CHAPTER FIVE

KAUPAPA MĀORI THEORY: IDENTIFYING ELEMENTS

Kaupapa Māori knowledge is the systematic organisation of beliefs, experiences, understandings and interpretations of the interactions of Māori people upon Māori people, and Māori people upon their world.¹

Introduction

As I have written in the previous chapter Kaupapa Māori theory is evolving, multiple and organic. What this means is that in terms of the writing of theory from a Kaupapa Māori base we have much more to explore, and that Māori communities will shape Kaupapa Māori theory in ways that works for them. However, as with any theoretical framework there needs to be some philosophical understandings through which to identify and relate to Kaupapa Māori theory. This is one attempt at outlining those understandings. It is an attempt, that is informed by the works of a range of Māori people who currently engage Kaupapa Māori theory, to identify some of the key elements that underpin their work.

The elements that I will outline here are not definitive in any sense. They represent the kinds of approaches that I have chosen to take in my own use of Kaupapa Māori theory as a tool of analysis. This includes contexts of policy analysis, to the research context within our own communities, through to examining possible forms of Kaupapa Māori process in representing ourselves in film and video production and publication. Each of these areas require similar approaches in that they are fundamentally about representation, whether that be through policy, moving image or written text. My intention in this chapter is to outline those aspects that I would consider are important considerations for Kaupapa Māori theory both as analysis and as process. One way of doing that is to highlight that Kaupapa Māori theory is grounded within fundamental Māori values and beliefs and therefore some discussion on what might be considered key elements in Kaupapa Māori theory is necessary.

In doing so I am hoping to bring together key elements outlined in already published works regarding Kaupapa Māori theory and Kaupapa Māori research. It is important to recognise that there are differing ways in which Māori academics engage their analysis and that throughout Aotearoa there are particular schools of thought that can be associated with particular institutions and academics within those institutions. I have come to refer to the way in which I utilise Kaupapa Māori theory as

deriving from the Auckland School of thought, for the precise reason that the Māori Education team
and the Indigenous Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education (IRI) have a particular
approach to analysis that is distinctive. This could be said for other universities and Whare Wānanga
that have selected, developed or adopted particular theoretical frameworks as fundamental to their
analysis. Tribally based whare wānanga in particular provide for very specific theoretical and
research developments that are whānau, hapū or iwi based. This is exciting for Kaupapa Māori
theory and the growth of strong critical kaupapa based analysis. There have always been key Māori
academics that have been proponents of particular theories within Pākehā universities, so current
developments are not new.2 The point here is that the diversity of approaches opens many
possibilities for Māori analysis. This is something, that as a proponent of Kaupapa Māori theory, I
find very exciting.

The objective of this chapter is to identify elements that appear consistently throughout the articulation
of Kaupapa Māori theory. In Chapter two I noted that Graham Hingararoa Smith has identified
six elements in Kaupapa Māori education; tino rangatiratanga the self-determination principle),
taonga tuku iho (the cultural aspirations principle); ako Māori (the culturally preferred pedagogy);
kia piki ake i ngā raruraru i te kainga (the socio-economic mediation principle); whānau (the
extended family structure principle); kaupapa.3 These elements are outlined here alongside other
elements such as te reo Māori me ōna tikanga, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, mana motuhake,
whakapapa, and whakatika as a process of decolonisation. In outlining each element and its
contribution to theoretical analysis I will begin with what I consider to be a central element of
Kaupapa Māori theory, that being te reo Māori me ōna tikanga.

Te Reo Māori me ōna Tikanga
When I first began my journey to learn te reo Māori it was undertaken as a cultural, social and
intellectual pathway, as a process that was a part of a wider seeking of identity and knowledge about
who I am in the world, the Māori world that is. For many, like me, who seek to develop fluency in te
reo Māori as adult second language learners and speakers, there is a passion that has been fired by the
radical politics of those involved in the initial drive for the revitalisation of te reo Māori.

2 For Example, the development of Māori Studies can be traced to a generation of Māori academics that were
involved in Anthropology; another more recent example would be the case of Massey University which is well
known for the theoretical developments of Mason Durie and his contribution to understanding Māori Health, in
particular is recognised nationally. In terms of whare wānanga, Te Wānanga o Raukawa have actively
promoted an academic approach that is clearly located in whānau, hapū and iwi linked to that particular
Wānanga. The possibilities of what these approaches bring to the growth of cultural projects can, in my view,
only be positive for future developments.

3 Smith, G.H. 1997 op.cit.:pp466-473
The positioning of te reo Māori me ona tikanga as central in Kaupapa Māori theory is not simply a theoretical statement but it is a part of the lived realities of many Māori people. The denial of te reo Māori within my whānau has meant that few are fluent speakers. Those of my generation who are speakers of Māori are so because of a commitment from some in our whānau to Kura Kaupapa Māori. However, for my own brothers and sisters there are only four mokopuna who have had consistent access to te reo Māori. My experience is not unlike the experiences of many of my peers.

We are children of those who were a part of a beaten generation. Those who were physically, emotionally and psychologically denied te reo Māori through the formal system of education and the strength of the ideological assertions that marginalised and devalued te reo Māori. Those who were constantly fed the ideology that in order for their children to survive in the world all they needed was English.

The bringing together of te reo Māori me ona tikanga in this conversation is important. It recognises the unbreakable bond that is language and culture, that is communication and action, that is theory and practice. Te reo Māori me ona tikanga, Māori language and its/her/his cultural forms. They are bound together in relationship to each other and can not be separated from each others influence and creation. There is a power in that interconnection that I believe is critical to future developments for Māori people and for Māori women in particular. Māori women have much to gain from the assertion that te reo Māori me ona tikanga must be seen whole and not be superficially separated.

The separation of te reo Māori me ona tikanga allows for dominant colonial ideologies to claim space through the manipulation of our language in processes such as translation and interpretation⁴.

The centrality of te reo Māori me ona tikanga is voiced powerfully by Rangimarie Rose Pere;

Kotahi he tino taonga kia nga taun te Maori, ahakoa te iwi, ahakoa te hapu, ahakoa te whanau, ko to tatau reo rangatira. Ko te reo i heke mai i Rangiatea, te hoki ki nga rangi tuhaha, i whakaparekereketia ai ki te oneone, i tanumia, a, mai te kohuretanga ake i roto i te oneone nei, i whakatipuria ai, i poiopoa ai, i penapatapia ai, i manauaitia ai, i tipu ai, a no te tipunga, ka haumi, ka awhiwhio tono kakara ki nga topito o te ao a ratau ma. Te reo rangatira nei, he wairua kamaatua tono, he momo huna, kia kore e mohio a tauiu ki ona hohonutanga, engari te raruru i tenei wa, he maha nga tangata Maori, kaore i te mohio ki nga hohonutanga, nga whanuitanga o te reo⁵.

⁴ The relevance of this to Māori women will be engaged more fully in chapters Nine and Ten.
⁵ The following translation is provided in the publication by Rangimarie herself: There is one truly great treasure among us Maori, no matter which tribe, sub-tribe, or family, and that is our chiefly language. The language which came from Rangiatea, the highest heaven of the far-flung heavens, down to earth, was planted here, and thereafter since it was first uncovered in the soil, it was grown, it was cherished; it was nurtured, it was cared for, it grew. Then, from its growth, it gradually spread its sweet scent to every corner of the universe of the ancients. This chiefly language has its own spirit of inherent wisdom, it is communication of the abstract, in order that outsiders might not understand it's hidden depths. The problem at this time is there are many Maori who do not know its depths, or the breadth of the language. Pere, R. 1999 'Te Reo Rangatira me ona Tikanga' in Māori Education Commission Newsletter, issue 2 May 1999, Wellington pp3-10
This kōrero encapsulates much of my own argument in terms of te reo Māori, a language that has its own inherent spiritual essence that permeates through all communications deriving from our ancestors, and therefore is in itself ancient. The statement too that few Māori know the depth of te reo is a direct consequence of the fragmentation and separation that is a part of our colonial experience. In recognition of this I would argue that Kaupapa Māori theory calls for the processes of reclaiming te reo Māori me ōna tikanga to be expansive, that is to seek the "nga hohonutanga, nga whanuitanga o te reo". This is a process not only of recovering of knowledge but of bringing forward conceptualisation of the world through te reo Māori that can allow us more critical reflection on our current position and to engage more fully with the colonial manipulations that have occurred over the past 200 years.

Where the fundamental language is the same nationally there is no single dialect in terms of te reo Māori; there are regional variations. There are also differing ways in which people refer to te reo Māori. Rangimarie Rose Pere uses the term te reo rangatira. This is recognition of the spiritual and chiefly status of te reo. In a conversation with Kaa Williams she informed me of the need to recognise the differing functional forms of te reo Māori, with distinctive kōrero for ritual purposes, for example pōwhiri and karakia, that varies from te reo o te kainga, everyday language use. Given the complexities of language use these distinctions are important to Kaupapa Māori theory as they draw our attention to the varying ways in which te reo Māori is utilised by our people and again affirms the diverse experiences of our people.

Te reo as a term also has a range of meanings, one being language and dialect. Te reo also refers to voice. In a traditional oral culture these notions were viewed as been critical to culture, hence the term often expressed now te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. This is an assertion of the direct relationship between language and culture. The importance of te reo is articulated in a range of statements and whakataukī. For example, a key statement noted in relationship to Te Kōhanga Reo is; Ko te reo te mauri o te mana Māori, The language is the life principle of Māori mana. Manuka Henare notes the following whakataukī as an indication of the essential part played by te reo.

Ko te pūtae o te Māoritanga ko te reo Māori, he taonga tuku iho na ngā tūpuna
The root of Māori culture is in the language, a gift from our ancestors.

---

6 Ibid.
7 Kaa Williams is a Māori woman who has for many years been active in education and in particular the survival and revival of te reo Māori.
9 Margie Hohepa 1990 op.cit.;7 notes that Māori elders at a Wānanga Kaumātua in 1979 affirmed te reo Māori through this statement.
Equally the place of voice and discussion is well known by Māori and is also expressed in whakataukī such as; Ko te kai a te rangatira, he kōrero, oratory is the food of leaders. The power of te reo is seen in its many possibilities, including the potential to inflict pain; he wero o te tao e taea te karo, te kī e kore e taea, the flight of the spear can be parried, what is said cannot.

The Waitangi Tribunal Report regarding te reo Māori (Wai 11) highlights both the role of colonisation in the denial of te reo Māori and also the critical need to ensure active moves for its revitalisation. Early in the report the Tribunal refer to a whakataukī presented to them;

Ka ngaro te reo, ka ngaro tāua, pērā i te ngaro o te Moa
If the language is lost, we will be lost as dead as the Moa

Amongst other conclusions, the Tribunal found that the education system was operating unsuccessfully for Māori; that te reo Māori was not adequately protected and that the Treaty of Waitangi asserted a fundamental right of Māori to education and all other human rights, this includes the need to ensure te reo Māori its rightful place.

The struggle for te reo Māori is a necessary part of our survival as Māori people. This must also be said for the need to ensure the relationship between te reo Māori and knowledge. Tuakana Nepe asserted that Kaupapa Māori knowledge and te reo Māori are intrinsically bound. Hence in order to maintain Māori knowledge there must be a reproduction of that knowledge through te reo Māori. In her thesis on Kura Kaupapa Māori and the philosophy of Te Aho Matua, Tuakana wrote;

Kaupapa Māori is the “conceptualisation of Māori knowledge” that has been developed through oral tradition. It is the process by which Māori mind receives, internalises, differentiates, and formulates ideas and knowledge exclusively through te reo Māori. Kaupapa Māori is esoteric and tuturu Māori. It is knowledge that validates a Māori world view and is not only Māori owned but also Māori controlled. This is done successfully through te reo Māori, the only language that can access, conceptualise, and internalise in spiritual terms this body of knowledge...this Kaupapa Māori knowledge is exclusive too, for no other knowledge in the world has its origins in Rangiatea. As such it is the natural and only source for the development of a mechanism which aims to transmit exclusively Kaupapa Māori knowledge.

Te reo Māori is in these terms the only language through which Kaupapa Māori can be fully expressed. In the context of the struggle for Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori this assertion is a necessary one in the striving for the affirmation of Kaupapa Māori schooling initiatives. In my own experience as a student of te reo I know the necessity of the position taken here.

---

11 The translation given in the Tribunal report relates that ‘man’ will be lost. I have chosen not to use that interpretation of the word ‘tāua’, which refers to ‘you and I inclusive’ and has no reference at all to gender. This highlights the very deep penetration of gendered assumptions in the process of translation or interpretation.

12 Waitangi Tribunal 1986 Finding of the Waitangi Tribunal Relating To Te Reo Māori And A Claim Lodged By Huirangi Waikerepuru And Ngā Kaiwhakapumau I Te Reo Incorporated Society, Wai 11, Government Printer, Wellington:54
Nonetheless, we need to be aware that in asserting the centrality of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga we are not in turn denying the ability of many Māori to sustain tikanga whilst having less fluency in te reo. Nor should we overlook the inherent danger of Māori becoming defined as being ‘real’ Māori only if we have a fluency in te reo Māori. These are important warnings that we need to heed. To be Māori can not be measured on levels of fluency or knowledge of tikanga. Experience may tell us that to be fluent in te reo Māori does not immediately mean that person is any more or less knowledgeable of what it means to be Māori than someone who has no knowledge of te reo Māori. Nor does being fluent in Māori necessarily mean that one will act in ways that are in the interests of Māori.

What is evident though is that within te reo Māori there exists ways of explaining the world that are distinctly Māori. There are also clues to how our tupuna may have thought about the world and their relationships within it. Those ways of thinking are encompassed within tikanga Māori. Tikanga is described in many ways by Māori. It can be defined as cultural template, customs, rules, laws, processes, appropriate ways of being, distinctive Māori ways. As with all Māori concepts to define tikanga in English is extremely difficult as the cultural parameters of the English language do not necessarily engage the many elements of te reo Māori. Rangimarie Perce has indicated this difficulty through her writings. Tikanga in her belief is multi-formed and indicates customs as appropriate to a given context or “customs that are seen to be right for a particular occasion”. In more recent writing for the Māori Education Commission, Rangimarie notes that the universalisation of te reo Māori leads to the loss of the ethos of the culture. Such is the interrelationship between language and culture. Language and culture are intertwined. Language carries and creates culture which in turn as practice recreates and reflects back onto language. Through te reo Māori we are able to gain access to what Rangimarie Perc has referred to as deep knowledges. This is indicated in the many concepts that are themselves possible theoretical frameworks. A recent example of drawing upon one tikanga concept as a theoretical framework appears is presented by Mason Durie in his application of the term mauri to a discussion of the dynamics of Māori health.

---

15 Nepe, Tuakana 1991 op.cit. pp15-16
14 Kathie Irwin 1992(b) op.cit. and Linda Tuhiwai Smith 1992(c) op.cit. note the danger of creating discourses of the ‘ideal’ Māori which deny the diversity of our communities. This is also discussed in some depth by Patricia Johnston 1998 op.cit., in regard to the construction of ‘difference’.
15 The current Māori fisheries debacle is a clear example of this, refer Pihama, L. & Smith, C.W. 1998 Fisheries & Commodifying Iwi: Economics, Politics and Colonisation: A series of readers examining critical issues in contemporary Māori society. IRI/Moko Productions, Auckland
16 Pere, Rangimarie Turuki 1991 Te Wheke: A Celebration of Infinite Wisdom” Ao Ako Global Learning New Zealand Limited, Gisborne:34
17 Pere, R. 1999 op.cit.
18 Mauri may be viewed as the life force or life essence which abides in all things.
19 Durie, Mason 2001 Mauri Ora: The Dynamics of Māori Health, Oxford University Press, Auckland
for research undertaken by Te Rōpu Rangahau ā Eru Pōmare regarding the impact of unemployment on Māori health.20

In placing the validity and legitimacy of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga at the centre of Kaupapa Māori theory we are challenging the assumed supremacy of English by saying that we as Māori have a fundamental right to our language and our culture, and that the call for the revival is a valid and legitimate one. It is also a call for survival. The loss that has been suffered by Māori is not merely a statistical concern. It has had detrimental effects on Māori communities across the country. The suppression of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga has had a huge impact on Māori people. That impact has been multiple. It is impacted upon identity, knowledge, language, confidence, access, whakapapa knowledge etc. All these things have been impacted upon over a period of time as a direct consequence of the denial of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. The extent of the loss of te reo Māori is evident in both past and recent surveys. The 1975 survey undertaken by NZCER highlighted the chronic state of te reo Māori.21 Chronic is the right word for it. Te reo Māori it was proposed would become an extinct language if there was not urgent developments to address the decline in the numbers of speakers.

A more recent survey by Te Puni Kōkiri and Te Taura Whiri indicates that te reo Māori is still in a fragile position.22 The National Māori Language Survey was undertaken to examine the proficiency of Māori adults in speaking te reo Māori, explore how they gained their Māori Language skills, identify how often and where te reo Māori is spoken and reveal actions and attitudes toward te reo Māori. In terms of language proficiency the survey found that 59 percent of Māori adults speak te reo Māori to some extent, however only 8% are considered highly fluent, and one-third of those are aged 60 or over. Overall 83% of Māori adults were considered to have either low fluency or did not speak te reo Māori at all. The authors of the survey research note that whilst Māori attitudes towards te reo Māori are positive, the language “remains in a critical state”.23 The importance of recognising the fragile state of te reo Māori is necessary in a Kaupapa Māori theoretical framework, as too is the need to recognise that where the survey research views Māori attitudes to te reo Māori as both positive and committed this is not the case in the wider non-Māori community. The impact of

23 ibid:64
colonisation on te reo Māori me ōna tikanga has been immense and the initiatives toward the survival and revival of te reo Māori are not necessarily affirmed by non-Māori. This too is alluded to in the research where past recommendations for the development of te reo Māori have been ignored by the Government.\footnote{ibid. refer to Waitangi Tribunal 1986 Wai 11 Appendix Six:pp 81-82} What is highlighted in both writings is that mauri can be impacted on and expressed in a range of ways, each of which can contribute to an understanding of Māori health. There are many Māori concepts, like mauri, that can be drawn on to deepen our understandings and theoretical developments within the context of a Kaupapa Māori framework.

Debates surrounding the validity of te reo Māori emerge in all sectors of Aotearoa. Most recently a debate ensued in the midst of the State hierarchy, when during a sitting of Parliament one Māori minister chose to speak in te reo Māori without giving prior indication to the ‘House’ so that an interpreter would be available. The outcome of that action, during Māori Language Week, was a debate concerning the position of te reo Māori within a Pākehā context of Parliament.\footnote{The Dominion, 26 Jul 1999, MPs to speak only in Māori, Edition 2, Page 2; The Evening Post, 25 Aug 1999, New Māori translator, Edition 3, Page 3.} Where questions can be raised in regard to party politics and point scoring with Māori, particularly given the proximity of a national election, it must also be noted that such debates are not new to that setting. In discussions surrounding the 1867 Māori Representation Bill both te reo Māori and fluency in English was raised on numerous occasions as reasons for why Māori [men] should not have representation.

Levels of English language fluency was deemed as an indication of degrees of ‘civilisation’ or ‘savagery’. One minister, Mr Harris, is recorded as follows;

> When the time came that the Natives were qualified by education and a knowledge of the English language, laws and social usages, he would be one of the first to recognize their right to the franchise, but until that time came he would raise his voice against admitting them to a participation in privileges which they could not properly value, and to which at present they had no right... he believed that some few of those Natives had partially emerged from savagedom, it would take very little to induce them to reform to the barbarous habits which characterized the whole race when Europeans first settled in the colony, and which still characterized it as a whole.\footnote{Māori Representation Bill 1867, New Zealand Parliamentary Debates Vol. I Pt.II Aug-Oct:815}  

The denial of te reo Māori has been systematic within the education sector and in wider society. It did not happen by accident but was debated and planned as a strategy to assimilate Māori through what was deemed as a superior language, English. If we look to the history of te reo Māori in the colonial system it is apparent that intention was one of English as the primary language of communication in Aotearoa.\footnote{See Simons, J. 1998 op.cit.; Walker, Rangiiti 1986 ‘The Māori Response To Education’ in Smith, G.H.(ed) 1986 Māori Perspectives of Taha Māori: Ngā Kete Wānanga: Readers in Māori Education, Auckland College of Education, Auckland; Ka'ai-Oldman, T. 1988 ‘A History of New Zealand Education From A Māori Perspective’ in Hirsh, w. & Scott, R. (eds) 1988 Getting It Right: Aspects of Ethnicity and Equity in New Zealand Education, Office of the Race Relations Conciliator, Auckland; Stephenson, M. 2000 Creating New Zealanders:} Debates within the colonial settler parliament surrounding the 1847
Education Ordinance and the 1867 Native Schools Act give us irrefutable evidence that the colonial settlers saw the demise of te reo Māori as imperative in the ‘civilising’ of Māori. These ideologies are explored in some depth in Chapter Ten, however a general comment can be made that the colonial assimilation policies of the 1800s and 1900’s were instrumental in the undermining of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. The fact that we have maintained our reo and tikanga is an indication of the strength of Māori people not only to survive but to resist the onslaught of colonial imperialism. Te reo Māori me ōna tikanga must then be located as central to Kaupapa Māori theory.

The role of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga in Kaupapa Māori theory is a critical one in that they provide a basis for understandings and world views. That does not mean that Māori people who do not speak te reo Māori with fluency are unable to hold such understandings as it has been argued by Mereana Taki that as a colonised people we have developed English-Māori idioms which act as a means by which we are able to maintain our own knowledge.28 This can be viewed as an act of resistance. Furthermore, I am cognisant of the fact that many of our people maintain the fundamental essences of being Māori in the most assimilatory environs. However, it is important that we position English as the language of the coloniser and that we explicitly note its shortcomings in regard to the transmission of Māori knowledge and tikanga Māori. As Rangimarie writes,

The language is not only a means of communication, but transmits within it the values and beliefs of a people. Some of the language used by these people may lace the richness of the traditional Māori variety if only because they have themselves been subject to the largely monocultural influence the Pākehā. But despite this limitation, the climate and general environment within which they work are essentially Māori.

This relates to what Graham Hingangaroa Smith has referred to as the validation and affirmation of te reo Māori. In discussing Kaupapa Māori theory Graham notes the following:

A Kaupapa Māori base (Māori philosophy and principles) i.e. local theoretical positioning related to being Māori, such a position presupposes that:
- The validity and legitimacy of Māori language and culture is taken for granted
- The survival and revival of Māori language and culture is imperative
- The struggle for autonomy over our own cultural wellbeing, and over our own lives is vital to Māori survival.29

These three points can be seen as the basis for the positioning of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga in Kaupapa Māori theory. The validation and legitimation of Māori language and culture as asserted by Graham opens space for those who seek the revitalisation of te reo Māori to develop and utilise Kaupapa Māori theory no matter what their level of fluency, which I believe is also the point made

---

28 Taki, M. 1996 op.cit.
by Rangimarie Rose Pere. Alongside the validation and legitimisation of te reo Māori is the issue of survival and revitalisation. This can then propel proponents of Kaupapa Māori theory to a place where fluency in te reo Māori becomes an aspiration for those who are not fluent or native speakers. Therefore, Kaupapa Māori theory raises the roles and obligations that we, who espouse this theoretical framework, have to te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. That in a sense is our praxis, the interrelationship between our theory and practice. It is not enough to state that te reo Māori must be affirmed if we ourselves do not commit to participating in the practice of ensuring it’s survival. This I would argue needs to happen on both a collective and individual level. It is not enough to expect our tamariki to carry the load. We must all carry the load. We need then to explore what this means in theoretical terms and how can we utilise the notion of the validation, legitimisation, survival and revival of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga as an analytical tool.

There are various ways in which te reo Māori me ōna tikanga can be utilised as tools of analysis. Firstly, to assume the validity and legitimacy of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga enables us to ascertain how we as Māori are being located within particular actions, representations, images, texts, discourses, legislation, processes or policies. It enables us to ask key questions such as:

Where is te reo Māori?
Where is tikanga Māori?
How are te reo Māori me ōna tikanga positioned?
Who is defining the position of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga?
How is that position being defined, what is the process through which it is being defined?
How are Māori people located in defining the position of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga?
Who controls the processes?
Is te reo Māori me ōna tikanga being validated?
Is te reo Māori me ōna tikanga being marginalised?
Who benefits from the position of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga?
Whose interests are being served by the positioning of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga?

These are some questions that may be asked to facilitate an understanding of a particular context in regard to te reo Māori me ōna tikanga, and to direct us to further exploration that is required. This is not merely an academic exercise. If we utilise a Kaupapa Māori theoretical process such as is being proposed then asking key questions such as these can open the issue being explored to deeper interrogation. A recent example in which I participated was a critical analysis of the Treaty Settlement processes and the Heads of Agreement for Te Ātiawa, my own iwi.30 The Treaty Settlement

---

30 The draft Heads of Agreement were presented to the iwi in 1998 for consideration. The analysis that ensued forced the negotiators to place the negotiations on hold.
processes were engaged fully by many Māori people when it was introduced in 1995.\textsuperscript{31} Māori communities across the country rejected the proposed model only to have it continually foisted up us as the ‘only’ process the Crown would provide. For Te Ātiawa, as for other iwi and hapū, the process has been fraught with controversy. Just hours before a general election a group from Te Ātiawa signed a Heads of Agreement with the outgoing Minister of Treaty Negotiations, Doug Graham.\textsuperscript{32} To ascertain the position of Te Ātiawa a Kaupapa Māori theory analysis was undertaken on the Heads of Agreement. It was identified clearly that te reo Māori me ōna tikanga were not only marginalised in the document but were virtually invisible.\textsuperscript{33} The document was constructed almost entirely in English, there was no mihi or opening of any form, the document was framed within Western legal discourse, there was no evidence of any recognition of tikanga Māori. An apology was written into the beginning of the document that was an exact replica of the apologies written into the Heads of Agreement for at least two other iwi in Taranaki, hence there was no recognition of the specific history of Te Ātiawa. The process of negotiation and writing of the Heads of Agreement were defined and controlled by the Crown and the Crown benefited most significantly if settlement took place as it validated their position in this country and denied the tino rangatiratanga of the people of Te Ātiawa. Such an exercise provides an example of how placing te reo Māori me ōna tikanga at the centre can open critical areas that require depth analysis.

It is my view that asking critical questions in regard to the positioning of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga can then open the issue at hand to more specific analysis which can be developed further through utilising Māori concepts to engage what can be complex levels of oppression or injustice. In the remainder of this chapter I will look at a number of concepts that have been identified as important to a Kaupapa Māori theoretical analysis. Firstly, however, I want to note two points (i) these are not the ‘only’ elements that can be drawn upon as foundations for analysis. There are many elements and concepts within te reo Māori me ōna tikanga that can direct our analysis and (ii) the concepts identified all fall within the gambit of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga and therefore need to be seen within the context of an entire world view not and although engaged separately they are in fact interconnected. A document that features strongly in that world view is Te Tiriti o Waitangi, which an agreement that carries the signatures of 512 representatives of whānau, hapū and iwi and that signifies a direction that our ancestors envisaged for future generations of whānau, hapū and iwi in relationship with the colonial settlers that arrived on our lands.

\textsuperscript{31} Pihama, L. 1996 The Fiscal Envelope, Economics, Politics and Colonisation, Volume One, Research Unit for Māori Education and Moko Productions Ltd., Auckland
\textsuperscript{32} The previous Minister of Treaty Settlements, Doug Graham has been lauded as being instrumental in Treaty Settlements, however a more radical view of his contribution highlights the Treaty Settlement Processes as being another instrument of denying fundamental rights of tino rangatiratanga to our people. Refer Pihama 1996 op.cit. Sadly the current Labour Government has maintained the status quo in regard to Treaty Settlements with the only change being the lifting of the billion dollar cap.
\textsuperscript{33} Te Ātiawa Draft Heads of Agreement 1999, Office of Treaty Settlements, Wellington
Te Tiriti o Waitangi

Te Tiriti o Waitangi is a crucial document in the articulation of Kaupapa Māori theory. It is a document that is considered by many Māori to be a binding agreement between Māori and the Crown. It is also a document that articulates the sovereign rights of Māori as Tāngata Whenua of Aotearoa. Eddie Durie has written

Treaties are agreements between independent sovereign nations.35

In line with such a contention Te Tiriti o Waitangi can be located as a document that was signed by Māori as independent nations with representatives of the Crown. It is a document that is often referred to by Māori as tapu36 because of the deep significance within which it is held. It has meaning to Māori that reaches into fundamental oral beliefs that the word once spoken must be recognised in its fullest. As noted in the earlier discussion regarding te reo Māori me ōna tikanga, we have whakataukī that announce the power of language.

In a culture that utilised primarily, although not solely, oral language as its means of collective communication, the word does in fact name the world.37 We can say therefore that each word in Te Tiriti o Waitangi has significance. Intentions and interpretations are important in the negotiating of meanings between languages. These have remained a point of contention in regard to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the relationship of Māori and Pākehā. From a Kaupapa Māori theoretical position the accepted validity and legitimacy of te reo Māori locates the Māori text as the primary one from which we need to operate. This too was validated by our tūpuna in that between 512 – 540 signed the Māori text38 whilst 39 signed the English text.39

There are many publications that outline in some depth the events leading up to the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Admittedly few of these have been authored by Māori and that is an area that requires serious redress. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to engage in depth the events of that time. It is however necessary on my part to indicate my positioning in regard to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the guarantees made therein. As I have noted, the centrality of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga within Kaupapa Māori theory takes me to a position that it is Te Tiriti o Waitangi that is the document to which I believe we need to refer. I realise that the Western legal frameworks of this country have

34 Te Tiriti o Waitangi refers to the Māori language version of The Treaty of Waitangi.
36 tapu refers to the sacred, revered state the document is held in.
37 The reason I write 'but not solely' is because there are many cultural forms of expression that exist. Written language is only one form of expression.
39 ibid. For discussion in regard to signatories refer Simpson, M. 1990 Ngā Tohu o Te Tiriti: Making a Mark The Signatories to The treaty of Waitangi, National Library of New Zealand, Te Puna Mātauranga o Aotearoa, Wellington
dominated the defining processes in regard to *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* have imposed numerous readings and have in many ways captured *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* within legal discourse.\(^{40}\) That, however, does not mean that we have to accept those definitions. What I believe to be more useful in regard to Kaupapa Māori theory is an undertaking of seeking to view this foundational document through our own eyes, through our own reo and through our own tikanga. What this also means is that as whānau, hapū and iwi we are able to explore our specific relationships with *Te Tiriti o Waitangi*.

While it is also beyond the scope of this thesis to engage the many debates regarding *Te Tiriti o Waitangi*, it is necessary to indicate that *Te Tiriti* is a document that is considered central to how Māori view a relationship with the Crown.\(^{41}\) It also affirms whānau, hapū, iwi, Māori as tāngata whenua, and guarantees that maintenance of fundamental rights. This is encapsulated within *Te Tiriti* which notes in Article Two:

> Ko te Kuini o Ingarangi ka wakarite ka wakaae ki nga Rangatira ki nga hapu ki nga tāngata katoa o Nu Tirani te tino rangatiratanga o o ratou wenua o ratou kainga me o ratou taonga katoa. Otitia ko nga Rangatira o te Wakaminenga me nga Rangatira katoa atu ka tuku ki te Kuini te hokonga o era wahi wenua e pai ai te tangata nona te Wenna ki te ritenga o te utu e wakaritea ai e ratou ko te kai hoko e meatia nei e te Kuini hei kai hoko mona.\(^{42}\)

*Te Tiriti o Waitangi* is a document that affirms not only Māori as tāngata whenua but also defines the basis for Māori - Pākehā relations.

Relating *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* in analytical terms means asking critical questions about the positioning of whānau/hapū/iwi/Māori as tāngata whenua and reflecting on how that is being constructed within a particular context. It also enables us to determine how relationships between whānau, hapū, iwi, Māori are being constructed, by asking pertinent questions about the state of that relationship. We can take the current Treaty Settlement processes as an example of how this relationship has been established in ways that undermine *Te Tiriti o Waitangi*. It may seem ironic that a Treaty Settlement process is itself in breach of *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* however there are key indicators that this is in fact the case. In drawing on *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* as a basis for analysis we can ask questions in regard to who constructed the process?, what was the involvement of whānau, hapū, iwi, Māori?, who determines the framework within which negotiations will take place?, how


\(^{41}\) For further reading regarding historical events refer to: Orange, C., 1987 op.cit.; For a range of opinions related to *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* refer to Kawaru, I.H.(ed) 1989 *Waitangi: Māori and Pākehā Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi*, Oxford University Press, Auckland

\(^{42}\) A translation provided by Hugh Kawharu of this article is as follows;

The Queen of England agrees to protect the Chiefs, the Subtribes and all the people of New Zealand in the unqualified exercise of their chieftainship over their lands, villages and all their treasures. But on the other hand the Chiefs of the Confederation and all the Chiefs will sell land to the Queen at a price agreed to by the person
are the fundamental guarantees agreed to within Te Tiriti o Waitangi represented in the process? How are the power relationships being maintained?

_Tino rangatiratanga_

_Tino rangatiratanga_, like te reo Māori me ōna tikanga, is considered an overarching element in Kaupapa Māori theory. By this I mean that it acts as a key tenet that I believe must be inherent in all forms of Kaupapa Māori theoretical analysis. _Tino rangatiratanga_ links us directly to a right to define and control what it means to be Māori in Aotearoa. _Tino rangatiratanga_ is expressed in Te Tiriti o Waitangi in relationship to the notion ‘kawangatanga’ which is referred to in Article one and translated by Hugh Kawharu as ‘government’ and which others refer to as ‘governorship’. The relationship between these two notions is perhaps one of the most hotly contested areas in regard to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. That contestation is shown in the complex legal interpretations that surround Te Tiriti. The Waitangi Tribunal Report on the Motunui claim notes that under the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 there is recognition that there are differences between the Māori and English texts and that the Tribunal is required to decide on issues raised by the differences. In that report there is significant discussion in regard to the importance, and interpretation, of the term ‘rangatiratanga’. The Tribunal notes that Māori were in 1840 conversant with Missionary use of the phrase _tino rangatiratanga_ as it was used in the ‘Lords Prayer’, they report,

It has been noted that many Maori were able to recite large passages from Scripture and the Book of Common Prayer by rote. It is also to be remembered that the missionaries played a major role in presenting and explaining the Treaty to Māori people, at Waitangi and throughout New Zealand. It must also have been readily apparent to the Māori that the Treaty was written in what could best be described as ‘Missionary Māori’. It appears to us that the Māori signatories to the Treaty would have been in no doubt that they and the missionaries were agreed on what “rangatiratanga” meant. It was well known to both parties for its use in scripture and prayer, as in “kia tae mai tou rangatiratanga” or “thy kingdom come”, as appearing in the Lords Prayer.

Where it is beyond the scope of this thesis to survey the literature in regard to Treaty interpretation, it is noted that _tino rangatiratanga_ is a key notion in the struggle with the Crown. It is a notion that affirms the argument that Te Tiriti o Waitangi guaranteed Māori the right to sovereignty in our own lands. There have been many Māori organisations that have formed for the express purpose of organising around Te Tiriti. One such group Te Kawariki worked to develop awareness about Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and have ensured that on February 6th (Waitangi Day) there would be a political
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43 ibid.
44 Refer Renwick, William 1991 op.cit.
45 Waitangi Tribunal 1986 op.cit.:51
forum held at Waitangi.\textsuperscript{47} Te Kawariki have been instrumental in the past twenty years at keeping Tino Rangatiratanga on the political agenda. Tino rangatiratanga is an expression of Māori aspirations for self-determination, Māori autonomy, Māori sovereignty. As such it is expressed as a key objective in many Māori movements. It is noted however that tino rangatiratanga is but one discourse that expresses the notion of Māori autonomy. The concept of mana motuhake is also used as a means of expressing Māori control over things Māori, that includes all taonga guaranteed under Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Mana motuhake however does not stem from Te Tiriti rather it is grounded in our Indigenous position in Aotearoa. Mana motuhake, like tino rangatiratanga asserts Māori as tāngata whenua, and the expectation of autonomous rights in line with that identity. In reflecting on both Te Tiriti o Waitangi and mana motuhake, Annette Sykes writes:

The Treaty is a symbol which reflects Te Mana Māori Motuhake.\textsuperscript{48}

Graham Hingangaroa Smith notes that from this context the term ‘tino rangatiratanga’ is drawn and related it to Kaupapa Māori in the form of a ‘self-determination principle of asserting Māori control over Māori kaupapa.\textsuperscript{49} That was an underpinning assumption inherent in the developments of Kaupapa Māori educational initiatives of Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori. The continued state denial of Māori aspirations for te reo Māori me ōna tikanga, and for our tamariki to experience 'success' in their schooling experiences became irreconcilable and the subsequent drive for independent autonomous systems was an expression in enacting tino rangatiratanga. This is not new. Our tūpuna have been enacting such assertions for generations, the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi is in itself an example of the belief that Māori have always held rangatiratanga over all things Māori. It is little wonder then that within the education arena this has been most successfully expressed in the Māori Education initiatives such as Te Kōhanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori, Whare Kura and Whare Wānanga. Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori, in particular held to the notion of Māori autonomous development by establishing outside, and some would say in spite of, the existing Pākehā state education system. This has changed structurally in that both Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori are now operating under the state umbrella, however the struggle for tino rangatiratanga remains a critical element to many involved in these movements.

In regard to the positioning of tino rangatiratanga as a key element in Kaupapa Māori theory, I would argue that tino rangatiratanga as a concept needs to be viewed in relationship to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, thereby bringing forward the wider issues of self determination and the responsibilities of the Crown to fulfil their obligations to Te Tiriti o Waitangi.\textsuperscript{50} These are but some examples but they

\textsuperscript{47} Te Kawariki 1999 20 Yrs Protest Action 1979-1999, Te Kawariki, Kaitaia
\textsuperscript{48} Sykes, Annette (n/d) op.cit.
\textsuperscript{49} Smith, G.H. 1997 op.cit.
\textsuperscript{50} The Crown's obligations are clearly identified in Te Tiriti o Waitangi as those of kawanatanga or governorship. As co-signatories to Te Tiriti o Waitangi there is also an expectation that the Crown will honour
give sufficient indication as to how referring directly to Te Tiriti o Waitangi we can develop important forms of analysis that will support movement towards creating fundamental structural change that will support Māori aspirations and the reclamation of what is referred to in Te Tiriti o Waitangi as taonga katoa. Ranginui Walker writes that the term taonga katoa refers to ‘all their treasured possessions’ and encapsulates all things that are treasured both tangible and intangible. This is also the position taken by the Waitangi Tribunal in the te reo Māori case, Wai 11. In Kaupapa Māori theory the notion of taonga katoa is encompassed also in the phrase taonga tuku iho, which I will turn to now.

Taonga Tuku Iho

As I have noted in the previous section taonga is a term that refers to all things that are held as ‘treasures’ therefore the concept of taonga tuku iho relates to those ‘treasures’, both tangible and intangible, that have been handed on to us from our ancestors. Māori Marsden shows the depth of the relationship of ‘taonga’ to Māori people. Taonga, he wrote denotes desirable values, that is desirable Māori values. In defining the term taonga, he noted;

... the Maori idea of value is incorporated into the inclusive holistic term 'taonga' - a treasure, something precious; hence an object of good or value. The object or end valued may be tangible or intangible; material or spiritual. 51

In regard to Taonga as cultural elements, Māori Marsden states that the following terms identify ways in which taonga are bequeathed by forebears to their descendants:

- Nga taonga a nga tupuna - ancestral treasures
- Taonga tuku iho - treasures bequeathed
- Ohaki a nga tupuna - guidelines, maxims of the ancestors

These taonga refer to the cultural tradition, love history; corpus of knowledge, etc, with which the descendants can identify and which provide them with their identity, self-esteem and dignity; that which provides them with psychological security. 52

The positioning of taonga tuku iho as a key element in Kaupapa Māori theory recognises the taonga that our tūpuna have held as important for the maintenance and reproduction of whānau, hapū, iwi, Māori. Those taonga include a vast array of things including whenua, moana, ngāhere, awa, maunga, te reo Māori me ōna tikanga and many elements that are a part of tikanga Māori. In the Te Reo Māori claim to the Waitangi Tribunal it was argued that te reo Māori is a taonga that is acknowledged within Te Tiriti o Waitangi and therefore the Crown has an obligation to support the maintenance and development of te reo Māori, to not do so would be in breach of Te Tiriti. The
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52 ibid:16
notion of taonga tuku iho is expressed in Kaupapa Māori theory through the validation and affirmation of being Māori and of Māori worldviews, beliefs, values, cultural preferences and all of those things that are tangible which are held to be culturally important. Kaupapa Māori theory affirms the cultural aspirations of Māori people and seeks analyses that support the attainment of those aspirations. Graham refers to the phrase taonga tuku iho as the ‘cultural aspirations principle’. In regard to taonga tuku iho and the validity of being Māori Graham writes,

In a Kaupapa Māori framework, to be Māori is taken for granted; one’s identity is not being subtly undermined by a ‘hidden curriculum’. Māori language, knowledge, culture and values are validated and legitimated. Māori cultural aspirations, particularly in a wider societal context of the struggle for language and cultural survival, is more assured.53

The notion of taonga tuku iho both validates Māori knowledge and also serves as a process of knowledge transmission between generations. It recognises the value of ancient knowledge that has formed over many generations and the importance of knowledge reproduction between generations. This is a critical element in the colonial disruption of whānau structures, and in the maintenance and reproduction of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. The assimilatory policies of the past and the ongoing denial of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga has had devastating effects on Māori. In discussing the denial of taonga tuku iho, Māori Marsden emphasised that cultural erosion and cultural genocide produces a psychological insecurity that then manifests itself in negative areas of social relations. Taonga tuku iho and the revitalisation of fundamental values then become critical in Kaupapa Māori initiatives. As Māori Marsden writes;

The cultural metaphysics or basic convictions which provide a people’s guidelines to life evolve over generations of life experience in which succeeding generations add their quota of knowledge and fresh discoveries to the corpus of their cultural heritage. The customs and traditions of previous generations based on their beliefs and attitudes regarding the nature of ultimate reality, of the universe, and of man [sic] are the foundation stories upon which the mores, standards and values comprise the body of the cultural metaphysics.54

The concept of taonga tuku iho reminds us of the need to draw upon fundamental values, beliefs, understandings and practices in understanding our current context and future developments for our tamariki and mokopuna.

Whakapapa

Central to the notion of taonga tuku iho are whakapapa and whānau, which act as mechanisms both of identity and of knowledge transmission. Whakapapa is a key element in Kaupapa Māori theory. Whakapapa exists irrespective of our specific knowledge of its complexities, and for many Māori the search toward knowing those specificities can be fraught with complications. Perhaps that is why so
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53 Smith, G.H. op.cit. pg467
54 Marsden, Māori 1988 op.cit. 16
many Māori academics include explicit references to their own histories and experiences within their thesis writings. Māori writers such as Mereana Taki and Taina Pohatu locate whakapapa as central to Māori analysis. It provides us with positioning in the world and affirms that positioning and cultural identification. Whakapapa is however more than a means of identification. It is a spiritual connection that brings together all aspects of te ao Māori. Through whakapapa our links are identified. It is a means through which we are able to place ourselves not only in the world but in relationship to each other. This is crucial in Kaupapa Māori theory and in Kaupapa Māori educational initiatives.

Mereana argues solidly that iwi epistemologies are enshrined within the complex relationships inherent within whakapapa. She identifies whakapapa as a relational framework that organises positionality within and between iwi, hapū and whānau groupings. This complexity is often denied in the eurocentric, anthropologically driven, inclination to reduce whakapapa to a one dimensional genealogical table. The key positioning of whakapapa can be seen in the reflection made by Dallas Pahiri in regard to Kaupapa Māori theory when she states that Kaupapa Māori affirms her own identity as a woman from Waitaha. Whakapapa is an essential element to who we are and what it means to be Māori. This is not singular but is inclusive of our many multiple identifications within collective grouping. Kathie Irwin notes the necessity of recognising the interrelationships within whakapapa; we are each recognised for who we are in relation to our collective being.

Whakapapa establishes not only relationships but also obligations and accountabilities.

Within whakapapa we are a part of a complex set of interrelationships. We are a part of whānau, hapū and iwi. Yet contrary to dominant belief, this does not deny our own person as individuals, rather what it contends is the prioritising of cultural relationships over a notion of privileging the individual. Rangimarie Rose Pere writes that each individual has their own absolute uniqueness and that we need to keep a balance between individual and group pursuits. There appears to be a false
assumption regarding Māori that we can only operate as a group, this is an incredibly simplistic belief in regard to what is an elaborate system of connections. What is needed is for us to define ourselves and how we wish to operate in regard to whānau, hapū and iwi. It is not for the Crown or others to define how we should relate to each other. Kathie Irwin succinctly places the control of identification in the hands of Māori. Control, she argues, is exercised through tikanga Māori including whakapapa.\(^{62}\)

John Rangihau warned of the cultural dangers of collectivising to the extent that whānau, hapū and iwi are denied.\(^{63}\) This, he wrote, may be yet another colonising tool. The act of collectivising iwi nations in such a way supported positivist paradigms that were located in colonial dualisms. The term Māori became a signifier for notions of inferiority, heathen, barbaric, uncivilised, immoral, natives whilst the coloniser placed themselves within the positions of superiority, civilised, christian, moral. These dichotomies served one purpose, to provide justification for the many acts of colonial violence that were to follow. In taking on John Rangihau’s point, we are alerted that the subjugation of whānau, hapū and iwi to a collective Māori being has the potential to deny the complexities of who we are. However, we must also be cognisant that the maintenance of an ability to mobilise collectively and be accountable for each other in a wider context. In our historic experience of collective movements such as Kotahitanga and Kingitangi there has been particular strength in being able to draw across whānau, hapū and iwi in terms of support.\(^{64}\) We need to find those spaces that allow for both our whānau, hapū and iwi beings to be validated in ways that enable us, as Māori, to maintain collective strength. In spite of many recent assertions to the contrary I would argue that whakapapa is a point of meeting, a space that enables us to be whānau, hapū, iwi, Māori, tāngata whenua, all simultaneously.

Whakapapa also brings to the framework notions of history that are located within Māori understandings. Whakapapa is integral to a discussion of our histories and the relationships that position how we relate to each other. To understand our whakapapa is also to understand the kōrero, the stories, the knowledge that comes with events, people, relationships. These are passed through whakapapa and whakapapa is passed through the telling of those histories. Te Rangihiroa Peter Buck notes that those who showed interest in whakapapa, or those who by virtue of birth required that knowledge, were taught both their own iwi links and the connections between iwi. This, he
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\(^{62}\) Irwin, K., 1992 (b) op.cit.:11

\(^{63}\) Rangihau, John 1975 'Being Māori' in King Michael (ed) Te Ao Huriuiri: The World Moves On, Hicks Smith & Sons/Methuen N.Z. Ltd., pp165-175

\(^{64}\) The Kotahitanga movement is discussed in Chapter Ten. For further reading refer Rei, T. 1993 Māori Women and The Vote, Huia Publishers, Wellington. Kingitanga was development as a means of unification across Māori in dealing with the oppressive actions of the settler government, in particular in regard to land confiscations. For an historical account of Kingitanga developments refer Gorst, J.E. 1864 The Māori King, Macmillan & Co., Kent, reprinted 1959 Oxford University Press, London & Pauls Book Arcade, Hamilton
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stated, ensured that the links were referred to appropriately in future meetings. Throughout writings regarding Māori history and Māori knowledge related to how our world came about are also references to whakapapa. History and who we are is not separate, it is one in the same. The relationship of whakapapa to history as inseparable. It informs us of our relationships with the world around us, with Papatūānuku, Ranginui and all the multitudes of atua that make up the Māori world. Whakapapa brings to Kaupapa Māori theory a necessity to view notions of history within Māori constructions.

History has been constructed within Western colonial definitions that are antithetical to Māori interests. In validating our own concepts such as whakapapa we validate Māori views on what constitutes history and how that is constructed. This then brings to Kaupapa Māori theory a form of analysis that calls for a number of critical reflections not only on how history is constructed but also how we view issues in the present. For many, the phrase ‘the past is our present is our future’ may be considered overused, however it is a phrase that brings with it a way of viewing the world that is not linear or strictly chronological. Whakapapa brings an assertion that we are accountable to our tūpuna, our mokopuna and all past and future generations. It also brings to the fore expectations in regard to our relationships to each other. In a time when we have seen increasing imposed fragmentation between many iwi organisations and urban based Māori groupings, whakapapa can mediate. That is if those parties involved are willing to consider whakapapa in ways that are not determined by money or colonially imposed structures.

Whakapapa also brings an understanding of relationships and how they can be viewed. This is critical in Kaupapa Māori theory in that we have certain forms of relationships that are defined within cultural frameworks. For example Linda Tuhiiwai Smith in her article regarding the building of a wharenui at Auckland Girls Grammar highlighted the complexities of Māori relationships within mainstream Pākehā schooling, which has its own sets of rules regarding relationships. What Linda highlights is that Māori people working within Pākehā institutions are not only having to negotiate relationships and accountabilities with the institution but also between each other as Māori. This brings to the fore a whole raft of relationships between whānau, hapū and iwi and also in terms of tuakana–teina relations. These relationships can have both cultural and political significance, and irrespective of our knowledge of whakapapa they are constantly in play whenever Māori people
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65 Buck, Te Rangihiroa Peter 1949 The Coming of the Māori, Māori Purposes Fund Board, Reprinted 1987 Whitcoulls Ltd. Wellington
66 atua relates to tūpuna Māori of the spiritual realm, the goddesses and gods, the guardians of the many realms.
gather together. Whakapapa embraces those complexities and within Kaupapa Māori theory we too need to engage the complexities rather than seek simplistic answers, which is what tends to be the habit of many who work alongside Māori people. Mereana Taki highlights this in her research as follows:

Whakapapa often appears deceptively simple as a theory. This has often been because of a eurocentric trend to reduce its meaning to a shallow one dimensional and single-meaning comparison of contemporary Pākehā concepts. Whakapapa is a part of a complex iwi epistemological body of iwi thought, universalisms, theories, concepts and their dialectical practices with the iwi world. Of importance to this thesis is a fundamental premise that the iwi is central in the reproduction, transmission and practices of their whakapapa. This body of theories establishes their direct descent to the iwi cosmos and ethos. Iwi whakapapa also sets out broad relational frameworks for organising positionality within and between iwi in their iwi, hapū and whanaunga groupings. Whakapapa is also relevant for articulating where and how iwi nations relates to Tāuiwi-Pākehā colonial society.70

Mereana articulates strongly the multiple levels of knowledge that are a part of whakapapa kōrero. Whakapapa is not only about identity and knowing who we are as Māori, but is surrounded by discussions of the whenua, of inter-relationships, of past experiences and key events in whānau, hapū and iwi history. Kaupapa Māori theoretical analysis must be equally as layered. We can not afford to parake in common-sense accounts that reduce issues to simplistic reasoning and explanations. Whakapapa as a key element in Kaupapa Māori theory requires us to explore relationships, how they are played out, how power is constructed within those relationships, and the layers of knowledge that are a part of those relationships.

Whānau/Whanaungatanga

Another element of whakapapa within Kaupapa Māori theory is that of whānau. The whānau and the cultural relationships that are expressed through whanaungatanga are central to the Kaupapa Māori project. Whānau provides a support base from which we as individuals are located in the wider dimensions of whakapapa and Māori society. Margie Hohepa describes the various ways in which whānau can be regarded.71 Whānau, she states, has both traditional and more 'evolved' meanings. Traditional in the extent that the construct of whānau through whakapapa connections remains as a key definition, and more recently the cooption of the term whānau in the linking of groups of common interest, or common kaupapa. Margie describes these groupings as follows;

Whānau based on unity of purpose rather then whakapapa lines, sometimes termed 'kaupapa whānau' or 'metaphorical whānau', develop around a particular aim or goal.72

70 Taki, M. 1996 op.cit.:pp24-25
72 ibid:18
Mason Durie also emphasises the diversity of whānau in contemporary Māori society. He notes that the term whānau has undergone changes in line with changes that have occurred in Māori society more generally, noting that there now exists a spectrum of whānau types that range from whakapapa whānau to kaupapa whānau. Mason identifies the following whānau types:

- **whānau** as kin: who descend from a common ancestor;
- **whānau** as shareholders-in-common: who are shareholders in land;
- **whānau** as friends: who share a common purpose;
- **whānau** as a model of interaction: for example in a school environment
- **whānau** as neighbours: with shared location of residence;
- **whānau** as households: urban dwellers;

the virtual whānau: that meet in cyberspace due to geographical separation. Those **whānau** that are not based within whakapapa relations may be seen in general terms as whānau of interest or kaupapa whānau. They are constituted and maintained through a particular purpose or set of circumstances, and therefore have diverse roles and obligations to their members.

In the context of Kaupapa Māori initiatives the **whānau** has a key role in providing support. Graham states that the **whānau** structure brings with it reciprocal roles and obligations. In the schooling context of Kura Kaupapa Māori this includes the **whānau** giving support to individuals and groups who are a part of it, and also that the **whānau** of the children give support to the wider school **whānau**. The **whānau** is a crucial component in Māori society. Meaning both extended family and birth, the word **whānau** is encompassing of both creation and of support mechanisms for all in the **whānau**. Whānau provides the basis for Māori society upon which other forms of organisation such as hapū and iwi are dependent. It has also been a key target for colonialism and colonising forces have actively sought to undermine the fundamental values and relationships that are the basis for **whānau** wellbeing.

**Whānau** also brings to the fore collective obligations and responsibilities for each other in the wider sense of wellbeing. This is critical in providing analysis of the individualistic drive of colonial ideologies. Family has been defined in dominant discourse as the nuclear family, the structure that supports and perpetuates colonial mythologies in terms of relationships in particular gender positioning. In an article I wrote recently in regard to lesbian **whānau** I made the following point:

The limited definition of the ‘family’ as nuclear, heterosexual and constructed within limited gender roles is not ‘natural’, but is constructed by certain groups to benefit their own interests...

---
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For many people the definition of ‘family’ is not dependent on a legal contract of marriage, nor is it dependent on the idea that family must be one man, one woman and their children. Such a definition is not only limited but it also imposes restrictions on how different groups wish to construct their families. With the nuclear heterosexual family being centred as the ‘norm’, the standardised version of family, everything else is measured against it and labelled and judged accordingly.76

If ‘family’ is defined as a nuclear, colonial, heterosexual model then any other familial forms are only visible if they are labelled, for example ‘extended’ family, ‘blended’ family, ‘mixed’ family. The term family itself is taken for granted structure. Where colonisation has clearly had an impact on whānau,77 it remains that whānau is not a nuclear family model.78 No matter how often people and organisations juxtapose the terms whānau and family they will never be the same. Hence, the role of whānau in Kaupapa Māori initiatives is essential in that it affirms the roles and obligations that we as Māori have as a collective group to each other. It also relates directly to a process of intervening in socio-economic areas, which Graham refers to as ‘Kia piki ake i ngā rarurau i te kainga - the socio-economic mediation principle’.79 Where Graham identifies this separately in his discussion of intervention elements in Kaupapa Māori I tend to locate this notion within the overall context of whanaungatanga. Rangimarie Rose Pere identifies whanaungatanga as the practices that provide the bond and strengthening of the whānau. She writes

Loyalty, obligation, commitment, an inbuilt support system made the whānau a strong stable unit, within the hapū, and consequently the tribe.80

These roles of whānau are roles that are worth cultivating in a movement for change. This needs to be in a context of recognising a point made by Margie Hohepa that belonging to whānau can be hard work and requires commitment.81 Mason Durie also indicates that there are both adversities and possibilities that face whānau.82 The adversities are the consequence of the colonial disruptions we have experienced as a people over the past 200 years. Colonisation actively targeted Māori societal structures for destruction, and in doing so have created a context of dysfunction. It is not whānau that is dysfunctional, it is the societal philosophies of capitalist greed, of racism, of sexism imposed through patriarchal institutions, of homophobia and the tolerance of misogyny that creates and perpetuates dysfunction. Each of these oppressive regimes impose conditions that are for many of our whānau intolerable and in societal terms must be considered unacceptable. The potential of whānau to intervene in whānau well-being is argued by Mason Durie, Graham Hingararoa Smith, Fiona
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Cram and Suzanne Pitama, Rangimarie Rose Pere. This requires rebuilding and reconstructing our understandings in terms of the possibilities of whānau and the roles and obligations that are a part of maintaining collective relationships.

It is my view that if the potential of whanaungatanga is able to be realised then that would include the supporting whānau and intervening in some of the impact of socio-economic oppression for those whānau members. The practice of supporting each other within kaupapa Māori contexts is critical in overcoming difficulties that face us in the current context of colonisation. This does not imply that whānau should carry the burden of ‘freeing us’ from an unequal class structure, rather it identifies that in terms of mediating effects of such oppression whānau is a tool that we as Māori can utilise. It is clear that the imposition of class structures and the denial of economic control to Māori of our resources is a central tool in the actions of colonising regimes. Given that the active undermining of whānau as a means by which to undermine the wider structures of Māori society was a calculated act, intended to facilitate the alienation of land and resources, we can look closely at the role of whānau in developing interventions. Whānau and whanaungatanga provide us with an understanding of fundamental relationships of Māori structures. Kaupapa Māori theory can play a significant role in engaging class issues and the imposition of class structures upon Māori, in providing critical analysis of the need for Māori to enact those fundamental values inherent within whanaungatanga that can intervene in the impact of class oppression through the collectivisation of resources and support. This is in line with Rangimarie’s contention that whanaungatanga is the key to the strength of the iwi.83

Whanaungatanga as an expression of forms of relationships then relates beyond whānau to hapū, iwi and Māori relationships more generally. This then provides us with opportunities to explore the complexities of relationships that exist both within whānau and beyond. For example, relationships of tuakana-teina are not regarded solely within whānau but also provide frameworks for relationships across whānau within hapū and iwi. There are also wider relationships between and across iwi that are equally able to be defined within whanaungatanga terms. In current debates regarding definitions of what it means to be Māori or the Fisheries ‘what is an iwi’ courtesies appear to continually ignore the complexities of whanaungatanga as they exist across iwi and our fundamental obligations to each other as whanaunga.84 It is my view that if we are to espouse notions of transformation and intervention as an element of Kaupapa Māori theory then we need to engage more deeply the ways in which colonisation and more recently neo-liberal market philosophies have undermined those obligations.
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Whānau and whanaungatanga bring to Kaupapa Māori theory notions of relationships, collectivity, obligations and accountabilities. These are important notions when analysing the positioning of Māori people. Within education policy over the past 30 years Māori whānau have been defined predominantly within deficit and deprivation models, where whānau has been regarded as maintaining 'undesirable' characteristics. Positioning Māori definitions of whānau as a starting point challenges those deficit models. Where the entrenchment of the nuclear family model was instrumental in the attack on Māori structures and gender organisation, the reaffirmation of whānau can in turn challenge the colonial constructions of gender. Rangimarie Pere states that within her whānau, hapū and iwi experiences of whānau, both women and men worked together for the wellbeing of all.\(^{85}\) Documentation by Anne Salmond also highlights the contributions of both Māori women and Māori men in the raising of tamariki.\(^{86}\) Whānau then, as an element in Kaupapa Māori theory, calls for us to engage critically the way that relationships are constructed and to ask where and how Māori structures are positioned within a given situation. Furthermore, as a range of Māori people have noted whānau provides a structure and mechanism for intervention.\(^{87}\)

**Ako Māori**

Alongside the structural notions of whakapapa and whānau are pedagogical notions such as ako Māori. Ako Māori is imperative to Māori Education, in that it is a critical term when referring to Māori pedagogical forms and also contributes significantly to processes of transformation. Ako refers to both teach and learn, it relates to both learning and teaching processes. The akonga as student and kaiako as teacher. Ako relates to the processes that informs both positions. Ako also notes the possibility of being both learner and teacher.\(^{88}\) Rangimarie Rose Pere addresses the complexities of relationships within tikanga Māori that are a part of informing ako. What is highlighted is the interaction between key concepts in tikanga Māori as contributing to learning and teaching. Furthermore, Arapera Royal-Tangaere asserts that the model provided by Rangimarie also illustrates the positioning of the tamaiti/mokopuna with a series of relationships.\(^{89}\) Arapera outlines pedagogical processes that are drawn from the poutama and relates these to Western theories of psychological development.\(^{90}\) What Arapera shows is that notions of ako and tuakana-teina provide us with clear processes of child development and of learning and teaching processes.
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The work of Margie Kahukura Hohepa in *Te Kōhanga Reo* also identifies the importance of *ako.* Margie discusses *tuakana-teina, whanaungatanga* and *āwhina* as culturally defined pedagogical methods that highlight Māori processes of *ako,* of learning and teaching are embedded in the *Te Kōhanga Reo* that her research was located in. Graham Hingangaroa Smith refers to *Ako Māori* in terms as a ‘culturally preferred pedagogy’ and asserts the need for culturally defined and appropriate teaching and learning strategies in particular practices that connect with the cultural and life circumstances of Māori. This has been established within *Kaupapa Māori* education initiatives. For example within the *Te Aratiatia* programme it is clearly articulated that we operate from a *Kaupapa Māori* base. This then places certain expectations on the group, both staff and students. It is noted that *manaakitanga, āwhina, tauteko* are all expected within the programme, that we are all responsible for each other to nurture, care for and support each other through the programme. Often this is a ‘new’ proposition for students who have experienced more individualistic, competitive approaches to their study. This is all part of *ako Māori.* *Ako Māori* thereby assumes the validity of Māori processes of learning and teaching, and asserts the notion that we have a right to access those processes. Drawing on notions of *ako* in analysis is, as with the other elements, relatively straightforward. Validating *ako Māori* means that in any context, policy document, curriculum document, and learning or teaching environment we can ask how and where elements of *ako Māori* are positioned. The pedagogical potential of *ako* are yet to be fully explored and this is an area of development required. However, as noted previously utilising culturally defined elements within the learning and teaching process is essential to *Kaupapa Māori* initiatives.

*Decolonisation: Kaupapa Māori theory and Counter-hegemonic Possibilities*

In my Masters thesis I argued that *Kaupapa Māori* theory is inherently anti-colonial and acts as a counter-hegemonic theoretical resistance to colonial oppressions. This deserves more in-depth discussion. *Kaupapa Māori* theory as a framework or theoretical environment locates itself fully in *āhuatanga Māori* and in doing so expresses critical Māori concepts and notions about the world, in all its forms. The articulation of *te reo Māori me ōna tikanga* as the central *pou* for *Kaupapa Māori* theory therefore ensures counter-hegemony, in that it demands that it is from a Māori worldview that we derive our analysis. It is also from this place, this cultural location, that we engage all other theoretical explanations.

---
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Kaupapa Māori theory does not take for granted the existence of colonisation, rather it assumes the absolute validity of our world-view and from there locates the acts of colonisation as impositions. Kaupapa Māori theory will, and does, exist of its own right, it exists irrespective of colonisation. It does not rely of colonisation for its expression. All aspects of Kaupapa Māori theory are located in being Māori. As such, Kaupapa Māori theory necessarily critiques colonial oppression or all forms of oppression that seek to deny our fundamental place as Māori. In this sense Kaupapa Māori theory differs from Critical theory, albeit that the desired critique of colonisation has parallels.

Kaupapa Māori theory is anti-colonial but that is not the central reasoning for why Kaupapa Māori theory exists. Kaupapa Māori theory exists because we are Māori and our reo and tikanga have their own fundamental right to exist and to be articulated within all parts of our lives. The outcome of that is that Kaupapa Māori theory is anti-colonial in that working from positions such as tino rangatiratanga directly calls in to question the position of colonial settlers on our lands. This is not an argument that places the anti-colonial nature of Kaupapa Māori theory as secondary but which regards the critique of colonisation as an essential element, however it is driven from a distinctive Māori analysis. A critical role of Kaupapa Māori theory is to provide us with frameworks through which to theoretically view the world and to engage understandings, explanations, descriptions and analysis of issues and events that impact on our lives. Colonisation is one such issue, as are the many oppressive ideologies that come with our colonial experiences.

Coming then from a Kaupapa Māori theory necessarily means that we must engage all forms of colonial oppression and those structures that maintain and perpetuate those oppressions. This indicates a need for Kaupapa Māori theory to have the scope to engage the multiple forms of oppression that exist. These include oppressions based on race, class, and gender, in all their many forms, and which includes analysis of these forms as they exist in a context of colonisation. In considering the writing of this section I began to think about the many resistance movements of our tūpuna and how those movements were based within the notions of revealing injustice, of resistance, of revolution, of struggle. In my own iwi of Te Ātiawa there is a legacy of struggle that is well known throughout the country. The struggle to hold land, the struggle to hold tino rangatiratanga is documented throughout the history of Taranaki.96

As a Māori theoretician these struggles indicate the involvement of many of our tūpuna in working against injustice. Kuni Jenkins documents this in her doctoral thesis. She emphasises the active role our people took in light of colonial oppression.97 Decolonisation is then not 'new' but can be seen in the ways in which our tupuna engaged the colonial forces of this country. For example in regard to the

illegal taking of lands in Taranaki, our people were engaged in multiple responses to the actions of the colonial settler government, in an attempt to seek redress and the return of the lands. Those actions ranged from direct confronting of colonial agents to long term acts of passive resistance. Decolonisation is a process of revealing and actively analysing the impact of colonial ideologies and practices upon our people.

Many authors refer to the decolonisation element of Kaupapa Māori theory with terms such as revitalisation or reclamation. These terms recognise a sense of loss through colonisation and emphasise the need to take control of those things we wish to vitalise and claim back. We need however to be continually critical and reflective of what it is that we are actually seeking to reclaim, and to be wary of the idea that there is a pure form of precolonial ways of being that exist in some uncontaminated state now. After 200 years of contact with our colonisers there now exist ways of being that have been integrated into Māori thinking that are not ours. What we need to determine as Māori is what of those things are useful and what is dangerous for our present and future generations. It is my position that just as it is for Māori to define and control what constitutes our fundamental values and tikanga, it is for Māori to provide the critical analysis and reflection on the impact of colonisation on our mātauranga and tikanga. It is my assertion that Kaupapa Māori theory supports and engages such a process. The counter-hegemonic element of Kaupapa Māori theory is crucial, it is the political articulation of the elements outlined here in that it brings to the fore the unequal power relationships that currently exist within Aotearoa as a consequence of colonisation.

Summary

Kaupapa Māori theory is a growing and thriving theoretical framework. This chapter has been focused upon outlining some philosophical underpinnings of Kaupapa Māori theory as a contribution to the growth and expansion of Kaupapa Māori theory. What is important to take from this chapter is not only what has been developed in the literature and discussions about what constitutes Kaupapa Māori theory but more importantly to gauge the future possibilities of what Kaupapa Māori theory can be or can become. The potential of theory for Māori, the possibilities for the political, social, cultural and spiritual understandings of the world that may be expressed through Kaupapa Māori theoretical analysis and explanations. Kaupapa Māori theory, it has been noted, is the poutokomanawa for this thesis. It is the strength which holds the wider structure of the discussion as is laid here on this paper, as one would lay thoughts for others to consider.
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In this chapter I have lain before you what I consider to be some key elements that appear in the literature regarding Kaupapa Māori theory. It is argued that te reo Māori me ōna tikanga are central factors for Kaupapa Māori theory as they provide the language and cultural framework within which all elements are located. The validation and affirmation of our own language and our own cultural knowledges and practices is essential to Kaupapa Māori theory, it is the tāhuhu or the backbone to which all things are connected. In extending on intervention elements of Kaupapa Māori schooling identified by Graham Hingararoa Smith I have outlined the following elements as fundamental to Kaupapa Māori theory, Te reo Māori me ōna tikanga; Te Tiriti o Waitangi; Tino rangatiratanga; Taonga tuku iho; Whakapapa; Whānau; Ako Māori; Decolonisation. Within each of these elements is a multitude of Māori concepts and ways of being and therefore the potential for Kaupapa Māori theory is expansive. The whānau, hapū and iwi context further opens the possibilities for Māori people to engage theory in ways that are not constructed with generic understandings. It is necessary to further reiterate that these elements are not exclusive, nor should they be viewed as prescriptive. If anything, this remains a very general overview of Kaupapa Māori theory as it is currently expressed, particularly within the 'Auckland School' of thought. It provides to the thesis a theoretical overview from which I will engage the theories and notions that follow, and on which I will expand in chapters nine and ten, when engaging the ways in which Mana Wahine theories are articulated.