fitted an underclass/working class/criminal description of Maori youth and was regularly stopped by the police for alcohol breath tests and checks on car registration and warrant of fitness. Yet, when she became an upwardly mobile professional driving a red sports car the police stopped her daily to check whether her car was stolen. What can a young Maori woman with dreadlocks be doing driving a car like that? Out of her place, marked by her race, Bell was seen by the police as a car thief.

As stated earlier, the emergence of a newly charged traditional identity during the 1970s and 1980s meant that a contemporary Maori subjectivity reflects a highly politicised consciousness about what it means to be Maori. Being Maori signifies a communal sense of difference from Pakeha based upon oppositional nationalist politics; Maori is Pakeha's underdog. Fuss [1988: 75] reviews Fanon's [1967] influential text *Black Skin, White Masks.* She states that Fanon addresses biological signification in a culture where the Other is the minority and therefore is always seen as the ethnic. So, the Other comes to be the 'biological'. Fanon connects racism to the Other as 'primitive and subhuman'. He sets up a dialogue where the black person is associated with nature or the 'biological'. This challenges a unified national identity in that the concept of racism has shifted from theorising difference based upon the assumption of eugenics to one of cultural difference. In the bicultural nation today, Maori identity then contains an uneasy polarisation of the Maori victim [associated with nature/biology] with the consciously politicised Maori activist [associated with culture/ethnicity]. Both of these Maori images are symbolised by the brown corporeal body. But for some women the call to Maori cultural politicization is not as significant as it is for others. It is not an essential ingredient in the development of a meaningful understanding of who they are in relation to their past, present or future. Their worlds hold other possibilities as they seek to avoid the trap of developing a politicised Maori consciousness that subjugates them within a racist bicultural system that promises to emancipate them. For other women, a politicised ethnicity exists uncomfortably alongside other subjectivities.

The concept of bi/multi racial hybridity invokes an imagery that symbolises the clashing of two cultural borders, their jig-saw edges touching each other unevenly and uneasily. The bi/multi racial woman's body interfaces these Maori and Pakeha cultural spaces. Mohanram [1999: 53] in reference to Elizabeth Grosz's text *Space, Time and Bodies* refers to Grosz's ideas on how space becomes place. She points out that space is not 'an empty receptacle'; however she argues that, to give it perspective, it cannot be perceived without any objects in it:

> It is our positioning within space, both as the point of perspectival access to space, and also an object for others in space, that gives the subject a coherent identity and an ability to manipulate things, including its own body parts, in space.

Further, McDowell [1999: 34] explains that the body *is* a place, distinguished from other bodies/places, "through the operation of the relations of power that construct boundaries between them." She [1999: 34] states:

> The body is the place, the location or site, if you like, of the individual, with more or less impermeable boundaries between one body and another. While bodies are undoubtedly material, possessing a range of characteristics such as shape and size and so inevitably taking up space, the ways in which bodies are presented to and seen by others vary according to the spaces and places in which they find themselves. In a club, for example, you might find your gestures, bodily adornment and the freedom with which you take up space are all quite different from when you appear in the lecture theatre on Monday morning. It is these attributes of flexibility, presentation and the occupation of space that I want to focus on... [O]ur bodies are more fluid and flexible than we often realize... [T]his mutability is related to place and position.

In an effort to ground the material reality of bi/multi racial women's experiences, a spatial metaphor is invoked which suggests that 'bicultural hot spots' exist as places of corporeal positioning/occupation which are fraught with cultural conflict. Within this, the bi/multi racial woman's body becomes a physical space that is contested by new patriarchal alignments within the bicultural nation. Her body is the place that records the violence on the bicultural borderlands. Bicultural hot spots require the bicultural knowledge and mediation skills of the bi/multi racial Maori hybrid. These spaces act as the material borders that have to be traversed, crossed and crossed again by the corporeal raced body. Weaving backwards and forwards, conversations between Maori men and bi/multi racial women, Pakeha/Other men and bi/multi racial women, Maori women and bi/multi racial women and Pakeha/Other women and bi/multi racial women create a taniko weaving that tells the story of the Maori Pakeha cultural borderlands and the violence that takes place within these spaces/places. A taniko is a traditional Maori weaving of embroidered borders that may edge korowai or may function as a meaningful tapestry. Each colour, like each pattern, is symbolic of something significant to Maori. Bi/multi racial women's stories symbolise these intricate strands of conversation that are unwoven to show how the bi/multi racial woman's body becomes twisted and pulled to frame the border upon which the taniko conversations are traversed.

Because bi/multi racial women have mastered the ability to work and live in non-Maori landscapes, as well as Maori ones, they are often positioned in places of employment or advocacy roles. Awatere [1984] recognised that 'assimilated' Maori are useful to Maori nationalist causes. As such, bi/multi racial women function as Maori interlocutors in the communication and cultural exchange between the newly emergent Maori and Pakeha/Other patriarchal alliances within the bicultural nation.

But these spaces are filled with conflict and danger. The taniko panel speaks these conversations into unsilence.

What happens to women who occupy two cultures simultaneously? As the bi/multi racial woman shifts physical and psychological spaces she is at risk of being caught in the cross fire between Maori and Pakeha cultural clashes. She is used as a corporeal conduit for the cultural exchanges and altercations between Maori and Pakeha men within the newly formed economic arenas symbolised in bicultural hot spots. Inclusions and exclusions are reward and punishment based. The bi/multi racial woman is feared and hated. Her real and imagined potential to vacillate between Maori and Pakeha cultural landscapes and subjectivity at will produces anxiety in others, having both negative and positive consequences for the subject and their whanau. Hine's example exemplifies the new form of subjugation levied against Maori hybrid women. She states she was employed to work in a prestigious "white male environment" that also had significant links to iwi involvement This position carried with it a great responsibility, and honoured Maori and the nation in general. Hine states, "I always had a feeling when I got the job that I was sent there for a purpose and it got really rough. I was a Maori woman in a white male environment and I hung on and hung on because I knew that I wasn't allowed to leave."

Hine was caught in the cross-fire of a newly formed patriarchal alliance between the white males who worked in the institution and the brown males who represented the various iwi involved in the project. Essentially, Hine had been selected for the job because her hybridity allowed her flexibility and greater movement between the Maori and Pakeha cultures. Her cultural knowledge, coupled with her Western education and professionalism, afforded her the skills to mediate between the respective cultural groups and their various representatives. But she was unable to be a passive interlocutor in these patriarchal exchanges when she witnessed cultural transgressions. When she challenged those responsible for certain oversights and cultural indiscretions, Hine was subjected to verbal and metaphysical attacks. Essentially, her body carried the burden of trying to fulfil her work commitment while she was absorbing the abuse from two opposing, yet related, patriarchal cultural groups. Eventually, the violence levied against her became intolerable and her tupuna cleared a way for her to leave her position. Hine's narrative is introduced to show her experience of being situated at the cultural borderlands between Maori and Pakeha. She explains:

> Once I had an extreme pain in my back. I have dreams; this is a legacy from my mother. It was when things were getting really rough and I wasn't quite sure who was directing a lot of what was happening to me. And I had this dream; from the dream I was able to identify the two people fairly clearly who were determined to remove me from [place of work] and two who were hurting me. And in my dream, the older of the two Pakeha men struck a needle in my back and I woke up in the morning and I could hardly move my back, and it [pain] was where in the dream the needle had struck. But I dragged myself out of bed in the morning

> because I had some work to do for the [iwi at place of work]. And I heard later that these two men, the two men who were both at the top of the tree in terms of [place of work] were very angry because I did not attend a meeting that they had called and at which they expected the senior staff of the [place of work] to attend.
>
> When I woke up I did something my mother had told me to do because I realised that the pain was metaphysical; it was coming because of these two Pakeha men so I dealt with it. And the funny thing was, within a week the elder of the Pakeha men...was doing something at his house, something fairly simple, a building type thing, and a piece of timber that he was working on broke and fell on him. He ended up with a black eye and he lost a tooth. And the other man, who in all the time I had been at the [place of work] had never been ill, he ended up with a very very bad case of the flu that just dragged on and on for months. He was very ill you know... I can't really say that it was what my mother had told me to do but...

Discrimination against people of Maori ancestry is well documented. But less is known about the forms of violence levied against bi/multi racial women. Given that hybrids are a popular choice to occupy the cultural borders between white/Pakeha and brown/Maori cultures, the hybrid woman is at risk of being victimised in bicultural hot spots. The violence that confronts this woman is particularly insidious. She is subjected to prejudice and oppression on the basis of her marginal status as Maori, on her status as female and now on her status as the place/body that becomes located on the violent bicultural borders. Iris Marion Young [1990, 61-62] claims:

> What makes violence a face of oppression is less the particular acts themselves, though these are often utterly horrible, than the social context surrounding them, which makes them possible and even acceptable. What makes violence a phenomenon of social injustice, and not merely an individual moral wrong, is its systematic character, its existence as a social practice.
>
> Violence is systematic because it is directed at members of a group simply because they are members of that group. The oppression of violence consists not only in direct victimization, but in the daily knowledge shared by all members of oppressed groups that they are liable to violation, solely on account of their group identity. Just living under such a threat of attack on oneself or family or friends deprives the oppressed of freedom and dignity, and needlessly expends their energy.

The bi/multi racial is the *uncanny* reminder that the bicultural nation is not made up of two unique and unrelated cultural groups, for Pakeha identity is inextricably linked to Maori identity as Maori is to Pakeha. Her unique positioning within bicultural landscapes places her as a susceptible victim where she is marked and then subjected to racism. Her unique difference as Maori and Pakeha/Other is embodied in bi/multi raciality and biculturalism. According to McDowell [1999: 39] the term 'embodiment':

> ... captures the sense of fluidity, of becoming and of performance that is the key element in the recent theoretical approaches that question the relationship between anatomy and social identities... the body is not taken for granted as a fixed entity but is instead seen as having a

> plasticity or malleability which means that it can take different forms and shapes at different times...

In this sense the fluidity of the bi/multi racial woman collapses the binary, challenging assumptions of authenticity. She is everywhere at once, watching, evaluating, resisting. Because these women are often positioned in landscapes which are non-Maori they can feel as though they are being surveiled by non Maori, who themselves experience being under a watchful politically correct Maori gaze. Being positioned with the power embedded in the minority gaze, bi/multi racial women may sense an obligation to act as an ambassador for Maori culture. It is as though the bi/multi racial woman acts as the nation's conscience, reminding New Zealanders of Maori epistemologies and practices as they consciously seek to challenge others to uphold Treaty obligations. One woman describes this process during her attendance in a course when she states:

> You can watch them; you are mindful that they're watching their Ps and Qs in terms of anything that you might say; like for instance, I went to a course.... called Technology, Language Curriculum, and I was the only Maori there; there were two Indian teachers there. I asked the course facillitator, "Well, what about the Maori aspect in terms of technology?" I was the only one to raise the question, yet it's something that everybody should be raising in terms of curriculum. And he said, "Well that's interesting; what do you people think?" Well, they actually didn't have much to say. When you ask questions like that, well, 'that's the Maori in the corner'! You're always mindful of being singled out and when you're quite often a minority voice in those sorts of forums it's almost a duty that you feel obliged to ask these sorts of things to make sure that they do get a hearing and get some recognition.

Bi/multi racial women's dual cultural subject positions promise freedom and liberation from racial oppression associated with class based 'Maori' subject positions intimately tied to the raced body. For some women, identifying solely as Maori and being located in Maori-only spaces is closely tied to the day to day struggles associated with survival. Consequently, as women grow and develop their own forms of resiliency, other subjectivities come into play as they become located in other subject positions. At times, some of these Other [lesbian, Chinese, artist] identities become more dominant and meaningful. However this does not mean that a Maori identity is eradicated, but rather it is not always the prominent or permanent subjectivity present. When required, the bi/multi racial woman will return to her whanau/tribal landscapes and participate as a subject in the cultural position congruous with her status in the whanau/Maori community.

Being able to smoothly take up different cultural subject positions and their relational subjectivities is contingent upon the racial signification of the corporeal body being able to blend, pass and/or participate in the desired cultural landscape. At this point I draw the reader's attention back to the example of the panopticon [Chapter Five] where I indicated that bi/multi racial women are at once always visible/marginal

[to the colonialist gaze] but are also positioned as the surveilling authority/colonialist. I now extend this by pointing out that the *ability* to be located in both places has links to racial corporeality. Mohanram [1999] states:

> If knowledge formation is Panoptic in structure - the discipline which comes with being always visible - so also is colonial identity predicated on vision. Within the structure of surveillance the one who sees is invisible, but the one who is seen, the colonized in this case, is always subject to scrutiny. Within the context of colonialism, visible racial difference plays a fundamental role in the conferring, or the taking away, of identity... [T]he visual index is central to colonialism and racism in that the superiority of the colonizer can be legitimized only through immediately perceptible visual difference.

Racial signification marks subjects in particular ways and creates definable bodies to locate and position according to class and gender specificities, thus making them an easy target to privilege or discriminate against. Whiteness masquerades as that which is transparent, has no meaning, contains no difference. In this sense, to have unencumbered [unsurveyed freedom] corporeal movement, the bi/multi racial woman must have whiteness in white cultural spaces. Fanon [1967: 114] recognises the fear the white person has towards the black body in this statement:

> My body was given back to me sprawled out, distorted, recolored, clad in mourning in that white winter day. The Negro is ugly, the Negro is animal, the Negro is bad, the Negro is mean, the Negro is ugly; look, a nigger, it's cold, the nigger is shivering, because he is cold, the little boy is trembling because he is afraid of the nigger, the nigger is shivering with cold, that cold goes through your bones, the handsome little boy is trembling because he thinks that the nigger is quivering with rage, the little white boy throws himself into his mother's arms; Momma, the nigger's going to eat me up.
> .....All round me the white man, above the sky tears at its navel, the earth rasps under my feet, and there is a white song, a white song. All this whiteness that burns me...
> .....I sit down at the fire and I become aware of my uniform. I had not seen it. It is indeed ugly. I stop there, for who can tell me what beauty is?

Further, Williams [1997: 72] states:

> Culturally, blackness signifies the realm of the always known, as well as the not worth knowing. A space of the entirely judged. This prejudice is a practice of the non-religious; it is profane, the ultimate profanity of presuming to know it all. Racism is a gaze that insists upon the power to make others conform, to perform endlessly in the prison of prior expectation, circling repetitively back upon the exposed utility of the entirely known. Our rescue, our deliverance perhaps, lies in the possibility of listening across that great divide, of being surprised by the Unknown, by the unknowable.

The experience of the hybrid enables an examination of how blackness and whiteness operate as forms of power to subjectivate and subjugate those with brown bodies. Perhaps the presence of the bi/multi racial woman will contribute to a deliverance of racism as described by Collins [1997]. Brownness and whiteness marks the subject in particular ways depending upon which cultural landscape is occupied. The presence of brownness or whiteness creates conflict and anxiety in the hybrid

subject. Being either too white or too brown can intrude upon their right to honour and to live the cultural subjectivities of their choice, or to effectively engage with other more relevant subjectivities. Their entry into either Maori or Pakeha communities can either be sanctioned, or threatened, by their corporeal difference or lack of it! Some women identify as Maori not because they consciously choose this subjectivity for themselves [because identifying as Maori is untenable given the negative experiences associated with their positioning as the colonised] but because their corporeal brownness marks them as 'different' from Pakeha/Other. In the New Zealand landscape, they have no choice other than to be Maori. Their desire to identify with an alternative culture, as a way of liberating themselves from colonialism/racism and the negative ramifications of this, is thwarted by the presence of brownness. For example, Lee's narrative shows how the brown woman's choice to become located in other spaces and identifying with other dominant identities is problematised by her *brown* corporeality. For Lee, her acceptance in Maori landscapes is not compromised by her brown racial signification but it raises anxiety in that this positionality is incongruous with her dominant 'New Zealander' identity. In this sense, naming oneself in unifying terms as a 'New Zealander' or a 'Kiwi' strategically usurps the racialised identification coding that accompanies cultural terms like Maori and Pakeha. But other women recognise that brownness helps to authenticate women in Maori landscapes because it acts as a signifier of community, commonality and a shared recognition of *us* in relation to *them*, the Pakeha colonial perpetrator.

Within the New Zealand landscape the brown bi/multi racial woman is not permitted to be anything other than Maori. Young [1990: 123] speaks of the "group-connected experience of being regarded by others with aversion" as prompted by Fanon [1967] where she states that "[t]he experience of racial oppression entails in part existing as a group defined as having ugly bodies, and being feared, avoided, or hated on that account." She adds that much of the oppressive experience of cultural imperialism occurs in mundane contexts of interaction - in the gestures, speech, tone of voice, movement, and reactions of others. Young writes:

> Pulses of attraction and aversion modulate all interactions, with specific consequences for experience of the body. When the dominant culture defines some groups as different, as the Other, the members of those groups are imprisoned in their bodies. Dominant discourse, defines them in terms of bodily characteristics, and constructs those bodies as ugly, dirty, defiled, impure, contaminated or sick. Those who experience such an epidermalizing of their world... moreover discover their status by means of the embodied behaviour of others: in their gestures, a certain nervousness that they exhibit, their avoidance of eye contact, the distance they keep.

In this sense bi/multi racial women violate racialised codes of conduct when they transgress the symbolically designated spaces allocated to brown bodies. Brown

bi/multi racial women experience overt forms of racism in much the same way as other brown Maori women experience discrimination. For example, Young [1990: 141] states:

> Even if they [women and Blacks] successfully exhibit the norms of respectability, their physical appearance continues to be marked, something others take note of, and, I have argued, often evokes unconscious reactions of nervousness or aversion on others. In being thus chained to their bodily being they cannot be fully and un-self-consciously respectable and professional, and they are not so considered. Upon first meeting someone they must "prove" through their professional comportment that they are respectable, and their lives are constantly dogged by such trials, which, though surely not absent from the lives of white men, are less regular.

Because hybrid women repeatedly move cross culturally they are at risk of disrupting the sense of security the nation has in its neat cultural borders, thus making these woman vulnerable to a backlash in the form of racial discrimination. When the diasporic raced body shifts cultural spaces these landscapes may not match the designated spaces symbolically reserved for the *brown* body. Because she oscillates from one cultural landscape to another she is at risk from racial discrimination and racial violence. She is perceived by others as out of her place and out of control and risks marginalisation. Young [1990: 53] points out that oppression increasingly occurs in the form of marginalisation rather than exploitation:

> ... [T]here is a growing underclass of people permanently confined to lives of social marginality, most of whom are racially marked... Marginalization is perhaps the most dangerous form of oppression. A whole category of people is expelled from useful participation in social life and thus potentially subjected to severe material deprivation and even extermination.

'Whiteness' and Bi/multi Racial Women

> Josh has blue eyes, olive skin, and brown hair. Last year, Josh and two of his cousins were playing happily in a playground which is attached to the local marae. His cousins are fairer than he is. Four boys, aged between eleven and fourteen saw Josh and his cousins playing. They yelled out, "What do you think you're doing in our playground Pakeha? Get out of our playground Pakeha!!" They ran after the Pakeha children yelling and swearing at them. Josh and his cousins ran as fast as they could, but Josh was slower than his cousins and got caught. The older boys threw him on the ground and proceeded to beat him with their fists and feet. They whacked his back with a long stick which left Josh with welts, abrasions and bruising [Moeke-Maxwell, 2001].

Josh's story was told to me by his mother Helena, a participant in this research. Helena was attending a hui at their marae at the time Josh was abused. She explains, "I was in our wharenui ... a mother knows her child's cry. I heard a loud wailing and knew it was Josh instantly." She ran to his aid and was shocked to see him lying on the ground, injured. This event is just one of the violent occurrences which happen with

some regularity in Helena's and other white bi/multi racial women's lives. Helena is olive skinned, blue eyed and has long blond hair. In another case of *mistaken* Pakeha identity, Helena was physically assaulted by a male member of her own iwi while on a work related home visit. The man in question had no idea that the new kai awhina for his whanau was a blond blue eyed Maori. He became enraged at this 'Pakeha' woman interfering with his family. His verbal abuse indicated that he thought Helena was personally responsible for colonisation, colonialism and the break down of his whanau relationships. His verbal violence was directed towards her Pakeha subjectivity but found its conclusion in the physical abuse he dealt her corporeal white body. Before Helena could qualify her whakapapa in a bid to save herself from his attack, he physically and verbally assaulted her. She struggled with him and eventually escaped to get medical and legal help. This man used his male body to dominate her female body. Her tinana was beaten for being white, for being in the wrong landscape and for being the sole cause of every single problem Maori has had to contend with post colonisation. Young [1990: 61] claims that:

> ... many groups suffer the oppression of systematic violence. Members of some groups live with the knowledge that they must fear random, unprovoked attacks on their persons, or property, which have no motive but to damage, humiliate, or destroy the person... [P]hysical violence against these groups is shockingly frequent...

Would this incident have happened if Helena was a brown Maori? Would this violence have taken place if she were a Pakeha male? Would she have been physically abused if she was situated within a Pakeha landscape? I think not. This narrative suggests that a regulation and control of the corporeal Maori woman's white body exists within Maori landscapes and this endangers bi/multi racial women. Identity gets written on the raced and gendered body. Both Helena and Josh's examples show how the corporeal body gets punished when it is out of its designated spaces/places. These anecdotes are important because they highlight several issues. They point out that racism, which is based upon the signification and culturally specific meaning and value attached to certain phenotypes, can no longer be sustained today. When racial signifiers fail to culturally represent the person being signified, racism turns on itself and beats itself up. This example of racism highlights the insidious nature of racial violence predicated as it is upon white and brown phenotypes. This narrative, speaks about the designated spaces which white bodies can legitimately occupy within Maori spaces. There is a threat of danger imposed by those bodies who become located in spaces which are not designated for them. The white bi/multi racial bodies of Josh and Helena were perceived as displaced Pakeha. The terror in the black body towards the white body being positioned in a Maori landscape is evidenced in the beatings Josh and

Helena received. The black body reacted to the historical relationship of hegemonic power imposed on the brown body by the white body.

These stories point to the relationships of power which exist at the interface of phenotype and landscape. They identify a concern with space, temporality and those Maori/Pakeha bodies that do not fit neatly in designated places. The fear of the body that is caught in between Maori and Pakeha polarities, a body which crosses boundaries and is both periphery and centre simultaneously, functions to create such anxiety in the nation that it spills over and finds its appeasement in the physical violation of the white Maori body. It was not coincidental that it was a Maori Pakeha child situated at that marae, in that playground, at that time. It was not coincidental that it was a Maori Pakeha kai awhina making a home visit to a member of her iwi. We are living in a time of global movement and cultural oscillation. Racial miscegenation is a reality. When one adds gender to this configuration, the relationships of power become even more insidious and conflicted.

At the root of New Zealand's identity politics a prevailing ideology which suggests that 'Maori ethnicity' is equivalent to the poor/disenfranchised body. When bi/multi racial women's *lack* of racial signification signifies 'whiteness' there is an unconscious assumption that they have somehow avoided the culturally related losses, negative experiences, social and economic discrimination, and alienation brown Maori face. In essence, they are white Maori Pakeha. In fact, some women articulated that they received less overt racial discrimination than their Maori counterparts. Bell explains:

> My features are quite Irish New Zealand. I'd say, at various stages I do look Maori as well. I guess, in that aspect, it's how I hold myself and how I conduct myself. At various stages I have green or blue eyes depending on what I wear. I guess I'm quite lucky, or unlucky, in some or both respects - that's because I'm quite pale. Some people say I can get the best of both worlds, you know; I don't suffer a lot of the racism that perhaps darker skinned people do.

But white bi/multi racial women live with their own sense of disenfranchisement, dislocation and alienation. Often this stems from a desire to be more Maori, to be recognised and accepted as Maori. There is often a desire to be 'brown', thus symbolizing difference from Pakeha and alliance with Maori culture. One young bi/multi racial woman implied that she felt more Maori after she had her son when she stated that "having a Maori son makes you feel like you have more of a connection, makes you feel like you have more status as part Maori." Heeni Collins' [1999] article *Nga Tangata Awarua* looks at 'appearance' and the incongruence of this for self identification as Maori. In it she [1999: 3] states:

> Though we have little choice as to how others perceive us initially, and can face disbelief if our appearance does not match our self-identity, still many of us [perhaps more than some Maori] do have choice as to whether we identify ourselves as Maori, and how strongly we do

> so. Our skin colour and Pakeha parent often shelter us from the worst effects of racism and discrimination... and many of us grow up mixing easily with Pakeha and experiencing relative success in the Pakeha education system... But involvement and investment in the Pakeha world can make it harder to turn, or return, to te ao Maori. Because it is he mea tauhou, or unfamiliar [and this is true for Maori who feel alienated from their culture for many reasons, such as urbanisation or adoption] there can be a lot of fear associated with entering, or re-entering that world.

The impact of colonisation, assimilation and colonialism impacts on bi/multi racial women in different ways depending upon the individual corporeal specificities of her historicity. Her white racial signification contributes to her ability to move between Pakeha cultural points freely and without racist repercussions. However, racism levied against white bi/multi racial women is an insidious form of bicultural colonialism. Within the New Zealand landscape, the white bi/multi racial woman struggles to be anything other than Pakeha. She is marked by her whiteness and tied to the discursive positioning which subjectivates her as a white woman. As Helena's example shows, whiteness is not transparent in New Zealand within the Maori community. Because whiteness *has* meaning in Maori contexts, it cannot masquerade as that which is transparent. As such, white racial corporeality signifies the colonial presence, and the symbolic association with the signified [white bi/racial woman] is loaded with political, social and cultural meaning. *Whiteness* is important for bi/multi racial women in that it signifies 'colonialist', 'Pakeha', 'class privilege' and 'the historic and contemporary perpetrator of racism with Maori'. The white bi/multi racial may have unencumbered [unsurvielled freedom] corporeal access to white cultural spaces but she had better watch out in Maori spaces. Both Maori and Pakeha seek assurance that brown and white bodies are in their designated cultural spaces.

But, what an uncanny sensation occurs in both the white and brown psyche when she enunciates as Maori. bell hooks [1997: 166] in her essay *Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination* writes that:

> ... everything has changed. Now many black people live in the "bush of ghosts" and do not know themselves separate from whiteness, do not know this thing we call "difference." Though systems of domination, imperialism, colonialism, racism, actively coerce black folks to internalize negative perceptions of blackness, to be self-hating, and many of us succumb, blacks who imitate whites [adopting their values, speech, habits of being, etc.] continue to regard whiteness with suspicion, fear, and even hatred. This contradictory longing to possess the reality of the Other, even though that reality is one that wounds and negates, is expressive of the desire to understand the mystery, to know intimately through imitation, as though such knowing worn like an amulet, a mask, will ward away the evil, the terror.

hooks is concerned with the primacy of the white signifier and the black's submission to it. In the New Zealand context, the white bi/multi racial woman problematises the black/white divide by being white and black simultaneously. Lloyd [1991] reminds us that a racial residue operates to mark the raced subject in particular and defining ways,

informing racial hierarchies between peoples. Lloyd's [1991: 74] ideas are extended when he argues that *whiteness* "legitimates a violent assertion of superiority by way of appeal of developmental categories: against the achieved identity of the white man, the black appears as being in greater proximity to childhood or animality." It is this hierarchy of white/non white *difference* which will eventually *mark* the bi/multi racial hybrid as different from the unmarked subject. As mentioned previously, the brown bi/multi racial body can never fully be white because that corporeal difference as the raced/brown body will mark them as Other. The white bi/multi racial woman escapes this marking, creating a difference in their subjectivation as Maori; they can also become positioned culturally somewhat differently from the brown bi/multi racial woman. Simply, the white bi/multi racial woman has a choice to become Pakeha because her corporeality will allow her that privileged position within society. Her whiteness acts as the privileged signifier, denoting cultural superiority. When the white Maori woman, who is also a descendant of Maori genealogy but who imitates whiteness/Pakehaness [by adopting Pakeha values, speech, habits of being] excludes her blackness/Maoriness, she can refuse her 'difference' only in so far as she can conceal the racial residue that accompanies/marks her de/raced body. Other markers of cultural difference operate alongside corporeal brown Maori bodies; speech inflection, body language, class, family and geographical location act as defining markers which cannot be assimilated. As hooks points out, the longing to be the Other captivates and swallows the black/brown subject. They "do not know themselves separate from whiteness" [hooks, 1997]. In their "desire to understand the mystery, to know intimately through imitation" the white Maori [who refuses a sole white/Pakeha subjectivation] internalises the negative perceptions of their black/brown selves and see themselves and their whanau through white eyes of hatred, marking Maori as those evil Others and feeling the terror reserved for the white subject. Eventually, the white Maori becomes the Pakeha. hooks [1997: 167-8] explains:

> Often their rage [white people] erupts because they believe that all ways of looking that highlight difference subvert the liberal conviction that it is the assertion of universal subjectivity [we are all just people] that will make racism disappear. They have a deep emotional investment in the myth of "sameness" even as their actions reflect the primacy of whiteness as a sign of informing who they are and how they think. Many of them are shocked that black people think critically about whiteness because racist thinking perpetuates the fantasy that the Other who is subjugated, who is subhuman, lacks the ability to comprehend, to understand, to see the working of the powerful. Even though the majority of these students politically consider themselves liberals, who are antiracist, they too unwittingly invest in the sense of whiteness as mystery.

Conversely, the white bi/multi racial lives with the ambiguity of being doubly positioned through her appearance of whiteness/Pakehaness and her internal reality of brownness/Maoriness. She lives with the awareness that to come into a non racial

cultural subject position and to be identified with Pakeha and the white Other, she must completely relinquish her cultural differences lest these 'out' her. Racial residue operates to mark bi/multi racial women. For example, Tiri states that "when they hear my name they will certainly know it." 'It', in this statement, refers to the name 'Tiri', a racial marker of Maori difference. These differences can reside in markers such as the subject's name [if it is Maori] intonation of speech, underclass/working class origins, geographical location of belonging and cultural specificities which signify as indicators of the subject's participation in Maori culture and related practices. In other words, unless the white subject forgoes her racial markers she will eventually be 'dis/covered' and discriminated against on the basis of her difference from Pakeha. This is Lloyd's [1991] point when he articulates that the conclusion of assimilation is evident in the presence of racism. Racism is the boundary between what can be assimilated and what has to be denied. The white bi/multi racial woman who refuses her Maoriness can assimilate on the basis of her corporeal whiteness, but only in so far as the symbolic presence of brown *difference* is subjugated. Conversely, the white bi/multi racial woman who does not refuse her Maoriness *actively* embraces and lives with her cultural duality and oscillation. However, to succeed in the Pakeha world, white bi/multi racial women have to adopt a white subjectivity if they wish to be recognised and accepted as authentic citizens within white landscapes.

In addition, because Maori cultural difference is metonymic of brownness, and the white bi/multi racial woman carries the mark of her residual difference in other forms, there is nothing *outside* her marking her as raced/Maori. Racial corporeality is understood semantically via the gendered and racial specificities encoded in the symbols embedded within the national pedagogy. It must be denied in order to come into a position of authority within white contexts. For example, Liz [brown skin, brown eyes and black hair] signifies as brown/Maori and says, "I couldn't get mistaken for anything else in New Zealand. When I go to Greece I get mistaken for being Greek, which really makes you start thinking about notions of identity and colour." When in Greece, Liz felt that Greek men perceived her as a Greek woman. She felt her 'brown body' was reconfigured via the Greek landscape, which held implications for the regulation and control of her gendered corporeality. Liz recalled an experience she had when she visited Greece, which highlights how she perceived her brown body in a Greek landscape. She relates:

> There was a time when I first arrived... I put on tracksuit pants [we're talking 1980s] and I just wanted to go out for a walk. I'd just got off the plane, you know...I put on a tracksuit and a jacket and took a camera. I wanted to take some photographs. I was a new tourist. And there were these two old men who came up and abused me. Now, in *my* language you could tell it was abuse. Greek women don't wear trousers out in public, and they don't go out by themselves, always in groups, and I think they thought I was Greek and I'd sort of gone too far. You know, I'd obviously crossed the boundaries of that social space. It really makes

me think about who *I* am in New Zealand because I look Maori. But there are times when I guess I can operate as if *it's* [brownness] not there... I think in terms of trying to be a [name of professional occupation]... that I have to *see* myself as white. I have to *see* myself reflected in the white community for me to be able to participate in that sort of thing... I don't think there's any doubt about that.

I am reminded of Mohanram's [1999: 52] earlier comment on race when she states that "...' black' can only resonate with the meaning that it does when it is considered to be geographically and socially in or out of place". Liz's brown body was perceived of as *in* place by Greek men as she sensed their dissatisfaction over her inappropriate attire [for a Greek woman]. The cultural sanctions placed upon the raced body when it is 'considered to be geographically' in its place are often unspoken, yet felt. The often subtle, yet sometimes overt, regulating and normalising social mechanisms of control over the brown body cannot be over emphasised here.

New Zealand nationalism, in an effort to uphold the social, political and economic structures which underpin the nation, ignores the differences of its corporeal subjects, concealing the fact that it *needs* them to construct its white, male, normative identity against. However, the real/material presence of the white subject disturbs the symbolic quintessential *brown* cornerstone of Maoridom. Hence, the emergence of new and insidious forms of racism directed towards white Maori in relation to brown Maori. In a move towards the positive discrimination of brown Maori, white Maori are being overlooked and undervalued in both Maori and Pakeha environments. Joyce recalls an incident that happened in the education system during the late 1970s and which involved preferential treatment being given to her *brown* daughter:

It involved a Maori teacher, and she said to me one day that if she'd known that one of my [white] daughters was related to one of the other [brown] daughters that she would have welcomed her with open arms. But I already knew that this particular teacher treated anyone with white skin very badly in her class. She treated the Maori girls really well. But when she knew that this particular girl was my daughter she said, "Joyce, why didn't she tell me?" And from then on, this girl told me that this woman would throw her arms around her and give her kisses and that. It was so embarrassing. Why did she treat one lot like that just because their skin was white... and suddenly my [white] girl's got a Maori mother...

In a more recent example Abbie found that identifying as Maori within the education system during the early 2000s is problematic when racial signification still continues to mark students as culturally identifiable as Maori. In this scenario racism is experienced by the bi/multi racial because her cultural identity does not equate with her unmarked corporeality. She relates:

All the Maori students get off with bloody murder. They get caught wagging and they don't get shit. I get caught wagging because my skin is white; they [teachers] don't automatically think I'm Maori because my skin is white. I get detention straight away. My walkman got taken off me in the third form and I saw a Maori girl walking around with it. Mrs [Maori teacher] had given it to a Maori girl. And I said, "That's my walkman". She said, "No it's

not, Mrs [Maori teacher] gave it to me. She said I could have it because I did all my detentions."

As increasingly higher numbers of white bi/multi racial women become spatially located in Maori environments and cultural work spaces, a new crisis is emerging. Because racial signification stereotypically accompanies designated cultural spaces for raced bodies, bodies that are not in their correct cultural spaces are out of place. hooks [1997: 170] states:

> Stereotypes, however inaccurate, are one form of representation. Like fictions, they are created to serve as substitutions, standing in for what is real. They are there not to tell it like it is but to invite and encourage pretence. They are a fantasy, a projection onto the Other that makes them less threatening. Stereotypes abound when there is distance. They are an invention, a pretence that one knows when the steps that would make real knowing possible cannot be taken - are not allowed.

This holds repercussions for the subject who has crossed the boundary and safety zone of the cultural borderlands. Neo colonial racism is particularly violent when the white body transgresses the brown body's physical boundaries as evidenced by Helena's example. On a less dramatic scale, being spatially displaced threatens a sense of belonging and stability in the psyche of the white bi/multi racial. For example, despite Hine's status within her iwi, and her significant cultural knowledge and contribution to Maoridom and the New Zealand national community [she is a published author] she is perceived as Pakeha by Maori and Pakeha/Other. She says, "All my life I've walked into situations and people have thought, 'Who is this Pakeha woman and what's she doing here?' White bi/multi racial women experience anxiety from holding in tension two opposed and yet inter-related subjectivities within the one body. For example, other cultural subjectivities like class and sexuality do not always sit neatly within the same corporeal body and their presence is not always welcome within particular designated spaces. When these women take up occupations within the Pakeha landscape of employment for example, a slippage can occur which sees the subject's dual subject positions rub against each other. This is particularly evident for white bi/multi racial women whose Maori ethnicity is not always visually obvious. Obtuse forms of racism can then act as interlocutors in the subject's cultural subjection as the objectified Other. Terry [fair skin, hazel eyes and dark brown hair] explained that she is located in a white, middle class work environment and is confronted with racist comments by people who would not visually recognise her as Maori. This situation acts as a bicultural hot spot, provoking a deep anxiety in her and thus bringing her Maori working class subjectivity into play. She elaborates:

> What happens for me when I hear racist comments at work is I go back to my working class roots when I'm under stress. So people at the my place of work always say nice things about

> me and they see me as so professional and 'so this' and 'so that'. I have learnt those ways. The way I grew up, we were quite rough as children; we were rough and everything was a fuckin' bastard... and we were smoking cigarettes from the age of seven and I was drinking alcohol from the age of ten and we had an incredible amount of freedom. We lived in our little house but kind of marae style. So when I came into these Pakeha organisations I developed the necessary skills to get me through these sorts of things, but when I am under stress I revert right back to how I used to be.

As stated elsewhere, the horror of the white body is particularly disturbing when it is out of its place. The brown body is confronted with the presence of whiteness, the unknown, the infinite, the all powerful, embodied by the racist presence of the white subject. What terror this brings.

Wen Shu Lee [1997] in her essay *One Whiteness Veils Three Uglinesses* recognises that differences between the colour white, and "white" as a socially constructed category, no longer reference the colour white. The symbolism of superiority attached to corporeal whiteness, she explains the fact that whiteness, as a dominant ideology, is not deconstructed in the same way that race is. 'Whiteness' conceals the power which operates in the form of discursive forces invested in the history of 'whiteness/dominance'. 'Whiteness' is rarely named and recognised as a 'race/difference'.

The embodiment of whiteness is confusing and potentially harmful to the bi/multi racial subject and to those Other brown subjects that inhabit the space/s shared with the white bi/multi racial. But in this double brown/white positioning even these conflicting and ambiguous subject positions afford the white bi/multi racial woman an understanding and insight into the position of the brown Maori. Helena recalls:

> Some people come into [iwi agency] asking for a Maori [health professional] and then react in horror when they see me approach. And I actually found it a real interesting experience because I hadn't experienced it ever before. Because, working in [name of overseas city] is so multi-cultural; I mean you're more likely to have Lebanese neighbours and Vietnamese neighbours and Italians and Turks and it's not looked upon negatively. I think they are much more accepting in large multi-cultural cities ... because it's not so much of an issue. But to be here, and to experience that was a double edged sword for me because on the one hand I felt like I was out of place, and it hurt me that people would be racist towards me; and then on the other hand I found it really empowering because I started to understand how it was for Maori in this society, and it was something that I talked about a lot, and I raised it a lot with Maori colleagues, saying to them, "I'm starting to experience on a very minimal basis parts of how it's been for you living your whole life."

Positioned at the interface of two cultures, the white bi/multi racial is at a unique vantage point from which to witness the forms racism takes to discriminate against Maori in this struggling bicultural nation. Being white and Maori is an anomaly in that it carries within its corporeality conflicting possibilities. On the one hand the white bi/multi racial woman is a valuable cultural resource in that her skills contribute to the emancipation of the bi/multi racial woman, her whanau, the Maori community and the

nation. But she is also subject to the violent repudiation of her cultural identity as Maori, an identity obscured by a whiteness that symbolically positions her as Pakeha. Positioned thus, she is a potential target for brown-on-white and white-on-brown racism, a violent off shoot of oppositional identity politics. There are lessons to be learned for Maori and Pakeha racists in bi/multi racial Maori women's stories. Skin does not equal culture after all. Hine gives an expample:

> I used to take my Dad with me to talk to the kaumatua because there was no use me turning up on my own. They would never have thought that I was *his* daughter. And this kaumatua said to him in Maori, "She doesn't look like you." And my Dad turned around and said, "No she doesn't look like me, but our hearts are the same."

On other occasions the same kaumatua would jokingly and lovingly say to his 'white' daughters, "Fair skinned Maori were made in the daylight!"

Exotic Bi/Multi Racial Bodies

The colonial practice of judging people according to their colour continues. Wen Shu Lee [1997: 283] states:

> Awareness of the ideological operations of color codes challenges aesthetic values associated with different colors. One may argue that black pearls are as beautiful as white pearls, and white swans are no more elegant than black swans. When color is used to mark a group of people away from another group of people, and such a marking becomes the basis for one group's inferiority to another, color becomes "colorism" and is co-opted into as system of privilege and oppression, a hierarchy. Blackness and whiteness are no longer innocent, an abstract, aesthetic matter. They become markers used to explain and justify concrete material gain and loss, privilege and the lack thereof.

In the New Zealand context 'colorism' is alive and well, as evidenced in the preferential and discriminatory treatment of white and brown bodies. As stated previously, nationalism constructs itself in opposition to the female brown subject and relegates her to the nation's peripheral edges where she takes up the position of the abjected. The Maori woman who bears the mark of cultural disenfranchisement, alienation and dislocation carries those scars in the cells of her colonised, corporeal brown body. Her body is symbolically frozen in time and locked into its designated cultural landscapes as the Other. Conversely, the white bi/multi racial Maori woman is absolved of difference through the presence of corporeal whiteness. As white, she will be perceived as Pakeha or white Other and will avoid the overt forms of racism reserved for her brown sister. But, somewhere in-between these two polarised colour significations falls the bi/multi racial woman who signifies an excess of brownness and whiteness. Alice Walker [1983: 291] wrote about the many colours of blackness in *In Search Of Our Mothers' Gardens.* She states that *brown* corporeality signifies a

woman as one who is halfway between white and black. She also cites Other colour variations where shades of blackness are recognised as 'black black', 'cream colored', and 'light-skinned'. Values were then attached to these corporeal colour differentiations. Lee [1997: 283-4] in reference to Walker explains:

> When Walker was growing up during the 1950s, color codes also dictated different compliments, a form of social capital. "Beautiful" was reserved for white women. Light-skinned black women might receive a few "handsomes" and "prettys". "Medium browns like me," says Walker, "might evoke 'good-looking' or 'fine'..."In addition to compliments, black women of light skin are more likely to be the "prizes" sought after by both black and white men [often of greater means]. "Superiority" is bestowed on them rather than on black black women. But black women of light skin are merely "co-opted" into a colorism encouraged by a racist, sexist, and classicist society.

In a similar way, the Maori Pakeha/Other bi/multi racial woman often becomes the 'prize' or 'pick of the bunch' within the bicultural nation. The mixture of two or more racial genealogies often positions the woman as different from both brown and white Maori and white Pakeha/Other, despite the fact that the subject may identify with a primary Maori cultural subjectivity. Her olive skinned Europeanised corporeal body is aesthetically pleasing to the masculine Western [aesthetic] eye and her corporal difference [a combination of Maori and Pakeha genes] is exoticised. Unfortunately, Westernised masculinised pleasure principles also pervade the psyche of Maori, resulting in the exoticisation and at times eroticisation of the white/brown bi/multi racial woman by Maori men and Pakeha Other men. At the core of this desire for the exotic body is the attraction to, yet repulsion by, the essential difference of the brown body. Phina Werbner [1997: 228] in her essay *Essentialising Essentialism, Essentialising Silence* in *Debating Cultural Hybridity* writes:

> To essentialise is to impute a fundamental, basic, absolutely necessary constitutive quality to a person, social category, ethnic group, religious community, or nation. It is to posit falsely a timeless continuity, a discreteness or boundedness in space, and an organic unity. It is to imply an internal sameness and external difference or otherness.

The bi/multi racial woman disrupts the neatness of the essentialist brown Other, juxtaposed against the pure white body, by signifying simultaneously as the white body. The ambivalence created in her white, but not white corporeal presence emanates from her racial signification as that which is both desired yet feared. Werbner [1997: 233] points out that ambivalence functions as a site reflecting the colonial situation which is "characterised by the continual fluctuation between attraction and repulsion" between coloniser and colonised. This is evidenced in the attraction towards the bi/multi racial 'exotic' body. Gilman [1985: 24] explains:

> One major category with which pathology is often associated is human sexuality. The sexual dimension of human experience is one of those most commonly divided into the "normal"

> and the "deviant," the "good" and the "bad." Human sexuality, given its strong biological basis, not unnaturally is often perceived as out of control of the self. Since fantasy is an innate part of human sexuality, it is not only the biological but also the psychological which can be understood as out of control. For a secure definition of the self, sexuality and the loss of control associated with it must be projected onto the Other. Fantasies of impotency are projected onto the Other as frigidity, fantasies of potency as hypersexuality. Or an obverse image appears - where loss of control is defined by the label of infertility, the Other becomes overfertile.

The bi/multi racial woman signifies the sexualised body that is out of control, marked through her racial pathology. But, she is also white. Hence she is doubly desirable, first by the fantasy of her as the potently hypersexed, and secondly, through her beauty/purity as the white woman. This means the bi/multi racial woman suffers a specific form of exoticised/eroticised racism which can then be transposed into a form of cultural exoticisation as well. Mahinarangi [composer/musician] states:

> When there are reviews or overseas people writing about me, they use this exotic mix...[they write that] I come from all these sub cultures, Jewish, lesbian, Maori and I just think, "No you don't." It's *Other* people's way of looking... *they* see me as exotic! I think it's very loaded and it takes it completely away from who *I* am as a person... [a person] who's suffered mental depression and who has a lesbian relationship and ordinary relationships with people and who has an ordinary family... it [exoticisation] doesn't help to validate who I am. They try to imply all these things and marvellous things that I don't see as being there. When I say, "My mother's Maori and my father's Jewish" they go "Oh" and sometimes they say, "Gosh, that's exotic!" It just fences in *who* I really am from who I am.

When the corporeal body is neither white nor brown but a curious mixture of both, the bi/multi racial is exoticised and marked by her aesthetic beauty. Bentley [1999] made the point in his text *Pakeha Maori* which records historical accounts of Pakeha who lived with Maori during the 1700s -1800s. He claims that Maori have always been fascinated by whiteness and by fair featured humans. This exoticisation of non Maori corporeality still exists today although the form it takes now reflects a highly developed Western ideal of aesthetic beauty which is not only gendered and exoticised, but also eroticised. Leslie recalls an incident of exoticisation when she says:

> I worked at one place, at a hotel, and there were all these people at a big, huge table and they kept staring, and when I went to ask for their dessert order they gave me this money. I said, "What's that for?" and they said, "We just had a bet." And then they said, "Where do you come from?" And I just stood there and this one person said, "Are you a Maori?" And I said, "Yes." Someone said, "You don't talk like a Maori?" They were *betting!* I felt terrible. I'm not a horse. I'm not an animal. I was so embarrassed. I have never been so embarrassed.

A symbolic hierarchy of beauty operates between brown and white Maori women's raced bodies reminiscent of a politics of eugenics which hierachised women into a racial scale of which the Hottentot occupied the lowest position on the evolutionary ladder [Gilman, 1985]. Today, an aesthetic scale operates to signify the blackest subject at the lowest end of the aesthetic scale, marking the Maori woman as the

Pakeha woman's Other. The brown body is pathologised as the ugly victim of colonisation and colonialism. Located at the other end of the scale is the desired white Pakeha woman's body. Westernised conceptions of aesthetic beauty hold repercussions for bi/multi racial women's experience/s of being Maori and affect the way she is positioned within Maori and Pakeha landscapes. Rachael's appearance [honey blond hair colouring, green eyes and olive skin] indicates that the issue of aesthetic beauty is more an issue for bi/multi racial women than men because it contains within it the masculine desire of the feminine body. She states:

> There were lots of guys that liked me. One of them was part Samoan and part Asian and I was definitely an accessory on his arm. He just liked to show me off and then when we'd been to the movies it was "See ya later!" He just liked the prestige he got from a lot of other guys through talking to me at school.

Rachael indicates that a mixture of "classical Maori and European looks" are more attractive to Maori and Pakeha men. She elaborates on this:

> I think there are images you are given in the media and they're all very European aren't they? So when Maori girls at school were attractive they usually had smaller noses and smaller mouths, and didn't have any distinctive cultural features, like their skin was paler. Actually, the Maori girls that were the most popular with the boys were usually the ones with the fairer skin. I remember the girls in the bilingual unit that were most popular with the Maori boys. There was this one particular girl who was very popular, [with] very caramel coloured skin and her eyes were green and she had full lips and her nose was fine and she had very long hair which was caramel coloured as well. She was very popular with everybody.

Hierachised beauty is exclusive and Othering and may not reflect how individual women feel about themselves. For example, some bi/multi racial participants desired to look more Europeanised. Two participants recalled that they used to pinch their noses during their youth to make their noses finer, "like the Pakeha girls had". Aesthetically, the exoticisation of Maori women is also used as a marker of Pakeha approval of specific forms of Maori difference. Joyce experienced a situation where she was likened to Kiri Te Kanawa:

> I was quite young then...38, 39, something like that. And I was standing up on the platform and of course, in the car below, waiting to be served was this European lady who asked me if I was Kiri Te Kanawa. I just threw my head back and laughed, because I thought it was the funniest thing I'd heard for a long time. But she was really annoyed. She said, "I'm paying you a compliment and all you're doing is laughing about it."

Ambivalence is caused within some cultural contexts when the exotic body is caught on the interface between Maori and Pakeha culture. Helena [slim, blond and blue eyed] claims that Maori women colleagues regularly exclaim, "Feed Helena up because she is too skinny." Her Europeanised, slender features are seen as a negative' by Maori women. She states, "They're always trying to push food at me; they're

always trying to fatten me up." On the other hand however, her corporeality is exoticised as the preferred/desired body by Maori and Pakeha men. Her corporeal difference [slender and white] marks her in the Maori world as different from other Maori women while in the Pakeha world she is the preferred feminine subject. Hine experienced an exoticised form of racism when she recalls:

> I grew up with my aunties being very very proud of me. I can remember going over to [name of place] as I had two aunties that worked in the foodshop there. And they always made such a fuss over me because I looked so Pakeha and they saw that as something desirable... But it had its drawbacks. I can remember not liking the way I looked despite the fact that I'd grown up with all my aunties and rellies telling me that it was really attractive that I was so fair. To look more Maori, to me that was beautiful.

The ramifications of being constructed with an aesthetically pleasing 'exotic' brown body is evident in one participant's story. Her whanau perceived her 'exotic' physical characteristics positively. She expresses that she was a well loved child and was considered beautiful by her Maori family. However, because she was considered beautiful she was inappropriately singled out and objectified by her beauty and potential sexuality; she describes:

> As I grew older and got into my teenage years, the [family] were always saying "How are we going to keep the boys away?"... What amazed me was this *beauty* was always commented on and valued. Yet there was always that cry, "What about me?" There was always that feeling in me, "But what about me?" ... Because they were really very much talking about my exterior which to me didn't have any value.

She felt as though her family/community missed seeing her essential inner beauty because they were so intent on seeing her aesthetic physical /sexual potential as they prepared her for inevitable occupation as the desired feminine body. She states:

> I was supposed to *be something* that I wasn't capable of... I was supposed to be something that I *wasn't capable of being*... and it set me up for my teenage years. I expected all these men to come, because that's what people had always said, you know; there'd always been these comments [about] my appearance in my presence - "They're going to have a hard job keeping the boys away from her, you know." I just expected it was going to happen. I just thought it was actually going to happen.

But in reality, she was a quiet person who did not have a sense of herself as 'beautiful' or 'erotic' in the way her whanau/community and others viewed her. For example, she recalls:

> I remember going to hospital when I was about nine with suspected appendicitis; well, I never spoke to anybody for four days! I just refused to speak. I can remember being in hospital quite clearly and being too shy. I just would not speak to anybody because I was too shy.

In this narrative, the aesthetic principle was so strong that it created in her family a concern over her sexual desirability/vulnerability. How would they be able to keep the boys away? This perception of her ignored other attributes that she felt she had, positioning her solely within the landscape of the eroticised corporeal body. The value placed upon her physical appearance is evidenced in the following incident:

> I had a really bad car accident and I had about fifty stiches in my face... I rang to tell my mother and she abused me. She abused me on the phone and it was, you know, "What have you done about [fixing] your face?" I just remember crying, holding the phone and she was going on and on about this accident. "What about your face" and "Have you been to a plastic surgeon?" I was crying, "What about me. What about me... who cares about my face... who cares a shit about my face!! My face will heal but this heart won't." You know... that was such an acknowledgment of my childhood, the external thing and not the *m;* nobody cared about *me.*

The participant felt objectified, reduced to a face, a body. Ironically, after all the warnings and surveillance that were carried out in the name of her 'protection' during her adolescence she recalls that the control and regulation of her body was all for nothing while the unacknowledged sense of her self/identity searched for its own meaning and expression:

> But I never got to go to the ball. I never got to kiss Prince Charming or whatever Cinderella did to meet Prince Charming... there was definitely that feeling of yeah, there was a*nother* me somewhere in there that wasn't being acknowledged or recognised.

She recalls that the confusion and unhappiness during her early life played an important role in her conscious cultivation of other non Maori subjectivities. Despite her father enculturating her with 'Maori values', despite the contact she had with her iwi, the association with her marae and the cultural experiences this brought, she relinquished a claim to an homogeneous Maori cultural identity. She associates her experiences as Maori with her child/adolescent experiences of having her 'inner' identity neglected while her aesthetically pleasing corporeal exterior received a disproportionate amount of unwanted attention. As a form of resistance to the dominant exotic/erotic discourses which sought to call her into being as the epitome of Maori beauty, she escaped the 'exotic' construction of her corporeal Maori feminine subjectivication by reconstructing herself as an Italian. Positioned through her marriage to an Italian, She identified with an Italian subjectivity; she re/positioned herself within Italian cultural spaces/enclaves where she lived as an Italian both in New Zealand and internationally.

Reconfiguring the *self* through the deployment of Other cultural subjectivities is strategically undertaken in an attempt to avoid being exoticised and sexualised in New Zealand as the exotic Maori woman. Bi/multi racial women may cultivate non-Maori cultural subjectivities as a refusal of their brown/pathological or white/exoticised

difference, despite the fact that their upbringing reflects a Maori cultural and genealogical worldview. Changing cultural identity presents some metaphorical possibilities. An Italian identity, for example, escapes the over determined status of being positioned and subjectivated with an exotic Maori identity. However, Liz's narrative of her Greek woman's experience [discussed earlier] suggests that changing identities and shifting corporeal landscapes do not dissolve or replace *brownness* or *exoticness* from the corporeal body. Rather, brownness, like bi/multi racial exoticness, gets reconfigured along new, albeit *different* gender, race and class specificities thus informing new forms of discrimination and subjugations. Suddenly, the words of my brown bi/multi racial sister ["When I'm in Germany, I'm an Italian."] uncannily return with a new twist. I am left wondering, what rewards will be bestowed upon her as an exotic/Italian woman and what forms of subjugations will she suffer as a brown Italian woman living inside the borders of a German landscape? Given that her cultural specificities as biracial will have different meanings within a Swiss German landscape, what forms of gendered and racial subjugations might she encounter, if any, and what part would her de/raced body play in this? In contrast, will my white biracial sister living in Switzerland, by the nature of her Australian accent, ever be anything other than a white Australian Other?

Conclusion

The bi/multi racial Maori woman becomes problematic for a nation trying to construct itself in essentialist/ethnic terms. Her corporeal bodily difference means that she is situated ambivalently within the nation. The bi/multi racial woman may signify culturally anywhere between Maori and Pakeha; overseas she is often mistaken for Italian, Spanish or a member of a Pacific Island community. I have argued that she is perceived as a threat to bicultural coherence; her existence is disruptive and is capable of invoking deep rage and anxiety in Maori and Pakeha alike because she does not sit neatly into the either/or cultural category specified within the bicultural arrangement. The Maori/Pakeha bi/multi racial woman is out of her natural landscape, she is everywhere at once, she refuses to fit, to be compliant. She is a threat. She is the conclusion of assimilation. She has accepted her ambivalence and makes it work for her. She has agency as she moves from landscape to landscape and back again. Her dual/multiple subjectivity tolerates great ambiguity and contradiction. Positioned with an eye towards Maori culture and an eye towards her Pakeha/Other cultures, this woman occupies a vantage point which can unmask the ambivalent relationship between Maori and Pakeha/Other and uncover the newly forming patriarchal alliance between Maori and Pakeha men.

Bi/multi racial womens' life histories contain the memories of two or more cultural historiographies within in the experiential embodiment of the subject as either white, brown or an uncanny mixture of both. Positioned at the cultural interface between Maori and Pakeha landscapes, such women have the ability to comment upon the inherent racism and gender asymmetry embedded in the Maori and bicultural nation. Their narratives highlight the specific forms that Maori identity must take to be considered authentic/privileged. Bi/multi racial women's stories illuminate their erasure as they highlight the specific form that Maori identity must *not* take under biculturalism. These women are marked as the inauthentic and are punished by the silence of their hybridised and corporeal difference.

Bi/multi racial women's experiences show [by the nature of their being positioned in occupations which reflect the bicultural skills of the hybrid] a unique insight into how Maori women are being maligned within the bicultural nation, caught in-between Maori and Pakeha cultures and new forms of patriarchal dominance. As the repudiated subjects, their unique cultural positioning unmasks the current practices of discrimination used to subjugate them. They point to the way that racial misogyny does not only emanate from the dominant Pakeha majority but comes also from deep within our own whanau, communities and Maori nation. Their voices describe the new forms of colonisation bi/multi racial women face in the name of progress and development in an evolving bicultural nation. Insidious forms of race-related violence are levied towards the bi/multi racial subject. As shown, race acts as a signifier of difference which names, marks and places people in particular ways linked to colonialism, imperialism and modern capitalism. In resisting the nation's cultural placing of white and brown bodies, bi/multi racial women take up the ambivalent space on the cultural borders, oscillating between the bicultural hot spots and designated spaces for Maori and Pakeha, brown and white bodies. These locations are often fraught with political tensions as the binary categories Maori/Pakeha, women/men, lesbian/heterosexual, rich/poor, brown/white and us/them compete for dominance.

The bi/multi racial woman creates an anxiety in the nation. Who is the Other, if the Other is white? If the brown subject fails to enunciate as the Other who is the Other that enables Pakeha to define their whiteness/dominance against? Further, within Maori cultural landscapes, how is the Other identified if the Other is brown? We, as bi/multi racial subjects, are the women whose corporeal bodies, minds and souls carry the memories and the mark of our unique racial and cultural histories. We are the *body* which records the Maori/Pakeha binary relationship in our corporeal materiality and in our conflicted yet resilient psyches. Positioned on the fringes of both cultures, our subjective knowledge uncovers the racism and misogyny inherently operating deep within the bodies of the Maori and Pakeha national communities.

Chapter Eight

Spirit Talking Wairua

> Io Matua, the Divine Parent, the Great Spirit, the Creator of everything across the universe, is regarded as the presence and breath of everything. *Aroha* is the Maori word for love. *Aro* means presence and *ha* means breath so that everything is directly linked up to Io Matua.
>
> Wairua is an apt description of the spirit - it denotes two waters. There are both the positive and the negative streams for one to consider. Everything has a wairua; for example, water can give or take life. It is a matter of keeping balance [Pere, 1991: 16].

So far, I have argued that bi/multi racial Maori women's identity is not stable, unified and mutable. I have posited the existence of an anti-essentialist, socially constructed, multiply located subjectivity that takes into account the raced body in the construction of Maori bi/multi racial cultural identities. I have deconstructed the concept of a 'traditional' Maori women's subjectivity by arguing that biracial and multi racial women move in and out of traditional Maori cultural landscapes and Pakeha/Other cultural landscapes, thus prompting shifting cultural subjectivities to accommodate the ever changing cultural environments and cultural contexts occupied. I have also pointed out that cultural flexibility is contingent upon the marked [raced/brown/Maori] body and the unmarked [unraced/white/Pakeha] body being able to assimilate [blend, pass, participate] in the cultural environment being inhabited. However, in focusing on the heterogeneous differences between, as well as within, individual Maori women, I have neglected to focus on that which is common between bi/multi racial women. I have suggested that bi/multi racial women live under extraordinary pressure to identify and live authentically as either Maori *or* Pakeha/Other. Their refusal to do so highlights an integrity to honour their conflicted cultural histories and the relationships/connections to Maori and non-Maori resulting from being positioned across dual/multiple cultures. Given that this is no easy task, how do bi/multi racial women make sense of themselves in relation to their conflicted histories, dual/multiple subjectivities and contemporary lifestyles that position them ambiguously in the bicultural nation?

In this chapter my aim is to identify a theme common to all these bi/multi racial women's narratives which will enable these women to make sense of their conflicted cultural identities. I seek to identify a narrative that contributes to a sense of resiliency about being culturally dislocated and fragmented, and which serves to connect bi/multi racial women to each other, forming a common element between women. In order to

achieve this objective, bi/multi racial women's narratives are examined to determine that which operates as an *affinity* between these new women of difference. Given the degree of heterogeneity present in bi/multi racial women's narratives, I explore a common theme that emerged pointing to a commonality of shared experience. More specifically, a narrative of *spirituality* appeared in bi/multi racial women's stories which leads me to identify the part spirituality plays in their hybrid self-representations of themselves, their life experiences and their emancipation. How does a spiritual narrative contribute to their sense of resiliency in the nation today and what are the positive outcomes of this for them and for their families/communities and nations?

In order to explore these questions this chapter is divided into four parts. The first section 'Cultural Hybridity': Bi/multi racial Women's Roots/Routes' identifies the need for a narrative that is capable of accommodating the contradiction between the bi/multi racial's dual/multiple diasporic spatial locations/*routes* and the multiple connections to her cultural *roots*. In this, I identify a common narrative that enables the bi/multi racial woman to constantly change the routes used to undergo transitional spaces between a sense of rootedness and homespaces. In the second section 'Settling Spirit: Wairua at Work' I argue that heterogeneous forms of spirituality operate as a central theme reflecting the cultural hybridity of the subject. The third section 'Spiritual Resistance and Resilience' looks at the role of spirituality in notions of bi/multi racial women's resiliency and resistance to colonialism. What does this narrative of spirituality look like and how does it work to empower women of Maori Pakeha/Other ancestry? Finally, the fourth section 'Living Bridges: Healers and Wise Women' looks at the unique ways in which the participants creatively contribute to the healing and emancipation of Maori and Others through their own unique understanding of cultural difference.

Cultural Hybridity: Bi/multi Racial Women's Roots/Routes

I have already emphasised that criteria like whakapapa, landscape, cultural practices and wairuatanga act as markers of Maori affinity within traditionalist narratives of Maori identity. Butler [1990: 172] argues that *affinity* within groups operates as a marker of commonality that enables the defining of specific groups in contrast to others. Political alignments are formed across these specific points of affinity. Butler maintains that affinity is a reaction to the "social processes of interaction and differentiation in which some people come to have a particular *affinity*". Broadly, she describes affinity as the shared common assumptions, 'affective bonding' and ways of networking which differentiate cultural groups from other groups and give rise to the presence/marking of a particular group in contrast to other groups.

In the previous chapters I have called into question the homogeneity of commonly held signifiers of cultural difference by introducing a narrative of bi/multi racial hybridity For example, I pointed out that not all bi/multi racial women have access to whakapapa, nor do they all speak te reo Maori or identify themselves via their relationship to their landscape/s of tribal origin.

Further, not all women of Maori ancestry are marked with corporeal 'brownness' which signifies bi/multi racial women within the New Zealand landscape as Maori. In fact, as demonstrated in the previous chapter, bi/multi racial women face punitive repercussions when their corporeal raced bodies are out of their designated corporeal spaces/places. Here then lies a paradox. The markers of Maori difference used to signify the essence of Maori, and which form the bases of arguments of Maori affinity, are problematised by the notion of a female subject that does not, by the nature of her lack of Maori cultural knowledge/practice, function as an authentic Maori subject. The presence of the bi/multi racial woman challenges the idea of a quintessential Maori identity and the political mobility this position offers. Therefore what is needed is a way to re-theorise the Maori woman's identity in such a way that it accommodates her cultural hybridity at the same time as it recognises that an affinity operates to connect bi/multi racial women to their Maori roots, in spite of the absence of a traditional, singular, stable and mutable indigenous subjectivity. I now look at what underlies bi/multi racial women's identities in order to identify that which constitutes a new affinity, one that is capable of transcending absent cultural histories, conflicted cultural subjectivities and corporeal raced and gendered bodies.

In order to strategically re-essentialise the bi/multi racial woman along a new axis of difference I need to set the scene to re-think her identity in terms of geopolitical influences. Susan Friedman [1998: 151] in her text *Mappings* looks at the homonym routes/roots to express a concept of cultural hybridity which takes into account the travelling between physical spaces/places of belonging/home. She states:

> Travelling is a concept that depends upon the notion of stasis to be comprehensible. Routes are pathways between here and there, two points of routedness. Identity often requires some form of displacement - literal or figurative - to come to consciousness. Leaving home brings into being the idea of "home," the perception of identity as distinct from elsewhere. Rootlessness - the sense... of being "always on the run" acquires its meaning only in relation to its opposite, rootedness, the state of being tied to a single location.

The presence of the *travelling* bi/multi racial hybrid usurps the idea of the binary existence of singular homogenous Maori/Pakeha cultural roots. I extended earlier discussions on 'home' by suggesting that the bi/multi racial woman's oscillating presence challenges the truism held in the attachment to *home* as a place of stasis, providing a sense of fixity and stability to the terms and identities Maori and Pakeha/Other. For Maori, the notion of 'home' as a stable entity is important for

social, political and economic mobilisation which relies upon a sense of rootedness. Although some bi/multi racial women align with local Maori causes and/or nationalist causes, evidenced for example in their joint efforts to support iwi/national initiatives to engage redistributive justice, the bi/multi racial woman is always in transition, enroute from one place of identity/belonging to another. For the diasporic bi/multi racial hybrid, the familiarity of 'home' is symbolically derived as much from having *multiple homes* [places interchanged depending on need or desire and contingent upon social/economic/political contexts] as it is to the journey embodied *between* those homes/spaces. Given that the bi/multi racial woman is not fixed in singular spatial locations and cannot be clearly defined as belonging to one cultural place, her multiple spatial positioning/cultural identity also means that she has multiple places of belonging. In order to live her diaspora, and respond to the changes that her cultural re-subjectifications demands, the hybrid requires a *calming* narrative to underpin her transient and fractured psyche and corporeal diaspora. In other words, she requires a way of making sense of her corporeal transience and multiple subjectivity in a way that re-stabilises a psyche in flux and a body on the move.

Friedman [1998: 153] explains that the formation and re-formation of identity depends upon the centrality of narrative "whether it is an effect of rootedness or routedness. The specular, the visual, the figural, the metaphoric - all, of course, also contribute to the production of identity". She adds that a "narrative poetics" enters the 'identity' process in three ways:

> First, identity is constructed through stories that communities and individuals tell about themselves... Individuals develop a sense of self through acts of memory, reflexivity, and engagement with others, all of which require forms of storytelling to come into being. Second, the ongoing production of individual and communal identities constitutes a story itself, a psychological and cultural formation that is located in and moves through time and space. And third, cultural narratives of domination, resistance, desire, and their complex interplay constitute the intertexual web out of which individual and collective selves are woven within the context of asymmetrically power relations.

In claiming these processes Friedman articulates [1998: 153-4] that a narrative must be capable of taking into consideration the fixity of home as well as the diaspora of cultural vacillation/movement. Further, a narrative of the formation of cultural identity depends upon a notion of sameness/sense of difference from others [Anderson, 1991] as well as an experience with cultural others in order to establish one's difference in the first place. Friedman [1998: 154] articulates that a "geopolitical identity rooted in 'home' insists upon sameness within the home circle; one formed through leaving home base involves interaction with others, which fosters the formation of hybridic combinations". She [1998: 153] writes:

> Roots and routes are, in other words, two sides of the same coin: roots, signifying identity based on stable cores and continuities; routes, suggesting identity based on travel, change, and disruption.

Enroute to her multiply located roots, the bi/multi racial woman is confronted by her hybridic difference. She sees it in the gaze of those who seek to place and mark her in particular ways dependent upon her racial signification; she feels it in her corporeal body as it bends and shifts to conform to the specificities required in the subject position being occupied; she feels it deep in her soul as she struggles to make sense of her 'self' and negotiate her corporeality in its changing cultural terrains. Life on the margins is fraught with discomfort, alienation and suspension. Given this, what sort of calming/stabilising narrative *enables* women of contradictory and conflictual racial and cultural backgrounds to equip themselves to make the hybrid journey between multiple homes/places of belonging? What permits the process and practice of cultural hybridity and the exchange of difference between the selves embodied by the bi/multi racial subject?

Settling Spirit': Wairua at Work

> I can sense things. I believe in God and I am quite spiritual. I often know when things are going to happen. I inherited it [spiritual gift] from my Mum. I think it *calms* me down and I feel okay. I feel safe. I have conversations with God when I need help to get through something. 'God' is a deep faith [that I've got], that there is something bigger than us [Lee, 2000].

At this point I argue that spirituality functions as a common *calming* philosophy that equips the bi/multi racial subject to make sense of her difference, at the same time as it affirms her disparate cultural selves and her attachment to the multiple homespaces she identifies with. Dana, like Lee above, explains that for her *spirituality* resides in "an inner hope or a spiritual presence" and she expresses this feeling as "a settling spirit". Spirituality is defined here as any narrative that reflects the subject's holistic understanding of herself in relation to others and the environment, and in relation to a larger, metaphysical existence that provides a measure of 'calming' and settling' the participant, enabling her to live with the complexities of her day to day life as a border crosser. The essence of this philosophy resides in the subject's beliefs and practices. For example, one kuia states that spirituality exists when:

> ... [w]e talk about Christ and other people talk about other gods and things like that, but it's all the same thing; except that they're all called different names, but it all leads back to the same thing. And different cultures approach it in different manners... Inside us are our thoughts and feelings; these come from *deep* inside. I believe that it's all wrapped up in what some people might call God, our maker, and it evolves depending on how we treat it, how much we listen to it, how we're guided by it. If we choose to ignore it then, of course, we're not going to do what we're supposed to do. And it's always been my belief [I was born

> thinking this] that we're supposed to listen and help. I listen to a voice telling us that we're supposed to help people - we're supposed to do good.

Individual narratives of spirituality operate as an invisible thread that symbolically binds the parts of the bi/multi racial together in a way that allows an elasticity of movement between all her selves, thus giving her a sense of coherence and stability. In this way, a brown skinned, blue eyed, red haired grandmother who self-presents as Maori and Scottish, and who also identifies as a middle class professional and a lesbian cross-dresser, is able to make sense of her plurality of difference through understanding herself within a larger spiritual context. In other words, a *connecting* dialogue of spirituality is interwoven in bi/multi racial women's narratives and provides the philosophical glue needed to explain how each woman makes sense of her own ambiguous identity and disparate cultural life-style. Spirituality is the essence that connects a bi/multi racial woman to her roots while she traverses the transitional space between her multiple roots/routes.

Ruth Tai [1997: 77] points out in *Faces of the Goddess* that Maori spirituality is something that is learned as a natural consequence of growing up Maori. For example, as a child Tai was exposed to the spiritual teachings of her ancestors which were disguised within the activities of everyday life. So distinctive were these experiences for her that Tai now teaches these wisdoms to others. Similarly, Hinewirangi Kohu [1997: 38] writes in *Faces of the Goddess* that her traditionally inspired spiritual knowledge and visionary gifts are grounded in her childhood cultural experiences as Maori and were an unspoken but integral part of her upbringing as an indigenous woman. Similarly, some of the bi/multi racial women's narratives reflect that they embrace a form of indigenous spirituality and embody the gift of matakite and spiritual vision. At times, these experiences incorporate the voices of others, namely tupuna/spiritual beings, mothers, grandmothers, sisters, children and menfolk and extended communities. Moreton-Robinson [2000] states that research that involves the generational experiences of many is:

> ... fundamentally social and relational, not something ascribed separately within the individual. Indigenous women's life writings are based on the collective memories of inter-generational relationships between predominantly Indigenous women, extended families and communities.

For example, Tiri speaks of her spirituality in terms of an indigenous psychic connection when she claims:

> I believe you have ancestors... spirit guides or whatever you want to call them. I believe I've been looked after and I also believe that we're always protected... I don't know how to put it into words... I just know there is a knowing, through the universe. I mean, look what's

created out there. Intuitively, I can feel people's energies. I go to someone and I know just how they feel... and animals too and plants...

Faith states that she uses dreams to find answers and guidance in everyday life and this helped her to eventually embrace the power of her own spirituality.

I can walk into a room and feel the temperature of a room. I can feel the grief level in a room. I didn't know how to cope with it then. I didn't love that spiritual side of myself because I just didn't know how to cope with it, basically. Then I learned how to heal myself.

However, in contrast to Kohu [1997] and Tai's [1997] culturally inspired indigenous spirituality, bi/multi racial women's narratives highlight the heterogenous and multifarious nature of a hybridised indigenous and Maori/Other spirituality. With the introduction of Christianity, the colonial destruction of Maori cultural/spiritual icons and practices, and the added burden of the Tohunga Suppression Act during the early 1900s, coupled with the migratory move of Maori from rural to urban sectors during the 1950s meant Maori were obliged to assimilate to Western [Pakeha] religious spiritual norms and practices. One kuia can recall her own subjectivication into a Christian/Pakeha subjectivity during the 1930s. She states:

We lived in a rural district that had one tiny... school; the most pupils ever in the school were 17 at any one stage. Two thirds of those children were from our family. It's going quite a long way back now. But we had a teacher there, a lady teacher, and she often used to talk to us about God, about Christ, and the good work that He did. And she used to say to us to listen and we'd hear a voice and if we heard that voice to listen very carefully and take note. And she pointed out that, quite often, we'd hear someone calling our name, and that we'd look and there wouldn't be anyone there, and she said that that would be the voice, and that we're supposed to be listening. All my life I've known that Christ intended us to look after each other, to try and be truthful, and to try and be honest, and not to be greedy.

As well as recalling her own subjectification into Christianity, she also witnessed her mother's spiritual alienation from her tribal faith as *she* was called into being as a Christian. Her mother was a direct descendant of a prestigious tohunga and was a spiritual woman in her own rights. The kuia recalls:

I always felt my mother was a very spiritual person. Because she had so many children, of course she couldn't spend a lot of time with different ones. She had to share herself out amongst us all. After all, she had 16 babies altogether and she died when she was only 49, so she didn't have that much time to give. But I always felt she was a very caring person. She used to do this funny little thing that absolutely terrified me. She used to take us outside if there were any problems. She'd take us outside in the dark, or just as it was getting dark, and she'd have a jar of water, and she'd be muttering all these things and sprinkling water over us. I thought there were Devils and wicked things out there. It really frightened me. I hated it. But she came to leave all that behind. I'm sure she turned Christian. I can remember the Minister from the Church used to come sometimes and talk to her and we didn't have the water stuff any more, which was a relief to me. She walked in Christ's light.

Today, bi/multi racial women's understanding reflects a mixture of Western and Eastern constructions of spirituality mingled with indigenous cultural ways of knowing and practising spirituality. For some women, their sense of wairua/spirit speaks through narratives of Christianity mixed with indigenous beliefs and practices, many of which reflect their cultural hybridity. For others, their spiritual beliefs echoes those of Eastern or pagan philosophies while others still seek their spiritual answers and a sense of belonging in the earth, wind, fire and water of this world. For example, adopted Jill talks about her spiritual home in the absence of whakapapa. She identifies a place that acts as a haven which connects her to the disparate parts of herself. When there, she is at peace, and at one with her multiple selves and others. She states:

> Religion is the Church. Spirituality is my connection with this space, like the space I currently occupy. But it's also my connection, within that space, with other spaces. It's about my purpose for being, my reason for being, my connection with the rest of the world, with the sea, with the bush and in the hills, on the beach, with the animals and with everything that's in [the world]. Whangamata is my turangawaewae; that's my place I go home to. I stand on that beach and I look at the river and I look at the sea and the surf and the islands and I look up at the sky and I look at the hills that are covered in native bush and I look at the pine forests and I look at the jagged mountains. And that's my place there. I am *One* there and I am *Met*.

Jill's emphasis on being *One* and being *Met* refers to a sense of unity, peacefulness and coherence of self that occurs through the conduit of spirituality. Re-connected and re-membered to the other parts of herself/world/universe she gains respite from the internal noise and conflict of being multiply located. To continue this theme, Pere [1991: 17] states:

> The natural place of worship/communion with Io Matua is *Papatuanuku* - Mother Earth where one can relate to the hills, spaces of water, the heavens, everything that is a part of us. The communication is at any time, with any one, anywhere, and any place.

Jill's and other bi/multi racial women's heterogenous articulations of spirituality may also reflect a general movement in New Zealand where, according to John Bluck [1998] in his text on *Kiwi Spirituality, Long, White and Cloudy,* New Zealanders are leaving more traditional Christian based philosophies and practices of religion in favour of a specific Kiwi spirituality which is ungrounded, lacks roots and is often informed by commercial interests invested in promoting a pop spirituality reflecting economic global influences. The bi/multi racial woman epitomises the struggle between discrete forms of Maori and Pakeha spirituality. For example, Roberta states that she was raised as Anglican; she was "very involved in a Maori Anglican Church" and later when married she had lessons in Catholicism for three years. But she rejected this faith in favour of following an Eastern spiritual guru. She explains:

> I mean, I totally believe in God. My spirituality is really hard to define. I'm not a traditionalist. I mean, my [Maori] father was horrified when we had this conversation because tradition means so much to *him*. I have a spiritual teacher that I have had for about twenty-five years. He is an Indian man. I hate labels because I have been labelled so much in my life. All I know is that there is a yearning in me. There always has been. I was never actually conscious in my search for spirituality. It was always a *heart* search. I can remember feeling as though I had this huge stone inside of me. I never understood why I wasn't satisfied. In a worldly sense, I had what I thought you needed to make you happy but there definitely was a part of me that wasn't happy. I knew that nothing touched my heart deeply.

Roberta's unique individual spiritual beliefs reflect her own hybridised construction of spirituality. As such, she may define herself outside the traditional spiritual narratives illustrated by Tai [1997] and Kohu [1997] and may exceed the traditional based Christian discourses as described by Bluck [1998]. Nonetheless, her sense of identity is seen through a spiritual lens, albeit a heterogenous one.

Bi/multi racial women's stories suggest that the difference between [as well as within] bi/multi racial women, and the repetitive coming and going from one cultural location/home to another, exists in accordance with an inner wisdom and spiritual awareness of self in relation to other individuals, cultures, nations and metaphysical worlds. Helena lived abroad for twenty years and searched for spiritual meaning in a variety of cultures and contexts despite being raised as a Catholic. She states:

> However, I do adhere to Christian principles per se but equally so to other sorts of spiritual influences. For instance, I am really interested in women's spirituality and have been for years and years. I was involved in women's spiritual groups in [international city]. So, I looked at the Goddess rituals and all that sort of practice. I was privileged to be introduced to some Aboriginal spiritual concepts and 'bones' also. One of the things I've been really interested in since I've come back to New Zealand is that I thought I was a little bit weird because I didn't fit into any sort of prescribed notion of spirituality - in other words the prescribed notion of religious practice per se as we know it in this culture. And as I've actually started to walk in the Maori world, I've realised that a lot it has been Maori, a lot of it has made sense to me... so it's been very validating from a spiritual perspective as well. The more I delve into it, the more I understand the common themes and practices right across cultures.

Helena's narrative points to the way in which spirituality operates to enable bi/multi racial women to make sense of their multiple identities and the multiple routes/locations they identify as home. Spirituality not only adds a sense of richness to women's lives but also provides a calming place and functions as a shared affinity between bi/multi racial women. Bi/multi racial women create their own forms of cultural hybridic spirituality, thus *confirming* their connections and metaphysical links to Maoridom as well. As a narrative that supports difference, it is understated, yet forms a central locus of *meaning* in constructions of identity and difference.

'Spiritual Resistance and Resilience'

> Every Maori is connected to every other Maori. Therefore all Tuhoe are connected to each other. All Ngati Porou are connected to each other. All of us to one another. Whakapapa teaches us those connections [Awatere, 1984: 104].

In the above quotation Awatere argues that whakapapa is the ingredient that binds Maori to one another and connects individuals from different tribes into one cohesive common identity/family. In this section, I argue that bi/multi racial women achieve a sense of connection to each other and to other Maori through a spiritual awareness and understanding, even when whakapapa information is absent. Spirituality acts as an essential conduit through which bi/multi racial women access a sense of identity as Maori. Spirituality circumvents corporeal/material whakapapa by placing the blood/whakapapa "connections" within a broader spectrum of whakapapa through an array of metaphysical links to tupuna, God, Jesus Christ, Maori prophets and/or spiritual deities. The symbolic relationships that are formed through metaphysical philosophies reconfigure the bi/multi racial subject within a larger whanau, evidenced in her awareness of a broader understanding of herself in relation to a non corporeal [spiritual] community. This idea somewhat extends the invitation Awatere [1984: 101-2] makes to Maori, suggesting they pull together to strengthen the Maori community in a move towards decolonisation, when she writes:

> The elemental forces of Maoridom are based on human connections, on the dynamics of human exchange, of pooling resources and pulling together, of mutual exchanges of thought and actions, of interweaving and interlocking patterns of human connections, of all skills, knowledge, talent and 'things' belonging to the group not the individual.

In this way, Awatere suggests that a unifying discourse emerge between Maori and Pakeha based upon a notion of human connection and exchange. But, as Mohanram points out, the 'human' part of her discourse also includes Pakeha and therefore Maori sovereignty, in these terms, functions as biculturalism. Mohanram [1999: 117] referring to Awatere's statement above, observes:

> While seeming to write only to Maori in this chapter, in this repetition of the term 'human' [Awatere] opens it up to Pakeha as well. By including Pakeha through human connections, mutual exchanges of thought and actions, the paradox is revealed; when Awatere posits sovereignty, she posits a biculturalism, not one that is about Maori being granted their rights due to the 'generosity' of the Pakeha, but one, in fact, already part of Maori cultural values which dictate, demand inclusion and connection and mutual exchanges of thought and action. It is biculturalism not initiated by Pakeha but by Maori, sharing that which is theirs with others.

I extend Awatere's notion of inclusivity by suggesting that bi/multi racial women's spirituality is the *essential* ingredient that enables the subject to dismantle the authority

invested in the nation's material/corporeal borders. Through the language of spirituality she can relate, communicate, exchange and connect with Pakeha/Others and, by extension, Pakeha/Others can relate, communicate, exchange and connect with her. In the act of embracing Other spiritual discourses her spiritual hybridity enables a desensitising of the cultural boundaries between Maori and Pakeha and eases the tensions between whiteness and brownness, Pakeha/Other and Maori, men and women. It is in the common language of her condition as a spiritual being, contrasted with Awatere's [1984] language of humanness, that I situate her emancipatory potential for biculturalism. I argue that spirituality is the key that allows Awatere's notion of "human connections" to happen in the first place.

As Chatterjee [1989] points out, spirituality is the traditional domain of women within colonial configurations of nationalism. Despite her spiritual hybridity, the bi/multi racial woman ensures that spirituality remains the essence of the Maori people and of the Maori culture. The bi/multi racial woman's body functions as the material conduit that travels from one physical and symbolic landscape of cultural 'exchange' to another and allows the 'interweaving and interlocking patterns of human connections' that emerge to be exchanged between all peoples. In her diasporic journeying, and under the hybridised articulations of her non-Maori spiritual beliefs, the bi/multi racial woman takes with her the essence of Maoridom, wairuatanga. Pere [1991: 16] puts it this way:

> Just as every culture has its own unique way of responding to spirituality so it is with each child. The physical realm is immersed and integrated with the spiritual realm. A powerful belief in spirituality governs and influences the way one interacts with other people, and relates to her or his environment.
>
> Some people assume that the European missionaries brought the gospel, Christian teachings, and understandings, to the Maori people of New Zealand. Maori people who have retained their own ancient teachings have always believed in Io Matua [God, the Divine Parent] and Rehua [Christ]. The two symbols that one hears in regard to Jesus Christ are the cross and the fish. When one looks at the night sky in the southern hemisphere the 'cross' stands out ever so clearly. Those of us who live in the North Island of New Zealand are constantly reminded about the fish. The Maori name of the North Island is *Te Ika a Maui* - the fish of Maui.

The place of spirituality is often glossed over and paid lip service to in articulations of decolonisation and Maori women's emancipation in preference for a theory of subjectivity and positionality steeped in an economic [valued/values] rhetoric. The latter reduces the Maori woman to an either/or subject position where she either can compete equally alongside Pakeha or she cannot. If she cannot, she is constructed as a victim, incarcerated by a representation of her identity that fails to acknowledge other agentic subject positions she may occupy. Approaches such as these conceal the wealth of plurality that many women claim makes them flexible and resilient in the

nation today. She is the cornerstone of Maoridom, yet her rich identity is not being theorised in ways that represent her own narrative of success. Identifying with and through a narrative of spirituality provides a cloak of resiliency for Maori; it is also a form of resistance to colonialism. For example, Roberta, like other bi/multi racial women, lives with the scarring that occurs in families that exist with violence, a legacy of colonialism. Her father's abuse of alcohol and his domestic violence towards her mother has left an emptiness inside her. As an adult, spirituality gives her a sense of resilience and enables her to make sense of her history and to feel peaceful. She states:

> I had a pretty rough sort of childhood. My mother came from a very wealthy Pakeha family and my father came from a very poor Maori family. She was sort of rejected by her family and his family rejected her. And Dad was a very violent man. He drank very very heavily and it was mainly to do with alcohol when he was pretty aggressive and violent. Mum was a very strong Irish woman and they clashed badly. They had a fairly violent relationship. My spiritual teacher helps me... I just go inside and concentrate on an energy that's in there... sort of like a meditation. There is no philosophy, no teachings, nothing to learn but from yourself. There's a very strong energy that you can actually touch - feel freely within yourself.

Deploying a spiritual identity as a form of protection against colonialism is not an uncommon process for Maori. Bronwyn Elsmore [1998] in her text *Te Kohititanga Marama* looks at Maori religions in the later part of the nineteenth century and the role Maori prophets played in responding to the spiritual need of Maori during the colonial epoch. In this sense, spirituality functioned as a form of resistance as Maori sought to find ways to alleviate their alienation and annihilation caused through the practices and enactment of the discourses of imperialism and assimilation. Seeking the solace and wisdom of a higher self in relation to a world filled with conflict provided Maori with a narrative that helped them through their trials and inspired their survival as a people. Hine relied upon her tupuna as a spiritual source of strength when she felt she was being persecuted professionally and personally by Maori and Pakeha colleagues. She explains:

> For a long time I had a circle of tupuna around me and I had to stay within the circle. In [month of year] they made an opening in the circle and said, "You can leave now" but there were still a few things left I had to do. But they basically told me, you know, "When the time is right, you'll know... we will allow you to go."

Bronwyn Elsmore's [1989] *Mana from Heaven* points to early Maori spiritual hybridity as Maori forms of spirituality were intertwined with colonial epistemologies at the onset of iwi and settler contact. She acknowledges the influence of Christianity on an indigenous spirituality. For example, Elsmore [1989: 151] states that Archdeacon Williams opened the first mission station on the East Coast during the mid 1800s although Christianity was taught in the region even earlier than this. She goes

on to say that a quasi indigenous-Christian movement emerged which "involved a revival of the traditional practice of communication with the spirits... [I]t's purpose was to find alleviation from the illnesses from which the people were suffering" at the time. Elsmore says one kuia:

> ... claimed to have as her spirit informer a Christian believer who had died a few years earlier. This man was one of the teachers who had come from the Waimate mission station in Northland with Williams to help begin the mission to the area. He was described as having been a consistent Christian and a much respected teacher, and now he was said to be bringing important communications from the spirit world.

This anecdote marks the early spiritual hybridity of Maori as they usurped the authority of the dominant colonial discourse of Judeo Christianity with their own cultural reading of spirituality. Similarly, today, bi/multi racial women seek ways to acknowledge their own inner wisdom and spiritual knowledge in their struggle to make sense of their identity and place in the world. Developing a spiritual understanding of who the subject is, in relation to their dual/multiple cultural histories and the cultural losses that emanate from processes of colonization, colonialism and cultural alienation, and ultimately the fragmented cultural difference that accompanies colonised peoples, is an important part in being able to *imagine* oneself as free from the ongoing, albeit changing forms of colonialism.

Loss and grief expert, Robert Neimeyer [2001] in *Meaning Reconstruction and the Experience of Loss* maintains that humans undergo a healthy grief process when they are able to make sense of their losses through re-creating new narratives of meaning. This new insight and understanding seeks to identify who the self is in relation to that which is lost [via the processes of colonisation] and results in a reconfigured identity in relation to that which is recognised as absent [in this sense an authentic ethnicity]. Making sense of significant cultural trauma and losses in relation to the subject's newly reconfigured self [a self that continues to exist despite the loss of authenticity] ultimately leads to a positive resolution and a reconstructed Maori Pakeha/Other identity. Spirituality provides the narrative element by means of which bi/multi racial women make sense of their *inauthenticity* and *cultural difference* from Maori and Pakeha/Other while still maintaining a coherent sense of self. Continuing bonds, in the absence of a real relationship to physical whanau, real landscapes, actual tikanga and tangible cultural epistemologies and practices, are achieved through symbolic narratives of home and belonging via a hybridised narrative of spirituality.

Such a narrative assists bi/multi racial women in dealing with the *real* issues of their disjointed lives. They require it to enable them to resist the pull towards being positioned with a singular 'traditional' Maori identity because it incarcerates them; it judges and limits movement and positionality within different landscapes. Spiritual

beliefs enable the subject to contextualise herself within a broader framework of identity by locating or positioning her within the whanau of humanity. Holding on to a narrative that re-imagines the subject as belonging to a larger cosmic family/universe, the bi/multi racial woman re-*members* herself in metaphysical ways as well as human processes and structures. In this way her ambiguous sense of self is reconfigured in spiritual terms and assists her in psychologically defusing the power contained in new colonial forms of racism directed at corporeal brown and white bi/multi racial bodies. The bi/multi racial woman mediates herself fearlessly in relation to the living as well as the dead.

Traditionally, one of the principle functions performed by Maori women within significant traditional rituals involves the powhiri, an official Maori greeting ceremony. The powhiri is a ritual that acknowledges the corporeal presence of the living as well as the presence of the spiritual realm. During this formal greeting a kuia welcomes the manuhiri with her karanga. Another woman responds with a karanga on behalf of the visitors; her call is a formal reply to the call from the tangata whenua. This done, the visitors can approach the tangata whenua and a meeting between the two groups can proceed. Within this process the welcoming kuia is aware that the visitors bring with them the spirits of their dead. She clears a spiritual pathway where the two corporeal peoples and their respective spiritual families can safely gather. Both the tangata whenua and the manuhiri are seen in the context of their spiritual relationships with their deceased. In this way the Maori woman shifts from human space/time to spiritual space/time, recognising the significance and importance of the relationships and connections between the living and the dead. The Maori woman mediates between real and metaphysical worlds; thus she inter-connects material/corporeal bodies and spiritual forces.

Similarly, within each bi/multi racial woman's conversation, a locus of spiritual commonality emerges to distinguish bi/multi racial women as those who recognise themselves as belonging to a larger universe than the corporeal/material space occupied by humans. Within this, bi/multi racial women make sense of themselves and their difference by knowing, imagining or believing themselves to exist within a large community, that of cosmology and a spiritual community. At the center of this is the acknowledgment of their spiritual and emotional ties to their indigenous roots. What is interesting about these concessions is that they provide a common language and an affinity, not just within the individual self but also within the physical, material and cosmic world that is loosely consistent with a traditional Maori understanding of human existence and purpose. Seeking an affinity amongst women is an important step to re-creating alliances and bridges between bi/multi racial women and is an opportunity to de-hierachise relationships of difference between women of Maori

ancestry based on arguments of authenticity. Being more proficient at speaking English or Maori, or having more tikanga than others, is not what a sense of spiritual belonging rests upon. Rather, it is the ability of the soul to love and serve that creates greatness in spiritual terms [Bluck, 1998]. At some core level an *affinity* is formed between Maori, as a reaction to New Zealand's social processes of cultural interaction and differentiation which have marked Maori and Pakeha/Others in particular and defining ways. Despite the lack of commonality across other key areas of Maori ethnicity, bi/multi racial women share common spiritual assumptions which allow affective bonding between themselves and Maori Pakeha/Others. In the absence of familiar cultural markers of difference [including corporeal brownness] bi/multi racial women can become re-essentialised via a spiritual narrative of wairua, epitomised by an awareness that a spiritual life-force exists which supersedes human/material life. This usurps the authority of whiteness/righteousness and the inevitable processes and practices of racism directed at the brown corporeal body. Bi/multi racial women make sense of themselves and their conflicted histories and plurality by placing spirituality at the centre of their lived realities. This acts as a mediator in their diasporic and hybridic realities.

Kearney [1997: 4] claims that her book *Faces of the Goddess* was inspired after she was told that New Zealand women ".. involved in developing their spirituality were not dealing with 'real issues' in the 'real world'." She claims that this attitude showed a "stunningly insular mentality" and prompted her to explore the place of spirituality in *real* New Zealand women's lives. Consequently, her text features thirteen different chapters written by Maori and non Maori New Zealand women. Each chapter depicts an insight into the importance of spirituality and the role it plays in experiencing a richer, more meaningful, quality of life. These stories celebrate the cultural diversity and wisdom of a variety of women through their various and heterogenous spiritual traditions. My research on bi/multi racial women endorses Kearney's findings that spirituality assists bi/multi racial women in their quest to develop a meaningful life despite their cultural hybridity and diaspora. When examined more closely, spiritual narratives function to give meaning to the individual subject while at the same time empowering bi/multi racial women. Spiritual narratives provide a sense of emotional resilience that enable these bi/multi racial women to defend themselves against racist and sexist assaults targeted at their corporeal raced and gendered bodies/difference. By constructing themselves, iwi and Others in terms of their spiritual place within the New Zealand nation and the world generally, the bi/multi racial women in this study underscore the binaries that operate in the nation to advantage and disadvantage raced and de/raced peoples. Thus the importance of whiteness over brownness, maleness over femaleness, rich over poor, and others, is

contested in favour of a narrative of identity and of belonging posited as existing before and beyond race, gender, class and culture. This enables the bi/multi racial women to adopt a positive sense of themselves and their cultural ambiguity as opposed to a sense of themselves as abnormal. An innate sense of recognising themselves as existing beyond race, gender and class enables a healthy attitude when dealing with discrimination, racism and violence aimed at the raced body, and in the case of white bi/multi racial women, the de/raced Maori body.

Spiritual beliefs enable bi/multi racial women to resist being positioned at the bottom of the social heap. A sense of self esteem grows from their spiritual beliefs and allows them to imagine themselves as somehow transcending their material bodies and corporeal realities. As such, they use their bodies to resist the stereotypes and spaces that had been reserved for them as Maori. They refuse to be located as either the traditional Maori or the colonial Maori, preferring to see themselves as agentic. They make life choices that utilise their ability to be flexible, to narrate or represent their bodies in ways that enable them to achieve corporeal movement and vacillation between cultural points of tension. They give examples of moving in and out of relationships of power where they consciously and unconsciously rely upon a spiritual esteem that means that they can use their bodies to facilitate their own agency. One woman speaks about a primary school experience of being called a "dirty Maori" by other children in the playground. She recalls that she suffered great emotional pain and anxiety over this judgement. However, she became a competitive and successful sports woman which she identified as occurring after she experienced racist attacks at school. Instead of becoming a victim, she used the very thing marking her as 'different' and Other [to that which was white and superior] to assert herself and gain mastery over the situation in order to ultimately succeed in the education system. She used her publicly visible physical body to resist racism and she fought back when she asserted herself in the white educational landscape of the school ground via the conduit of sport. This is the same body that was designated dirty and abjected. This peripheral body competed and won against the center, the white body. Holding on to a spiritual narrative reaffirmed the subject's sense of worth and enabled her to be resilient when faced with overt forms of racism.

Seeing herself through a spiritual narrative supports the bi/multi racial woman when she refuses to see herself through an exotic and sexualised lens. She is enabled to contextualise her life through a spiritual lens, allowing her to view her existence and experiences as a spiritual, rather than human process. Thinking in this way supports the confident corporeal vacillation of the subject from one cultural location/home to another. She does so with an awareness that she is performing a gendered and cultural function required by her spiritual presence on Earth in accordance with the guidance of

her tupuna. Further, a spiritual kaupapa enables the bi/multi racial woman to value equally her respective cultures of origin and participation as she is filled with an awareness that all people, as well as tupuna, are worthy of her love and respect. She has an evolved awareness that sees all pain and suffering as that which needs healing. Spiritual narratives provide a philosophy and resiliency that enable bi/multi racial women to exercise an insight into the way power works within both Maori and Pakeha communities. For example, one kuia reinterprets Maori and Pakeha obsession with the acquisition of land and material resources via an understanding of human greed. In this kuia's korero, a narrative of spiritual authority totally usurps the desire of materialism. She says:

> It doesn't really matter who owns what land, because we don't really own the land, do we? The land owns us! Like our children - we don't own our children; they're only leased to us. We're their guardians. And all this nonsense about different people owning this and owning that, it's stupid, because they die and the land still stays here. So, how can they own it? If they owned it, it would go with them. The only thing we do own is inside our soul. There is a voice telling us, we're supposed to help people, to do good.

Each woman interviewed, either consciously or unconsciously, relies upon a spiritual narrative to understand and cope with her multiply inscribed identity. This has implications for how she thinks about herself culturally and how she mediates the contradictions of her Maori/Pakeha bi/multi cultural polarised life-style. Their narratives demonstrate how a spiritual framework is employed to effect social and economic resilience. Articulations of her spirituality underpins her ability to feel whole. A sense of belonging is reflected in her confidence in her cultural identity and her ability to move between Maori and Pakeha landscapes. Each woman in her own way demonstrates her sense of achievement, success and vision as a Maori woman in contemporary society. They all represent themselves as agentic and in control of their lives.

Through their deep spiritual links bi/multi racial women mediate their conflicted and contradictory subjectivities and multiple positionality despite a tension to conform to the polarities dictated under bicultural nationalism. Each woman relies upon an over-arching belief in spirituality that helps her to mediate the tension and anxiety that she says accompanies an identity incumbent with instability. Her narrative of spirituality, in all its forms, enables a successful and fulfilling life journey beyond the constraints imposed by a sense of her own cultural duality. Hine, whose body wore the brunt of the neo-patriarchal Maori/Pakeha relationship in the work place, was able to complete the task set for her by her people through the help and guidance of her tupuna. Her ancestors talked to her and advised her on correct the conduct in her work and told her when it was time to leave her job. She was guided and protected despite her body physically manifesting symptoms of metaphysical attack by her

colleagues [see Chapter Seven]. It seemed as though these women were able to transcend materiality/corporeality and locate themselves in some way, beyond culture and beyond the raced and gendered body.

Living Bridges: Healers and Wise Women

> *Know* that neither the English nor Maori as a language is sufficient to heal others. All our words come loaded. They come with past concepts, they've got shadows on them. So we need new ways of talking about them [our spiritual healing experiences]. And people are doing it in varying ways... through social contact, through making films, through writing books, through singing songs... [Keri, 2000].

In this section I suggest that bi/multi racial women act as healing interlocutors in New Zealand race relations. Their cultural hybridity enables them to intervene in creative ways in ongoing colonial processes to increase emancipation for themselves, their families and others. For example, the above quotation from Keri emphasises that bi/multi racial women are developing a new language and a new way of approaching the question of Maori identity and cultural harmony in New Zealand. As stated in the previous chapter, the dominance of Pakeha culture and, by extension, 'whiteness' as a cultural category needs to be adequately addressed and challenged as a position of racial domination. Consequently, this will mean that Maori will no longer carry the negative ramifications of being the raced/marked body, nor will they suffer the violence levied at the unmarked Maori corporeal body. Maori emancipation will be evidenced in their improved social, economic and political positioning and their quality of life. In so doing, the bicultural nation will become a more tolerant, less aggressive, environment for all New Zealanders. The bi/multi racial woman contributes to this agenda by problematising the fixity of the signifiers 'brown' and 'white' and thus usurps the binaries embedded within disparate cultural groupings. For example, one woman said that she was writing a novel that looks at difference, relationships and conflicted identities emphasised through characters with *blue* corporeal bodies. Through her own racial ambivalence, purity invested in discrete ethnic categories is called into question, informing the educational subject of her text.

The presence of bi/multi racial women's cultural ambiguity problematises national boundaries that seek to name and place Maori and Pakeha, brown and white, in particular ways. The bi/multi racial woman is a peace keeping conduit in cultural and patriarchal transactions between Maori and Pakeha, men and women [see Hine's story Chapter Seven]. The bi/multi racial woman enables a new form of resistance to colonial processes by acting as an interlocutor in other Maori women's emancipation, educating New Zealanders to embrace cultural ambiguities and to develop tolerance towards difference. Bi/multi racial women unconsciously and consciously work to

create harmony between the various cultures of New Zealand thus contributing to improved Maori and Pakeha/Other race relations. One bi/multi racial woman's efforts are directed towards the healing of the land through educating about the relationship between papatuanuku and humans. The text is written from a vision her mother had some years earlier, woven into a tale using traditional Maori spiritual values in that "it deals somewhat with the wairua... and the nourishment of the wairua and the body." There is a real commitment to healing the land, the peoples and the fragmented spirit of New Zealanders.

In *Maori Sovereignty*, Awatere [1984] writes in her final chapter, *Exodus*, that Maori need to help one another and to love one another as a form of generating resistance and resilience towards colonial processes of domination and discrimination against them. At the end of her discourse on Pakeha injustice and the authority of whiteness over brownness she leaves us with no more than an appeal to Maori to stand tall, be proud and above all, love one another. Awatere [1984: 105-6] states:

> For those still hooked into white concepts of beauty just spend time looking at our women and men. Just look at the faces, the eyes, the way the shoulders move. Take a good look at our people and see yourself reflected in them. Love them and love yourself.

Awatere's [1984: 107] closing comment reinforces the right of all Maori to dream of Maori sovereignty and to make those dreams a reality. "This is the right we reclaim in reinforcing the separate reality of our tipuna and making it our own. To do this is to take the first step towards Maori sovereignty." For bi/multi racial women, a sense of cultural separateness is called into question by the subject's recognition and involvement in dual and multiple cultural communities thus challenging the idea of finite cultural groups. Being Maori, and identifying with the colonial plight of Maori, may be an important component to understanding themselves and/or their families as tangata whenua. Even in the absence of whakapapa, bi/multi racial women are able to operate at a deep spiritual level to effect social change in New Zealand. Despite the fact that bi/multi racial women acknowledge and value their tangata whenua status, they also exhibit a high regard and respect for other cultures. One bi/multi racial kuia, Joyce, put it this way:

> My whole life, I've always felt that we were just people on this earth supposedly to help each other, and it didn't matter where we came from, who we are. I was born with these beliefs. It's how we treat each other that counts.

Although social change for bi/multi racial women is often directed at Maori emancipatory objectives, through a commitment to individual women's whanau/iwi, it also involves the healing of the nation and *all* its people. Because the bi/multi racial woman does not position herself solely as either Maori or Pakeha/Other but, rather,

lives with the ambivalence created in this multiple positioning, she is adept at seeing the racial and ethnic tension that exists between Maori struggles for sovereignty and Pakeha/Others resistance to this. She is able to help those who have difficulties understanding cultural differences by consciously and unconsciously re-educating New Zealanders about mutual respect for all cultures. In drawing from her spiritual resiliency, she exhibits a fundamental desire to help others grow beyond their own cultural boundedness and racist limitations.

This altruism is not only directed at, or limited to, anti-colonialist objectives but is aimed towards a higher spiritual harmony between people across cultures. For example, Mahinarangi [composer/musician] explains that respecting all peoples and all cultures is an important element in the spiritual concept of wairua. Respecting cultural difference engenders healing and affinities between opposed cultural groups. Growing up with a Jewish father and a Maori mother, she was exposed to an eclectic array of music which enriched her life. She states:

> Dad was a practising Jew until he met Mum. He's no longer a practising Jew... He was in love with my mother [and kapa haka] and things Maori which is kind of cool for the kids who came along later. He was a very talented musical man... I think my Dad should have been a musician. Music was powerful in our house. I don't think Mum and Dad realised just how powerful [in a good way] that is. We had kapa haka and we had the lovely sounds from Dad; he would sing us Yiddish songs or Hebrew songs occasionally. We had a wide variety of music... We didn't have any money but we had this funny old radiogram and we had Beethoven and others and I loved it.

As an adult, Mahinarangi runs music workshops which cater to students of all ages, and ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Working with wairua [respect for all cultures] enables a healing within as well as between peoples. She states that in her workshop she talks about:

> ... respect all the time! People come and have a really good time which is really amazing. Once, I had these young Pakeha boys who were like young Punks, you know, Skin-Heads and they were fantastic because we *didn't* agree. They didn't like my music but they loved the workshops. They would come out with really ignorant statements like "That music fucks!!" or "Geez, I hate that crap!!" if I played anything other than their music. But I liked their music. So I played about eight different pieces of music about a minute each; they would say "Oh, that's fucken crap" all the time. So at the end I talked to them about it and I said that I wanted them to think about how they were feeling emotionally when they heard all the different pieces of music. I told them that when they interrupt the music they are actually interrupting other people's space. I said, "Can you keep your mouths shut while we're doing this and then when it's over, you can all tell us how you feel." So they sat through it and at the end some of the other kids said, "Well their behaviour [Skin Heads] did effect me because I felt embarrassed about saying that I really liked it [musical piece] because they [Skin Heads] were so anti it." If I'm explaining something to the Maori kids or the Pakeha kids about a Maori idea it's like [Skin Heads] go "No, I don't want to hear about that stuff." I say, 'It's okay. Other people want to hear about it so you can just close your ears if you don't want to know." The boys, they might not have liked my music but they learned something about respect and integrity... and at the end of the workshops they give me these lovely hugs and say "Thanks."

Having recognised the place of affinity within themselves with respect to making sense of their own conflicted subjectivities, bi/multi racial women seek creative ways to share this healing wisdom with others. In Mahinarangi's case, the multi cultural musical tastes generated by her parents' dual cultures enabled her to reach, educate and also heal others through music. Her spiritual values enabled a 'listening' and 'appreciation' of other cultures through her hybridic musical conduit. This is the point Bhabha [1994] makes when he reflects that the hybrid repeats the colonial subjectification differently, in ways that hold new possibilities for emancipation. Bi/multi racial women exhibit a desire to help others overcome the constraints that social alienation and dislocation creates. They use their heightened sensitivity to assist those who appear alienated, dislocated or 'out of place'. In another example, a young bi/multi racial woman, Abbie, articulated that she wanted to use her musical talents and lyrics to encourage Maori youth to take back their power and make the most out of their lives. Her desire is to help Maori youth resist their sense of unworthiness and disempowerment by striving to improve their self esteem through lyrics that are aimed at encouraging young Maori to 'get off their arse and reach their own potential'. Regardless of how big or small the healing contributions are, bi/multi racial women function as living bridges between cultures. Her body acts as a bridge that allows different cultures to traverse across her cultural hybridity, experiencing cultural difference in a way that encourages mutual respect and affinity between all New Zealanders.

By introducing a spiritual narrative to examine bi/multi racial women's resiliency and resistance, I have deliberately re-essentialised the bi/multi racial subject along a spiritual axis. Uniquely positioned with a hybridised form of spirituality that, loosely speaking, is a heterogeneous convergence of indigenous Maori and Western ways of knowing and practising spirituality, the bi/multi racial woman reconstructs her conflicted identity through a broader narrative of belonging and of community. Positioned thus, she has a sense of herself as agentic, self acting and emancipated. A freedom of spirit exists to permit her to traverse borders and engage in Maori and non Maori places/spaces; as well, it enables her to connect with other cultures and engage in multiple contexts. In this sense she shows liberation, confidence and pride in her own creative abilities to develop and reach her potential. As such, she acts as a role model for other Maori who live with conflicted cultural subjectivities and as an interlocutor in their cultural transitions.

Conclusion

The bi/multi racial woman employs a narrative of spirituality as a form of resistance to ongoing processes of colonialism. Core beliefs that reflect a hybridised blend of Maori and Pakeha/Other spiritual beliefs empower the subject to see herself beyond the confines placed on her corporeal body as the Other, in contrast to that which is male and white. Perceiving herself as belonging to a larger, albeit metaphysical, universe than that provided in the material and corporeal context of difference, evidenced in the binaries of man/woman, black/white and rich/poor, destabilises the importance placed on the relationship between these polarised identity categories. Spiritual beliefs enable bi/multi racial women to seek better lives for themselves and their whanau. They are privileged in that their ability to traverse backwards and forwards across cultural borders inevitably helps them to negotiate new landscapes that bring new economic opportunities. Freedom of movement across cultures/class ultimately creates better social opportunities, such as improved employment and housing conditions. In so doing, the bi/multi racial woman's diasporic and freeing lifestyle acts as models for other Maori to follow. Further, because bi/multi racial women can see beyond the binaries which seek to place white and brown bodies in particular ways, they also have a sense of compassion towards those struggling to come to terms with cultural difference. As such, they consciously and unconsciously emancipate others from the effects of colonialism and racism, as well as serving people in healing roles.

What these women of Maori ancestry demonstrate is that bi/multi racial women's resilience continues to be located in the ability to hold onto a narrative of wairuatanga/spirituality, albeit a hybridised version. Despite colonisation, colonialism, the formation and maintenance of a stable national identity, mixed marriages, miscegenation and the performance of our conflictual daily lives, the bi/multi racial Maori woman continues to be vigilant, successful, compassionate, loving, forgiving, strong, intelligent and agentic. Essentially speaking, she has found a way to move beyond her corporeality and the restriction placed on her by her signification as the raced and gendered subject. It is an old way, it lives deep in her soul and no amount of scrubbing at her skin will remove it.

Chapter Nine

Conclusion:
InSide/OutSide Cultural Hybridity

> Toward evening- we know it is evening - a canoe puts off from the bank of That Side and sets off over the river. In it are Huia and Memory and Sire paddling back from That Side to This, all chanting a paddle song the old one has recently taught them, keeping instinctive time with the paddles, which is one sure time they know - any instinctive rhythm. It is in Maori of course.
>
> Behold my paddle!
> See how it flies and flashes;
> It quivers like a bird's wing
> This paddle of mine...
>
> But as they reach This Side landing an unrest stirs in Huia. Her allegiance to her koro on That Side confronts her feeling for Puppa on This Side. In the crossing of the polished surface of the river is the crossing from the brown to the white, although she's too young to know it, and the emotional racial transition is not polished like the face of the river holding the gray of the sky in her waters and the glamorous gold of the trees; it is something with smudges on it, something with jagged angles. The racial transition is a sunken branch cutting the mirror surface. Not that she knows these things; all she knows at these times is that she doesn't like anyone else, while all that "anyone else" knows is that Huia is getting naughty: This Huia-kid she cheeky, ay?
>
> As they get out, wade ashore and fasten the canoe, her mind is full of Puppa and the touching image of him. Is he all right? she wonders. She leaves the others without saying a thing and wet-haired and wet-footed scrambles through the coarse river grass up the bank in a short cut to the road and trots uphill through the roadside flowers till she comes to the bridge at the corner, where she pauses to collect her breath. She looks down upon the stream below, her thick hair falling forward over her face, all but covering her eyes.
>
> .... As she draws near the house, however, she hears shouting, and the boys do too. They look up and hasten inside. Also the piano stops. Huia runs in through the porch to the kitchen and there is Mrs. Considine punching Puppa as he crutches desperately, crutches in jerks across the room trying to escape and shouting to God for mercy. Huia begins whimpering immediately, "Don't hit Puppa, Flower's mother," and the others try to get in between them... Mumma counts no cost, knows nothing of what she is doing. The next thing she has snatched a piece of wood and is battering at his face. There's a patch of shiny blood [Ashton-Warner, 196, pp.63-5].

Sylvia Ashton-Warner's [1966: 63-5] novel *Greenstone* highlights bi/multi racial woman's hybridity in her portrayal of Huia's coming and going, from one side of the river where she lives with her Pakeha family to the Other, the ancestral home of her people and the place where her Maori grandfather still lives. Ashton-Warner's novel is situated after the First

World War. She demonstrates how children of mixed racial ancestries were multiply located across different landscapes and cultures. In *Greenstone*, Hybrid-Huia's corporeal body regularly travels backwards and forwards across the river/boundary separating her two cultural worlds, This Side and That Side. The criss-crossing between This Pakeha Side and That Maori Side is portrayed as a journey/process of metaphoric images and competing landscapes that need to be traversed to make the [cultural] transition to the Other Side possible.

My aim in this concluding chapter is to offer a re-reading of my articulation of the bi/multi racial woman through the lens of Ashton-Warner's character Huia. As such, this chapter is presented in two sections. The first, 'This Side, InSide, That Side, OutSide', is a deliberate attempt to contain the flow of my ideas within a seamless body/text through the deployment of Ashton-Warner's novel. My intention is to show how the bi/multi racial female/girl/woman is constructed and positioned spatially within the neo colonial nation. I also show how new cultural and gendered relationships are formed and how the bi/multi racial woman negotiates the tensions that arise between Maori and Pakeha/Other men and Maori and Pakeha/Other women. Using *Greenstone*, I am able to demonstrate the points made in this thesis through Huia's positioning as the bi/multi racial hybrid. This re-reading demonstrates how the Maori hybrid female becomes discursively positioned to take up a borderland's existence, living *between* as well as *InSide* as well as *OutSide* the landscapes of This Side and That Side contained within her corporeal self. The second and smaller section, 'Conclusion: Embracing Maori Women's Hybridity', looks briefly at Maori resistance and to the idea of Maori women's cultural hybridity; I also offer some suggestions for further research.

This Side, InSide, That Side, OutSide

In order to fulfil my objective to highlight, synthesise and conclude the points made throughout this thesis, I first need to elaborate on the essence of this novel and some of the characters in the story. Essentially, Ashton-Warner's text recognises the position of the hybrid through the character 'Huia' who became estranged from her father when he went to fight in the First World War sometime after her birth, and the subsequent death of her Maori mother, Kaa. Huia is a bi/multi racial female. Ashton-Warner [1966: 52] describes Huia as "... not even half Maori but only a quarter." She is Maori and Pakeha/Other, emphasised in the nurturing relationships

she has with both her Maori grandfather and her surrogate father, portrayed in the character of her Pakeha grandfather. Huia lives most of her life as Pakeha in the landscape of This Side. She has white colonial genealogy, cultural history and lifestyle. She lives with her Puppa [who adores her] and his Pakeha wife Mrs Considine [who hates her]. They live in a small North Island rural settlement along with Puppa and Mrs Considine's numerous children. Huia's female Maori relatives have all died and only her koro remains. He lives on That Side, the other side of the river, in the traditional dwelling/landscape of his ancestors. His female relatives all died giving birth, which is attributed to a makutu placed upon the child-bearing women of Huia's iwi. She is the last female in their blood line. Both her Maori and Pakeha families felt the wrath of an angry tohunga who resented the inter-racial intercourse between a Maori woman and a Pakeha man - Huia's grandparents.

Huia's hybridity is depicted in her constant coming and going across the river enroute to her Two Worlds [roots/homes] via the body of water that divides her two cultures/families. The makutu manifests itself in the form of Puppa's illness and Maori women's death either before or during childbirth. Torn between her two worlds, her two *senses* of love for her koro/whanau and her Puppa/family create in her the anxiety that needs to be acted out, and simultaneously contained. Huia's story unfolds. Huia is split between This Side [living in the Pakeha world] and That Side [visiting her Maori grandfather]. Her mother and father had found love for each other in the rural landscape of the Ngati Te Renga Renga tribal people, Huia's people. Not permitted to marry, they would steal away to a small whare in the forest where Huia was eventually conceived.

Huia is 'defined' by the youthful, caring and paternal young male in the story, Togi, as the "next rangatira and heir to all its lands." Togi, recently "[r]eturned at last from the First World War... keeps both eyes on Huia". Huia is exoticised from her infancy, "[h]er skin is almost as white as [her white cousin] Flower's but her hair and her eyes give the Maori blood away. She is a very pretty child with a full top lip and eyes like canoes tethered at an angle [Ashton-Warner, 1966: 30-32]. " Huia loves her Puppa and identifies with him in his corporeal pain/anxiety. Puppa is portrayed by Ashton-Warner [1966: 15] in this way:

> He has one of these aquiline turned-down noses you find in aristocracy, while behind his glasses his eyes can only be described as English blue. Possibly the term "English" can account for the whole impression; his face has the fine

> complexion and coloring often bred in the English climate, a fresh but fragile face.

Ashton-Warner [1966: 15-16] portrays Puppa as a weak, *dismembered* and broken remnant of an Englishman:

> But look at his locked body. Rheumatoid arthritis as we know it but according to the Maoris in the valley it is the "limb-withering" curse of the tohungu makutu... He is locked at the hips too so that his whole thin body is a zigzag drawing of what a man's body should be, but you only see this when he gets up on his crutches, a far from graceful performance.

Puppa's wife [and Huia's surrogate mother] is referred to by Huia as 'Flower's Mumma'. Transferring the 'mother' to her young Pakeha cousin 'Flower' enables Huia to distance herself from a maternal relationship to this woman who has the responsibility to care for her, yet hates her. Ashton-Warner [1966: 22-23] portrays Flower's Mother's attitudes towards Huia when she has her saying to her husband, "The less I see of that brown rat the better... D'you expect me, a trained teacher, t'recognize a dirty little Maori? D'you expect me, a respectable woman, t'bow and scrape to a savage?"

As stated, Huia's biological mother, Kaa is dead. In fact *all* Maori women are corporeally absent from the story. The prevailing *memory* of Kaa portrays her as a woman whose sexuality/femininity was out of control. Strong images of her koro appear every so often, representing the last of his people: the withering lands *subject* of/to colonialism. His desperate need for Huia to reproduce the Maori race/iwi is etched in his every action towards her. His image is of a withering emasculated *noble savage*. Koro is constructed as the dying wise man. His eyes are constantly looking to Huia to be the new hope/healer for his people's revival. It is up to her to end the curse placed on Maori women during childbirth that results in their death.

River/Land Crossings

In Chapter One I showed how colonisation, imperialism, assimilation and colonial processes positioned Maori as the disenfranchised Other to the normative white masculine rational subject [Awatere, 1984; Kelsey, 1984; Orange, 1987; Sinclair, 1989, Walker, 1987, 1990]. The invention of the New Zealand nation and its national community meant that a specifically white monocultural nationalism assimilated Maori within its desire to create

an imagined community built through notions of sameness [Anderson, 1991]. However, this was only achieved through the expulsion of difference that was generated through the repudiation of Maori difference [Lloyd, 1991]. In fact, in order for a white national identity to emerge, it needed the brown body to formulate its 'self' against [Yeatman, 1995]. In a signifying chain of meaning, Pakeha could only come into existence as the white/right/rational/universal subject without properties if Maori were to carry the difference needed to signify itself against [Hall, 1997].

The insidiousness of colonialism can be metaphorically related to the undeveloped narrative of the river in Ashton-Warner's novel. What is not being talked about in this story is the *essence* of the river/current that hybrid-Huia has to negotiate in order to make her Maori and Pakeha/Other border crossings possible. There is an undercurrent of fear operating in the traversing over water. How deep is it? Will Huia drown, be swept away? Will the 'New Race' become extinguished before the colonial offspring have a chance to thrive? Danger lurks as the children [future nation] manage to negotiate the unknown, possible danger. I suggest in this scenario that 'River' functions as colonialism. Its origin, its point of departure, symbolises the beginning of colonialism. Its flowing body carries within it a new history of Aotearoa, as it moves silently into the future, seen, yet unseen, known, yet unknown, recognised, yet unrecognised.

River moves, swiftly, cold, with purposeful intent, a forceful passion; seemingly natural, like colonialism, it almost appears disinterested. It masquerades innocently, appearing as if it is a detached observer of all that is performed on *both* Sides of its banks/borders. Yet it laughs into the wind at the foolishness of *its* prisoners as both This Side and That Side are incarcerated by *its* desire to be the author of their performances, the master of their dance! [Butler, 1993a, 1993b]. Like colonialism, River needs their [This Side and That Side] *division* to flow through, in between their bodies. Colonial nationalism survives on the separateness between Maori and Pakeha, brown and white [Chatterjee, 1989, 1993]. To survive, the separate landscapes must not, cannot, will not touch. To touch, to merge would surely bring a withering, a drying-up, a winding d-o-w-n to River/neo colonialism. River winds down *towards* and *past* the *present* [This Side and That Side] towards its confident [perhaps unstoppable] future trajectory. It is a constantly changing yet consistent current/flow. River/colonialism ensures This Side/Pakeha/white and That Side/Maori/brown are kept separated, condemned to view each other

across a deep divide of make-believe [and yet real] difference [Lloyd, 1991].

In Chapter Two, I argued that the shift to biculturalism was effected through Maori counter nationalist efforts to argue for Maori sovereignty [Awatere, 1984, Yeatman, 1995; Walker, 1990]. As such, Maori were reinscribed through a representation of themselves as the native, intimately linked to the landscape of Aotearoa [Awatere, 1984]. This was done in an effort to achieve emancipation through economic development initiatives and advancement in a competitive market driven economy alongside Pakeha [Sharp, 1995]. In the current time, this desire is manifested in iwi corporate development which is achieved through the auspices of the Waitangi Tribunal's recommendation to award a share of a fiscal envelope to iwi as a recognition of past wrongs [of raupatu] carried out in the name of the Crown, which may [or may not be] sanctioned by the Government [Pearson, 1996; Sharp, 1995; Te Whanau, 2001]. Underpinning this, Maori must re-present themselves through their whakapapa, thus highlighting their unchanged status as the nation's tangata whenua. [Mohanram, 1999; Te Whanau, 2001]. I also demonstrated through Chatterjee's [1989, 1993] ideas that the task of reproducing the Maori national community as primordial became the responsibility of Maori women, epitomised in their reconstruction as traditional.

In Chapter Three, I showed how Maori nationalists reinvoked Maori as the Other through a narrative of difference [from Pakeha] reflecting back to Pakeha the latter's rationality, progress, development symbolised in their whiteness, and the former's brownness/primitiveness [Lloyd, 1991]. Within this move, the racial tensions of the 1970s and 1980s became somewhat placated as Maori men/iwi forged new relationships with Western/Pakeha men in the market place [Chatterjee, 1989, 1993]. Pakeha needed to defuse the tension in the nation, while iwi needed to position themselves as corporate players for the market stakes in an environment of capitalist neo liberalism [Mohanram, 1999]. Both were locked into a relationship of need based desire. Within this new patriarchal alignment, the bi/multi racial woman has found herself unrepresented in narratives of what it means to be Maori woman in the early 2000s.

In Chapters Four and Five, I conceptualised a research model in my articulation of 'Bi/multi Racial Kaupapa Maori' methodology [Bishop, 1998; Irwin, 1992; Smith, 1999]. This provided the foundation to introduce my qualitative research with twenty women who position themselves as bi/multi racial [Middleton, 1993, 1996]. Their voices added

the experiential material needed to complete an analysis of Maori women's cultural hybridity [Bhabha, !990, 1994, 1994a, 1994b; Meridith, 1990, 1999a, 199b]. I argued in Chapters Five and Six, that bi/multi racial women are different from traditional Maori women and different from Pakeha/Other women by virtue of their cultural hybridity. Through employing Butler's [1993] ideas on interpellation, and McDowell's [1997, 1999] ideas on spatialisation, I showed how bi/multi racial women are located in multiple landscapes and become subjectivated multiple identities.

InSide-ness

I illustrated in Chapter Seven that the bi/multi racial woman has a unique role in the New Zealand nation, and in the Maori community/nation. Located on the border between Maori and Pakeha/Other cultures, her corporeal racial difference positions her in the nation as hybrid. The women's stories demonstrated how bi/multi racial women have to negotiate the new forms of colonialism that emerge amidst the newly formed bicultural relationships, between corporate iwi/Maori and Pakeha men [Chatterjee, 1989, 1993; Mohanram, 1999]. This newly reconfigured flow of power is symbolised by the River flow in Ashton-Warner's [1966] novel. In her plurality of cultural difference the hybrid is positioned with the skills to operate in multiple discourses, her conversations collapsing the binary myths upon which colonialism/River sustains itself [Anzaldua, 1987]. Speaking and listening in her multiple voices, she hears multiple conversations via her location as Maori and Pakeha/Other in both the New Zealand national community and the Maori national community [Bhabha, 1994a, 1994b; Meridith, 1990, 1999a, 1999b]. The bi/multi racial woman responds in multiple voices, interpreting, translating, negotiating and mediating between That Side and This Side through the conduit of her InSide corpo/reality [Foster, 1996]. With her "eyes like canoes tethered at an angle", hybrid-Huia has the advantage of seeing both sides of the river simultaneously, her peripheral vision giving her insight, advantage and power [Ashton-Warner, 1966]. By the nature of her InSide-ness, the bi/multi racial's corporeal body functions as a *place* that cannot be fixed, tied or incarcerated to That Side, This Side or any Other Side.

Her InSide-ness [sense of coherence/stability] is possible as she mediates the OutSide-ness [cultural contradiction] etched on her corporeal skin. The bi/multi racial woman's racial residue/difference masquerades ambivalently as either Maori or Pakeha *culture,* but never both [Bhabha,

1994a, 1994b] Because she is *more* than This Side or That Side, but an *excess* of both, she moves beyond the binary categories embedded within Maori/race/brown and Pakeha/de-raced/white homogeneous articulations of identity [Bhabha, 1994a, 1994b; Butler, 1993]. Symbolically, Ashton-Warner's novel recognises [through the makutu placed on the *pre-colonial* child-bearing Maori women] that as soon as Maori women come into representation via the symbolic birthing process, the mother/landscape dies - is taken away. Thus, Maori are abandoned, left emasculated, disenfranchised and agency-less [Awatere, 1984; Walker, 1990]. Traditional Maori women function as a metaphor for Papatuanuku. The message is clear; old-time *landless* Maori cannot survive in this new colonised Aotearoa.

Positioned between Maori and Pakeha/Other cultures, the bi/multi racial woman functions as the new body/landscape upon which the Pakeha nation and the Maori nation constructs its identity. Her body is the skeleton, the framework needed for the place where both Maori and Pakeha can stand separately, yet somehow remain connected. Her corporeal *difference* plays a critical role as the body that gives identity/meaning to the reconfigured, tribal *and* settler cultures. By extension, her difference [racial impurity] provides the borders that give Pakeha/Other men, Maori men, Pakeha/Other women and traditional Maori women their cultural *meaning* in the bicultural nation [Gilman, 1985; hooks, 1997; Mohanram, 1999; Moreton-Robinson, 2000; Williams, 1997]. The nation's culturally pure subjects subjugate her difference by denying her existence, yet *both* the Maori and colonial nation *need* her cultural 'impurity' to construct themselves [via the conduit of the authentic - traditional Maori woman's body] as a culturally alive and thriving organism [Mohanram, 1999]. After all, dead cultures don't speak. Dead cultures cannot compete in the worldly matters of corporate development. The bi/multi racial Maori woman's corporeal body provides the departure from all that is 'essentially essential' to Maori and Pakeha culture. In a signifying chain of cultural meaning that is founded upon notions of sameness and difference, she is the *difference* that Pakeha and Maori construct their respective difference against [Hall, 1997]. She is the *difference* that must be subjugated in order for Maori to come into representation. The uncanny bi/multi racial woman *acts* as the interlocutor that calls both Maori and Pakeha into being thus permitting a new patriarchal alliance to emerge and sustain itself against [Freud, 1919]. Yet, the desire/necessity for her body

of difference must then be denied in order to ensure that the recently placated cultural relations of the 1970s and 1980s remain indefinitely.

Pathologised Other

Earlier chapters have also argued that the bi/multi racial woman can only come into representation through the dominant narratives available to her, either as the traditional Maori woman or its *poor* cousin, epitomised in a pathologised construction of Maori woman's identity [Gilman, 1985]. This is evidenced in the following passage in which nine year old Huia's brown corporeality is associated with her *badness*. In this passage she receives negative attention from her father on his first visit. Ashton-Warner [1996: 81, emphasis added] writes:

> And when her father speaks to her and tells her to be a good girl and a credit to her mother she hangs her *black* head in a manner not witnessed before. "If you don't behave yourself," gently enough from Daniel, "I'll send you back to the pa. It strikes me, young lady, that you've got more of your great-grandfather's melancholy in you than is good for you. You seem to have more *Maori* in you than *appears* in your *face*. Now pull yourself together, my lady, and behave yourself. If I come this way again and find you misbehaving I'll take down your pants and smack your bottom and send you back to the pa."

Huia can only come into representation as the pathologised 'out of control' Maori child or, the more desirable alternative, epitomised in the *good* Pakeha girl [Gilman, 1985]. If she is not good, like a Pakeha girl, her father's intention is to incarcerate her in pre-modernity along with her Maori grandfather and his waka. Like the dominant representations of Maori women's identity [deconstructed in this thesis] Huia lacks the agency to be her 'self'. For as soon as the bi/multi racial woman comes into representation via these two narratives, she is positioned without agency and lacks the resiliency to emancipate herself. Relegated to the landscape of a traditional Maori women's subjectivity [with all the cultural norms and regulations that seek to regulate and control her body] she is without agency to be positioned in *alternative* landscapes and cultural contexts. A traditional identity excludes the specificities of her multiple identities [Collins, 1999]. In terms of a pathologised identity, where is the agency in being yet another Maori women's statistic? For the bi/multi racial hybrid, these alternative subject positions deny her *her* experiential *differences* as female, Maori and Pakeha/Other. In short, the contemporary 'Maori nation' [the Maori 'half' of bicultural New Zealand], promotes itself as a traditional

homogeneous national community which has the responsibility to protect the needs of its disparate members by ensuring that iwi develop normatively/rationally through the conduit of the capitalist corporate economy. The newly reconfigured, upwardly mobile iwi/corporation conceals the fact that the discursive processes of colonialism have historically disenfranchised *all* Maori, including those not represented by their iwi [Te Whanau, 2001]. As I demonstrated with Jill's examples [Chapters Five and Six] her lack of whakapapa positions her as whanau-less and land-less [Awatere, 1984, Te Whanau, 2001]. How can the Crown speak to her ultimate sense of disenfranchisement, the absence of her ancestor's physical home/place of belonging? Where is *her*urupa whanau? Where do *her* dead sleep? When she needs the bones of her people to comfort her, where does she return to be held by them? What responsibility does the Crown have to Jill and Others like her [Te Whanau, 2001]. I return to Huia's story to further illustrate these dilemmas.

Huia is caught between her koro's desire of her [which is focused on her saving the Maori community/nation from extinction] evidenced in the ancient teachings he gives her, and her Pakeha Puppa's desire of her. A symbolic war is waged InSide her corporeal body as it shifts and changes landscapes to accommodate the needs of the emasculated paternal figureheads, symbolising pre colonial times epitomised in the dying koro/noble savage and his counterpart, the dying British patriarch [McDowell, 1997, 1999]. Neither can survive the new world that has intruded upon them and which has ended their respective 'glory days'. Hybrid-Huia is the Maori nation's only hope of surviving the ravages and changes of colonialism. She is the one whose spirit is being fed by the wise old Maori man; she is the *promise* that her people will return to Aotearoa through her reproductive potential [Anthias and Yuval-Davis, 1989]. Like Huia, my interviewees' stories have demonstrated that other bi/multi racial women also suffer from being positioned as interlocutors in 'bicultural' hot spots. Torn between loyalties to Maori and Pakeha communities, and the men and women who represent these communities, the hybrid gets burnt on the fringes of post modernity and neo colonialism.

White Women, Bi/Multi Racial Women, White Men

But, what is this? Huia's heart is tuned to her Pakeha grandfather. "... Her mind is full of Puppa and the touching image of him. Is he all right? she wonders [Ashton-Warner, 1966, 64]." She finds herself caught

between the white man and his wife. The ailing white patriarch is juxtaposed against the strong white woman. Ashton-Warner [1966: 75] writes:

> "Mumma, he's at the door," from the children diving under tables and beds. Not "Puppa, he's at the door"; in the final count it is she who is the protector as well as the breadwinner.

Huia's desire is to protect her emasculated grandfather from losing his power to his wife's strong, articulate, able bodied, highly reproductive, white, educated authority. She rushes to intervene, to disrupt the beating Puppa receives from his wife. A dichotomy is formed in this story between the prolific prowess of the white woman [she produces baby after baby thus creating the new colonial Pakeha national community] and the Maori woman who dies during her reproductive moment. Caught in-between these polarities stands Huia, full of reproductive potential, challenging the dominance of Flower's Mother [the Pakeha nation] to "stop" killing Puppa [former British dominance]. Huia presents as the *future*, a synthesis of Maori, British colonial and Pakeha history, an antithesis to the gendered and racial war that is being waged on the belly of Papatuanuku.

The white British man's metaphoric castration is laid at the feet of his Pakeha wife, the white woman. But, remember, his withering has been caused by the tohunga's makutu. His immobility/paralysis finds its origin in the curse he bears. His Pakeha wife's anger towards him is inflicted as a projection of her own sense of castration/lack of power. His body is immobilised, ugly, broken. The white Pakeha woman violently beats against his brokenness. She is angry; why does *she* have to be responsible for producing [giving birth] and reproducing [working, parenting, teaching, nurturing] the new nation of *his* white children? [Anthias and Yuval, Davis, 1989] Silently, he dreams about the day his mobility [agency] will return. But his children, the future nation, know *it* never will. His corporeal body, symbolic of his once proud British culture, can *never* be again. His aristocratic blood line cannot prosper in this new landscape. The decline of British nobility/authority is symbolised in his withered legs. In the landscape of Aotearoa, he lacks his own turangawaewae, a place where he can *stand* firm.

Huia functions as an interlocutor not only between brown and white peoples and landscapes, but also between white men and women [Mohanram, 1999]. The white woman has derision towards her, hatred and jealousy. It is Huia's responsibility to *be* [perform] the brown body, the

dirty body and the pathologised body upon which the white woman constructs her own sense of gender/identity [Butler, 1993]. Further, it is obvious that Huia is positioned to save Maori from the plight of colonialism/extinction. But what is less obvious is that she is also positioned as the one to save white men [the dying patriarchy] from white women who function as the female authority, the reconfigured dominant signifier. Somehow it is hybrid-Huia's brown/white corporeal presence that is needed to interrupt the violent conversations between white/Pakeha men and white/Pakeha women. It is her *body* that is needed to placate the tension between the power/authority of the white woman over the white man, and to simultaneously reflect the white man's *authority* over the white woman *and* brown Maori Others [Mohanram, 1999]. But, the white man is withered/emasculated and entirely dependent on the white woman for survival. The virility of the new colonial nation depends on the white woman's gendered performance of reproduction and domesticity that not only provides the nation with labour but also demarcates the boundaries between the public and private worlds of its citizens [Butler, 1993a, 1993b]. The colonial nation is crippled, illustrated in the f/ailing patriarch, Puppa. Maori have used the only resource left to them to retaliate against their colonialist perpetrators, makutu. It is up to Huia to bridge the gap, traverse the river, heal the divide, remove the makutu.

Huia's brown/Maori grandfather is portrayed as being stuck on the Other side ['That Side'] of the River, where he is incarcerated by his traditionalism, abject isolation, disenfranshisement in *his* withering culture. There is a sense that his corporeal being is trapped in the past along with his dying women/nation Tied to the flora and fauna of his traditional home/landscape, he is immobilised, fixed [Appadurai, 1984]. Similarly, on the Other side of the river [This Side] the white children [new colonial nation] are tied to their New Zealand rural landscape and cultural traditions. It is only Huia's body/waka that can vacillate between the two points of difference; it is only her mind, soul and wairua that belongs, breathes and is at home in these two different, contrasted worlds and landscapes, now related via the processes of colonialism [McDowell, 1997; 1999; Werbner, 1997].

Huia lacks a corporeal relationship with *living* Maori women. This is no accident. Rather, it is symbolic of the fact that the old Maori world is dead; the bones of its mothers lie deep in the soil of Papatuanuku. This mysterious absence is explained in Huia's future role to re-produce a new nation, a hybrid nation. This new nation must be able to contain the flaxen

essence of the traditional past, as well the new woollen fibre of the present. But who is this young patriarch Togi, showing his interest in and adoration of the young hybrid, Huia? Healthy and strong [virulent] he desires the small Huia. He protects Huia the baby, cares for her as a toddler, watches over her as a child, and is fascinated by her exotic beauty. Huia's newness/beauty is a metaphor for the new nation's evolution and potential development. She is watched over and coveted by many men; a f/ailing white patriarch, a dying koro and the future patriarchy symbolised in Togi. Eventually, it is Togi who will take over defining and redefining Huia to suit his/nation's desires [Chatterjee, 1993]. Her transformative abilities [cultural hybridity] are a source of desire for the white and brown patriarchs and act as a constant thread that binds them into commonality. Her body is the affinity they share, the focus of their desire, the necessity of their mutually exclusive future success [Butler, 1990].

InSide the Outside

Represented without recourse to agency, is Huia condemned to dance like a monkey to the tune of her brown/white patriarchal organ grinders? This phallocentric imagery conjures up her feminine vulnerability and her passive penetrate-ability. Yet is the female Maori hybrid merely a victim in her interpellators' desirous interplay of power or does she find a way to transport herself to another time and another place deep within her 'self'? This is the question I addressed in Chapter Eight where I argued that bi/multi racial women seek an *affinity* in the form of a narrative of wairuatanga which is resilience forming [Butler, 1990; hooks, 1997; Kohu, 1997; Tai, 1997; Pere, 1991]. Similarly, Hybrid Huia finds her answer in her regular sojourns back to the ancient [*timeless*] meeting house, now abandoned in the woods. It is a place that has known life and love. The 'meeting house' is the *place* that witnessed Huia's conception as the love between her Maori mother and Pakeha father found an affinity in each other and became joined in one spirit and one corporeal body. The result of this union was Huia, the hybrid. Ashton-Warner [1966: 31-2] highlights Huia's return to her roots in this example of her disappearance when she was a toddler:

> It was here in this deserted meeting house that Huia was conceived... As Togi makes his unerring way along the forgotten track, weaving like a tunnel through massive trunks overlaid with delicate creeper and between the frothing ground ferns, Flower and Sue trail him... he steps upon the veranda of this

> haunted place, lowers his head for the Maori door opening and penetrates the odorous gloom. And sure enough, just as in one of Puppa's stories, here they find Huia sleeping, tucked in a ball like a forest creature all but covered in hair. You can see little more beyond the hair than two bare feet. "Jus' like I think, ay?" as he picks the child up. "I think when I bring her here las' Sunday, now this kid she's going to come back here on her lonesome and got herself los' and have everybody flying about. An' now here she is. You come here on your lonesome Huia? Jus' what I think las' Sunday.."... Flower and Sue do not run to the carved panels of the ancestors on the walls with their eerie paua-shell eyes; the gloomy atmosphere terrifies them. They remain together, touching each other, surveying... all but brushing off physically the spirits of the ancestors crowding invisibly around them.

Huia, like other bi/multi racial females locates her corporeal-ness and spirituality within the construction of her own real [and metaphysical] turangawaewae. As I demonstrated in the previous chapter, this is achieved through a reworlding of themselves via their intimate, spiritual relationships with tupuna. In Huia's case, her whanau of origin are symbolised in the presence of her dead mother and her tupuna. In the absence of the nurturing Maori mother [Kaa], juxtaposed against the presence of the alienating white surrogate mother, her dying brown and white grandfathers, and the new patriarch Togi, Huia finds a place to rest and recuperate and a place to call home. Her discarded, forgotten and abandoned ancestral home provides refuge and shelter from the coming and going to her roots [hooks, 1990, 1997]. The meeting house is just that, it is the *space* where she stands face to face with her tupuna, her history, her future. It is a space away from her Maori and Pakeha colonial landscapes, away from the endless river crossings, away from colonial relationships fought with the gendered and racial interplay of power between the old and the new, between the brown/Maori and the white/Pakeha/Other, between women and men. This sacred [resilient] space is OutSide This Side and That Side. It is *InSide.* The meeting house is a private place, a silent place, but a space filled with the happy noises of her people as they re-member themselves to her, gather her up into their arms and whisper, "E kare, haere mai."

Conclusion: Embracing Maori Women's Hybridity

The problem with post modern conversations is that they work against a cosy universal truth, an unquestionable reality [Young, 1990]. Post modern articulations on Maori women's cultural hybridity can be uncomfortable, challenging and for some of us frightening in their instability, unfixity. It has been true of my efforts to theorise bi/multi racial

women's identity in Aotearoa. I have been openly challenged and criticised for expressing the need to theorise bi/multi racial Maori women's cultural difference. As soon as I enunciate the words *Maori* and *hybrid* in the same sentence I am bound to be met with suspicion, judgement and wero! Somehow, when I talk about bi/multi racial identity it seems as though I am perceived with the power to wave a magic wand that will instantly make the category 'Maori' invisible or, to be more precise, make the idea of a quintessential Maori *essence* invisible. There is a fear that in talking about 'individual' experiences of Maori women's cultural hybridity, I will usurp the mana of all Maori and, in particular, the mana of Maori women. There is a fear that the Maori community will be fractured/undone. Unfortunately, like Meridith [1999, 1999a, 1999b] the worst criticism of cultural hybridity that I have experienced has come from my own people. For example, I recall a presentation I gave to an academic audience. To my disappointment, a small group of Maori women talked and giggled throughout the address. During the discussion session, one of these women asked me where the Maori women were in my presentation. I responded courteously, saying, "You were late arriving and you were talking, so you missed the part where I spoke about *parallel narratives* of Maori women's identity". I am well aware that when Maori talk through a formal speech it is a form of resistance towards either the person or material being presented. The point I am trying to make is that, like my half-caste friend Meridith [1999, 1999a, 1999b] my efforts to talk about bi/multi Maori racial women's cultural hybridity are not always well received by Maori.

Why Not Cultural Hybridity?

It became clear during the 1980s that if Maori were to mobilise in the name of Maori sovereignty, in their quest for biculturalism, they needed numbers to substantiate their cause [Awatere, 1984; Mulgan, 1989; Walker, 1987, 1990]. However, not only was a show of Maori hands required [to be part of a Maori nationalist initiative to mobilise in this emancipatory effort] but the hand had to be attached to a particular ethnicity [Spoonley, 1993]. This 'traditional' ethnicity, I argue, required the commitment and allegiance of its members. One could not just *say* they were Maori, one had to have a *sense* of themselves as Maori and to *be* the Maori subject they had to *perform* as Maori [Spoonley, 1993]. Using this line of thought, the presence of the bi/multi racial becomes a threat to the

homogenous, albeit re-imagined Maori identity constructed out of Pakehas' desire for authentic natives. As mentioned in Chapter Three, anti-colonialist Maori borrowed the image of themselves as native/primordial from colonial Pakeha and reconfigured themselves and their sense of community through Pakehas' fantasy of Maori [Mohanram, 1999]. Maori emancipatory objectives have only been partially realised for some iwi while other iwi are just beginning to seek distributive justice from the Crown [Sharp, 1995]. With this in mind, there is a real fear that post modern/post colonial narratives will challenge the *temporal* advantage that Maori have achieved in strategically aligning themselves as unchanged over time, untouched by the discourses of assimilation, integration and colonialism.

In her material presence, the dual/multiple corporeality of the bi/multi racial woman denies the time lag which posits Maori as a discrete cultural group. Under these terms, she functions metaphorically as the bastard that has been fathered by the neighbour over the fence. Her existence testifies to the *intimate* border crossings that have existed since Maori and Pakeha first met. Worse still, the offending neighbour is white. The presence of whiteness in Maori corporeality functions paradoxically. I mentioned in Chapter Seven that the exotic/erotic white/brown body functions as a site of desire for Maori; it encapsulates within its *not quite brown* materiality the promise that Maori can someday be white [Fanon, 1967]. Desire for whiteness in this sense is not a literal corporeal whiteness [although for some it may be] but, rather, the desire is attached to the symbolic swipe card that white bodies carry which allows them better opportunities to seek the same advantages as the white/right Western subject [Moreton-Robinson, 2000]. However, whiteness is also hated and feared, in that it symbolically functions as the colonial perpetrator of Maori. This point was evidenced in Helena's story [Chapter] where she was mis-recognised by a male member of her whanau and beaten for being an interfering Pakeha colonialist. Rachael and Abbie's stories [Chapter Six] also showed how the promotion of Maori ethnicity in the education arena is creating an 'anti-Pakeha' attitude and a *learned helplessness* in some Maori girls. Therefore, the presence of a post colonial articulation of Maori women's identity presupposes that Maori have arrived in present time. Extending this, a contemporary post colonial articulation of subjectivity threatens the idea that Maori are still rooted to their past, confined to their native spaces and rooted to the places reserved for the Other. The bi/multi racial woman testifies to the fact that Maori women have been everywhere, are

everywhere and have participated in things unMaori [Bhabha, 1994a, 1994b].

The bi/multi racial woman functions as the uncanny [Freud, 1919]. By Sigmund Freud's [1919] definition, the *uncanny* is something that is produced as a 'shocking' psychological effect when the subject confronts something that is simultaneously familiar and feared. In her familiarity [her Maoriness] she metaphorically resembles 'home', a landscape that is recognised and loved. Further, her ability to move across cultures at will destabilises the idea of fixed cultural boundaries and spaces. Her diaspora means she has multiple homes/homes and, enroute, she is out of her place [McDowell, 1997, 1999]. Yet in her difference [Pakeha/Other racial/cultural identity] she is perceived as a threat, that which horrifies and invokes terror in both Maori and Pakeha. Thus terrorised, the observer has to deny the presence/reality of the bi/multi racial woman and push her from the mind in an effort to deny her existence. But she refuses to be fixed or located by the new patriarchal demands placed upon her corporeal person. If she is absent from her 'traditional' kitchen, who will take care of reproducing the Maori nation and enculturating future off-spring into taha Maori? Who will be metonymic of the marae/traditional landscape if she is out vacillating? Further, who will carry the wairua for Maori to fashion their traditional identities against?

What's in a Colour?

I revisit my bi/multi racial reconfiguration of Pere's [1991] model of 'Te Wheke' in order to make some final comments on the bi/multi racial woman. In Chapter Five I introduced the idea that multiple identities can be symbolised using Te Wheke, a holistic model of well-being defined by Pere [1991]. So far, I have concentrated on the multiplicity of cultural differences bi/multi racial women live with. At this point I would like to expand the bi/multi racial woman's plurality of identity by placing yet more Te Wheke next to *red* 'Maori Te Wheke', *blue* 'Bi/multi Racial Te Wheke' and *gold* 'Jewish Te Wheke'. I do so to promote further awareness of the critical issues that bi/multi racial women live with as multiply subjectivated peoples. Imagine that the bi/multi racial woman also identities as *lesbian* and this 'Lesbian Te Wheke' is symbolised in the colour *violet*, and imagine that this bi/multi racial woman also identifies as a lesbian *Cross-dresser* and this 'Cross-dresser Te Wheke' is symbolised by the colour *magenta*. Now there are two extra colours added to the equation. Further, imagine

she identifies as *feminist* and this is represented by the colour *orange*. And, to compliment our picture of diversity, imagine a 'Christian Te Wheke' coloured *silver*. Finally, add a *spotted pink* and *azure* coloured 'Asian Te Wheke' to the growing layers of identities/Te Wheke here gathered.

Now, imagine all the Te Wheke identities are placed one on top of the other; red, blue, gold, violet, magenta, orange, silver and spotted pink and azure. Imagine now that these magical Te Wheke are alive and pulsing in the life of the corporeally multi-coloured bi/multi racial woman. The interplay of colour created as their tentacles become discursively positioned in new and challenging social, political, economic and personal rotations makes the crossing and overlapping of colours quite exquisite. But if one looks closely, not all these colours when edged next to each other are complementary. For example, are the subject positions 'Te Wheke Maori' [red] and 'Te Wheke Cross-dresser' [magenta] compatible identities? Would these identities/colours be complimentary when merging/bleeding into the spotted-pink and azure 'Asian Te Wheke?'[Lee, 1997]. I suggest that some of these identities/colours will clash as they shoulder each other, touch, slip below and above and emerge again to become repositioned along new gendered, racial and cultural landscapes.

Having illustrated further that bi/multi racial women live with diverse [and not always complimentary] identities, new questions are formed. What are the specific forms of racism, sexism and discrimination that bi/multi racial women confront in the nation today? Are the issues that bi/multi racial Maori Indian women face the same as Maori Pakeha hybrid women? I think not. I was recently told a story about a young black skinned Maori Afro-American woman being pelted with rocks by a group of young Maori girls who thought her 'ugly' because her skin was *'black'* not 'brown' like the other Maori girls. I have also been told stories about Maori Asian women's racial discrimination from Pakeha/Other, Maori and Asian people, because they look different from Maori, Pakeha and Asian. The presence or absence of whiteness in these identity categories permits all kinds of insidious forms of racism to emerge which sit alongside other forms of discrimination, like sexism and homophobia. I suggest here that *all* New Zealand feminists [both Maori and Pakeha/Other] should pay attention to the diversity of differences masquerading themselves under the category 'Maori women'.

I have shown throughout this thesis that the bi/multi racial woman is positioned on the borderlands that permits both Pakeha and Maori traditionalists to construct their identities against her brown/white body of

difference. It is this border crossing that enables the hybrid to vacillate culturally and become located in new landscapes/spaces/places to effect emancipation for herself, her family, her community and others [McDowell, 1997, 1999]. I have just begun the task of discovering how Maori women identify themselves, imagine themselves and reconfigure themselves to accommodate the dual and multiple racial and cultural genealogies and cultural histories they live with. I have only just started to examine the racial tensions occurring in 'bicultural hotspots' which discriminate against bi/multi racial women who are located as inter-cultural mediators between iwi and Pakeha men as they form new alliances and developmental objectives. I have only just begun to understand that bi/multi racial women face new forms of patriarchal oppression emanating from the emergent relationships between the Crown, corporate entities and iwi. I invite New Zealand feminists, Maori experts, sociologists, anthropologists, social scientists, social workers, psychologists, educators, medical professionals, lawyers and Government departments to address the fact that Maori women's identity is not a simple thing and not easily polarised around a traditional, assimilated or 'pathologised identity' [Irwin, 1992].

Future research and professional undertakings on bi/multi racial Maori women must take into account the specificities of her corporeal difference/s, her cultural hybridity and the new and multifarious forms of discrimination that she is subjected to in the nation today. As Moreton-Robinson [2000] indicates, an examination of *whiteness* is central to this task. On the basis of the experiences of white bi/multi racial women who have been *mis-identified* as Pakeha, I extend this wero to suggest that an examination of whiteness within *Maori* communities is also required. Further, I suggest that a close examination of the place of whiteness within the New Zealand nation and its colonialist discursive trajectories [for example, the education system] must be undertaken to deconstruct the colonial authority invested in the unmarked, *disinterested* subject [Lloyd, 1991, Morton-Robinson]. At all times, researchers must be aware that even in the absence of the bi/multi racial woman's Maori cultural capital [markers of traditional Maoriness] such as te reo Maori, tikanga, whenua and whanau, she may still *identify* and even *define* herself as Maori. In the absence of an alternative identity narrative that can speak to her cultural hybridity, bi/multi racial women may invariably elect to be identified as 'Maori'. In the landscape of Aotearoa, the homespace of her people, she recognises and sustains herself through the relationships she has with her ancestors, finding refuge in the lands they watch over and the lands that

watch over her. She feels it in her bones; she feels it every time she identifies a significant landscape as *her* turangawaewae. She performs it every time she reaches out her hand to another human being to help them understand and manage *their* difference. Her sense of Maoriness is not diluted by the existence of her Other identities. Rather, they give her an internal referent against which she can constantly reaffirm her sense of Maoriness. *By her spirit she is Maori.*

In Maori tradition, I end this korero where I started, back at the beginning. In so doing, I deliberately invoke a spatial and temporal metaphor. My own identity discursively re/positioned, re/imagined, re/configured, finds its resonance in Huia's story. Born 'Teresa *Huia* Lyons', I retrospectively deconstruct my present identification as a 'multiply subjectivated' Maori Pakeha/Other woman. For me, the name 'Teresa' functions as the contemporary name/identity I was positioned with at birth, while 'Lyons', the name of my Pakeha/Irish father, represents his ancestry. 'Huia', the name chosen for me, symbolises a precious exotic and extinct bird, greatly prized by Maori. As an agent of my shifting subjectivity, I reconfigured my new 'self' by relinquishing the name 'Teresa', a name I associated with modernity symbolised in the popular culture of the 1960s. By extension, I forewent my paternal/patriarchal name 'Lyons' because its white dominance did not sit comfortably in my future trajectory as a female Maori hybrid. However, I retained the name 'Huia' which symbolises my turangawaewae, the continuity in my dual/multiple racial and cultural histories linking me to this land, this place, at All Time.

To tell this story in [slightly] other words, situated between the name 'Teresa' [emphasising my entry into modernity via my contemporary positioning as a first generation urban Maori/Pakeha] and Lyons [emphasising the colonial presence in my history and the fixity of this for my future] I retained the name 'Huia' [that which denies the legitimacy of modernity and the processes of colonialism]. Further, by formally reconstructing myself as 'Tess' [a derivative of Teresa] when I was ten years old, I took the pieces back from modernity that suited me and fashioned a tool to work for me in the present/future, a tool *and* an accessory embodied in the name 'Tess'. I then added to this configuration the names/voices of my Maori tupuna 'Moeke-Maxwell' that sit protectively [in post-colonial presence] after 'Huia' [continuity with the past] and beyond 'Tess' [entry into post-modernity]. The spirit of my tupuna' s presence comforts me and positions me in this nation in a familiar way, despite my Maori Pakeha/Other hybridity. I am at home *in* my tupuna and

they *in* me. My corporeal body carries the mark of their presence, connection and relationship to Papatuanuku and to *all* peoples who live here. Perhaps the bi/multi racial women in this thesis, and I, are not afterall so unlike Ihimaera [1998], Grace [1998] and the other contributors who *strategically* situate themselves as Maori in *Growing up Maori.*

Ko au te Mokopuna o Minaora raua ko Hori.
I am the grandchild of Minaora and Hori.

Aotearoa

This
land is joined
everywhere
Seamless
Papatuanuku is not
sutured, stitched
Dividing lines
just make her laugh
until her big
belly quivers
Her breasts shake

Her breath escapes
in one Long
White Cloud
Aotearoa
Her skin stretches
to fit everyone in
She laughs loudly
at the myth that
her Body is
dismembered

Split

Finally, I leave you with an anecdote told to me by a bi/multi racial woman which highlights the ambivalence of being positioned spatially in the nation as a gendered and raced Maori hybrid female. Maia describes her 'self' as having brown skin, black hair and brown eyes. She says that she looks like a 'typical Maori woman'. I offer her story to demonstrate that the agency of bi/multi racial Maori women is *alive* and *prospering* in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

One morning I was down in the bar, pottering around. The bar wasn't actually open. This place, it's a big building, one of those hotels that has thirty guest rooms and a lounge bar, a restaurant and a couple of smaller bars. Anyway, this sales rep waltzed in.

I was down behind the bar pottering around and I looked up at him and he said "Hi." And then he asked if he could see the proprietor or the manager.

I looked at him and said, "How can I help you?" Then he said, "I want to see the *manager*." And then I said, "Ye-epp, that's me." And then he said, "I want to see the *general* manager, not the bar manager*!*"

I said, "Ye-epp, well that's me too. What can I do to help you*?*" He must have thought I was the *bar* manager. [I just thought, "Oh, oh, this is going to be a bit of a doozy."]

And then he said again, "Can I see *your* manager?" So I said, "Yeah, well buddy, that's me too!"

Then he said, "Well, can I speak to the over-all manager?" So, I said "Ye-e-a-ah, uh, ha, that's *me* too. What can I do for you?"

And then he said, "Um, well is the proprietor or the owner around?" So I said, "Yep, we-e-ll that's *me* again."

He was like a blubbering idiot; he was going, "Oh, ah, um, ok, ah... you're the owner?" "Yeah," I said.

By then I was that pissed off, I just said to him, "Hold it. Stop right there. Whatever it is you're selling I'm not interested in buying!"

He looked at me and said, "Oh, but you have an account with us." [I bought about twenty grands' worth of products from this company every month. I didn't just have this business but about four others around the country as well. He must have been a new rep because he didn't know who I was.]

So, I said to him, "Look, I don't want to waste your time, and you've already wasted mine. And you've made a dick of yourself and embarrassed me. I told you six times it was me you were looking for. So, I suggest you get out of here right now and *go back* and get your boss to ring me. If she hasn't called me within the next hour I will take away what business I'm doing with you, and that goes for the other businesses I own as well!"

He must have gone straight back and told her because she rang about ten minutes later. I explained to her what had gone on. She was shocked, and apologised. I was one of her best customers. I never saw the rep again.

Appendix: A.

Introductory Letter and Participant Information

'Maori/Pakeha Women Talk About Their Dual Identity

Dear
This letter is to explain what the research project is about. You have been invited to be a participant in a research project which will provide valuable, experiential material needed to help me fulfil the requirement of my PhD (Doctoral of Philosophy). For the past ten years I have focused the majority of my academic work on Maori women's health issues and, in particular, Maori identity. I am very passionate about this project and your story greatly interests me. Thank you for giving this research your consideration. I realise that your time, energy and enthusiasm are very precious.

I am interested in gathering the stories from a number of New Zealand women who identify as having both Maori and Pakeha ancestry and who identify that they have a positive sense of living in both the Pakeha and Maori cultural worlds. I want to ask you about your experiences. I want to know what it is like for you, living in Aotearoa/New Zealand and having both Maori and Pakeha ancestry and a dual cultural identity.

At least twenty stories from women will be recorded during July and August 2000, from Wellington, Auckland, Hamilton, Tauranga and Rotorua and the South Island. I am selecting women from all walks of life. They come from a variety of backgrounds with various educational and employment histories. Some are mothers and some are grandmothers. Some are in relationships with men, some are on their own and some identify as lesbian. These women also have different economic backgrounds and have diverse interests politically, socially and personally.

Your stories will be audio-taped. These stories will be examined by identifying key themes which emerge. These stories will be read and theorised in the context of social and political understandings of Maori identity and representation using a variety of theories: post colonial theory, post modernist and feminist. Excerpts from the transcripts may be used in my thesis. I want to include some case studies about what it's like to be both Maori and Pakeha/Other and your material could be important.

Participation is voluntary. Please consider whether this is something that you would like to be a part of. I will contact you within two weeks to see whether you have made your mind up. Meanwhile, please feel free to contact me (see letter head for details) if you have any questions. Of course, you are free to withdraw and can either tell me this at your convenience or wait until I contact you. You are under no obligation to participate. You have the right to withdraw from the research at any stage prior to, during or after the interview. Your material will be returned to you or will be destroyed upon your written consent. You also have the right to erase any information that you do not wish to have included during the interview or afterwards. You do not have to answer all the questions.

Your interview involvement should take about two hours. This should also give us enough time to debrief or to simply have a cup of tea together. I would also like to contact you after the interview to see how you are and you should expect

correspondence from me within two weeks of being interviewed, informing you of the transcribing progress.

When the interview has been completed, the tape recording will be transcribed (typed out for easy reading) but, at your request, I can remove any identifying names or places. We can talk more about this at the interview. Remember that you have the right to ask for any information to be erased during the interview as well. I will not identify you in my thesis unless you specifically tell me to on the tape.

All information pertaining to you will be stored at the university in a locked room or at the office in my private dwelling. All material pertaining to the interview will be held until I finish my doctoral thesis. At this point your tape and transcript will be returned to you if you so wish or they will be destroyed.

The intent of this study is not to publish information, but to contribute to my PhD thesis. This material will not be published or given to any other person, agency or source, without your prior permission. This will need to be verified by a consent and release form if necessary, although I do not think there is any reason why this would occur. I expect to have the project finished in 2001.

I am bound to follow the ethical guidelines specified by the Education Studies Ethic Committee. I also have a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi and will observe appropriate cultural procedures and specificity when needed.

Please feel free to address any concerns, complaints or queries, or procedures. Or, you could contact my Chief Supervisor, if you would prefer - 07 8562 889 ex 8083. This research has the approval of the School of Education's Ethic Committee.

I would like to point out that this interview is based upon your participation and does not involve any physical risk to you or the researcher. However, in the event that some information may cause you some discomfort please tell me during the interview, or phone me on 07 544 3960 to see whether I could help you in some way.

I would like to thank you for participating in this project. Your story will make a valuable contribution towards understanding the complexities of Maori/Pakeha dual/multiple identity. I am hopeful that this material will enrich my doctoral thesis and provide an important comment on contemporary Maori women's identity.

Tess Moeke-Maxwell (Researcher)

Appendix B.

Consent Form - Participant's Copy

'Maori/Pakeha Women Talk About Their Dual/Multiple Cultural Identities'

Researcher: Tess Moeke-Maxwell

I have received and understood the information that the researcher Tess Moeke-Maxwell has sent to me. I agree that she has also verbally explained the interview/research process.

After considering the invitation to participate in this project, I accept knowing that it is voluntary research. I am aware that I can ask questions about the research at any time and I can pull out without any form of interrogation by the researcher.

I consent/do not consent to being audio tape recorded. I consent/do not consent to notes being taken. I have been informed that I can ask for information to be deleted as we go. I have also been informed that I have the authority to alter or delete any information from the transcript that may compromise me in any way. I can indicate these changes at any time during the project. I am confident that my requests will be honoured and that I have all the information necessary to help me make a decision to voluntarily participate in this project.

The researcher has highlighted the fact of confidentiality. I am aware that I can use a different name if I wish. I am also aware that any tape recordings, notes and transcripts pertaining to my interview are confidential. I have been told that I am able to edit my own transcript and remove any unwanted material or identifying features. The researcher has indicated that she will consult with me on any personal information that she may use in her thesis. I also understand that this material will not be made available for any purpose except that specified in this document.

My signature indicates that I consent to being part of this project and will therefore agree to any interview. I give the researcher permission to use the material generated by me, to help her understand Maori/Pakeha dual/multiple cultural identity, in order to complete her PhD thesis.

I am fully aware that I can indicate to the researcher if I have any concerns about the interview or the material. In the case of conflict between the researcher and myself, I am aware I can make a formal complaint to the Education Ethics Committee and the University of Waikato.

The interviewer is Tess Moeke-Maxwell.

Tess Moeke-Maxwell's Chief Supervisor is Professor Sue Middleton.

I am aware that I can contact these people at the address located at the top of this letter head.

Signed:_____(Participant)

Signed:_____(Researcher)

Appendix C.

Brief Interview Questions: An Interview Guide

'Maori/Pakeha Women Talk About Their Dual/Multiple Cultural Identities'

Researcher: Tess Moeke-Maxwell

Part One - Biographical Information
Would you please describe for me who you are?

Part Two - Reason for Consenting to Interview
Could you please tell me why you were interested in doing this interview?

Part Three - Landscape
Could you tell me what whanau land means to you?
Do you know where your whanau lands are?
Have you ever been to your whanau lands?
If yes, do you think you fitted in there? Why or why not?
How often do you visit and what are your visits for normally?
Could you tell me why you visited last time?
Could you tell me what you wore?
Did you play a particular role there?
Would you like to spend more time on whanau lands and Maori places?
Please explain why or why not.

If you don't know where your whanau lands are:
Could you describe how it feels not to know?
Have you ever imagined visiting your whanau lands? If so, can you tell me about this experience?
Have you ever been to other Maori lands or places? What was this like for you?
Did you feel like you fitted in there? Tell me about this?
Would you like to spend more time on Maori land- or in Maori places?
Please explain why or why not.

Both Groups:
Have you ever been aware of moving from a Maori environment to a Western/Pakeha one?
If you answered yes, could you tell me how you prepared yourself for this shift?
Could you tell me whether you were comfortable with moving in and out of Maori and Pakeha landscapes and places?
Could you explain what it is like for you being in a Maori environment?
Could you explain what it is like for your being in a Pakeha environment?
Do you feel more comfortable in one culture than the other? Why?
Do you deliberately wear different clothing or jewellery to go to Maori or Pakeha places?
If you answered 'yes' to these questions, could you describe why it is you do this?
How do you do this? Please give examples.

In your experience, when you are in a Maori setting or place, do people generally identify you as Maori or Pakeha or both? How does this make you feel?
If you are in a Pakeha environment, do people generally identify you as Maori or Pakeha or both? How does this make you feel?

Part Four - Cultural Capital

Language:
Can you speak te reo Maori? To what degree?
Do you have much knowledge of traditional Maori cultural values and practices?
Where did you learn this from?

Spiritual Beliefs:
Can you tell me about your spiritual beliefs (if you have any)?
Where did you learn them from?

Whanau Responsibilities:
Do you have any specific obligations within your whanau/hapu/iwi?
If the answer is yes, how did you get these responsibilities?

Physical Appearance:
Do you think you look Maori? Explain this.
Do you think other people think you look Maori? Explain this.
Do you think you look Pakeha? Explain this.
Do you think other people think you look Pakeha? Explain this.
If you had a choice and you could look either Maori or Pakeha, or you could wear clothing, jewellery and accessories to look Maori and Pakeha at different times, what would you choose and why?

Racism:
Have you ever experienced or witnessed racism?
Can you describe what happened?

Part Five: Anything Else?

Have you told me everything you would like me to know?
Is there anything else you would like to say?

Close and Thank Participants

Glossary Of Maori Words

Ao:	Light; world; day; dawn
Aotearoa:	New Zealand; "Land of the Long White Cloud"
Aroha:	Love; caring; concern; compassion
Atua:	Supreme being; God
E hine:	Form of approach to a girl/young woman
E kare:	Darling; loved one; term of endearment
Haere mai:	Welcome; come here
Hangi:	Earth oven; food cooked in earth oven
Hapu:	Sub-tribe
Hikoi:	Walk; land march
Hinengaro:	Mind; heart; conscience
Hui:	Gathering; meeting
Huia:	Extinct indigenous bird prized for its feathers
Iwi:	Tribe; extended family group; people
Kai awhina:	Nurturer; carer
Kai tiaki:	Guardian
Kapa haka:	Cultural group
Karakia:	Prayer; incantation
Karanga:	Formal call onto a marae by women
Kaumatua:	Tribal leader; respected elder
Kaupapa:	Rule; agenda; idea; topic; philosophy
Kina:	Sea urchin
Kingitanga:	Maori monarchy/king movement
Kiwi:	Indigenous flightless nocturnal bird; New Zealander
Koha:	Donation; gift
Kohanga reo:	Maori language pre-school centre; "language nest"
Korero:	Talk; speech
Koro:	Elderly man; grandfather
Korowai:	Cloak woven of natural fibres and feathers
Kotahitanga:	Consensus through unity
Kotiro:	Girl
Kuia:	Elderly woman; grandmother
Kura kaupapa:	Total immersion Maori language school
Makutu:	Supernatural power; black magic
Mana:	Prestige; influence; authority
Manaakitanga:	Kindness
Manuhiri:	Visitor
Marae:	Meeting ground; traditional infrastructure
Matekite:	Prophecy; seer; second sight
Mihimihi:	Formal speech
Mokai:	Servant
Mokopuna:	Grandchild
Ngati [Nga/Ngai]:	People of... (used with tribal names)
Pa:	Fortified village
Pakeha:	New Zealander of European/British ancestry
Papatuanuku:	Earth mother; the land
Paua:	New Zealand abalone
Pepi:	Baby

Po: Night; darkness
Puhi: Virgin
Rangatira: Chief/tan (male/female)
Rangatiratanga: Chiefly; self-government; tribal independence
Rangi: Sky
Rohe: Geographical area of belonging
Taha Maori: Maori culture; "the Maori side"
Taku: My
Tane: Man
Tangata whenua: Indigenous person/people; "people of the land"
Tangi: Weep; funeral
Tangihanga: Mourning; funeral process
Taniko: A woven design in flax fibre
Taonga: Property; treasure; artefact
Tapu: Sacred; spiritual ban; forbidden
Tauiwi: White colonial settler; foreigner; immigrant
Te reo Maori: The Maori language
Tikanga: Indigenous knowledge/ practice; traditional custom
Tinana: Body
Tino rangatiratanga: Total self-government; national independence
Tohunga: Priest
Tohunga makutu: Priest who uses supernatural power
Tupuna: Ancestor
Turangawaewae: Living place/homeplace; "place to stand"
Tuturu: Authentic; original
Urupa: Cemetery
Wahine: Woman
Waiata: Song; to sing
Wairua: Spirit
Wairuatanga: Spirituality; spiritual life force
Waka: Canoe
Wero: Challenge
Whakapapa: Ancestry; genealogical links
Whanau: Family; community
Whanaungatanga: Kinship systems/relationships; relative; kin
Whangai: Adopt; foster
Whare: House
Wharenui: Meeting house
Whenua: Land; placenta

Bibliography

Althusser, L. 1971. *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus.* In *Lewis and Philosophy and Other Essays.* London: New Left Books.

Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections of the Origin of Nationalism.* London: Verso.

Anthias, F. & Yuval-Davis, N. 1989. *Woman-Nation-State.* Yuval-Davis, N. and Anthias, F. Eds. London: Macmillan. pp. 1-17.

Anzaldua, G. 1987. *Borderlands/ La Frontera: The New Mestiza.* San Fransisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.

Appadurai, A. 1988. *Putting Hierarchy in its Place. Cultural Anthropology.* Vol. 3. No. 1. pp. 36-49.

Ashton-Warner, S. 1966. *Greenstone.* New York: Simon and Schuster Inc.

Awatere, D. 1984. *Alliances.* In *Broadsheet.* Auckland: Broadsheet Collective. pp. 34-35.

Awatere, D. 1984. *Maori Sovereignty.* Broadsheet. Auckland: Broadsheet Collective.

Ball, T. and Dagger, G. 1995. *Political Ideologies and the Democratic Ideal.* New York: Harper Collins.

Belich, J. 1986. *The New Zealand Land Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict.* Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Bhabha, H. 1990. The Third *Space: Interview with Homi Bhabha. In J Rutherford. Ed. Identity: Community, Culture, Difference.* London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Bhabha, H. 1994. *The Location of Culture.* London and New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. 1994a. *Of Mimicry and Man.* In *The Location of Culture.* London and New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. 1994b. *Signs Taken for Wonders: Questions of Ambivalence and Authority Under a Tree Outside Delhi, May 1817.* In *The Location of Culture.* London and New York: Routledge.

Binney, J. 1992. *Some Observations on the Status of Maori Women.* In *Women in History. Essays on Women in New Zealand.* Brookes, B. Et. al. Eds. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books. pp. 12-25.

Bishop, R. 1998. *Freeing Ourselves From Neo-Colonial Domination in Research: A MaoriAapproach To Creating Knowledge.* In *Qualitative Studies in Education,* 112. pp 225-231.

Bluck, J. 1998. *Long, White & Cloudy: In search of a Kiwi spirituality.* London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Distinctions: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste.* Nice, R. Trans. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Brodkin, K.2000. *Preface.* In *Talkin' up To The White Woman: Indigenous Women and Feminism.* Brisbane: Uni. of Queensland Press. pp. xi-xv.

Brookes, B. & Tennant, M. 1992. *Maori and Pakeha Women: Many Histories, Divergent Pasts?* In *Women in History. Essays on Women in New Zealand.* Brookes, B. et. al. Eds. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books. pp. 25-49.

Butler, J. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. 1993a. *Bodies that Matter. On the Discursive Limits of "Sex".* New York and London: Routledge.

Butler, J. 1993b. *Gender is Burning.* In *Bodies that Matter. On the Discursive Limits of "Sex".* New York and London: Routledge.

Chatterjee, P. 1989. *The Nationalist Resolution of the Women's Question.* In *Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History.* Sangari, K. and Vaid, S. Eds. New Delhi: Kali for Women.

Chatterjee, P. 1993. *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Chen, M. 1993. *Discrimination in New Zealand: A Personal Journey.* *VUWLR*, Vol. 23.

Christie, W. 1999. *New Zealand Education and Treatyism.* Auckland: Wyvern Press.

Collins, H. 1999. *Nga Tangata Awarua: The Joys and Pain of Being Both Maori and Pakeha.* In *National Oral history Association of New Zealand: Oral History in New Zealand.* Vol. 11. 1999. pp. 1-5.

Durie, M. 1993. *Maori and the State: Professional and Ethical Implications for a Bicultural Public Service.* In *Proceedings of the Public Service Senior Management Conference.* Wellington.

Elsmore, B. 1989. *Mana From Heaven: A Century of Maori Prophets in New Zealand.* Tauranga: Moana Press.

Elsmore, B. 1998. *Te Kohititanga Marama: New Moon, New World.* Auckland: Reed Books.

Fanon, F. 1967. *The Wretched of the Earth.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Fanon, F. 1967. *Black Skin, White Masks.* New York: Grove.

Foucault, M. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Sheridan, A. Trans. New York: Vintage Books. p 205.

Foucault, M. 1979. *Discipline and Punish.* New York: Basic Books.

Foucault, M. 1979. *The History of Sexuality. Volume One: An Introduction.* Hurley, R. Trans. London: Allen Lane.

Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-77.* Gordon, C. Trans. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foster, R. 1996. *The Bilingual Self. Duet in Two Voices.* In *Psychoanalytic Dialogues* 6 1 97-98. Symposium on Language and Psychoanalysis. Part 11.

Freud, S. 1919. *The Uncanny.* In *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud.* Vol. XVII. Reprinted 1962. London: The Hogarth Press Ltd.

Freud, S. 1927. *Fetishism.* In *Sexuality and the Psychology of Love.* Rieff, P. Trans. New York; Collier Books.

Frankenberg, R. 1997. *Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism.* Frankenberg, R. Ed. USA: Duke University Press.

Friedman, S. 1998. *"Routes/Roots": Boundaries, Borderlands, and Geopolitical Narratives of Identity.* In *Mappings: Feminism and the Cultural Geographies of Encounter.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press. pp. 151-179.

Friedman, S. 1998. *Mappings: Feminism and the Cultural Geographies of Encounter.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Fuss, D. 1989. *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature and Difference.* London: Routledge.

Fuss, D. 1992. In *Feminism and Psychoanalysis.* Wright, E. Ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. p.77.

Gibbins, R. and Youngman, L. 1996. *The Nature of Ideologies. In Mindscapes.* Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd. pp 1-30.

Gibbons, P. 1992. *The Oxford History of New Zealand.* Rice, G. Ed. Auckland: Oxford University Press. pp 308-337.

Gilman, S. 1985. *Difference and Pathology. Stereotypes of Sexuality, Race, and Madness.* New York: Cornell University Press.

Gilman, S. 1992. *Black Bodies, White Bodies: Toward an Iconography of Female Sexuality in Late Nineteenth-Century Art, Medicine and Literature.* In *'Race' Culture' & Difference.* SAGE Publications Ltd.

Grace, P. 1998. *Two Worlds.* In *Growing up Maori.* Ihimaera, W. Ed. Auckland: Tandem Press. pp 47-57.

Grosz, E. 1995. *Space, Time and Bodies. In Space, Time and Perversion.* London and New York: Routledge.

de Lauretis, T. 1984. *Alice Doesn't: Feminism, Semiotics, Cinema.* Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.

Hall, S. 1990. *Cultural Identity and Diaspora.* In *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference.* Rutherford, J. Ed. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hall, S. 1991. *The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity.* In *Culture, Globalization and the World-System.* Anthony, K. Ed. London: Macmillan.

Hall, S. 1997a. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices.* Hall, S. Ed. SAGE Publications Ltd. pp. 231-243.

Hall, S. 1997b. *Cultural Identity and Diaspora.* In *Undoing Place?* McDowell, L. Ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Haraway, D. 1988. *Situated Knowledges: The Science Question* in *Feminism. Feminist Studies. 14*, 3, pp. 573-99.

hooks, b. 1990. *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics.* Boston: Southend Press.

hooks, b. 1990a. *Homeplace: A Site Of Resistance.* In *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics.* Boston Massachusetts: South End Press. pp. 41-49.

hooks, b. 1997. *Representing Whiteness In The Black Imagination.* In *Displacing Whiteness.* Frankenberg, R. Ed. USA: Duke University Press. pp. 165-180.

hooks, b. 1997a. *Homespace: A Site of Resistance.* In *Undoing Place? A Geographical Reader.* McDowell, L. Ed. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. pp. 33-39.

Ihimaera, W. 1998. *Introduction.* In *Growing up Maori.* Ihimaera, W. Ed. Auckland: Tandem Press. pp. 11-16.

Irwin, K. 1992. *Towards Theories of Maori Feminism.* In *Feminist Voices. Women's Studies Texts for Aotearoa/New Zealand.* Rosemary Du Plessis Et. al. Auckland: Oxford University Press. pp 1-22.

Kearney, C. 1997. *Introduction.* In *Faces of the Goddess: New Zealand Women Talk About Their Spirituality.* Kearney, C. Ed. Birkenhead: Tandem Press. pp. 4-13.

Kelsey, J. 1984. *Legal Imperialism and the Colonization of Aotearoa.* In *Tauiwi: Racism and Ethnicity in New Zealand.* Spoonley, P. et. al. Eds. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press: pp. 15-44.

King, M. 1992. Ed. *Te Ao Hurihuri: Aspects of Maoritanga.* New Zealand: Reed Publishing Group.

Kohu, H. 1997. *Hinewirangi Kohu.* In *Faces of the Goddess: New Zealand Women Talk About Their Spirituality.* Kearney, C. Ed. Birkenhead: Tandem Press. pp. 38-61.

Larner, W. 1996. *Gender and Ethnicity: Theorising 'Difference' in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* In *Nga Patai: Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* Spoonley, P. Ed. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press. pp. 159-175.

Lee, W. 1997. *One Whiteness Veils Three Uglinesses: From Border-Crossing to a Womanist Interrogation of Gendered Colorism.* In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity.* Nakayama, T. and Martin, J. Eds. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications. pp. 279-298.

Lloyd, D. 1991. *Race Under Representation. OLR* Vol. 13.

Locke, J. 1980. *Second Treatise of Government.* Macpherson, C. (Ed.). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co.

McArdell, P. 1992. *Whanaupani.* In *Feminist Voices. Women's Studies Texts for Aotearoa/New Zealand* Rosemary Du Plessis Et. al. Auckland: Oxford University Press. pp. 74-91.

McDowell, L. 1997. In *Undoing Place? A Geographical Reader.* McDowell, L. Ed. London; New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

McDowell, L. 1999. *Gender, Identity and Place: Understanding Feminist Geographies.* Oxford: Polity Press and Blackwell Publisher Ltd.

McKinley, L. 1995. Maori Women in Educational Policy, 1960-91: A Discourse Analysis. In *Toi Wahine.*

Malkki, L. 1992. *National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territoralization of National Identity Among Scholars and Refugees.* In *Cultural Anthropology. Vol.* 7. No. 1. pp. 24-44.

Martin, J. et. al. 1999. *What do White People Want to be Called? A Study of Self-Labels for White Americans.* Nakayama, K. and Martin, J. Eds. In *Whiteness: The Communication of Social Identity.* SAGE publications.

Memmi, A. 1990. *The Colonizer and the Colonized.* London: Earthscan Publications.

Maxwell, A. 1991. *From Cannibalism to Biculturalism.* In *Arena* 96.

Melbourne, H. 1995. *Maori Sovereignty: The Maori Perspective.* Australia. Griffin Press.

Meridith, P 1999. *Hybridity in the Third Space: Rethinking Bi-Cultural Politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* In *He Pukenga Korero.* Ngahuru Autumn. Vol. 4. No. 2. pp 12-16.

Meridith, P. 1999a. *Don't You Like Kina Bey? Et, You're Not a Real Maori!* In *Tu Mai.* June, 1999. pp 4-6.

Meridith, P. 1999b. *Being 'Half-Caste': Cultural Schizo or Cultural Lubricant?* In *Tu Mai.* July, 1999. p 24.

Metge, J. 1967. *Kinship* in *The Maoris of New Zealand. Rautahi.* London: Rutledge & Paul, 1967. pp. 121-125.

Middleton, S. 1988. Ed. *Women and Education in Aotearoa.* Wellington: Allen and Unwin/Port Nicholson.

Middleton, S. 1993. *Educating Feminists: Life Histories and Pedagogy.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Middleton, S. 1996. *Doing Qualitative Research in the Mid-1990s: Issues, Contexts and Practicalities. Waikato Journal of Education*, 2. pp. 2-23.

Minogue, K. 1985. *Alien Powers: The Pure Theory of Ideology.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Mitchell, K. 1997. *Different Diasporas and the Hype of Hybridity.* In *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space.* Vol. 15. pp. 533-553.

Ministerial Advisory Committee 1986. *Puao-Te-Ata-Tu.* Report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare. Wellington.

Ministry of Women's Affairs 2001. *Maori Women: Mapping Inequalities & Pointing Ways Forward.* Wellington.

Mohanram, R. 1999. *The Memory of Place: Maori Nationalism and Feminism in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* In *Black Body: Women Colonialism and Space.* Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Mohanram, R. 1999. *Black Body: Women Colonialism and Space.* Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Moreton-Robinson, A. 2000. *Talkin' up To The White Woman: Indigenous Women and Feminism.* Australia: University of Queensland Press.

Morgan, A. 2000. *What is Narrative Therapy?* Adelaide: Dulwich Centre Publications.

Mulgan, R. 1989. *Maori Pakeha and Democracy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Neimeyer, R. 2001. *Meaning Reconstruction & the Experience of Loss.* Washington. DC: American Psychological Association.

O' Dowd, L. 1990. *Introduction.* In *The Colonizer and the Colonized.* London: Earthscan Publications. pp. 28-66.

Orange, C. 1987. *The Treaty of Waitangi.* Port Nicholson Press. Allen & Unwin.

Pearson, D. 1990. *A Dream Deferred: The Origins of Ethnic Conflict in New Zealand.* Wellington: Allen & Unwin. Port Nicholson Press.

Pearson, D. 1991. *Biculturalism and Multiculturalism in Comparative Perspective.* In *Nga Take: Ethnic Relations and Racism in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* Spoonley, P. Et. al. Eds. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press Ltd.

Pere, R. 1991. *Te Wheke: A Celebration of Infinite Wisdom.* Gisborne: Ao Ako Global Learning New Zealand Limited.

Pettman, J. 1992. *Living in the Margins.* Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

The New Zealand Department of Statistics. *New Zealand Census of Population Dwelling. Ethnicity Groups.* 2001. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand.

The New Zealand Department of Statistics. *New Zealand Census of Population and Dwellings. Maori.* 2001. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand.

Rangihau, J. 1992. *Being Maori.* In *Te Ao Hurihuri: Aspects of Maoritanga.* New Zealand: Reed Publishing Group. pp. 185-190.

Renan, E. 1990. *'What is a Nation?'* In *Nation and Narration.* Bhabha, H. Ed. New York and London: Routledge.

Ritchie, J. 1992. *Becoming Bicultural.* Wellington: Huia Publishers and Daphne Brasell Associate Press.

Sharp, A. 1990. *Justice and The Maori: Maori Claims in New Zealand Political Argument in the 1980s.* Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, K. 1986. *A Destiny Apart: New Zealander's Search for National Identity.* Wellington: Alan and Unwin: Port Nicholson Press.

Smith, L. 1992. *Maori Women: Discourses, Projects and Mana Wahine.* In *Women and Education in Aotearoa.* Middleton, S. and Jones, A. Eds. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books Limited.

Smith, L. 1998. *Decolonizing Methodologies*: Research and Indigenous Peoples. London & New York: Zed Books Ltd. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Sorrenson, M. 1986. *A History of Maori Representation in Parliament.* In *Report of the Royal Commission on the Electoral System: Towards a Better Democracy.* The New Zealand Royal Commission of the Electoral System. Government Printer. Wellington. Appendix B.

Spivak, G. 1988a. *Can the Subaltern Speak?.* In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture.* Nelson, C. & Grossberg, L. Eds. Illinios: University of Illinios Press. pp. 271-313.

Spivak, G. 1988b. *Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics.* New York: Routledge.

Spivak, G. 1992. *The Politics of Translation.* In *Destabalising Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates.* Barrett. M. & Phillips. A. Eds. Cambridge: A Polity Press. pp 177-200.

Spoonley, P. 1991. *A Response to Maori Sovereignty.* In *Nga Take: Ethnic Relations and Racism in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* Spoonley, P. Et. al. Eds. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press Ltd. pp. 154-171.

Spoonley, P. 1993. *Racism and Ethnicity.* Auckland: Oxford University Press. Auckland.

Tai, R. 1997. *Ruth Tai.* In *Faces of the Goddess: New Zealand Women Talk About Their Spirituality.* Kearney, C. Ed. Birkenhead: Tandem Press. pp. 77-96.

Te Awekotuku, N. 1978. *Whakaaro Noa Iho: Some Ideas For Maori Women.* Paper read at Piha Women's Congress, January, 1978.

Te Awekotuku, N. 1988. *He Whare Tangata: He Whare Kura? What's Happening to our Maori Girls?* In *Women and Education in Aotearoa.* Middleton, S. Ed. Wellington: Allen and Unwin/Port Nicholson Press. pp. 89-97.

Te Whanau O Waipareira 2001. *Te Whanau: A Celebration of Te Whanau O Waipareira.* New Zealand: Te Whanau O Waipareira.

Walker, A. 1983. *In Search Of Our Mothers' Gardens:* Womanist Prose. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. p. 291.

Walker, R. 1987. *Nga Tau Tohetohe: Years of Anger.* Auckland: Penguin Books.

Walker 1990. *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End.* Auckland: Penguin Books.

Werbner, P. 1997. *Essentialising Essentialism, Essentialising Silence: Ambivalence and Multiplicity in the Constructions of Racisms and Ethnicity.* In *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism.* Werbner, P & Modood, T. Eds. London and New Jersey: Zed Books. pp. 226-257.

Wetherell, M. & Potter, J. 1992. *Mapping the Language of Racism: Discourse and the Legitimation of Exploitation.* Columbia University Press.

Williams, P. 1997. *Seeing a Colour-Blind Future: The Paradox of Race. London*: Virago Press.

Wright, E. Ed. 1992. *Feminism and Psychoanalysis: A Critical Dictionary.* Oxford: United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishers.

Yeatman, A. 1991. *Postmodernism and the Politics of Representation. Olive Pink Society Bulletin.* Vol. 22. pp. 14-19.

Yeatman, A. 1995. *Interlocking Oppressions.* In *Transitions: New Australian Feminisms.* Caine, B & Pringle, R. Eds. NSW: Allen & Unwin. pp. 42-56.

Young, I. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference.* United Kingdom: Princeton University Press.

Young, R. 1995. *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West.* London: Routledge.