CHAPTER THREE
MĀORI/WOMAN/ACADEMIC

My dream of becoming an academic has sustained me through the first decade of my chosen career. It has the power to re-energise and re-commit me as a Māori feminist academic, because it is not my dream in an individualistic sense, but part of a dream and vision handed to us by our ātipuna. This dream, more than anything else, keeps me working as an academic, against the odds.1

Introduction

As a Māori woman researcher/academic I am approaching this research from a position whereby to be Māori is a valid way of being. Te reo Māori me ōna tikanga are viewed as appropriate and legitimate ways of understanding the world, and therefore are asserted as valid and critical elements in the articulation of how the research topic is engaged. This thesis, which is primarily one of theoretical development and textual analysis. Kaupapa Māori Research is influential primarily in how I choose to frame my questions and in the theoretical frameworks that I choose to engage as tools of analysis. The framing of questions is a part of the selection process that researchers undertake in determining their research parameters. If I were to name a research question that has influenced the shape of this thesis is would go something like this; What are the key elements of a theoretical framework that would enable us to engage an analysis of the construction of representation of Māori women? Framing the question in such a way allows for an assumption that there has been a construction of representations and that it has occurred because of the influence of specific elements. It also assumes a validity in the role of Māori women in developing and articulating our own preferred forms of analysis. The assumptions that underpin how we frame our research questions are important as the framing of questions actively influences the ways in which research is approached.2

The University of Auckland is a particular context within which Māori writing takes place. At a recent Māori student graduation a number of Māori students receiving degrees commented on their joys and struggles to complete within a Pākehā institution. This is something that is the experience of many Māori students who enter tertiary education. The university is itself a site of struggle. The University of Auckland is not exempt from that. Universities are also spaces where radical thinking

2 A key example of this came to light publicly after the police shooting of a young Māori man, Stephen Wallace in Waipara. Research regarding police attitudes to Māori had been commissioned by Te Puni Kōkiri, the Ministry of Māori Development, however the research was never made public, instead a second research was commissioned where the ‘questions were reframed’. Given that the first report found that there was significant racism in the Police Department we can only wonder why there was a need for a new research with ‘reframed’ questions.
can be engaged and developed. This too has been the experience of Māori. There are many examples of both the struggle and the radical possibilities. From the development of Ngā Moteatea by Apirana Ngata to provide ‘evidence’ of Māori literature to the involvement of Māori students in the organisations such as Ngā Tamatoa in the 1970s. Cheryl Waerea-i-te rangi Smith refers to the university as a colonial institution. She notes that upon entering the university Māori students become aware that the university is not exempt from racism and colonial imperialism. Cheryl also reminds us that we can not down-play the role of universities, she writes;

I do not want to play down the fact that the universities have produced some of our most strident activists and a number of dissenting voices. In fact the universities are often the place where Māori students can first begin to learn Māori language and history. Also, there do exist within the universities (too few) radical educators who are concerned with creating strategies of resistance, liberation struggles and strategies for ‘decolonising minds’.

The contradictions and conflicts that are present as a Māori woman academic in working within the university have become increasingly apparent to me. In researching this thesis I have needed to work through issues of voice for myself as a Māori woman academic who is writing within an institution that has often been antagonistic to our concerns. This includes discussion of the positioning of Māori women within academia, the multiple roles that we as Māori academics carry and the expectations that we face within the academy. I am of the opinion that Māori academics have an obligation to be active across many areas; our disciplinary area, our university, our local communities, our whānau, hapū and iwi, and in the national Māori, and international, Indigenous, movements. The majority of Māori academics are located in the context of universities that operate within dominant Pākehā cultural structures and practices and therefore it is necessary to provide further discussion on issues surrounding the roles and obligations of Māori academics.

Māori/Academic

As Māori, we have a history of investigation. It is an ancient history of exploration, of navigation, not solely in the physical domain, but in ways that reach throughout the many dimensions of Te Ao Māori. These are all forms of research, they are all ways within which our people have developed knowledge and have located ourselves in the wider world. The searching for the source of the first
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4 Ngā Moteatea is a publication of Māori compositions that was developed by Apirana Ngata.
6 Ngā Tamatoa was a Māori activist group of the 1970-80’s who brought about major changes in particular in terms of advocating for te reo Māori and fundamental Treaty rights.
7 Smith, C.W., 1994 op.cit.
8 ibid:14
9 Ao refers to the world and therefore Te Ao Māori refers to the Māori world.
slither of light that emanated from between the armpits of Ranginui ¹⁰ and Papatūānuku, the journey of Tanenuiāragi to gather ngā kete o te wānanga, te kete tuauri, te kete tuatea, te kete aronui ¹¹ are but two examples of how ancient Māori research is. The point is that research is not ‘new’ for Māori people. Neither is the idea that as Māori we can take control of our own research processes and outcomes. What is new is the context within which many of us currently locate our research and ourselves. For myself this is in a Pākehā university, an institution that has its foundations deeply in Western philosophical traditions. The complexities of what this means for Māori require discussion.

As a Māori woman academic/researcher it is important that I note explicitly that intellectual and scholarly thinking is not something that came with our colonisers. As a people we have a rich tradition of research and knowledge. Education systems are a part of Te Ao Māori and processes of ako ¹² existed in all aspects of our daily living. More formalised processes ensured the maintenance of all forms of knowledge, with Whare Wānanga ¹³ being one example of highly formalised and ritualised forms of pedagogy ¹⁴. The denial of this has been, and continues to be, a fundamental flaw in the existing education system. The active suppression of Māori knowledge in colonial legislation and through ideological warfare meant that much Māori knowledge has been either lost or alternatively was forced ‘underground’. ¹⁵ This suppression was instrumental in the development of the colonial education system that sought to take the place of Māori systems of knowledge transmission. ¹⁶

The marginalisation of Māori knowledge and Māori pedagogy has meant that our learning and teaching processes have been denied to generations of Māori people. This has without doubt been the situation in the University system, both in academic teaching and research. Researching within institutional frameworks, such as those of the PhD thesis, means having to deal in a daily way with critical issues related to Māori research, being a Māori researcher, being a Māori academic, a Māori woman academic. These positions within the University are not uncomplicated, nor are they safe from contradiction. What is critical, I believe is that research related to Māori Education by Māori researchers must necessarily lead to some form of transformation.

¹⁰ Ranginui is referred to by many as the Sky Parent.
¹¹ Ngā kete o te wānanga refers to three baskets of knowledge that Tāne brought to earth from Iomatua kore, Io the parentless one, the Creator to provide knowledge for people. This is discussed further in Chapter Four.
¹² Ako is learning and teaching, and can be considered to be a term referring to Māori pedagogy.
¹³ Whare Wānanga are higher schools of learning.
¹⁴ For discussion of Māori pedagogies refer to Pere, Rangimarie Rose 1994 Ako: Concepts and Learning in the Māori Tradition, Monograph, Te Kōhanga Reo Trust, Wellington
¹⁵ The Native Schools Acts of 1847 and 1867 are both indications of the legislative denial of Māori knowledge and the beginnings of the active political marginalisation of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. Refer Chapter Eight.
¹⁶ In the Native Schooling system there was a clear intention that te reo Māori be removed as a medium of instruction and that in order to receive support for a Native School there be a commitment made to English as the medium of instruction with te reo Māori being used purely as a means of facilitating the learning of English.
As I have noted previously involvement in University education is a site of struggle for Māori. The fact that this thesis sits within this domain raises concerns. Struggle within the university occurs on multiple levels; culture; language; structures; staffing; access; retention of staff and students; resources. These struggles are not new but derive from a history of colonial imperialism. The University of Auckland is like other Pākehā dominated institutions, founded upon a history of colonial oppression. We are often denied real knowledge about such a history. Andrea Morrison informs us that the ‘official’ history of The University of Auckland written by Keith Sinclair for the 1983 centenary only gives scant discussion of Māori involvement with the university. She finds that from the outset the university was a place for Pākehā settlers not for Māori.17 The University of Auckland Calendar tells us nothing about the involvement of colonial imperialism in the establishment of the university, rather the history given in the Calendar bemoans its financial situation.18 It does not inform us of the Auckland University College Reserves Act of 1885 where confiscated land from the Waikato area and in Whakatane19 was utilised to fund the development of The University of Auckland.20 Linda Tuhiai Smith notes that in concrete ways The University of Auckland has benefited directly from the losses suffered by one of her iwi, Ngāti Awa. The apparent insignificance of these events to Pākehā historians is evident in the documentation. As Linda notes

The first paragraph of the history of Auckland University written by a prominent New Zealand historian Sir Keith Sinclair, for example, immediately connects the history of Auckland’s university to the establishment of other universities in the ‘English-speaking countries’. The official history acknowledges that land was indeed vested in the university but focuses more on the inability of the rent to provide a decent income for the new university because the land was ‘poor and heavily forested’. There was scant official knowledge, even in hindsight that these lands belonged to Māori people.21

The University of Auckland was not the only university founded from colonial imperialism. Both Otago and Canterbury universities were developed as part of attempts to increase settlements in those areas.22 Legislation was also passed, by the colonial settler government, for the confiscation of lands for the benefit of other universities. J.C. Beaglehole includes in the appendices to the publication ‘Victoria University College: An Essay Towards a History’,23 a memorandum on the Opaku Reserve from Herbert Ostler the chair of the College in 1914. The memorandum outlines issues regarding the

18 It is noted in the Calendar “... educational reserves were such poor land that they brought in very little” The University of Auckland Calendar 2000, Auckland :
19 Whakatane is an area in the mid-eastern part of the North Island. It is the lands of Ngāti Awa of the Mataatua waka (canoe). The name Whakatane itself refers to a fact of one of the tūpuna wāhine of Mataatua, Muriri, who saved the Mataatua waka when it began to drift out to sea. To draw strength to herself she called “kia whakatane ahu i aha” thereby calling on the strength equivalent to that of a man.
21 ibid:98
22 Morrison, A., 1999 op.cit.
Opaku Reserve and Waitotara lands in South Taranaki. The Opaku Reserve was essentially 10,000 acres of confiscated lands that is located near the town of Patea. Ostler notes that the land was confiscated from 'rebel Natives' and was through section 6 of the University Endowment Act 1868 set aside as a reserve for the endowment of a colonial university. At that time however there was no university established in Aotearoa and the funds were placed into a Colonial University Fund. The first university was established in 1870 in Otago and it was deemed in Section 30 on the New Zealand University Act 1874 that lands in the Province of Otago reserved under the University Endowment Act 1868 would be granted to the University of Otago.

It was not until 1878 that the recommendation was made for the establishment of Colleges in Auckland and Wellington and, as Ostler documents, it was suggested that those lands held in the North Island Reserves be put toward endowments for those colleges. By this time the Waitotara Reserve of 4,000 acres had been included in the schedule of lands via the New Zealand University Reserves Act 1875. The Auckland University College Act 1882 established the University of Auckland, and the Auckland University College Reserves Act 1885 saw lands stolen from three iwi in the upper North Island, Ngāti Awa, Tainui and Ngā Puhi, vested in the Council of the Auckland University College. The Victoria College Act 1897 brought the establishment of what is now known as Victoria University in Wellington, which Ostler notes was to provide higher education for Wellington, Taranaki, Hawke's Bay, Nelson and Marlborough. Section 38 of that Act set the Waitotara Reserve aside as an endowment however the Opaku Reserve was not included, instead the Opaku Reserve was in 1905 diverted to the Taranaki Scholarships Trust to provide scholarships for Taranaki scholars to any of the universities in the country.

Given the colonial beginnings of the university system and the dominance of monocultural ways of operating it is not surprising that being a Māori academic can bring us into conflict within our institutions as a direct consequence of the differing cultural values and expectations. In terms of cultural space Andrea Morrison notes that Māori 'space' is a notion that has multiple applications. It refers to physical, cultural, spiritual, spatial and temporal concepts. In the university context it also relates to constructions of theory and disciplinarity. Creating 'space' then for Māori within the university must happen on all these levels. As Andrea has argued the unequal power relations that exist in the university context for Māori means that this is not an easy task.
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25 ibid.
26 Auckland University College Reserves [1885:1], New Zealand Statutes 1885, Government Printer, Wellington: 411
27 Beaglehole, J.C. op.cit, also see Taranaki Scholarships Trust, 1958 Avery Press Ltd, New Plymouth
28 Morrison, A., 1999 op.cit
In a symposium by members of the Research Unit for Māori Education29 a range of papers were delivered regarding the need to create space for Māori within educational institutions, in particular within the university setting. Linda argues that the struggle for Māori academics is that of creating both the space and the conditions for Māori knowledge to be engaged.30 The notion of space is a very broad one in Māori terms, when engaging an idea of creating space we are not solely talking of spatial and temporal notions but are encompassing physical, intellectual, social, cultural and spiritual ways of being. That puts a considerable challenge in front of Māori academics within university structures.

Linda Tuhiwi Smith argues that in fact the structural struggles are critical to creating space.

Although at a social level it is important to make students feel comfortable by claiming a culturally appropriate space to work in and by developing support mechanisms for Māori students this does not begin to address the underlying structural issues which are concerned with what students are required to learn, how they learn and how this learning will serve them in their own practice. It is in their control over what counts as knowledge that the power of traditional intellectuals is paramount.31

The control over knowledge, what constitutes valid knowledge and how knowledge is selected has been outlined in some depth by Michael Young.32 This work has been related directly to Māori Education by Graham Hingangaroa Smith who draws upon key questions posed by Young in regard to knowledge and the ways in which unequal power relationships between colonised and coloniser leads to the suppression of Indigenous knowledge. Graham asserts that questioning the basis of what counts as knowledge, how knowledge is produced and whose interests are served by that, exposes the myth that knowledge is neutral and therefore reveals that power underpins the ways in which education is constructed.33

The imposition of Pākehā knowledge and ways of being has been our experience since colonisation. It is evident that within university settings this is manifested in many ways. As an academic there is an expectation that teaching and research will be couched within the various theoretical frameworks of ones discipline. This becomes problematic when those same theoretical frameworks have historically served to provide a platform for the oppression of Indigenous Peoples. The history of State education systems within colonised countries highlights that schooling was utilised as a mechanism for the denial of indigenous languages and culture. The struggle over affirmation of Māori knowledge and

29 The Research Unit is now known as the International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education and is located at The University of Auckland.
30 Smith, Linda Tuhiwi 1992(c) 'Ko Tāku Ko Tā Te Māori: The Dilemma of a Māori Academic' in Smith, G.H. & Hohepa, M.K. (eds) 1993 Creating Space in Institutional Settings for Māori, Monograph No. 15, Research Unit for Māori Education, University of Auckland, Auckland
31 ibid:10

51
Māori contributions to the University is ongoing. Leah Whiu documents developments in the Law School at Waikato University, highlighting that a lack of vision from the Foundation Dean, Margaret Wilson, led to the 'bicultural objective' being viewed as a process of merely adding some Māori content to existing programmes. Such processes do not bring about change for Māori in the University. Interviews taken with participants in the Waikato University Law School programme raised issues of racism, marginalisation of te reo Māori and limited Māori presence in the curriculum content, particularly in the final year. Leah summarises her research findings as follows:

In summary, the Law School is failing to provide an educational environment and experience in which; Māori students feel safe; Māori students and staff are free from racism generated by Pakeha (or tauiwi) students and staff; the use of te reo Māori is promoted and actively supported by staff; Māori issues, values, aspirations, traditions and whakaaro can be freely discussed without opposition from Pakeha (or tauiwi) students and staff; Māori content and a Māori presence pervades all courses and all levels of the Law School.

There is no doubt in my mind that the University is a site within which colonial discourses are simultaneously debated and perpetuated, the writing of this thesis within the University is then both necessary and contradictory. Native Hawaiian academic Haunani Kay Trask asserts that formal education in Hawai‘i has been constructed in a context of colonialism. In a powerful critique Haunani highlights the role of universities in maintaining colonial objectives and racist structures through the legitimisation of the colonising cultures. She states

The University of Hawai‘i stands atop the educational pyramid of public schools as the flagship campus for the State. With over 40,000 full and part-time students, it is a living symbol of colonization. In many ways, the University is an educational equivalent to the American military command center in Hawai‘i. Both serve as guardians of white dominance, both support the State economy, and both provide a training ground for future technocrats.

After a five year battle with racism at the University of Hawai‘i Haunani gives important reflection, and in particular warns of the ability for such institutions to wear down Indigenous Peoples resistance to colonial structures, through "petty bureaucratic procedures and the force of inertia". Haunani gives a vivid reminder that in any struggle for space we need to be aware of the institutional practices that work against our interests. Māori academics have experienced similar situations in Universities and Colleges of Education in this country.
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34 Whiu, Leah 1999 Bicultural Legal Education A Tool of Liberation of Merely Educating the Oppressor, unpublished paper, Waikato University, Hamilton
35 Tauriwi refers to those non-Māori, who have come and settled in these lands.
36 Whiu, Leah op. cit.:35
37 Trask, Haunani Kay 1993 From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai‘i, Common Courage Press, Monroe, Maine
38 ibid:202
39 ibid:224
Māori academics struggle within the universities of this country. In the economic climate of the late 1980s and the 1990s Māori initiatives struggled with new right driven and market controlled State policies. A number of Māori Studies Departments in universities and Technical Institutes were downsized or re-positioned into other faculties. At the University of Waikato, Māori staff were involved in High Court Action. At The University of Auckland Māori developments in the Faculty of Arts have been slow, Māori staff numbers have reduced based fundamentally on economic constructs. In the area of Māori Education staff replacement has also been limited, in what is potentially a major growth area. This is within a context where the key research initiatives in the Faculty are Māori. Bell hooks also indicates that in the wake of progressive initiatives being undermined or threatened with elimination struggle is a critical response. She writes:

To create a culturally diverse academy we must commit ourselves fully. Learning from other movements for social change, from civil rights and feminist liberation efforts, we must accept the protracted nature of our struggle and be willing to remain both patient and vigilant. To commit ourselves to the work of transforming the academy so that it will be a place where cultural diversity informs every aspect of our learning, we must embrace struggle and sacrifice. We cannot be easily discouraged. We cannot despair when there is conflict. Our solidarity must be affirmed by shared belief in a spirit of intellectual openness that celebrates diversity, welcomes dissent, and rejoices in collective dedication to truth.

Many Māori staff and students in the academy are cognisant of the need to struggle and to be committed to a long-term vision as is expressed by bell hooks. The university is a site worth struggling over in that it provides opportunities for Māori to research in more depth both colonial discourses and te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. The struggle is one that is necessary as we as Māori academics seek to create spaces that are healthy for future Māori staff and students. There are many Māori academics that have preceded us who have striven for similar outcomes and who in doing so have been successful in creating many changes in university settings. Many too have been instrumental in working for the development of Te Kōhanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori, Māori Immersion education, Whare Kura and Whare Wānanga, which are institutions that have been formed through Māori needs and aspirations. These changes and developments indicate the resistance of Māori within Māori Education.
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40 I have personally witnessed attacks on two Māori women academics by students who disagreed with their approach to Māori issues. The result being one having to take leave for a period of time to remove herself from an antagonistic environment and one having to leave the institution.
41 The three research facilities in the Faculty that are gaining significant contracts are: The International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education, The Wolff Fisher Centre and The James Henare Research Centre. All three have been developed by Māori.
42 hooks, bell 1994 Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom, Routledge, New York
43 ibid:33
44 Te Kōhanga Reo refers to the pre-school Māori language nests; Kura Kaupapa Māori are Māori language immersion schools; Māori Immersion education in this context relates to Māori language immersion programmes but in particular Immersion classrooms in conventional schools; Whare Kura are Māori language Secondary schools; Whare Wānanga in a contemporary context refer to Māori Tertiary Institutions
The difficulties experienced by Māori academics are not solely to do with theory or structural issues. They may also be located in the lecturer/student relationship. Time and time again Māori lecturers in the academy are challenged by Pakeha students for teaching Māori content. I have come to consider this a process of talking with the ‘dominant Other’. The relationship between Māori and Pakeha in the university can be fraught with danger for Māori staff and students. Māori are often considered to be available for any Pakeha staff or students who want to know about anything Māori. At times I have felt that Māori are not considered to have any personal or professional boundaries when it comes to the needs or Pakeha staff or students. I recently read the experiences of African-American academic Gwendolyn Parker who described her time as a law student at New York University. She describes an incident in the library after an article appeared in the law school newspaper comparing LSAT scores of black students to white students. Studying in the library a white male student interrupted her, the description of the event is worth detailing as it is recognisable to me as a Māori woman academic.

... all I remember is that he was suddenly at my table, speaking to me as if he were resuming a conversation that had been interrupted. “A lot of us are kind of mad” he said. I looked up when I heard his voice, mainly to see to whom he might have been speaking. I was surprised that he appeared to be talking to me. “What?” I asked. His face had a serious expression, and he was rubbing his hands on the table nervously. “You know, the article in the paper a few days ago. A lot of us are pretty upset.” “Us?” I asked. “We white students.” “White students?” I asked. I was still confused. I briefly wondered if he was part of some organization or was taking a survey of which I was unaware. I felt as if my attention had lapsed in the middle of a movie. Surely there was an explanation for why this stranger was talking to me.

What is especially familiar with this account is the assumption that minority group individuals should speak for the entire group and that dominant group members have the right to invade our space and demand attention. Gwendolyn later notes that the white student had

... sneaked up on my hard-sought solitude like some sort of racial grenade and neatly riven the world in two.

There are times when there have been highly publicised issues related to Māori and I have seen Pakeha people treat any available Māori as either an authority on the issue or as a sounding board, often with little or no invitation from the Māori person involved. This can become even more likely if you are known to be a Māori academic, and it can happen in the least expected situations both professional and social. Gwendolyn Parkers’ experience is very familiar. bell hooks refers to this as being placed in the role of ‘Native Informant’. She recalls particular incidents with students that echo the experience of Gwendolyn Parker. bell hooks writes that often when there is a sole student of
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44 hooks, bell 1994 op.cit.
colour in a class she or he is placed in the position of the Native Informant to be objectified by white students.

The objectification of Māori staff and students in the academy requires discussion. Much has been written in regard to working with Māori students, more often than not those writings have been done by non-Māori. Many of those writings are based within deficit ideas that locate Māori as deficient or culturally deprived. It is some relief that there are a growing number of Māori academics willing to challenge such accounts. There is however very little discussion regarding Māori academics or teachers working with Pākehā students and yet in the university setting this is an inevitable reality. I have found in my own experiences that working with Pākehā students, and some Pākehā colleagues, is not a straightforward activity. This is particularly the case when issues related to things Māori are raised. Working with the dominant Other is an important discussion to have for Māori academics as the Māori – Pākehā power relationships that exist within the academy can impact directly on how we as Māori academics function and survive.

**Talking With The Dominant Other**

I have had many experiences of explaining myself to the dominant others. My children are being educated in a conventional Pākehā school in the inner city area of Auckland. They are in a rūmaki reo\(^{49}\) classroom. They speak Māori all day in the classroom. When they leave their room and enter the life of the wider school they are surrounded by English speakers. I consider our children to be brave. They take on board the kaupapa to kōrero Māori in the midst of a dominant language environment. As a group we have chosen to remain with our ‘local’ school and to work to bring about change. When our tamariki began school we met with one of the Māori women teachers who was running a bilingual unit. We discussed the possibilities for our tamariki. One year later the rūmaki whānau\(^{50}\) began. It was an initiative that was grown from whānau in the school.

More recently a Pākehā parent, in a community forum, stated that she didn’t know what happened in Room 13, the rūmaki reo class, and that perhaps we could explain and even allow her to sit in and ‘see’ what we did. Our children were to provide her with knowledge, they were expected to be objects for her observation. It was expected that she had a right to go and watch the Māori children, so she could learn from them. It seems that even our children are supposed to educate, often ignorant, Pākehā people. It was assumed that the dominant group had a right to access Māori knowledge for their own individual need to know. There was no indication that there would be any reciprocal
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\(^{49}\) Rūmaki reo refers to an immersion Māori language context

\(^{50}\) Rūmaki whānau refers to whānau involved with Māori Language Immersion classrooms in conventional schools.
relationship, our children had nothing to gain from the interaction nor did any of the Māori whānau. It was for self-knowledge, to make her feel better about what was happening in the school. Of course the request was rapidly refused and it was made clear that the rūnaki whānau had no idea what was happening in her child’s class and perhaps we should all go and observe him. The absurdity of the request was immediately evident to us, it was however seen as a valid request by the Pākehā woman involved.

A similar example is given by Dr Alison Jones in her article ‘The Limits of Cross-cultural Dialogue: Pedagogy, Desire and Absolution in the Classroom’. Alison collected journal entries from a Stage Three course ‘Feminist Perspectives in Education/Mātauranga Wāhine’. The journal entries reflected on the separation of the class, by ethnicity, into two streams. Many of the Pākehā women students reflected negatively on the separation, and maintained a sense of having ‘missed out’ on something. This was in stark contrast to the Māori and Pacific Islands women who saw the separate groupings as a means of having space to operate within their own cultural frameworks and who as a consequence felt validated and affirmed in their own identity.

As a lecturer on that paper I remember vividly the first sessions. The course was organised so that the Māori and Pacific Islands women would first engage with literature related to their definitions of the roles of women and the positioning of women within our respective societies. The Pākehā women began their course with the work of western feminists and in particular postmodern and poststructural analyses. The philosophy underpinning the course structure was that in recognition of the fact that the group ‘women’ is not homogenous, there was a need to instigate a pedagogical structure that would provide more effectively for the cultural diversity within the group, in particular to develop a structure that would place Māori and Pacific women's knowledges in the centre. in a position where they were not only acknowledged but were actively validated. This was a radical move in a paper that in the past has been predominantly Pākehā. It was also a recognition of the growing numbers of Māori and Pacific Nation's women who wanted to take the paper.

These developments grew from the strength of the two women lecturers on the course, Dr Alison Jones and Kuni Jenkins. Together they had, over time, developed a course that included the voices of Māori women, as tāngata whenua, and then extended to Pacific Nation's women with the support of Lita Foliaki and Louise Tane-Lu. Adding the term ‘Mātauranga Wāhine’ to the name of the course was also a significant move. For Māori the naming of a course with te reo Māori brings particular assumptions, the key being that there will be Māori involvement and Māori content. Likewise for Pacific women it indicated at least some cultural content beyond the dominant group would be
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51 Mātauranga Wāhine refers to Māori women’s knowledge and ways of knowing.
provided in the course. Finally, the decision to separate into ethnic groups was made as a means of instigating separate space to more readily enable the Māori and Pacific women to be able to express themselves without having to be concerned with the ‘feelings’ of Pākehā women in the group.53

My own teaching has highlighted for me the ability of Pākehā students to silence many Māori (and Pacific) students. This happens in a number of ways. Dominating time is one way in which dominant group students silence Māori. This is most evident in tutorial groups or more interactive lectures. Often by virtue of numbers Māori students can be deprived space to speak. However, it is not only a matter of numbers. I have worked with groups that have had majority Māori students and still Pākehā students have sought a disproportionate amount of speaking time. I have come to a point in my teaching that I have more fully recognised the difficulties for many tutors in trying to negotiate this situation. Another way in which Māori students are denied space is the constant pressure on Māori lecturers and tutors to engage issues at the level of understanding held by Pākehā students. The reality of colonisation is that few of the dominant group have any indepth understanding of the politics surrounding the struggle for Indigenous languages, culture and knowledge. The consequence of this is that in lecturing undergraduate papers with ‘Māori content’ there is often the expectation that we, as Māori, will provide quite basis understandings of the issues for Māori. What this means for Māori students is that their existing knowledge base is effectively made invisible.

A key element in the denial of Māori space is the positioning of cultural capital. All groups have cultural capital, but as Bourdieu identifies it is the dominant group’s cultural capital that is given validity and provides the basis for a whole range of structures and systems.54 The assumption exists that Māori will, even when focusing on Māori issues, derive our theory and analysis fundamentally from the premise of Pākehā cultural capital, that what we locate as the centre of analysis will be readable and immediately understandable by the dominant group. When this is not the case it is Māori who are called in to question. It is our understandings that are seen out of place within the university. The existing theoretical and cultural hierarchy remains a taken-for-granted, an unquestioned basis from which all courses are expected to emanate. For the team that I work alongside in Māori Education this is not the case. We work to centre Kaupapa Māori. This means developing pedagogies that are conducive to our worldview. There are obvious limitations and constraints that exist in a university. Limitations of time and space. Limitations in terms of the resources that are made available to Māori. Limitations in terms of cultural understandings. These

52 Tāngata whenua refers to People of the Land, or Indigenous Peoples.
53 For discussion of an attempt at forming alliances where similar issues are raised, refer to Albrecht, L. & Brewer, R.M. (eds) Bridges of Power: Women's Multicultural Alliances, New Society Publishers in cooperation with the National Womens Studies Association, Philadelphia
limitations can constrain the implementation of radical pedagogies. Alongside the dominance of Pākehā culture and structures the struggle to bring about change is exactly that, a struggle.

The expectation that Māori academics will speak ‘to’ the dominant group is highlighted in the following journal entries of two of the Pākehā students:

The introduction to lecture one was in Māori, which even though it was obviously appropriate, was disappointing as I could not understand it. While some may say that this is as it should be with the resurgence of the Māori language, I was brought up to believe that speaking a language your guests or audience could not understand was rude, and as I do not know of any Māori who do not speak English, this seems unnecessary.

The structure of this course takes me aback in two ways. The large Māori/ Pacific Islands content of the course, and the high level of representation from these groups on the course. Secondly, the splitting of the students into two groups – Pākehā and Māori/Pacific Islands. I had more anticipated a course which focused on western feminism, although I did not have the language to describe it as such then. I guess that I, in typical western feminist style, had thought of women as a relatively homogenous group. Yes, I knew that there were differences in the way different groups of women were oppressed, but I guess I had assumed that, within the university, our studies would focus on white women’s feminist issues. 55

These reflections give us some insights into how Pākehā women perceive not only themselves in relation to Māori but also the position of white feminism. It is expected that Māori people ‘should’ accommodate English as the dominant language. Where the first writer begins with a hesitant recognition of the resurgence of Māori language she still maintains a fundamental belief that it should not be spoken in a public space. The taken-for-granted belief that English must be the language of the public domain is held quite strongly, to the point that Māori are positioned as ‘rude’ for not adhering to the dominance of the English language. The monocultural dominance in this country is in no way viewed as an issue. The issue is that Māori ‘dare’ to speak the indigenous language of this land. The second reflection is one that highlights a possibility for critical reflection when dominant beliefs are challenged in quite fundamental ways. For this student the structure of the course raised questions as to notions of difference and brought her to recognition of the assumptions underpinning her own expectations.

Journal entries in regard to the physical separation of the Pākehā students from the Māori and Pacific Islands students highlight significant differences in response. For many of the Māori and Pacific women this was the first time in their academic careers that an entire course was taught in a way that validated who they are. For the Pākehā women students the feedback indicates that there is a sense of loss for the oppressors if oppressed groups seek their own space. The separation for the Māori and Pacific women is quite clearly celebrated as an opportunity for further growth and for self-affirmation.

This is the first time I have had a [course], which has been streamed, with Maori and Pacific Islanders in one and non-Maori in the other. I can not begin to describe just how much more I enjoyed coming to classes...

I felt validated or even vindicated. Being in a class of Maori and Pacific Island students, I stopped feeling like I was the other. Instead I felt as though I had moved towards the centre and stepped into the centre where white people normally reside. It felt good.

In the lecture room I witnessed an interesting sense of power-shift once it was suggested that Maori and Pacific Islanders would form their own group. Once the dominant Pakeha group had lost their 'marker', things Pakeha seems to suddenly lose their advantage. As Maori knowledge was being affirmed as being important, a comment from one of the students next to me was “It’s alright for the Maori students. They have all the information.” Suddenly there was a reversal as to what counts as knowledge and who was having it.\(^{56}\)

The separation is conceived of by the Pakeha women as a lost opportunity.

I would have thought it would be interesting for all the students to be able to share their unique cultural perspectives with each other. I know I would have found that valuable. I am sometimes quite ignorant and intolerant of other viewpoints, so a wider input would have been educational.

It does not seem right. Could we not learn from each other? Wouldn’t it be valuable to share our differences in experience? ... It is different reading about it in books, or having it taught by teachers. It is better to hear it straight from the women who are having the experience. It is easier to relate to.

When will I ever get to learn how Maori and Pacific Islanders perceive the world (since we are supposed to be so different) when we are continually separated?\(^{57}\)

The journal entries provide a number of insights. Firstly, that Maori and Pacific Nations peoples in Aotearoa rarely experience having their own space within the classrooms of the University of Auckland and when they do in a context where they are recognised in themselves and in terms of the knowledge they bring there is a sense of affirmation. That sense of affirmation is one that centres their experiences and understandings. For many of the Pakeha students however there is a sense of loss, that their ‘Native informant’ has been removed. Another point that is raised is that notion that Maori and Pacific students are there to ‘educate’ Pakeha students, to provide knowledge to the dominant other. Both Maori staff and Maori students are positioned as the ‘Native informant’, and are expected to deliver to Pakeha staff and Pakeha students. Often for Maori staff the outcome of presenting radical Maori centred lectures is that we receive what are considered ‘poor’ evaluations from students. Evaluations of Maori Education contributions to courses can yield such general comments such as ‘this lecture was racist’. Facing these kinds of responses from Pakeha students is a common experience for many Maori academics.

\(^{56}\)ibid.

\(^{57}\)ibid.
Reminding the dominant other that we are not there as their informants or challenging their underlying assumptions about who we are as Indigenous Peoples can draw fervent and often vicious responses. Haunani Trask relates her experiences at the University of Hawaii after responding to a letter in a student newspaper. Challenging the assumptions of the letter she was also challenging the basis of the acts of the American government and the invasion of Hawai‘i. Haunani reflects on the response to her letter as follows;

So, when an uppity Native woman educates one of their own about his white history and his obligations to Natives, their fears and angers spill over into crazy accusations that, if examined, reflect back on their own sick history of violence.\textsuperscript{58}

Being an Indigenous person that speaks out against racism and dominant ideologies can mean being on the edge of violence, both symbolic and physical. A number of Māori academics and activists have had threats made in a similar way to that expressed by Haunani. Linda Tuhikai Smith notes that a prominent Māori academic had his personal phone number broadcast over public radio and listeners encouraged to ring him directly.\textsuperscript{59} This is not to say that other academics do not face challenges from their students in terms of their paper content, or from the ‘general public’ in regard to how they position themselves but the point is that as Māori academics we are constantly having to defend our presence in the university on multiple levels and while expected to carry multiple roles.

\textit{Multiple Roles}

As a Māori academic there has always been a degree to which I have involved myself in the educating of the dominant group. It has been a role that I have chosen to involve myself in, not because of any sense of individual freedom of choice but because of the obligation that I have toward bringing about change for Māori people. Paulo Freire tells us in ‘Pedagogy of the Oppressed’\textsuperscript{60} that it is the oppressed who in turn humanise the oppressor. The denial of Māori knowledge is directly linked to the denial of our humanity. Freire discusses this as a process of dehumanisation. Dehumanisation is characteristic of the colonial experiences of many Indigenous Peoples. As a means of justifying our fundamental rights as Indigenous Peoples our colonisers have denied our humanity and even worse have attempted to strip our humanness from us through denial, fragmentation, alienation and

\textsuperscript{58} Trask, Haunani Kay 1993 op. cit.:232-233
\textsuperscript{59} Smith, L.T. 1992(c) op. cit.
\textsuperscript{60} Freire P. 1972 ‘Pedagogy of the Oppressed’, Penguin Books, New York. I need to note here that the publication Pedagogy of the Oppressed has been critiqued in light of the sexist language use employed. This is an important critique and needs to be articulated in light of the fact that I chose to use a significant amount of work by Paulo Freire. In the context of the time that this publication was written I can locate the language use as a part of the wider sexist societal relations. Just as Māori people have been rendered invisible in much of the documentation of that time so too were women made invisible in many radical publications of the time. This is not to excuse such omissions, however I agree with the position taken by bell hooks (op.cit.) in regard to Freire’s work that to critique the sexism should not be the same as dismissing the work entirely. Paulo Freire has offered
representation. For Freire anyone who denies another the right to self-affirmation is creating a situation of oppression and is denying the other their humanness. It is not, Freire states, the oppressed that are the initiators of violence, but the oppressors.\textsuperscript{61} For Māori people the denial of cultural knowledge, of te reo Māori, of whakapapa and identity, is the denial of self-affirmation. It is the denial of our right to be fully human.

Linda Tuhiwai Smith asserts that the dehumanising of Indigenous Peoples is a process of justifying imperialism. Through colonisation Indigenous Peoples were presented as less than human, as the definition of what constituted humanity was controlled by the colonisers.\textsuperscript{62} Returning to the work of Paulo Freire, there is an assertion that the reclamation of our humanness can only be undertaken by oppressed groups themselves. The oppressors he argues are not capable of finding the strength to work toward liberation, but it is the oppressed who in their knowing of the state of dehumanisation will rise to struggle against it. Any belief that the oppressor can ‘give’ to the oppressed their humanity or their freedom from oppression is fundamentally flawed. Inherent in such a belief is a false generosity. In order to ensure against liberation the oppressors seek to maintain a false generosity. False generosity is itself dependent on a continuing state of oppression.\textsuperscript{63}

False generosity is informed by the oppressors constructions of what constitutes appropriate change. False generosity derives itself from a paternalistic colonial ideology that states that the coloniser knows what is good for the colonised. It is a part of the paternal belief that Indigenous Peoples are ‘childlike’ and required the parent from the colonial ‘mother’ country to tell them what they need. False generosity is not new to Māori. Nor is it something that has gone away. False generosity thrives within the colonial, Pākehā structures that have taken root here in Aotearoa.\textsuperscript{64} As Māori academics we must be aware of the need to ensure the development of real generosity within the university that encompasses Māori staff and students in ways that are affirming.

The struggle over cultural space has become increasingly obvious to me in terms of staffing for Māori programmes within the university. It is apparent that the multiple roles carried by Māori academics within our Department are accorded little if any recognition by the wider institution. There is little institutional acknowledgement that most Māori staff consider their work with Māori communities as much to the struggle for transformation in this country and as a result of that was invited here by radical organisations in the 1980s to provide insights into working for change.

\textsuperscript{61} ibid.
\textsuperscript{62} Mead, L.T.R., 1996 op.cit.: 83
\textsuperscript{63} Freire, P. op.cit.:21
\textsuperscript{64} The current Treaty Settlement processes in this country epitomise ‘false generosity’. At a hui that rejected the Treaty Settlement framework it was asked why Māori have our land stolen and then the thief determines how much is returned, when and to whom, and Māori are supposed to be grateful. The Treaty settlement framework
an essential part of their overall academic role. Indeed many Māori academics begin their own academic pathways through a role that Italian theorist Antonio Gramsci described as an ‘organic intellectual’. Gramsci identified two forms of intellectual, each of which has particular functions in relation to the State and communities. Māori-Chinese academic Jenny Bol Jun Lee notes that the social function of the organic intellectual is to transmit ideas within civil society, performing both ideological and organisational functions in ways that provide for change. She writes:

The ‘organic’ intellectuals are essential to the success of a revolutionary programme, they are those people who are located in the participatory process of the group which they belong to and are the product of ‘lived experience’. It is this group who will provide ‘organic’ leadership in which the oppressed and disempowered can raise themselves to a ‘philosophical’ as opposed to ‘common sense’ view of the world.

In further advancing the relationship of the concept of the organic intellectual to Māori, Graham Hingangaroa Smith attests that Māori intellectuals working in the struggle for change, that are driven by and for Māori interests, can rightly lay claim to the position of the organic intellectual. What this means is that Māori academics carry multiple roles and, furthermore, are expected by our communities to carry those. As a mother with children in Te Kōhanga Reo I was viewed as having particular skills as an academic. That manifested in particular forms of expectations from the whānau. Involvement in these areas has been an important way to input into the life of our Kōhanga Reo and to support the kaiako who nurture our tamariki in te reo Māori me ōna tikanga.

These are not roles that Māori academics necessarily put themselves forward for, but they are often ‘given’ to us from the whānau groups involved. To say yes is a part of being an organic intellectual, is a part of being a Māori academic. One implication of this is the difficulty of maintaining other academic expectations such as publications. Publications are critical for consideration for promotion in the academy. Community involvement is not deemed so, however for Māori academics that is often the foundation for both our teaching and research. The non-recognition of this in promotions processes seriously works against Māori academics. Equally, I am constantly amazed at the ability of some Pākehā male academics to complete publication after publication, and therefore access internal promotion pathways with relative ease, but who make little if any contribution to transformative action outside the academy.

that is currently the negotiating platform between the Labour Government and iwi remains virtually unchanged from that proposed by the right wing National Government.

56 Ibid:19
57 Smith, G.H. 1997 op.cit.
58 Kaiako refers to those that teach, in this case in the context of the kōhanga.
Linda Tuhiai Smith has given valuable insights into the roles and obligations of Māori academics. In her doctoral research Linda reflected on the politics of being a Māori woman academic in a University setting. She argues that for Māori women there are competing and intersecting tensions which are struggled over simultaneously in our academic work.69

When discussing the role of Māori academics it is critical that these tensions be highlighted as it is often through, and because of, these tensions that Māori academics are positioned in particular ways within our institutions. Linda highlights the multiple struggles within the academy:

We are engaged in making space through struggles over power, over what counts as knowledge and intellectual pursuit, over what is taught and how it is taught, over what is researched, why it is researched and how it is researched and how research results are disseminated. We also struggle to make space for our students, space for them to be different, space to make choices and space to develop their own ideas and academic work. We struggle to make a future, to build an educational base for our own whanau, hapu and iwi in order that they may participate more fully in Māori development. We struggle to make jobs, academic jobs which can elaborate our own cultural knowledge and social systems. We struggle to make theory, theory which connects our work to our aspirations and which can contribute to the wider world in which we too are citizens.70

Similar struggles have been expressed by Pat Hohepa in a paper on the role of the Māori academic.71 After many years of working within academia Pat was able to share strong insights about the multiple roles of the Māori academic and the difficulties and possibilities. Pat identifies four key roles of Māori academics as follows; to be mainstream academics and academic administrators; to support and mentor students and other Māori staff; to be “a beacon and a servant” to their Māori worlds; to act as interpreter between Māori and Pākehā. He argues that each of these roles is important for Māori academics. To focus solely on the requirements of mainstream academia may mean success in the university setting but can mean failure as a Māori. Similarly to ignore the requirements of the academy can mean success as a Māori and failure as an academic. This is noted by Pat in the following way:

For any Māori staff member to do just one and not both is to fail either as an academic or fail as a Māori. I know we have to publish or perish as well as teach to survive. To exclude the rest of the world merely to ponder then write academic articles and books that will be read by no more than 10 others outside the circle of friends and colleagues seems a waste of talent to me. For any Māori academic staff to be confined to a university work in totality fails as a Māori. For any Māori on the other hand, to be a pied piper and commandant without the necessary teaching and creative publications fails as an academic. These tasks are intertwined because we are Māori academics.72
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These are the tensions that Linda alludes to, the tensions of being a Māori academic in a Pākehā institution. They are also part of those dilemmas that Māori women academics such as Linda, Kathie Irwin, and Ngahuia Te Awekotuku have articulated.

**Māori/Woman/Academic**

In her article ‘Becoming an Academic: Contradictions and Dilemma of a Māori feminist’, Kathie Irwin voices the many roles and obligations that are a part of the life of a Māori feminist academic. In her position she was expected to develop a new programme in Māori Education whilst teaching on a range of other interdisciplinary courses, undertake research and provide liaison with Māori Studies. As a Māori feminist academic Kathie was also aware of the obligations to provide for Māori women and encourage their participation, whilst also encouraging the continuance of Māori students from undergraduate into graduate degrees. What she highlights is that there is little space available to Māori academics to, as Pat Hohepa has already argued, sit back and write articles for an elite few as is the case with many of our colleagues in the academy. In fact to do so often means not only failure as a Māori but can also mean less than supportive response from Māori.

Kathie Irwin talks of the difficulties that are often experienced by Māori women in the academy. Her reflections on entering into academia give some insights into the power of dominant discourses in convincing Māori women that we don’t have a place in institutions such as universities. The description of her first day is important to this discussion;

I still have vivid memories of the first day that I went to sign up, to collect the key of my office and to start my new career. I can see myself walking down the corridor, in a bright skirt (florals set on a black background, elasticised waist and frill at the hem), a matching peach-coloured tank top, my sunglasses perched stylishly (sigh, that’s what I thought then) on top of my head. My high-heeled, suede, multi-coloured, wooden-soled shoes slipped on the carpet and were bloody difficult to walk in. I was twenty-four years old, fit, lean, tanned, married, heterosexual and shit scared. If I didn’t look or speak like a ‘normal’ academic, that was no loss, because I didn’t feel like one either.

Unlike Kathie I have little recollection of my first days as a lecturer at the University of Auckland. Perhaps that is a reflection of the fact that from returning to the university as a student in 1989 I have never actually left. Equally my employment in other tertiary institutions has been directly linked to the university. Having said that, I still consider Kathie’s description of her first days as being

---
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reflective of many of my own experiences more generally both as a lecturer and as a PhD student. There are days that I half expect someone to tap me on the shoulder and say 'you’re an impostor, you shouldn’t be here', it is not a pleasant feeling. It is a feeling that is a part of the colonial legacy of doubt and insecurity that many of us feel within Pākehā institutions. By ‘we’ I am referring more directly to Māori women as I’m not sure that Māori male academics have this sense, but I have heard similar comments from many Māori women, some of which have been documented.\textsuperscript{78}

The feeling of being an impostor or not a ‘real’ academic is not an imagined one but originates from both discourses about what and who is a ‘real’ academic and by real lived experiences. I have on numerous occasions been questioned about my academic status or assumed to have been general staff not academic staff.\textsuperscript{79} These kinds of experiences are not uncommon, nor are they outcomes of ‘just a mistake’ but there are the kinds of actions that are a part of internalised personal racism that supports wider institutional and structural racism. Institutional racism in the university operates at many levels and has multiple effects on Māori students and staff in the university, from an assumption about where we are located within the structures to the denial of Māori students the validation of their own worldview, from the monocultural nature of many courses to the ongoing mispronunciation of Māori names. These show the range of racist experiences that confront Māori people in the university in a daily way. In recent processes in the School of Education Māori staff are struggling for the survival of established positions. Māori Education are expected to argue for staffing positions that were struggled for over the past ten years, whilst the university continues to benefit from the reputation that has been built up by Māori staff.

The struggle over staffing positions brings to the fore the dominant idea that we each operate on a level playing field and that our needs should be assessed with equal weighting. This is such a ridiculous idea. Māori people have struggled to gain the slightest space within the university and

\textsuperscript{78} ibid:58-59


The most recent occurred with my re-enrolment process for my PhD. Having received my enrolment forms late I decided to go in person to Registry to complete the process. I spoke with a Pākehā woman and was informed I needed two forms filled in, regarding my employment status, to complete enrolment. On receiving the forms I was told to bring them back to her on completion. This appeared relatively straightforward until I asked for some details related to time frames for doctoral research. There was an obvious lack tracking and I was informed that as a PhD student I didn’t actually need to return the forms to Registry but instead to the PhD office. Apparently she hadn’t ‘ realised’ I was doing a PhD, nor had she bothered to ask. Leaving the office I felt the frustration that is my response to institutional assumptions about who I am, assumptions that are rarely reflected upon by those who hold them. Returning to my office I moved to filling in the forms, only to find that what I had been given were forms for General staff, not for academic staff. I immediately rang Registry and asked why there had been an assumption that I was General staff, and why if there were different processes for different staff, had she not asked me what my position in the university was.
when we finally achieve something that shows possibility we are told that we are not guaranteed the positions and that others may put up a ‘better’ case. Well, what actually is a better case over the case of Indigenous peoples who have continued to be denied access to education and in particular tertiary education, whose people are researched on and written about by the colonisers, who experience disproportionate levels of underachievement, whose language has been on the brink of extinction and whose land has been illegally confiscated? Even if we ignored all this, many of the Māori positions have been argued for under the umbrella of Māori Education, and therefore the creation of such positions have been struggled for by Māori staff.

These scenarios are also not uncommon. Having read Kathie’s article I realised early in my academic career that the insecurities that I felt were not mine alone. There is something about knowing that your experiences are not an isolated case, which doesn’t necessarily change anything except that I was able to place events in their context, a context of struggle and tensions. Those struggles are about being Māori and being woman in an institution that tends to privilege knowledge from those who are white and male. For Māori academics, within the academy there is an inherent struggle that is reflective of wider societal non-affirmation of Māori epistemologies. For Māori women this is further intensified by the gender relations that exist within universities.

Ngahuia Te Awekotuku notes that her first appointment was to an unpaid position in The Centre for Māori Studies and Research at Waikato. She writes of her difficulties in securing employment in the academy as a Māori lesbian woman. Not only were there barriers to her as a Māori woman but also as a lesbian, in her terms ‘not just an uppity Māori but a queer’. As a Māori lesbian in the university I struggle with the positioning of issues of sexuality in my work. The invisibility of issues of gender and sexuality brings with it a major struggle that must be engaged alongside the assertion of being Māori. I have always appreciated Ngahuia’s courage to bring all of these issues to the fore in her writing. It is something that I aspire to be able to do more effectively. Very few Māori academics engage analyses that incorporate issues related to sexuality. Just as few Māori men are brave enough to challenge their own gendered assumptions, there are few Māori academics willing to discuss sexuality. This can be viewed in the wider context of colonialism as it exists within both our communities and within the institutions where we are employed.

The tensions explored in this chapter do not exist solely within the academy, they also exist within Māori communities and the ways in which many Māori view academia. A further factor that needs to be considered is that of the role of the State in locating Māori academics. Agencies of the State
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engage regularly in processes of ‘consultation’ with Māori communities, and in doing so Māori academics are invariably involved within these processes, either in our role as researchers or, as defined by the University, in a role of ‘critics of society’. While working as both insider and outsider within these settings Māori academics need, for survival, to develop clear positions and arguments. For Māori academics there are multiple roles and obligations that come with being Māori and having access to Western institutions of ‘higher learning’. As a Māori academic I am cognisant of the potential for cooption into the system and recognise that often Māori academics are selected for positions based on our Pākehā credentials. What this means, in my view, is a need for a constant consciousness about our roles, obligations and accountabilities to our people. As I have discussed earlier the multiple roles can require constant negotiation. This negotiation is a part of our colonial experience since the imposition of Pākehā institutions that have denied the validity of Māori ways of being. Such denial is instrumental in the colonising process and is based on an intention of alienation and fragmentation.

It is necessary to also state that being in the university also affords Māori academics pathways and opportunities. As an institution that is committed to ideas, thinking, philosophies about the world, research, writing, theorising there is a wealth of opportunities available to Māori academics. As a lecturer and researcher I have had real freedom to engage those areas that are important to me and to Māori Education. This is where the ‘ivory tower’ terms derives, from the ability of academics to sit ‘high above’ and theorise, detached from the people. This is a very real construct and one that as a Māori woman academic I am constantly wary of. It is also something that we are often reminded of by our own communities. But much also needs to change within the academy in order for Māori staff and students to feel validated in who we are and in our cultural knowledge. There remains a belief in a hierarchy of knowledge where Māori knowledge is placed very low on the list and that remains a constant struggle for Māori in the university. The denial of Māori knowledge is an outcome of colonialism where Māori as a whole have, through colonisation, experienced incredible fragmentation. We feel the consequences of that in our daily lives.

The notion of fragmentation is important to this thesis. Linda Tuhiiwai Smith links fragmentation to what she refers to as the “principles of disordering” that is encoded in both colonialism and imperialism. Fragmentation is in this sense a key feature in the alienation of Indigenous peoples and the disordered of all aspects of our being. Linda writes that fragmentation is a systematic process that occurs under colonialism operating through multiple sites. Fragmentation culminates in processes of re-presentation, disordering, disruption, renaming and reclassification of Indigenous systems and
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The fragmentation of Māori worldviews, and hence relationships, has had dire consequences for Māori women. Those consequences take many forms and their expression influences the physical, emotional, spiritual and intellectual realms. The economic focus of social policy that has been actively imposed in Aotearoa for the past 16 years has continued this fragmentation. Māori knowledge has been fragmented, redefined and reordered through processes of commodification and the establishment of credentialing frameworks that define Māori knowledge through units and standards that determine what is considered of value. The fragmentation of Māori knowledge has meant the disruption of our theorising. Māori explanations, understandings and theories have been disturbed through the imposition of other theoretical frameworks justified by the idea that the colonisers knowledge is superior to that of the colonised. Western theories have taken precedence within the Universities that now stand on Māori land. The prioritising of Western theories over Indigenous theories has been disturbing on many levels and that too is a reason why I have chosen to explore in this thesis the constructions of Kaupapa Māori and Mana Wahine theories. It is a form of writing back to the importation of Western theories that have on the whole worked against the interests of Māori people.

**Theoretical Disturbances**

A range of theoretical frameworks have been consistently used against the interests of Māori people. These are not new theoretical developments but are founded upon early colonial constructions. In Education, theories of biological and environmental deficiencies have been used as dominant frameworks when discussing Māori children. These theories are inherent to theories of assimilation promulgated in the 19th Century. This is outlined by Patricia Maringi Johnson, who describes three distinct views of assimilation in Aotearoa, these being:

- The assimilation of Māori and Pakeha to form one race;
- The assimilation of Māori in terms of formal equality under the law;
- The civilising of Māori into Pakeha cultural and social norms

---
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Having identified these three existing views from the literature, Patricia argues that the dominant form of assimilation in regard to Māori – Pākehā relations is that of the intention to assimilate Māori into Pākehā culture, language and social norms. This assimilatory view is based on a fundamental assumption of the superiority of the dominant group, in this case the coloniser. Such assumptions are intrinsic to racial stratifications that are outlined in Chapter Six. In terms of Aotearoa the overall objective was to both civilise and christianise Māori in order to ensure an outcome where Māori would reject the cultural, political and social norms upon which Māori society was based. Assimilation then depended not on the removal of biological race differences but on the removal of cultural, political and social differences of the oppressed group and replacement with those of the dominant group. In other terms Māori were to cease being Māori socially, politically and culturally.\(^{86}\) Furthermore, she argues that the ‘ultimate goal’ of assimilation was the demise of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga as a means of bringing Māori under the control of the colonial forces. This is outlined in more depth by Patricia;

> The ultimate goal of assimilation was to facilitate the demise of Māori language, culture and world-views; to bring Māori under the direct control of Pakeha; to assimilation Māori into a distinctly Pakeha controlled and defined society, governed by Pakeha cultural, political and social norms.\(^ {87}\)

Jenny Lee brings an added dimension in her discussion of Māori-Chinese relationships. The notion that assimilation focused on making Māori more like Pākehā is reinforced by the discourses surrounding Māori-Chinese relations where Māori, women in particular, were actively ‘warned’ away from such relationships, in a similar approach taken in regard to Chinese-Pākehā relations.\(^ {88}\) Assimilation, then can not be viewed separately from wider notions of control and power but must be seen in the context of colonisation which is itself an act of imposition of one peoples on another. Judith Simon also highlights the differing intentions of the assimilation agenda.\(^ {89}\) Judith names two clear intent as (i) the ‘protective impulse’ and (ii) the ‘civilising impulse’. For the missionaries these two impulses were often conflicting, as she notes was regularly the case in terms of humanitarian perspectives. However, she argues that for the Government and the settlers there was less of a tension and the focus was primarily of the ‘civilising impulse’. In terms of schooling both the ‘protective’ and the ‘civilising’ impulse were evident when the system was under missionary control however the ‘protective impulse’ was less evident once control shifted to the Settler Government.\(^ {90}\)

\(^{86}\) ibid.
\(^{87}\) ibid:90
\(^{88}\) Lee, J.B., 1996 op.cit.
\(^{89}\) Simon, J., 1990 op.cit.:138
\(^{90}\) ibid.
The theories and process of assimilation were entrenched through legislation. From the very beginning of the colonial Government there was a thrust towards ensuring the assimilation of Māori people. In the 1844 Native Trust Ordinance it was stated:

Her Majesty’s Government has recognised the duty of endeavouring by all practicable means to avert the like disasters from the native people of these islands [New Zealand], which object may be best obtained by assimilating as speedily as possible the habits and usages of the Native to those of the European population.\(^91\)

Couched in what appears to be humanitarian intent the Native Trust Ordinance is illustrative of the objectives of the colonial settler Government. To ensure the assimilation of our tōpuna as quickly as possible. What was required, as outlined in the Ordinance, was the replacement of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga, or what is described as the ‘habits and usages of the Natives’ with the customs and language of the Pākehā colonists. This needed to operate at multiple levels in multiple sites if the assimilation agenda was to be successful. This agenda was further articulated in the colonial settler parliament and practiced in both the mission and native school systems. The relevance of this discussion is that theories of assimilation acted as ideological tools for the disruption of Māori society and undermining fundamental values, beliefs and practices. Assimilation is then a theoretical disturbance. It also provided the foundation for other theoretical disturbances. Western Psychological theories focused on the individual have consistently placed Māori children as requiring change.\(^92\) Deficit theories have defined our whānau as deprived and key to the ‘failure’ of Māori children.\(^93\)

However, we should not delude ourselves that it is only the more conservative theoretical constructions that require challenge. There are also more radical theories that posit notions that have the potential to further disturb and disrupt Māori epistemologies. Within Aotearoa, there is appearing increased academic legitimation of ‘post’ paradigms which lay claim to "opening the debate" to issues of difference and otherness which Māori women Māori people have struggled to have heard over the past 150 years. This is the idea that post-colonialism provides a space from where the oppressed may speak. This is asserted by Gunew and Yeatman in the introduction to their collection of feminist writings titled 'Feminism and The Politics of Difference'. They state that post-colonialism may be

\(^91\) Native Trust Ordinance 1844 The Ordinances of the Legislative Council of New Zealand, Session III, no. IX, New Zealand


\(^93\) I have discussed the development and imposition of Deficit theories in some depth in Pihama, L., 1993 op.cit. It is noted that theoretical explanations of environment and cultural deficiencies have been prominent in this country in discussing Māori education since the 1960’s, and it is my view that the underpinning assumptions that are held by deficit theorists remain highly influential.
loosely defined as a body of theories which offers a place to speak for those who have been excluded from Western metaphysics. ⁹⁴

This is further explored by Ashcroft with the emphasis on post-colonialism as manifesting opposition to colonialism through the counter discursive. ⁹⁵ Where I don't disagree that the counter discursive and the creation of space for voice is crucial for Māori, particularly given that our struggle for the survival and retention of Te Reo Māori me ona tikanga is in itself a process of creating space and reclaiming voice. What I do dispute is the position of the colonisers to define this, on our behalf. The post-colonial potential is identified by these authors as the creation of spaces for the colonised to speak, however, there is little recognition of the possibility that the colonised themselves may create their own spaces which are defined within their own terms, or that we may have our own terminology and language through which to name these actions. The problematics of such claims is expressed clearly by bell hooks, who challenges the failure within the academy to recognise the presence of African-American writers in relation to postmodemism, and calls into question the 'intellectual seriousness' of a framework that espouses recognition of difference, and the need to legitimate difference and otherness in the academy, whilst ignoring black cultural critique. ⁹⁶ I take a similar position in terms of Kaupapa Māori theory. In short, these 'post' theoretical frameworks have the potential to be 'new talk but an old story.' ⁹⁷ What I have found is that increasingly after hearing seminars or papers based upon 'post' paradigms I have been left feeling the disturbingly colonial implications of these theoretical frameworks.

It is argued by some academics that the prefixing of the term 'post' to the term 'colonial' is, on the whole, used as a framework for moving outside of colonial models. ⁹⁸ Within this paradigm it is argued that in moving beyond colonialism the intention is to provide space for voices of the colonised, the marginalised, the westernised 'Other'. Bill Ashcroft articulates this argument with some vigour.

How many times must we insist that Post-colonialism does not mean "after colonialism" that it means from the moment of colonization. Indeed how often must we insist that Post-colonialism exists. ⁹⁹

⁹⁴ Gunew, A. & Yeatman, A (eds) 1993 Feminism and the Politics of Difference, Allen & Unwin, New South Wales : xii
⁹⁶ hooks, b. 1990 'Postmodern Blackness' in Yearning: Race, Gender And Cultural Politics, South End Press: Boston
⁹⁷ This comes from a discussion I was having with Merenea Taki in regard to new ways in which colonisers are attempting to ensure their positions of superiority.
⁹⁹ Ashcroft, Bill 1994 op.cit.:34
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Post-colonial theory is a growing form of analysis in areas that are significant to Māori people. Where much of the material derives from outside of Aotearoa there are a number of key writers who draw upon these frameworks in their analysis of relationships within Aotearoa. Extensive critique of these theories is required, but this is yet to appear. However, Māori academics are engaging with the theories and providing strong Kaupapa Māori analysis.\cite{hoskins2000} In exploring these theories I see myself as contributing to the process described by Linda Tuhiwai Smith as 'writing back'. Writing back to and against colonial impositions.\cite{spoonley2006} My involvement in theorising/talking/writing back' is related to a desire to create space for Māori within the dialogue and in doing so talk back to the theoretical impositions that are occurring in the 'post' arenas.

Recent writings by Paul Spoonley highlight the ways in which post-colonial theorising is being utilised within the academy, in particular by Pākehā academics.\cite{spoonley2006} Spoonley argues a number of points related to post-colonialism and its usefulness in theorising issues in this country. He acknowledges the inadequacy of post-colonialism in its assumption “that colonial relations and institutions” have been removed, however he explains his use of the term post-colonialism as follows;

> to mark a critical engagement with colonialism, not claim that colonialism has been overturned...post-colonialism is used here to signal a project by those who want to critique and replace the institutions and practices of colonialism.\cite{spoonley2006}

Spoonley notes that the inadequacy of the term is highlighted by the implication that colonial relations and institutions have been replaced, which is not the case.\cite{spoonley2006} His continued use of the term then becomes even more problematic. A reason for this is posited by Sheilagh Walker in her thesis ‘Kia Tau Te Rangimarie’.\cite{walker1996} Sheilagh argues that post-colonialism is a Pākehā-centred theoretical framework, which is more about Pākehā definitions of themselves than about struggling against the colonisers oppression of the colonised. I would agree with Sheilagh and further contend that the use of the notion of 'postcolonial' in this country is disturbing in its denial of the voices of Māori. The question must be posed as to how we can possibly refer to Aotearoa as ‘post-colonial’ when every aspect of our lives is touched and imposed upon by the colonisers? Whose interests are served by such a proposition? The interests served are those of the colonisers and of those Pākehā academics who draw upon these frameworks to validate their own position in the academy, and more widely in this

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{101} Mead, L. T.R., 1996 op.cit.
\textsuperscript{102} Spoonley, P., 1995 op.cit.
\textsuperscript{103} ibid:49
\textsuperscript{104} ibid.
\textsuperscript{105} Walker, S, 1996 \textit{Kia Tau Te Rangimarie: Kaupapa Māori Theory as a Resistance against the construction of Māori as the 'Other'}, Unpublished Master of Arts thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland
\end{flushleft}
country. For example, Spoonley locates post-colonialism alongside Indigenous Alternatives. These ‘Indigenous Alternatives’ are positioned in opposition to what is listed as colonial, perpetuating the exact binary oppositions that the theory is supposed to critique. The description of Indigenous methods or language as alternatives must be challenged in that it locates Māori as the ‘Other’ to the defined norm. At the ‘Alternative to APEC’ forum held in Auckland in 1999 I made the following comment in regard to the term ‘alternative’.

The word alternative is one that has always been problematic for me and yet it is used often in the articulation of radical causes. This is primary because much of what is created by Māori is located within dominant thought and systems as ‘alternative’. Māori education, Māori health, Māori law, Māori healing are all referred to ‘alternative systems’ as being the ‘Other’ system to the dominant structure that exist. This is dangerous for Māori, in that it constructs us as the ‘alternative’ and not as the Indigenous. I want to say that to be Indigenous is not to be ‘alternative’.

The idea of ‘Indigenous Alternatives’ serves to locate indigenous peoples on the fringe, and as such Māori are located as appendages to the ‘post-colonial’. In listing ‘Post-Colonial/Indigenous Alternatives’ the majority of the terms listed are in fact Māori. Whilst the only term in te reo Māori that appears in the ‘Colonial/Racial Labels’ is the term ‘Māori’. At what point do Pākehā academics get to determine that the term Māori is a colonial one? Quite a crucial question alongside a theory that calls for ‘marginalised’ groups to determine their own identities. This is not to deny that the use of the term ‘Māori’ can be tentative at times, however as a collective group of Iwi nations it is crucial that we maintain positions that allow us to maintain a collective struggle as Māori. What is particularly problematic about this assertion is its ability to reduce our position as Māori, as Tangata Whenua, to being the same as the ‘post-colonial’ Pākehā. The table itself locates Māori, Pākehā and Tagata Pasifica all as ‘postcolonial’ and in itself subsumes our position in this land in a kind of multicultural ‘post-colonial’ pluralism.

The publication ‘The Empire Strikes Back’ provides in-depth discussion of the notion of post-colonial theory and writing. The authors state that definition given to the term covers...

... all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day.

There exists a fundamental assumption with Pākehā, white Australian, white American and white Canadian post-colonialists that the construction of post-colonialism is all encompassing. This

106 Spoonley, P. 1995 op.cit.
107 Philama, Leonic 1999 ‘To Be Indigenous is not to be Alternative’ Reflections at the Alternative to APEC forum, Unpublished Paper, Tāmaki Makauara (Auckland) September 1999: 1
108 The full lists given by Spoonley as examples are: (i) Colonial/Racial Labels: Māori; Caucasian/European; New Zealand; Pacific Islanders; (ii) Post-Colonial/Indigenous Alternatives: Iwi/Hapū/Whānau; Tangata Whenua; Pākehā; Aotearoa; Tagata Pasifica
definition and others like it are supposedly inclusive of Indigenous Peoples experiences. The authors note that European theories are presented as 'universal' and are inadequate in engaging post-colonial experiences. They argue that 'Indigenous' theories have needed to develop to accommodate the differences in the colonies. Again the term 'Indigenous' is used with some ambiguity, inferring post-colonial theory as part of the development of Indigenous theories. This is more evident in terms of how the authors define post-colonial literature, arguing that in New Zealand it includes Pākehā and Māori writings. Māori therefore are considered a part of post-colonial developments. The positioning of Indigenous Peoples is also indicated in their discussion of notions of 'dominated' and 'dominating' where it is argued that there are particular relations that exist not only between colonised and coloniser but also between dominated and dominating societies. An example given is as follows;

In Australia, for instance, Aboriginal writing provides an excellent example of a dominated literature, while that of white Australia has characteristics of a dominating one in relation to it. Yet white Australian literature is dominated in turn by a relationship with Britain and English literature.\(^\text{10}\)

What strikes me in the literature is the tendency for the post-colonial drive in colonised countries, such as Australia, Aotearoa, Hawai'i, Canada and America, to be focused on the second aspect of this example, that is the position of white colonisers on our land in relation to either their colonial 'mother countries' or to white colonisers in other lands.

In the main, few Māori people use the term 'post-colonial' to describe or locate their work rather Māori works tend to be labelled as 'post-colonial' by Pākehā. This then raises issues about who defines Māori writing, Māori Art, Māori filmmaking etc. as for Māori to be positioned as 'post-colonial writers' is to remove the notion of 'Māori writers'. As Māori we need to ask whether this is actually what we want to happen. This is not to romanticise any idea that there is a definition of Māori Art or Māori Writing or Māori Music, but is to challenge the idea that the term 'post-colonial' can or should supplant the term 'Māori'. As such we need to look at the ways in which our writings, thoughts, languages are being coopted by Pākehā/non-indigenous writers as a means of affirming their own positions.

Numerous writers have sought to justify the use of the term 'post-colonial', however those justifications are unconvincing for many Indigenous Peoples who live day to day experiencing colonial oppression. The transferral of the concept from countries (e.g. India) that can clearly claim post-colonial realities to countries such as Aotearoa, where we remain in the midst of colonial control, is not only unacceptable for many Indigenous Peoples of those countries but is equally unbelievable. The use of the term post-colonial to describe the present social context within this country is clearly.

\(^{10}\) ibid:32
problematic. So too is its use in naming, describing or positioning Māori expressions of resistance. Where the aims of post-colonial theories are focused on challenging colonial discourses, as a theoretical framework it continues to perpetuate those exact forms of oppression that it argues against. It is these forms of recent theoretical disturbances that indicate the urgency of Kaupapa Māori theory. While this thesis is not written to ‘answer’ the growth in post-colonial, post-modern and post-structural theories it does by its argument for Kaupapa Māori and Mana Wāhine theories provide an act of ‘theorising back’ to those Western theories that serve the interests of their theoretical masters. As Audre Lorde so powerfully wrote

the masters tools will never dismantle the masters house.\textsuperscript{111}

**Summary**

The focus of this chapter has been to discuss the multiple roles that are a part of being a Māori woman academic and the imposition of Western theory. It is important to this thesis that there is recognition given to the fact that our tupuna have always been active philosophers, researchers, theorists, explorers and that these notions as conceptualised in the academy are not owned by academics. The university is but one context within which these activities take place. For Māori there are multiple sites where engagement with philosophies and theories take place, the marae, at hui,\textsuperscript{112} at thousands of work sites and in our homes. My experiences are that some of the most deeply challenging theoretical discussions I have been fortunate to participate in have happened in peoples lounges or lying in the evening in a whare nui\textsuperscript{113} as people talk through the issues of the day. We have in our own whare\textsuperscript{114} around the country our own libraries of accumulated knowledge, much of which will never be heard in a university setting.

The history of the development of university education in this country is also a history of loss of land and denial of mātauranga Māori. In this chapter I have highlighted the relationship between wider colonising acts, such as land confiscations and the development of the University of Auckland and Victoria University. These two institutions clearly benefited from the colonisers drive for land. That benefit continues in that the accumulation of lands, buildings and resources have fundamentally grown off the back of Māori land, and more particularly for the University of Auckland off the benefits derived from the lands of Ngā Puhí, Tainui and Ngāti Awa. In terms of Taranaki land loss the benefit has accrued to particular scholars and therefore to their families through the instigation of scholarship systems from the confiscations of the Opaku Block.

\textsuperscript{111} Lorde, Audre 1984 *Sister Outsider*, The Crossing Press, Freedom, CA 95019
\textsuperscript{112} hui refers to gatherings
\textsuperscript{113} whare nui refers to large gathering houses, many of which are carved although as a consequence of colonisation some are not adorned by carvings
\textsuperscript{114} whare here refers to house/home
Alongside the land issues sits the active marginalisation of Māori knowledge. It is argued in this thesis that Māori academics have particular obligations that derive from being Māori and having access to the academy. Those obligations and roles are multiple and are closely connected to the need for transforming oppressive relations. It is also noted that Māori academics are often at the forefront of dealing with dominant groups and that there is a danger of being constructed as the 'native informant'. Māori academics it is argued need to be constantly aware of our roles and the potential for cooption by the State. To maintain a position of organic intellectual is to be always accountable to and work with our own communities. For Māori women academics there appears to be a constant reflection on these roles. Writings related to the complexities of Māori women’s experiences in the academy point to having to deal with gendered notions alongside being Māori.

The academy is a site where theories are developed and promulgated. Those theories more often than not impact directly upon Māori people. Any theoretical development that gains prominence in this country will at some point impact on Māori people. Theories of assimilation are clear examples of conservative, colonial approaches to Indigenous Peoples that were designed to meet the interests of colonising nations. Assimilatory notions underpin dominant educational theories, such as deficit theory, have had huge negative influence on Māori educational achievement. Deficit theory continues to provide educational explanations for the 'underachievement' of Māori children in conventional state schooling and greatly influences policy developments. What this chapter also illustrates is that theoretical disturbances come not only from conservative factions but can also emerge from liberal and radical domains. Current academic obsessions with 'post' theories are also having an impact on how notions of identity and being Indigenous are constructed in this country. Whether these theories are of the right or the left there is the potential for their universalising tendencies to continue colonial disruptions for Māori people. These processes are what I have termed theoretical disturbances. The theories noted here are examples, there are many more that could be engaged in some depth. Māori academics have a role in engaging and challenging such constructions. We also have a role in the affirmation and validation of being Māori, and that includes creating and maintaining space in the academy for Māori people and for te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. As a Māori woman academic that includes engaging and supporting the struggle for cultural and theoretical spaces that ensure the validation of Māori women’s voices and Māori women’s theories. It is my hope that this thesis will contribute to that wider project.

115 A discussion of race, gender and class theories is provided in Chapter Six.