Chapter 4
Space for Maori

Introduction

This chapter is an exploration of spatial ideas that can be seen as derived from ‘Maori’ world-views. The spatial discourses that have been traced in Chapter three have shown some indication of the expansiveness of the topic in western academic views. Within world-views of Maori, understandings of spatial ideas would also be expansive. Therefore, this chapter aims to track some spatial ideas or spatial constructions that we, as Maori, may use to explain our position within education today. This is a problematic exercise firstly because there is no one definition of ‘Maori’ and no one worldview for all Maori. There are areas of contestation regarding what is ‘traditional’ and what is ‘contemporary’ or what is ‘tuturu’ and what is ‘adapted’. These areas are unresolvable and concerning some knowledges such as with kawa, unable to be discussed or argued appropriately or adequately in languages other than Maori. To show these problematics in more detail, this chapter begins with a brief discussion of some aspects of Maori identity and then with the restrictions in mind, the discussion of space will then go forward in the English language.

Maori Identified

Historically, the term ‘Maori’ was used by the tangata whenua of Aotearoa/ New Zealand to mean a human being or a person. The tangata whenua of pre-contact time did not use the term ‘Maori’ in identifying themselves, rather they identified themselves as being part of iwi and hapu groupings. Perhaps then, for the time zone of pre-contact society, we could understand ‘being Maori’ as a given or a common assumption amongst tangata whenua. The word took on a different dimension when ‘Maori’ became part of the vocabulary of colonisation. The Europeans who came to New Zealand used the word ‘Maori’ as a name for all tangata whenua, although initially, tangata whenua were referred to as ‘natives’. Regarding the word as an
official name, the English crown signed it into history in the Treaty of Waitangi. The
period of colonisation leading up to the present day has seen ‘Maori’ constructed as an
identity in a variety of ways. Some of these constructions have originated from Maori
ourselves and some have originated from the colonisers. So we find ourselves today
with a vast array of understandings and assumptions of what ‘Maori’ is.

The term ‘Maori’ has been problematic for Maori. John Rangihau pointed out that the
use of the term ‘Maori’ as a label for all tangata whenua has been a means of
homogenising tangata whenua and subordinating hapu and iwi identity.

I can’t go round saying because I’m a Maori that Maoritanga means
this and all Maoris have to follow me. That’s a lot of hooey. I have
a faint suspicion that Maori is a term coined by the Pakeha to bring
tribes together. Because if you can not divide and rule, then for
tribal people all you can do is unite and rule. Because then they lose
everything by losing their own tribal histories and traditions that
give them identity.¹

The potential for denial of iwi identity can be matched by the use of a band of
common assumptions to deny indigenous identity altogether. Some common
characteristics that are used to attribute and deny Maori people an indigenous identity
are characteristics such as knowledge of the Maori language, kawa/tikanga,
whakapapa; a person’s political beliefs; and superficial aspects such as a person’s
name and a person’s physical features. Many Maori people are not able to fluently
speak the Maori language as a result of assimilatory education policies set in place
from the nineteenth century that forbade the speaking of the language in schools.
Some Maori may have little or no knowledge of their iwi affiliations, whakapapa, or
kawa/tikanga. There are many reasons why this may be the case such as dislocation
caused by the urban migration; adoption policies which allowed for inter-racial
adoption; or because of active discrimination which has caused people to mask or
disown a Maori identity. Maori people cover a full spectrum with our political views;
from those who believe that Maori should not have any rights which are different from
other New Zealand citizens to those who would never recognise themselves as being a

citizen of New Zealand. Some Maori physically resemble Pakeha ancestors, for example, with blond hair, blue eyes and white skin, and many Maori have English language names. The presence or absence of these characteristics are used by people who may be tauiwi or indigenous, to identify a Maori person, sometimes even a 'real' Maori person.

Governmental institutions and agencies continually define and redefine Maori. Initially, self-identification may be sought and then that identification is shaped, for example through questions in such instruments as the census. In the last census (1991), the government asked for those who identify as Maori to hierarchically categorise tribal affiliations in order of major to minor affiliation. This is hardly a common practice for Maori where, in general, tribal connections are not rated on a scale. There were no given criteria for judging the major to minor measure and no reasons given for asking the question. This positivistic approach of measuring affiliation may serve some unnamed governmental purposes, but is a relatively useless and antagonising activity for Maori. As Cherryl Smith noted "This is not a small issue because the mana of ones ancestry is at stake."²

An example of the importance of identity can be seen in tribal organisations. Maori Trust Boards have been in existence since early this century. These organisations were formed ostensibly to manage land resources of a collectivity of owners within tribal groups or as a tribal group. Maori who are owners within these trusts are termed beneficiaries. To become a beneficiary, a person has to be able to show whakapapa as evidence of belonging to the particular grouping involved or inherit ownership and beneficiary status through family conferral. With recent events, whereby the Waitangi Commission has heard grievances and the government has addressed grievances with compensation, the beneficiary status has become a means of disseminating benefits from compensation. However, in some instances where compensation has been proposed for all Maori, Maori who do not have beneficiary status have been excluded from direct benefit. This has been the case in the fisheries settlement where the Treaty

of Waitangi Fisheries commission has been unable to construct an acceptable model for disbursing benefits to Maori who are not beneficiaries of trust boards³.

As well as instruments of the Crown defining and redefining ‘Maori’ as a group of people, the media is also heavily engaged in re-presenting Maori. Often media representation relies on Maori stereotypes thus restricting Maori identity. Generally, the stereotypes cast Maori as the often bothersome ‘other’ in a dominant/subordinate relationship. For example, Maori claims for compensation are often represented not as claims of real grievance but as Maori causing trouble again. Justification and notions of justice and fairness are often bypassed for a sensational story that intimates Maori are gaining unfair advantages. In effect, Maori stepping out of the status quo is represented negatively. Often, Maori are pictured in the newspaper within a cultural iconography. For example, Maori men are pictured poking their tongues out in puukana whether the report is about ceremonial cultural activity or not. This image of the warrior fulfills a stereotype of the unpredictable, perhaps dangerous other and even plays to the racist nineteenth century views of the savage native.

Despite the problematic nature of the term for those of us who have been and are labelled as Maori, the label has endured and is now part of common usage. This section has only touched briefly on some parts of what is a huge topic area. It has touched on identifying Maori structurally in terms of legislation, institutionally in terms of bureaucracy and socially in terms of the media and our everyday lives. It has done this to show that the remainder of this chapter may reflect the truth of some people who identify as Maori rather than all who identify as Maori.

**Cultural Historical Concepts of Space**

The remainder of this chapter offers some suggestions as to ways in which people that identify as Maori may construct space. This particular section, titled ‘cultural historical concepts of space’, seeks to connect with concepts which are derived from iwi

knowledges which have evolved over time. It acknowledges that 'Maori' is a problematic term which attempts to homogenise iwi and that the identity of Maori has been constructed in a variety of ways by hegemonic forces, as has been discussed in the previous section.

The label 'cultural historical' is an attempt to avoid using the terms 'tradition' and 'traditional' because these terms often carry an assumption of stasis. In relation to Maori, this assumption leads to the notion that traditional Maori cultural ways existed only in a time prior to contact with Europeans. The logic of this assumption further implies that Maori traditions from the point of contact have been influenced and eroded by western culture to the extent where nothing traditionally Maori can exist any longer. In contrast, in this thesis, a cultural historical label assumes culture has a dynamic nature; dynamic being that people can maintain and apply cultural ways and understandings to changing conditions over time such as the conditions caused by colonisation. It assumes therefore that Maori cultural understandings prior to contact with Europeans have been transmitted through the generations of Maori in spite of the forces of colonisation.

There is a myriad of ways in which space for Maori maybe constructed in a cultural historical sense. Some obvious ways are through the existence of marae, urupa, fishing grounds and so on. These are physical aspects of space in a Maori world, however, their significance is not only physical and the phenomenon of whakapapa is largely responsible for this. Whakapapa links Maori as descendants of Papatuanuku and Ranginui and records an intimate link for Maori with the earth and the physical world. We can be linked through whakapapa in the varying relationships of whanau, hapu, and iwi, to the landscape of tribal areas specifically to mountains, rivers, lakes and sea. Whakapapa also means that a person's ancestors populate space through historical time and present time. Historically, places have been named by ancestors and named after them. The stories of ancestors and places they are associated with are recalled in thought, at hui and in conversation. In the present, the relation of belonging in terms of whanau, hapu, and iwi connects individuals with those who also belong to those
same lines of whakapapa. From such a position, we can find many living descendants with whom we share space. However, whakapapa gives us more than stories and connection with others, as Mereana Taki describes

Whakapapa as a body of knowledge also articulates a politics of identity within the iwi world, as it marks out iwi and hapu territories and contestation, political conflicts and alliances or basic knowledge of kin based relationships of power.\(^5\)

Pat Hohepa provides examples of the space for Māori in the following quote. He notes how whakapapa affects how he views landscape.

Our whole view of space is nurtured and coloured by the way we are brought up to view that space. In your own communities, the spaces differ, you know where your tapu areas are, where your marae is, your burial places, the areas where you traditionally launched your canoes, the areas where the afterbirth is buried or put into trees. If I drive anywhere around the country, my feelings about an area depend on what has happened in that area…. When I go to Rotorua, my feelings for Hongi’s Track are guided because I’m Ngapuhi. Whenever I go there I have to stop and put green leaves by the tree at Hinehopu. I think of the damage that Hongi has done. Everytime I see Putauaki, Mt Edgecumbe, to me its not a mountain covered in a pine that is being fought over. This side of the mountain belongs to Pu and the other parts of the mountains are shared with Tuwharetoa and Te Arawa. There are areas where there have been battles and I can recognise pa sites. All that is important to me rather than ‘that is a neat little farm’ or ‘the hedge needs cutting’.\(^6\)

The living and those now dead therefore populate our physical world, they are a record of our history and they give us a place in our world by a politics of identity.

As well as our spaces carrying social significance in terms of our history and our connections or kinship relationships with others, space for Maori is constructed with what may be considered an obligation or special responsibility. Some Maori call ourselves tangata whenua that literally translates as people of the land. Identifying

\(^4\) Recorded at the beginning of Chapter Two
ourselves with the land as tangata whenua can occur through our whakapapa specifically Papatuanuku and Ranginui (as was noted above) and whakapapa specifically at the hapu and iwi level can identify us with particular lands and waters. Some of the ideas and values encapsulated in the term tangata whenua, involve an understanding of belonging to the land in a physical sense and in a spiritual sense. Firstly, there is a physical belonging because Papatuanuku is the mother who generated human life and still sustains it. Secondly, there is a spiritual belonging because Papatuanuku is the mother of gods and also the home of gods in Maori cosmology. The sense of belonging brings with it a special responsibility for caring for the land and waters, sometimes known as kaitiakitanga. Kaitiakitanga can be witnessed in rahui which are placed over certain areas, for example, to ban the collection of shellfish while numbers regenerate or if someone has recently drowned in the sea in that area. In recent times, it can also be witnessed in some claims that have gone before the Waitangi tribunal, for example the Kaituna river claim\(^7\) to stop pollution of the river. Kaitiakitanga is not a burden in any way, instead it is part of the holistic cycle of life which sustains the natural world we depend on.

The aspects of cultural historical space including the physical world, history, whakapapa and kaitiakitanga, which have been outlined above, give an indication of how Maori have constructed and still do construct space. Space is inseparable from the social world of Maori or basically, space is inseparable from a cultural historical Maori world-view. This world-view constructs space with a certain order and within that order there are rules and values.

**Contemporary Forms of Space For Maori**

Contemporary understandings of space for Maori would be as varied and various as the people we are. Some understandings may be informed by cultural historical concepts and others may be grounded in the material world of late capitalism. Between these two world-views are a vast range of combinations of these ideas.

\(^6\) Pat Hohepa (1996) Personal Communication  
\(^7\) Wai 4, Kaituna River (Te Arawa) November 1984
Further, some people’s understandings may be relatively fixed and others continually evolving. For some Maori people, there may be a conflict or an uneasy relationship between what is understood as the western world and the presence of what seems a distinctly Maori world. Others may negotiate the two world-views with relatively little personal conflict and may in fact conceive that they live within one world-view. Some may find that pursuing further understanding of this relationship is an emancipatory process that reveals and disintegrates limits we place on ourselves or that others place on us.

The capitalist world has been responsible for colonisation and the subsequent near destruction of Maori people and culture. Capitalism and colonisation is responsible for viewing land in Aotearoa as a commodity and it is responsible for the division, selling and seizure of Maori lands. It is also responsible for breaking communal possession of land. The dispossession and alienation of Maori people from land, along with education policies and religion, has contributed to the majority of Maori becoming working class citizens in the capitalist machine. Overall, capitalism fundamentally changed pre-contact Maori society. The emphasis was on individualism rather than communalism and the change from a self-sufficient lifestyle to one largely alienated from the means of production.

Materially, in the 1990’s, the world of late capitalism has played a large role in the lives of Maori in Aotearoa. For some, this role is pervasive in how space for Maori is viewed. In the following quote from the 1970’s Manuhuia Bennett sees capitalistic dominance as replacing Maori cultural historical space or ‘neutralising’ it.

...the life of the modern Maori is now worked out in his (sic) bedroom, in his kitchen, at the hotel bar, in and around the motorcar, and in the streets where his children play. The marae is rapidly becoming symbolic of another time and place. More and more it is becoming a neutral thing for the modern Maori. But the man’s home, the man’s car, the man’s TV set, the man’s small family - these are far from neutral. Therefore, one of the duties that lie before planners is to recognise that the modern Maori will find his objectives and understanding of his purpose in these
non-neutral things. They will often be more real than what takes place on
the marae or on his tribal land.\footnote{Manuhuia Bennett, (1979) \textit{He Matapuna}, N.Z. Planning Council, Wellington}

Bennett, at this time, relegated Maori cultural historical space to the ‘un-modern’ and
by his comment of ‘another time and place’, he even relegated it to being alien or
foreign. The year this comment was printed, 1979, was prior to the advent of many
initiatives for Maori such as Kohanga Reo and the widespread resurgence of
commitment to te reo and tikanga Maori that that inspired. It was also prior to the
Waitangi Tribunal and the government addressing long held Maori grievances.
Needless to say, it was also prior to sexist language being seriously considered
inappropriate in published text. However, though the words are dated and Aotearoa
has changed markedly for Maori in the twenty years since this piece was written, the
commentary is valid as a view of Maori within a capitalist context. The car, the street
and the home are hugely important in the lives of most Maori as are our workplaces if
we are in paid employment. Probably for a large majority of us considering that most
Maori live in urban centres, the material spaces of the capitalist world would be seen
to dominate our lives rather than any Maori cultural historical material spaces, if we
were to measure the physical use of these spaces in some positivistic way.

However, consideration of capitalist material space is only one aspect of
contemporary understandings of space for Maori. As noted above, some
understandings are informed by cultural historical concepts. The quote from Pat
Hohepa in the previous section gives an example of how Maori in contemporary
society can be raised from childhood to view the physical world as a product of a
distinctly Maori world-view. Within this world-view, sites such as marae or old
battlegrounds are not neutral or ‘becoming neutral’, instead they are representative of
a dynamic political and social life. The cultural historical Maori world view is being
further kept alive in formalised schooling structures such as Kohanga Reo, Kura
Kaupapa Maori, Kura Tuarua and Whare Wananga which offer alternatives, based on

\footnote{Manuhuia Bennett, (1979) \textit{He Matapuna}, N.Z. Planning Council, Wellington}
a philosophy of self-determination or rangatiratanga\(^9\), to dominant culture schooling. Rangatiratanga assumes and promotes the Maori world-view as a 'natural' and 'normal' perspective. From this position, the cultural historical Maori world offers completely valid, in fact, integral topics of study. Examples of such topics are: te reo Maori, waiata, cosmology, whakapapa, history and whaikorero. The schooling structures mentioned above also intend to follow pedagogical and assessment procedures that are appropriate in a Maori world-view\(^10\).

As noted at the beginning of this section then, contemporary Maori understandings of space can range between those that are informed by the capitalist colonised world and those that are informed by a Maori cultural historical perspective. There may also be other influences that factor on this continuum such as religious beliefs or cultures other than secular western culture and historical Maori culture. However, such influences are not being considered in this discussion.

**Space in Tertiary Educational Institutions for Maori**

Many initiatives in education undertaken by Maori practitioners, from the flax roots to the ivory towers, over the last ten to fifteen years have been philosophically driven by the concept of rangatiratanga whereby Maori have control over or make the decisions for education for Maori. These initiatives in education are part of a wider movement pushing for rangatiratanga in many aspects of our lives in order to improve life chances, life choices and to retain Maori cultural heritages. Though the last ten to fifteen years have seen changes for Maori driven by the philosophy of rangatiratanga, this is not a new paradigm for involvement. Maori have been struggling to regain rangatiratanga almost since the beginning of colonisation\(^11\). Educational initiatives driven by rangatiratanga constitute what is considered in this thesis as space for Maori in education.

---

\(^9\) Rangatiratanga is also sometimes translated as self-determination for Maori or Maori creating our own destiny. The authority of tino rangatiratanga was guaranteed in Te Tiriti O Waitangi in article two over all aspects of Maori taonga as well as over possessions including land, forests, and fisheries.

\(^10\) Discussion of Maori schooling structures is extended in the sections following.

In the tertiary education sector, recent changes in economic policy driven by ‘new right’ agendas, have brought significant changes. The user pays principle of the new right has caused the introduction of substantial fees for tertiary courses and the student loan scheme for students to finance themselves through their study years. The environment has also been deregulated to allow a variety of organisations to set up as education and training providers thus encouraging a competitive market. However, deregulation has come with strings attached to the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) which is continually attempting to standardise and regulate tertiary courses that may be offered for a qualification.

In this environment, iwi and Maori organisations, which may be considered the ‘flax roots’, have set up educational institutions at a tertiary level. Mead\textsuperscript{12} labels these as self-determination models. Te Whare Wananga o Raukawa in Otaki has been operating as a tribal university since 1981, however, since deregulation, it has competed successfully for central government funding and its diplomas and degrees are now accredited by NZQA. In 1992, Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi was set up in Whakatane. It has close links with Ngati Awa and like Te Whare Wananga o Raukawa, it also offers diplomas and degrees. A third wananga is Te Wananga o Aotearoa that was an initiative of Ngati Maniapoto and offers certificate and diploma programmes. As well as these three ‘wananga’, iwi and Maori organisations have established a number of private training establishments which have been accredited by NZQA to offer certificate and diploma programmes.

However, the focus of this thesis is the ‘ivory tower’ model of tertiary education - the large university-type provider of the European, specifically British tradition which may be labelled a ‘western traditional’ institution and sometimes labelled ‘mainstream’.\textsuperscript{13} Within these institutions, Maori have worked to ‘create space’ for Maori. Examples of creating space include: the courses offered; the establishment of support structures for Maori students; the appointment of Maori staff; and the establishment of physical


\textsuperscript{13} The mainstream label reveals central and periphery notions or a dominant subordinate power relationship.
spaces where Maori can gather. The diversity of manifestations of what represents 'creating space' for Maori is unified by the intention of making Maori people, ideas, knowledge and culture the main focus of these spaces. This intention can also be seen as a regaining of rangatiratanga.

Western traditional tertiary institutions as a manifestation of the authority and power of the dominant culture, mean that creating space for Maori in these institutions involves struggle in various areas - from the administrative to the physical to the ideological to the theoretical. Linda Smith\(^{14}\) notes that in tertiary institutions, as in many other sites, Maori work in marginal spaces which are constantly struggled over. The struggles over spaces may be seen as struggles for the right to create spaces for Maori worldviews and thus Maori existence. Linda Smith notes that in these struggles Maori face firstly the institutions' denial of the existence of Maori. This attitude occurs when the institution views all people as the same, for example, all part of the group who the university was set up for - white, male, middle class. She also notes that once there is some form of acceptance of the fact that Maori exist then there will be active competition in world view because the existence of another world view questions the existence of the dominant view.

Cherryl Smith, drawing on Ashis Nandy (1983), notes that a hegemonic turn to this competition is played out at universities.

Maori academics struggle to articulate space but legitimacy is often only given when a Pakeha has named the process or realised the same idea.\(^{15}\)

The space referred to is particularly the area of theory. Smith observes that Pakeha academics sometimes claim that opposition to dominant discourses through theoretical analysis is the work of academia. Such a claim can be seen to co-opt theory which seems to belong or be derived from a minority group. Academia can be seen to legitimate Maori theorising according to a dominant culture perspective. An academic

process such as refereeing a paper is a general example of legitimisation. In terms of creating space for Maori in tertiary institutions then, dominant culture legitimisation can be seen in the acceptance of the theory justifying the creation of space.

Initiatives for Maori by Maori then, are often only what is ‘allowed’ by a sanctioning body of the dominant culture. Maori engaged in creating space have needed to take the gaining of legitimisation into consideration as one of the tasks or struggles. Smith\(^\text{16}\) notes that what has been ‘allowed’ has been expanded over the years by Maori students and staff whom have ‘written back’ to the dominant culture. ‘Writing back’ as a strategy to create space involves continually writing the justification for initiatives using the tools of the dominant culture, which is often theoretical, to obtain legitimisation. Linda Smith has further described this task and the associated struggle, with regard to knowledge taught,

With the exception of Maori Studies Departments, most Maori academics work in departments as the ‘minority’ voice. Many are employed because they are Maori, but are expected to teach Maori perspectives on topics that continue to reflect the theoretical interests of Pakeha. Reprioritising and ‘bringing to the centre’ topics which may interest Maori represents the ‘special battleground’ mentioned by Fanon. In present-day terms this battleground is spatial. It is about theoretical spaces, pedagogical spaces, and structural spaces. It is also about culture, history and power, about making sense of, transforming, struggling against, the institutions within which we work.\(^\text{17}\)

Legitimisation from the dominant culture is not a straightforward process. Sometimes what may seem to be a Maori ‘voice’ is what has been legitimised by dominant culture interests and it is more beneficial to dominant culture interests rather than Maori interests.

In brief then, space for Maori in western traditional tertiary institutions is created in many different areas from the theoretical to the physical and structural. Since these

\(^\text{15}\) Cherryl Smith, \textit{op. cit.}, p15
\(^\text{16}\) \textit{Idem.}
institutions are part of the dominant power base of society, creating space for Maori as a minority voice and subordinate power group in society is a struggle. Part of this struggle requires Maori to ‘write back’ so that initiatives that will create space for Maori will gain legitimacy from the dominant culture hierarchy. ‘Writing back’ is credited with expanding what has been ‘allowed’ by the dominant powers in institutions. However, Maori need to be aware that sometimes, what is ‘allowed’ serves the interests of the dominant culture rather than the interests of Maori.

**Kaupapa Maori Theory - Theoretical Space for Maori**

This section looks more closely at Kaupapa Maori theory and its use for Maori in a western traditional tertiary institution. Kaupapa Maori theory, in many ways, originates from pre-colonial contact. However, the articulation of Kaupapa Maori theory as a theoretical development and a tool may be located in the 1980’s. It was developed from an interface of western critical theories, Maori philosophies and the praxis of education, especially in the models of Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori. As such, the theory incorporates Maori cultural historical space and contemporary forms of space for Maori and it places these within an educational environment that assumes Maori as the norm. In some tertiary institutions, Kaupapa Maori theory is the basis of Maori creating space for Maori. Mead elaborates

> The challenge of the Kaupapa Maori project has been to assume that every space of resistance in education is worth struggling over. This includes the ‘academy’ as an institution and disciplines of knowledge privileged within it..."^{18}

To understand this challenge fully one needs to understand the historical context^{19} and also have an understanding of Kaupapa Maori theory. An outline of the historical context is provided in Chapter Two and the following text elaborates further on the theory. The well used term ‘kaupapa Maori’ belongs to all Maori and is part of Maori epistemology. Graham Smith states that

---

^{18} Ibid, p16
Kaupapa Maori can be defined in general terms as the ‘philosophy and practice of being Maori.’ It is a common sense taken for granted assumption. In this respect ‘being Maori’ has a valid and legitimate social, political, historical, philosophical, intellectual and cultural authenticity.²⁰

However, though Kaupapa Maori theory draws on the ideas above it has several specific elements. Firstly, it is an educational theory that aligns itself closely with critical theory. It therefore exposes assumptions and inequalities, as Leonie Pihama notes, Kaupapa Maori theory reveals

...underlying assumptions that serve to conceal the power relations that exist with society and the ways in which dominant groups construct concepts of ‘common sense’ and ‘facts’ to provide ad hoc justification for the maintenance of inequalities and the continued oppression of Maori people.²¹

This understanding of power relations is often called conscientisation. Secondly, Kaupapa Maori theory is counter hegemonic in that it is a tool of resistance and emancipation.²² Thirdly, it emphasises praxis or the “undertaking of transformative action to evolve change.”²³ The element of praxis can be seen to initiate the creation of space for Maori. Settings such as kohanga reo, kura kaupapa Maori and whare wananga have been established using Kaupapa Maori theory to inform their models for education. These institutions operate outside of dominant culture schooling structures in a conscious effort to resist “the inhibiting elements embedded within state schools...”²⁴ However, Kaupapa Maori theory can create space and has created it within dominant culture schooling structures such as western traditional tertiary institutions.

---

²⁰ As outlined in Chapter Two
²¹ G.H. Smith (1992) Tane-nui-a Rangi’s Legacy...Propping up the Sky, conference paper presented for the NZARE/AARE Deakin University
²³ Idem
²⁴ Ibid, p438
Guiding principles have been developed from Kaupapa Maori theory to create space for Maori. In kura kaupapa, there are several key principles. Linda Smith states that "...these same principles can be said to operate in any Kaupapa Maori context". She explains that while these principles might be re-framed according to the context, the basic principle remains the same. Therefore, the following principles can be extended to the context of creating space for Maori in a tertiary institution. The first principle of Tino Rangatiratanga refers to Maori decision making power accorded under the Treaty of Waitangi. The second principle, Taonga Tuku Iho refers to the valuing and validity of Maori culture including language, cultural practices and knowledge. Ako Maori, the third principle values knowledges, Maori preferred methods of learning and teaching and acknowledges the importance of sharing knowledge for group benefit. The principle of Whanau emphasises group or collective responsibilities for the benefit of the group and acknowledges the relationships of individuals with each other. Ka piki ake i nga raruraru o te kainga, is another principle of shared responsibility for group members but this principle acknowledges that sometimes intervention into an individual’s domestic circumstances may be necessary to enable that individual to participate in the educational experience offered. An example of this maybe organising financial help for a student or assisting with child-care. A final principle outlined is Kaupapa. This is defined as excellence in the Maori framework of culture and language and also excellence in non-Maori languages and knowledges. It is also a principle that reinforces Maori people and Maori culture as the norm.

Within the final principle of Kaupapa, a particular struggle and challenge has been identified which is perhaps specific to the context of the western traditional tertiary institution at this point in time. Linda Mead has observed this challenge from the point of view of a teacher,

we struggle as educators to open up intellectual and imaginative spaces in the minds of our students. The challenge is that we need to draw not only from western ways of knowing but from the alternative ways of knowing ...
This challenge is also part of the student experience and has been expressed as a need by Pahiri,

There has to be space to create an indigenous imaginative universe. There has to be symbolism that says if you think about me I am Maori or I am indigenous.\textsuperscript{28}

Within the academic framework of the western traditional tertiary institution then, one of the challenges and struggles for academics, both student and staff, is to make or create space for Maori to initiate, extend and participate in our own theorising.

Kaupapa Maori theory can be related to the discourse of radical cultural politics that was discussed in the previous chapter. Firstly, the theory assumes a Maori world-view as the norm or the centre. Therefore, it encourages inhabiting the margin or re-centring the centre. It has been identified as counter-hegemonic because it is a tool of resistance and emancipation and further, Kaupapa Maori theory emphasises the undertaking of transformative action. Soja and Hooper also prescribed that radical counter hegemony is inclusive of multiple subjectivities. In the sphere of education, Kaupapa Maori theory can be seen as inclusive in that it is applicable to the education of all ages from early childhood to adulthood. It is also inclusive of any person who wishes to participate - regardless of experiences as Maori and regardless of race. Kaupapa Maori theory then, can be termed a radical counter-hegemony.

\textbf{Summary}

Space for Maori can take many forms. Those discussed in this chapter have been categorised as cultural historical space, contemporary forms of space, space in tertiary educational institutions for Maori and Kaupapa Maori theory as theoretical space. Contemporary forms of space for Maori can be seen to occur on a continuum between cultural historical notions of space and the space of the dominant ideology of the capitalist nation of Aotearoa. In western traditional tertiary institutions, space for Maori is struggled for rather than given as of right. Often this space is seen as a
challenge to the western world-view and before space is created for Maori, the justification for that space often has to be legitimised by dominant power processes. Legitimisation can become co-optation or hegemony when dominant groups include minority group theorising as part of the tradition of academia. Nonetheless, this theorising or ‘writing back’ as it has also been called is a part of the process of Maori creating space for Maori. Kaupapa Maori theory is an example of the creation of theoretical space for Maori and has become part of writing back to the dominant culture. The principles of the theory can be used to model educational practices in spaces that have been created for Maori and the principles also encourage the expansion of theoretical space for Maori.

28 Dallas Pahiri (1996) Personal Communication