CHAPTER SIX

COLONISATION AND THE IMPORTATION OF IDEOLOGIES OF RACE, GENDER AND CLASS

Colonisation has had, and continues to have, a major impact on the ways in which Māori women's realities are constructed. Colonial discourses based within ideological constructions of race and gender [and class] have served to define Māori women in line with particular roles, expectations and practices.¹

Introduction

Within Aotearoa, pre-colonisation, whānau, hapu, iwi had developed and interrelated in complex ways. This included forms of relationships that existed between women and men. These relationships have however been interrupted through our experiences of colonisation. This chapter explores ideological importations that have contributed to those interruptions; the ideologies of race, gender and class.

Identifying the construction of race, gender, and class ideologies through colonial discourses is a means of understanding underpinning ideologies that exist in the maintenance of unequal power relationships. The importation of these ideologies that are based within Western colonial paradigms has meant the disruption of some fundamental beliefs. As Ani Mikaere has stated there are many Māori who have taken on colonial belief systems, however there has also been active resistance to such those ideologies.² If that was not the case then many of the writings that appear in this thesis would not exist. This chapter sets out processes whereby colonial beliefs of race, gender and class have impacted on positioning and experiences of Māori women. It is my view that in order to effectively talk or write back to such ideologies we need to interrogate the origins of those constructions. This chapter provides an overview of historical beliefs related to those constructions in order that we are able to more deeply understand the complexities of the dominant discourses that pervade our society, and the ways in which the intersection of such discourses impact multiply on Māori girls and women.

The concept of race is a colonial importation. Prior to contact between Māori and Pākehā race did not exist for Māori. As has been discussed in the Kaupapa Māori Theory chapter social organisation was mediated through whakapapa and the complex ways in which relationships were determined

amongst whānau, hapū and iwi. Those constructions were based within culturally defined structures. The Western notion of race is also constructed within culturally defined notions however this is rarely made explicit, nor is the means by which racialisation of peoples served the interests of some groups over others. Racially based hierarchies, as they exist in present day Aotearoa, are a historical consequence of colonisation. Colonisation as a process has been significantly influenced by the ways in which race has been constructed. Race and the development of racial hierarchies has been both the justification for, and maintenance of, imperialism around the world. As both the reasoning for and the means by which colonisation is perpetuated the construct of race requires careful consideration in this thesis. What is considered here is the way in which race is constructed both historically and in current day usage. The importance of this is located in the need to identify those multiple discourses and ideologies that impact upon Māori women. Race is one of those ideologies. The colonisation of Aotearoa was conducive to the universal expansion of the capitalist mode of production in an attempt, by colonising forces, to provide new sources of land, raw materials and labour power. According to Cherryl Smith\(^2\) it was clear that colonisation was driven by a "desire of profit". It is equally clear that imperative to the accumulation of profit was the subjugation of the indigenous population. Cherryl argues that the realisation of the empire required the rendering as inferior indigenous peoples.\(^4\)

Authors such as David Bedggood argue that throughout the colonisation of Aotearoa, a conscious attempt was made to create a 'little england' through the transplanting of key elements of British society: economics, politics and ideologies\(^3\). There is little doubt that capitalism may be directly implicated in the use of racial justifications for the colonisation of our lands. It also has a direct relationship to the maintenance and reproduction of racist and sexist discourses. It is not, however, the sole reason for the existence of these discourses. This chapter gives discussion as to the origins and foundations of dominant colonial ideologies and engages with the ways in which these ideological constructions contribute to the development of specific discourses about Māori.

The construction of class in Aotearoa is also premised upon the importation of particular definitions and structures within a defined colonial hierarchy. As David Bedggood has argued the imposition of class was necessary for constituting a 'little england'. Colonial imperialism has been a flagship for capitalist exploitation around the world. Some of the earliest contact between Māori and Pākehā was often in the form of traders, sealers and whalers.\(^5\) The concept of 'discovery' as asserted over Indigenous Peoples
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lands generally can be viewed in relationship to ideas of ownership. In Australia, Aboriginal people were made invisible in their own lands when the colonising forces assumed 'ownership' on the basis of 'Terra Nullius'. The theft of Indigenous lands and subsequently the theft of natural resources through to the commodification of our language, culture and genetic makeup, has all been reasoned and justified through capitalist growth and expansion.

Gender is a concept that is used generally to refer to being either female or male, however in sociological terms gender is defined more specifically as being those beliefs and understandings about what it means to be either female or male. Gender in this sense is considered both socially and culturally constructed. Bev James and Kay Saville-Smith note the following definition of gender as a social construction:

The concept of gender refers to qualities, traits and activities collectively deemed to be masculine or feminine in any given society. Although 'things feminine' are associated with females, and 'things masculine' are associated with males, sex and gender are quite distinct. The content of masculinity and femininity does not have an immediate biological foundation, despite the fact that gender defines what it means to be a male or female in a social sense. Gender is a categorization based not on physiological but on social attributes. Sex, that is the categories of 'female' and 'male' is purely physiological.

Not only is the categorisation of gender not physiological it is also necessary to state explicitly that biological arguments are used purely as a justification for the maintenance of unequal power relations which privilege the controlling group. Gender is socially constructed. That social construction is undertaken within political and cultural boundaries. In a chapter on Gender and Education in Aotearoa, Diane Mara and I provided the following definition:

Gender is therefore a social construction, which may be viewed in general terms as the social overlay of beliefs, values and practices that are attached to our biological sex.

Such definitions directly challenge the notion that gender roles are natural or derive from biological and physical makeup and in doing so provide a critique of the construction of roles and beliefs as 'natural', relocating them as social and cultural. Gender relationships are not 'natural' and neither are any unequal power relations within society. Gender roles are socially constructed as opposed to being biologically determined and therefore are able to be transformed. Gendered beliefs are produced and reproduced
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within the context of particular societal and cultural structures. As a social construction gender then may be located within the beliefs, understandings and values of a society.

Colonial ideologies encompass those beliefs and ideas that are constituted through the worldviews and knowledges of the coloniser. This is a much easier statement to make than it is to define. The parameters of what constitutes the colonisers worldviews and knowledge are not necessarily clearly delineated, but are blurred by the many years that lie between us in 2001 and the experiences of those in the 18th and 19th centuries. This could potentially raise issues for the identification of colonial ideologies, however there are ample writings to draw upon that trace diverse sources and explanations of European worldviews and dominant Western thinking of the time period. This chapter outlines some of those views beginning firstly with ideas of race and racial hierarchies then moving to discussions of gender and finally class. The ordering is of no particular significance as it is the intersection of these understandings that is of central concern to this thesis.

Race

Bob Blauner\textsuperscript{12} argues that a product of Western colonialism is the development of other means of categorisation, which ideologies of race contribute to. This chapter provides a general overview of the development of race as a basis for social organisation and in terms of the ways that race as a social construct operates as a means to engage more directly the impact of those constructions on Māori. Race as a social phenomenon cannot be separated from issues of gender, class or indigenous struggles. This chapter is designed to begin the discussion on the ideologies that fundamentally underpin wider discourses pertaining to Māori women in order that we more fully understand their origins.

There is little talk in wider society about race, even though racial ideologies are a part of the structural arrangements of this country. An avoidance of racial issues is a part of maintaining the dominant myth that Aotearoa has 'good race relations'. There are many organisations that work to maintain a 'we are one people' mythology in order to continue the marginalisation of Māori.\textsuperscript{13} This idea is not new to Aotearoa. It is in fact a mythology that is perpetuated daily through a colonially imposed system.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{11} ibid.
\textsuperscript{14} The avoidance of engaging discussions about race have become increasing evident to me. Recently two Pākehā colleagues reported back on a seminar held about issues of Equal Educational Opportunities (EEO). The seminar that had been given clearly stated that Māori and Pacific Islands students were being disproportionately affected by
African-American author Toni Morrison discusses the invisibilisation of race within the American Literary field through a habit of ignoring race and argues that this must be engaged with by writers and literary critics. The process of ignoring race she notes;

...is understood to be a graceful, even generous liberal gesture. To notice is to recognize an already discredited difference. To enforce it's invisibility through silence is to allow the black body a shadowless participation in the dominant cultural body.15

This statement can be related directly to Māori. It seems that many people in this country do not want to talk about race in ways that are identifiable. Issues of Māori student participation are often more conveniently reduced solely to economics, which as a consequence means Pākehā staff are not challenged to deal with wider cultural and political implications that are a part of the racial stratification of this country. It is not easy to call into question the denial of the impact on racialism, especially in a country that oppressed the indigenous peoples whilst simultaneously promoting our land as a 'new' land where the colonial settlers could access 'new opportunities'. Their new opportunities have been, and continue to be, off the backs of Māori people. To use a term from Cherie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa, the colonisers have crossed to a land of opportunities via 'this bridge called my back'.16 Critical race discussion is imperative in any analysis of Māori issues in Aotearoa as race has been a defining notion since early contact.17 This involves engagement with and critique of the myths that found notions of racial superiority and contribute to the promotion of white supremacist practices.

**Challenging the myth of the ‘Scientific’ Order**

Many authors note that the term race is problematic. Blauner writes that race is a problematic notion because there is such a variance between scientific and commonsense definitions.18 He notes that physical anthropologists reject the notion because people are of mixed lineage. However, the commonsense usage of race as a defining characteristic remains prevalent and therefore race cannot be considered a fiction. David Goldberg19 notes that although the term race has become a contestable notion most still agree that it continues to impact upon contemporary society. For Angela Davis race is a key defining element in the stratification of societal hierarchies.20 Likewise, Floya Anthias and Mira

---

17 Johnston, P.M. 1998 op.cit.
18 Blauner, B. 1994 op.cit.
19 Goldberg, David Theo 1990 (ed) *Anatomy of Racism*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis
Yuval-Davis note that where race as criteria for designation has been widely discredited it remains and continues to impact and therefore cannot be denied. As such the term race cannot be dismissed, as it has a particular place in the way that differences and inequalities have been constructed. Added to this is the recognition that racism exists and is experienced by many people daily.

Michael Apple argues that race is not a stable category but that how, why and by whom race is used is both contingent and historical. Equally race is not an object that is easily quantified or measured as a biological phenomenon but is a complex set of social relations that are constructed and reconstructed. Race has on the whole been presented to us through dominant discourse as biological with the hierarchical structuring of race being presented as inevitable because of the 'naturalness' of biology. Western sciences have contributed significantly to the development and maintenance of such ideologies. As such I agree with Michael Apple's contention that issues of race must be treated with a seriousness and complexity that recognises it is critical that we refuse to separate our discussion of race from gender, class, sexuality and other relations. Furthermore, we must be always mindful of the ways in which power, power relations and interests are central to the construction and perpetuation of any ideology, as too is the ability for such ideologies to change form dependent on the historical and social context. As Cameron McCarthy and Warren Crichlow remind us:

... racial difference is the product of human interests, needs, desires, strategies, capacities, forms of organization, and forms of mobilization. And that these dynamic variables which articulate themselves in the form of grounded social constructs such as identity, inequality, and so forth, are subject to change, contradiction, variability, and revision within historically specific and determinate contexts.

As racism is founded upon discourses of racial difference then the notion of race must continue to be a key part of our analysis. For those who are aware of the expansiveness of this field it will be obvious that I have not sought to bring forward an authoritative version of these developments. If indeed that is at all possible. The focus taken here is one of providing an overview of the development of racial ideologies in order that I can later explore the impact of those developments on Māori.
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Constructing a Mythology: Race As A Defining Notion

Lucius Outlaw\textsuperscript{24} notes that the notion of race first appeared as a form of categorisation in a poem by William Dunbar in 1508. Later, it was used in literary works referring to a class of people or things. Race as a classification gained increasing authority through the 18th century with works that Outlaw describes as ‘typological thinking’, that is, the defining of people as being of certain ‘types’. This lay the foundations for the next step into classificatory systems of race.\textsuperscript{25} Drawing on ‘scientific’ explanations, race became quickly legitimated as a means by which to classify peoples and place groups in relationship to each other through the existence of a ‘natural’ hierarchy. This then legitimated of the idea that groups’ behaviours could be determined by their positioning in the racial hierarchy. The movement to a hierarchical construction was not, however, immediate but was developed throughout the early 19\textsuperscript{th} century. It was in the 19th century the term race gained more specific definition related to a process of signifying groups on the basis of biology. The development of this definition of race is linked to a greater need, of Europeans, to classify peoples, particularly given the increased encounters with other peoples.

Gustav Jahoda provides an indepth literature review in terms of the development of discourses on race.\textsuperscript{26} Looking firstly at Western notions of race from within Western societies Jahoda identifies the construction of the ‘wild man’ as being key in subsequent developments in regard to race. He argues that the images of the ‘Other’ as strange, exotic and feared has been a constant feature in European history and has its ideological foundations in early Greco-Roman traditions. The conceptualisation of difference as foreign and fearful may be seen in ideas about the ‘monstrous races’. The ‘monstrous races’ be argues were believed to have been located in Asia, Africa (then referred to as Ethiopia) and remote parts of Europe. Relating writings by Adam of Breman in the 11\textsuperscript{th} century Jahoda identifies clearly that the construction of the ‘monstrous races’ was located very much in notions of the ‘ferocious barbarian’ who were often recorded as being physically misshapen and more often than not referred to as ‘flesh eaters’.

What we see in the early writings is the establishment of way in which physicality and beliefs in cannibalism became defining characteristics of the ‘Other. These were to become increasingly prevalent in the definitions and discourses that developed in relation to Indigenous peoples. In order to show the

\textsuperscript{24} Outlaw, Lucius ‘Toward a Critical Theory of “race”’ in Goldberg, David Theo (ed) Anatomy of Racism, University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota, pp58-82
\textsuperscript{25} Outlaw identifies Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, James Cowles Prichard, Georges Cuvier, S.G. Morton, Robert Knox, Count Joseph Arthur de Gobineau as key figures in the early writings about race.
\textsuperscript{26} Jahoda, G. 1999 Images of savages: Ancients [i.e. ancient] roots of modern prejudice in Western culture, Routledge, London ; New York
prevalence of such constructions Jahoda has provided abundant references as examples, two of these follow as illustrations of the ideas upon which more recent race theories are based.

In this sea are also very many other islands, all infested by ferocious barbarians... Likewise, round about the shore of the Baltic Sea, it is said, live the Amazons in what is now called the land of women. Some declare that these women conceive by sipping water. Some too, assert that they are made pregnant by the merchants who pass that way, or by the men they hold captive in their midst, or by various monsters, which are not rare there... And when these women come to give birth, if the offspring be of the male sex, they become Cynocephali; if of the feminine kind, they become the most beautiful women. Living by the themselves, the latter spurn consort with men and if men come near, even drive them manfully away. The Cynocephali are men who have their heads on their breasts. They are often seen in Russia as captives and they voice their words in bards... Palefaced, green and macrobiotic, that is, long-lived men called Husi, also live in those parts. Finally, there are those who are given the name of Anthropophagi and they feed on human flesh.\(^{27}\)

And in those isles are many manners of folk of divers condition. In one of them is a manner of folk of great stature, as they were giants, horrible and foul to the sight; and they have but one eye, and that is in the midst of the forehead. They eat raw flesh and raw fish. In another isle are foul men of figure without heads, and they have eyes in either shoulder one, and their mouths are round shaped like a horseshoe, y-midst their breasts. In another isle are men without heads; and their eyes and their mouths are behind in their shoulders.\(^{28}\)

In each of these accounts, which have been written two centuries apart, there is clear indication of discourses about the ‘Other’ that include ideas about physique, sexuality, gender, cannibalistic tendencies, barbarianism, aggression. The first account gives some insight into the ways in which gender, sexuality and race have, from very early in Western ideologies, intersected in ways that establish complex beliefs about the ‘Other’. According to Jahoda the tendency to embellish accounts about adventures was common, as to was the practice of developing chronicles from second or third hand descriptions. As Jahoda rightly indicates such inventions present views to the world about the ‘Other’ that are developed through a process that gave authors open licence to reinvent in line with their own belief systems.

The ‘wild man’ figure continued to be a significant influence throughout the 17\(^{th}\) and 18\(^{th}\) centuries, alongside this existed earlier biblical notions that saw the descendants of Ham as linked to evil. Jahoda argues that the link between the ‘wild man’ and blackness has been determined through interpretations of the biblical stories of Ham and his descendants, noting that the legend of Ham was seized upon to provide justification for the enslavement of blacks.\(^{29}\) The defining of certain races in animalistic terms grew increasingly through the many attempts to outline the ‘Great Chain’. This included many attempts

\(^{27}\) Adam of Bremen 11\(^{th}\) century, Trans. 1959 cited in Jahoda ibid.:1
\(^{28}\) Letts [1346?] 1953 Vol. 1, pp 141/2 cited in Jahod ibid.:2
to compare humans with animals, in particular apes as a means of determining the evolutionary chain from which humans descended. Discourses surrounding the relationship between apes and Black and Indigenous peoples were powerfully expressed and the assertions made in respect to the chain of creation are nothing less than sickening to read. Jahoda notes that author after author sought to position Black and Indigenous peoples as ape-like in their process of seeking a social order. A prominent example of this Jahoda contends is what he refers to as a ‘watershed publication’, that being Edward Longs’ ‘History of Jamaica’ published in 1774. According to Jahoda, Long argued that there were close resemblances between apes and ‘Negroes’ [sic], however Jahoda himself although aware of Longs writings states that he was not ready for ‘the shock of reading his distasteful rantings’.

In order to gain some idea as to the thinking that pervaded writings regarding race and ideas of animality and bestiality we need only look to some of Longs statements in the area.

The women are delivered with little or no labour, they have therefore no more occasion for midwives than the female orang-outang, or any other wild animal.

I do not think that an orang-outang husband would be a dishonour to an Hottentot female; for what are the Hottentots? They are... a people certainly very stupid, and very brutal. In many respects they are more like beasts than men.

[Orang-utans do not] seem at all inferior in their intellectual faculties to many of the Negro race; with some of whom, it is credible that they have the most intimate connexion and consanguinity. The amorous intercourse between them may be frequent; the negroes themselves bear testimony that such intercourses actually happen; and it is certain, that both races agree perfectly well in lasciviousness of disposition.

In the context of slavery in Jamaica such discourses were accepted by many in the time as they provided justification for the perpetuation of slavery that provided labour in the Jamaican sugar plantations. It is also easy to be sickened by the vulgarness with which Long sought to deny the humanity of Black peoples.

**Seeking ‘Scientific’ Justification: Debating the Origins**

A prominent area of debate throughout the development of race theories was that of the origins of races, in particular surrounding the concepts of monogenesis and polygenesis. Monogenesists believed that all race groups came from a single origin and therefore were also able to reproduce across races. The basis of monogenesis belief was christianity with the origins deriving from Adam and Eve and a firm belief in

---
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eugenics, of the fertility of people with each other.\textsuperscript{32} The polygenesis argument was that races had multiple origins. Stephen Gould notes that the polygenist debate was considered part of the 'American School' of Anthropology, which was not surprising, he advances, given that it was a nation that was practicing slavery and actively dispossessing Native peoples from their lands.\textsuperscript{35} Louis Agassiz a theorist of polygeny was first 'convinced' of the separate origins of the races after immigrating to America and having contact with African-American people. His assertion of polygeny is without doubt derived from his personal experiences in American, writing to his mother he stated;

... all the domestics in my hotel were men of colour. I can scarcely express to you the painful impression that I received, especially since the feeling that they inspired in me is contrary to all our ideas about the confraternity of the human type (genre) and the unique origin of our species...
What unhappiness for the white race - to have tied their existence so closely with that of negroes in certain countries! God preserve us from such contact!\textsuperscript{34}

Polygenists argued that sexual relations across races would be unable to reproduce 'offspring' and if they did it would mean a deterioration of the superior race.\textsuperscript{35} There was a solid belief that any interracial mixing would inevitably mean the deterioration of the superior race, producing what was viewed, by polygenists, as a "vicious type of half-breed, useless alike to himself and the world".\textsuperscript{36} For Agassizi the idea of sexual relations between races was explained as being an outcome of the 'overeager' sexual desires of young white men and the 'sexual receptiveness' of Black women. He warned resolutely against the 'mixing' of races, arguing that it would be difficult to "eradicate the stigma of lower races" if there was a continued 'mixing' of blood.

Origins of language provided both monogenesis and polygenesis arguments with 'evidence' to support their claims. Monogenists argued all languages derived from three primary sources, Indo-European, Semitic and Malay, which then traced to a singular language that had, conveniently, disappeared. Dismissal of this argument was not difficult, particularly given the many varied languages that were supposed to belong to each category. The plurality of languages was more conducive to the idea of plurality of 'races', the polygenesis belief. The Darwinian process of evolution was important to the development of ideas regarding race, especially the notion of 'species'. There is some contention as to how Darwin himself saw the relationship of his studies, of animal and plant species, to people. Lucius

\textsuperscript{33} ibid.
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Outlaw\textsuperscript{37} notes that Social Darwinism grew from some attempting to relate Darwin’s work from the ‘Origin of the Species’ to people. He remarks that this is something that Darwin was hesitant to do. Christine Bolt, however, observes that Darwin hinted in ‘Origin of the Species’ at the relevance to that work to people and later accepted the application of his work to studies regarding classification of people.\textsuperscript{38} This is more evident in his 1871 publication ‘The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex’, where Darwin refers directly to the differences between

the highest men of the highest races and the lowest savages, are connected by the finest gradations\textsuperscript{39}

In the role of ‘naturalist’ on board the Beagle, Darwin had opportunity to make contact with a range of Indigenous peoples and he comments on those meetings, and his observations of slavery, in his publication ‘Naturalists Voyage Around the World’.\textsuperscript{40} Darwin is, at least, contradictory in his position in regard to both slavery and the positioning of Indigenous peoples. He exhibits humanistic beliefs in regard to the treatment of ‘slaves’ noting with some concern acts of degradation, however at no point does Darwin challenge or question the underpinnings of slavery. In one discussion he goes as far to note in regard to those enslaved at one particular estate that “on such fazedas as these, I have no doubt the slaves pass happy and contended slaves”\textsuperscript{41}. A comment easily made by a ‘free’ white man. In general terms Darwin appeared to have been sympathetic in terms of treatment of peoples but in both his writings and his theorising on the ‘origin of man’ [sic] he maintained dominant oppressive beliefs in terms of where Black and Indigenous peoples were positioned in the racial hierarchy. In his observations whilst on the H.M.S Beagle Darwin refers to the ‘Indians’ as immoral, “\textit{like wild beasts}”\textsuperscript{42} and described one groups of ‘Fuegians’ as follows:

These poor wretches were stunted in their growth, their hideous faces bedaubed with white paint, their skins filthy and greasy, their hair entangled, their voices discordant, and their gestures violent. Viewing such men, one can hardly make one’s self believe that they are fellow creatures, and inhabitants of the same world.\textsuperscript{43}

‘Origin of the Species’ was published some 20 years after Darwin’s experiences on the Beagle and was clearly influenced by that journey. It was published as a abstract of what had intended on being a significantly larger piece of work, and was reprinted on numerous occasions which also gave him the

---

\textsuperscript{37} Outlaw, Lucius ‘Toward a Critical Theory of race.’ in Goldberg, David Theo (ed) \textit{Anatomy of Racism}, University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota, pp58-82

\textsuperscript{38} Bolt, C. 1971 op.cit.

\textsuperscript{39} Darwin cited in Jahoda, G. 1999 op.cit.:pp57-58

\textsuperscript{40} Darwin, C., 1897 \textit{A Naturalist’s Voyage : Journal of researches into the natural history and geology of the countries visited during the voyage of H.M.S. Beagle round the world, under the command of Capt. FitzRoy R.N.}, J. Murray, London

\textsuperscript{41} ibid:22

\textsuperscript{42} ibid:208

\textsuperscript{43} ibid:203
opportunity to make changes to the text and to answer criticisms. Where Darwin may have initially been cautious in taking his thesis from flora and fauna to human classification there is no doubt that in following works such as ‘The Descent of Man’ that this is exactly what he did. ‘The Descent of Man’ was developed for the express purpose of determining whether there was relevance of his earlier work to people. Here, Darwin argues that there is as much diversity within races as there exists between races and therefore intellectual abilities could not be accurately gauged solely be cranial measurements. However, in saying that Darwin also very clearly articulates that races graduate into each other and therefore exists as a part of the processes of human development. Throughout his publications Darwin consistently infers the inferiority of the ‘natives’ and there is no doubt in my mind that the use of his writings on evolution, the survival of the fittest, natural selection and sexual selection could readily be taken up by others who wished to argue the inferiority of Black and Indigenous peoples.

Ruth Benedict notes that Darwin, a monogenesist, argued that ‘mankind’ [sic] did not constitute groups of fully developed species as if this was the case then people of different races would produce sterile offspring if they ‘mated’ (as argued by the polygenists). This was clearly not the case so the concept of species required categorisation through identification of other characteristics. Skin colour, eye colour, hair colour, hair form, shape of the nose, cephalic index (measuring head shapes), and stature were the most common forms used to distinguish anatomical features for racial classification, however these classifications are all superficial in that the diversity within ‘races’ means that clear classifications are unable to occur. Benedict contends that there is no doubt that the categorisation of people through groupings such as Caucasoid, Mongoloid and Negroid represent a history of “anatomical specialization”, however she argues that people can not be assigned to a singular category on the basis of biological characteristics. To clarify this point she writes;

There are Whites who are darker than some Negroids; dark hair and eyes are common among all ‘races’; the same cephalic index is found in groups of the most diverse ‘races’; similar hair form is found among ethnic groups as distinct as native Australians and Western Europeans; blood groups do not define ‘races’.

Moreover, she is clear that no one characteristic can determine categorisation and that any emphasis on the superiority of one race that is justified through such categorisation is highly flawed. Where she is without doubt placing a challenge to the racial superiority notion Benedict continues to accept, if not maintain, the fundamental typologies and has been criticised for that.

44 ibid:preface
46 Benedict, R. 1942 op.cit.
47 Benedict ibid:28
The movement to identify physical differences between races as a means of determining positioning in the order of things was highlighted even further through processes such as craniometry. Craniometry was utilised in Europe and America as a means by which to determine physical differences as a basis for classification. Stephen Gould challenges the fundamentals that underpin these forms of 'science'. He provides a depth analysis of a range of measuring tools and their theoretical explanations regarding intelligence. What is most useful is the careful deconstruction of a range of racially based theories in order to reveal both the inadequacies of much of what has been present as valid science and whose interests have been served. As such he has given considerable analysis to reveal the inadequacies of much of what was presented as 'pure' science and drawn the connections between works that asserted the racial superiority of white people to acts of oppression and colonisation. Research supporting the notion of racial hierarchy are carefully deconstructed by Stephen Gould, his findings being that either unintentionally or intentionally, either through incorrect calculations or conscious manipulation of data, research undertaken by these 'leading scientists' was shaped by priori racial prejudices and conclusions.

Christine Bolt argues that the danger of the term race came when it was located beyond a biological concept to one where race and culture were directly linked, and cultural characteristics were used as a means by which to classify divisions of races. This points highlights the connection between expressions of the existence of biological race and ideologies of superiority as based on notions of cultural supremacy. The biological sciences pertaining to race gave justification to supremacist ideologies, which in turn spawned the need for the further development of the 'sciences' of race. In essence they became one in the same, 'science' confirmed the stratification of peoples that in turn legitimated its own existence. There can be no artificial separation as has been indicated by those themselves who participate in such 'science', just as there can be no separation of the cultural and political interests of those who control and drive such 'sciences'. Christine Bolt indicates that there was confusion in the articulating of the link between race and cultural characteristics. In my view she is generous in her analysis. There was no 'confusion'. Confusion implies a lack of awareness. The legitimation of unequal power relationships through the 'scientific' premise that some 'races' are proven to be inferior occurred not due to confusion but because it directly maintained the privilege of colonising nations.
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Constructing Gender: The myth of a God-Given Order

Gender and gender relations are most pertinent to this thesis in understanding forms of social relations and dominant worldviews that were inherent in the colonising process. Conservative notions of gender emphasise that these relations are 'ordained by god' and therefore is not only 'natural' but is the way 'god' planned it. Such arguments are concerned with the conservation of dominant relations between women and men, in order to maintain 'traditional' gender relations e.g. that women's roles are as mothers, wives, nurturers and men as breadwinners, public figures, leaders etc. Conservative explanations also view biological difference as 'proof' that traditional gender relations are expected and necessary in order to maintain stability in society. Women and men, girls and boys, it is argued in a conservative paradigm, are different both biologically and in a god-given order and therefore must be socialised appropriately in to their traditional 'natural' roles in order to ensure societal stability. To change the 'natural' order of things is to undermine the fabric of society. The construction and maintenance of gender hierarchies are dependent upon the acceptance of such ideological assertions as 'natural' and necessary.

Radical feminist writer Mary Daly relates the symbolism of 'Father God' within Judeo-Christian beliefs as spawning in the 'human imagination' the validity of patriarchy. Simultaneously, she argues, societal mechanism of oppressing women were viewed as 'fitting'. Quite simply Daly has identified the beliefs of God as male, God as ruling, God as natural. To which I would add, God as white. She argues that if God is constructed as male then it may be equally said that men are constructed as God, which is a state that then functions to maintain the subordination of women by man/God. A similar argument is proffered by Luce Irigaray, who argues that man is defined through his relationship to God. She states that God is necessary to man in that God has been created from man. Moving further she posits that not only is God defined as male, God is also infinite and therefore man is able to locate himself as infinite, that is without limits. For women, however, there is a denial of access to infinity, as a direct consequence of a denial of a woman-God. For Irigaray the denial of a female trinity has culminated in a form of paralysis for women in that women remain defined only through the mother relationship to the male-God thereby maintaining the dominant Western representation of a male trinity God with a virgin mother. The limited consideration of the 'virgin mother' and her alliance with the God-father contributes to the ongoing reproduction of patriarchal, male-God ordering, and therefore the ongoing

52 It is important to note that where the examples given are primarily from a fundamentalist framework there are clearly more 'liberal' christian groups that would agree and endorse the basic ideas promoted in regard to gender roles as 'ordained'.
53 Daly, Mary 1973 Beyond God The Father: Toward a Philosophy of Women's Liberation, Beacon Press, Boston:13
55 Irigaray is speaking directly of men
positioning of women as subordinate. Māori woman academic Helene Connor argues that one means by which this positioning is maintained is through the defining of Eve as the 'temptress' who was seen as being morally inferior to Adam due to what was viewed as lack of control. Interpretations of Eve as the 'inferior' being, the instigator of 'sin' and cause of man's (Adams) fall from divinity provided strong discourses that reproduced the overall notion of the inferiority of woman, and the belief that such inferiority was a part of the God-given order. As Helene argues, the 'curse' on Eve served to construct women as subordinate and 'morally inferior'. Drawing on the writings of Rosemary Ruether, Helene identifies the 'theology of subordination' as locating the subordination of women as a part of a divine and 'natural' order. This assumed order is clearly evident in Genesis:

    Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy desire shall be to thy husband and he shall rule over thee.

Helene argues that the maintenance of the hierarchy of patriarchal order was also dependent of the maintenance of the dichotomy of the two Marys, those being the Virgin Mary and Eve. This was particularly influential in the development of the notion of an 'ideal' woman. 'Eve' became woman as corruptible and as a corrupting influence, whilst Mary as Virgin mother was that of the 'divinely chosen'. Marina Warner also brings to light the constructions of Mary as Virgin that provide a basis for definitions of women-hood within Christianity. Marina Warner raises critical questions about construction of Mary as the Virgin mother through challenging dominant beliefs that surround the idea of virginity. She identifies that Christian notions of virginity were reproduced through two fundamental discourses and that these were affirmed through a range of practices, one of which included the process of acknowledging the conferring of sainthood on select women.

First, the Fathers of the Church taught that the virginal life reduced the special penalties of the Fall in women and was therefore holy. Second, the image of the virgin body was the supreme image of wholeness, and wholeness was equated with holiness. For both these reasons, the defence of the virginal state was worth all the savagery to which saints like Catherine of Alexandria (d.c.310) and Maria Goretti submitted, and won for them the eternal accolades of the Church.

---
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To be a virgin was to escape the ‘Fall’. There were those that espoused virginity as a state for women so they would not suffer the consequences of the ‘Fall’. Where men were also expected to be chaste, for women virginity was associated strongly with purity. Marina Warner argues that women were presented with the belief that they had equal possibilities as men as long as they adhered to the Christian code, specifically that of sex and childbirth. The notion of purity is central to the notion of virginity as presented through the dominant Christian ethic. This was supported through the positioning of Mary, the Virgin Mother, in opposition to that of Mary Magdalene. The construct of such dualisms i.e. the Virgin and the harlot, supported the maintenance of the more general concepts of purity and impurity. In the wider context the idealising of the Virgin promoted conditions whereby the majority of women were ‘impure’.

Marina Warner argues that in order to accept the Virgin as the ‘ideal purity’ required all women to regard their own condition as impure. Mary Magdalene is one of a number of women constructed as the ‘harlot’ figure. She provides the alternative to virginity, and is the prototype of all that is impure and sinful. However, even the harlot has possibilities for redemption and this is fulfilled through the taking the Eucharist as a means by which their ‘sin’ is forgiven. The extremes within which women are located through notions of good-evil, pure-impure, virgin-harlot, construct powerful discourses that define women’s positioning, and which maintain the notion of female inferiority and male superiority.

The entrenched notion of male as superior and in particular the conceptualisation of God as male (and therefore male as God) within Judeo-Christian beliefs is highlighted by the resistance of any attempt to shift that paradigm, as feminist theologist Rosemary Radford Ruether notes that the very possibility of referring to God as female, as ‘she’ is enough to arouse intense responses that in her view exhibit a ‘phobic response’ and ‘emotional hostility’. She argues that in a system of male monotheism there is an established hierarchical order through which women relate to men as men relate to God. The hierarchical God-man-woman ordering then serves to ensure the maintenance and reproduction of processes that subordinate women, citing the following New Testament as one example of this ordering:

But I want to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a woman is her husband, and the head of Christ is God. Gender relations become the basis for the denial of women’s direct relationship to God and thereby provides the justification for the creation of dualisms that reinforce women as inferior to men. Furthermore, she argues that male monotheism serves to reinforce patriarchal rule and that women are
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connected to God not directly but only through men.\textsuperscript{58} This order is further intensified with the notion of ‘evil’. I agree with Ruether’s argument that evil is spoken of as ‘sin’. Sin, in her words, “\textit{implies a perversion or corruption of human nature}”, and only humans can ‘sin’.\textsuperscript{59} The oppositional arrangement of good-evil is directly related to notions of inferior-superior. The notion of ‘sin’ mediates these dualisms in that it provides mechanisms for recognising ‘perversion’ and imposing judgement. The hierarchical ordering of gender in Judeo-Christianity leads to notions of evil and sin being more directly related to women. This is not to ignore the belief that ‘sin’ is expressed as being a part of ‘human nature’ but recognises that the patriarchal hierarchisation of Christianity has directly associated origins of sin with women. Mary Daly\textsuperscript{70} also highlights the notion of God as the ‘Judge of Sin’ as one example of the process through whom women are judged as righteous or sinful, and that women consistently receive messages that locate their subordinate position to men.\textsuperscript{71} Mary Daly is clear in her argument that women have suffered both physically and mentally under the male-dominant God. It is through Christianity that Eve was elevated to the status of being the ‘cause’ of the fall of Adam. Ruether highlights that the Hebrew ‘myth’ of Eve became significant through Christianity, as it had not been considered with great seriousness in Hebrew thought. In summary, Rosemary Ruether notes that it was not only Eve’s supposed ‘sin’ but it was her mere existence that represented the ‘fall’ of ‘man’.\textsuperscript{72} Stories like this then reinforce the idea that the oppression of women is an outcome of her ‘primordial sin’.\textsuperscript{73} What is important to this thesis is the way in which Christianity defined what constituted ‘woman’, and that those definitions which derived from Judeo-Christian based notions were, and I would argue remains so, directly reproducing subordinate roles for women. The justification is clear, women were subordinate because of the acts of other women, Eve as a particular example.

\textbf{Domesticating Western Women: Gender in the Victorian Era}

The notion of the ‘Victorian’ woman comes from an idea that certain values, practices, expectations and roles of women were derived from the Victorian era. This era relates to the rule of Queen Victorian spanning from 1837-1901. The Victorian era included the beginning of major expansionism that was a part of the Industrial revolution. The rapid expansion of the Industrial revolution brought about considerable change in terms of physical conditions and philosophical positionings. For women, some of key changes in terms of roles can be argued to be a direct consequence of the material shifts that
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occurred. In order to explain some of these shifts it is important to look to writings that discuss the positioning of European women pre-Victoria.

The writings of Anne Oakley explore the positioning of English women in the 17th Century. Oakley’s study ‘Housewife’ explores the roles of women in pre-Industrial society, claiming that in non-industrialised societies work and family did not necessitate separation, and therefore life was not divided into work and family but these were interconnected. Adults roles in ‘work’ derived from identification within the family not separate from it. Where there often existed some division of labour between the sexes the variation between societies was considerable. For British women their involvement in pre-Industrial work was a necessity for the economic well-being of the family, the key occupations being agriculture and textiles. The inter-dependency of work and family enabled women to participate in the means of production and in many areas of production they received equal recognition to men. What constituted domestic labour for women therefore provided more possibilities. Oakley cites the following quote, from Alice Clark, to highlight the many roles of the 17th century English woman.

Under modern conditions, the ordinary domestic occupations of English women consist in tending babies and young children... in preparing household meals, and in keeping the house clean... In the seventeenth century it [the domestic role] embraced a much wider range of production; for brewing, dairy-work, the care of poultry and pigs, the production of vegetables and fruit, spinning flax and wool, nursing and doctoring, all formed a part of domestic industry.

Here ‘domestic industry’ incorporates the idea of the family as a productive unit and therefore the reference is to a family industry, which Anne Oakley identifies as “the unit of production”. The production process was an integral part of the family operations, with production for family use being a part of the wider goal of production for sale or exchange. Oakley also identifies that in the wider societal structures women’s involvement in production was generally seen as appropriate. Her discussion of cotton and wool production gives us an example of forms of division of labour by sex and also the wider economic possibilities for women outside the family industry model.

Anne Oakley describes cotton production in the family as being “like a miniature factory”. Spinning was done by women and children, however women also participated in the weaving and other parts of the production process. This contributed to the overall economic well-being of the entire family. In the wool trade women had a range of potential ways to participate including buying wool herself and selling the yarn or receiving payment for spinning for clothiers. Oakley also notes there were some women “spinsters” who provided totally for themselves through the wool industry. But roles of English women
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in production were not confined solely to what could be considered more ‘domestic’ related activities but reached into diverse occupation as is identified in the following quote;

Work pursued by women in the seventeenth appears perhaps even less congruent with modern ideas of the feminine role. Women worked as pawnbrokers, moneylenders, shipping agents, contractors to the Army and Navy, as glassmakers and managers of insurance offices. They also owned ships and collieries.77

Marriage in the 17th century was viewed as a taken for granted means of ensuring the well-being of the wider extended family unit. Marriage however was, as Oakley so succinctly puts it, not generally undertaken until couples had ‘established their fertility’.78 In this marriage form women were expected to contribute economically; there was no idea that women would be dependent on husbands. Such realities in the life of the 17th century English woman was in sharp contrast to the Christian ethic such as that espoused in biblical terms.79 The subjugation of women as preached by the church, was legitimated in ‘Common law’, however Anne Oakley argues that the impact of this on women’s lived realities was minimal up to the Industrial revolution as economics and production for the family determined relationships.

What is clear is that family relationships were altered considerably through Industrialisation. With Industrialisation came a shift in the dynamics between work and family. Work became located separate from the family, from the domestic unit. Drawing again on the example of the cotton and wool industries, the introduction of the loom meant a change in the structure of these industries. The loom required multiple spinners and so now the weaver would pay for others (outside the family unit) to spin.80 Later, the machinery became too large and could not be housed in the home. The introduction of exporting brought new roles in the process of exchange, and with it the capitalist mode of production. It was no longer a matter of family industry and direct exchange. The industry movement outside of the home and the growth of large-scale factory production had brought a ‘new order’ that emphasised not production for the survival of the family unit, but work as a separate activity that was then measured by its monetary return. The family was soon redefined within which there rose the position of ‘husband as breadwinner’, on whom all in the family depended. This was not a rapid change but was a shift that took place between the mid-17th to mid 18th century. Within the Victorian era, Industrialisation was a critical event that contributed to changes in the roles of English women.
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The strength of, and resistance to, the denial of women to access activities outside the home is evident in the writings of early British feminist Mary Wollstonecraft. Mary Wollstonecraft gave depth discussion of the role of women in the 18th Century drawing together arguments for the advancement of women, however she focused primarily on middle-class women, through education. She argued soundly that women are 'enslaved' by men through the denial of access to an education equal to men and that the subordination of women was linked directly to Christian doctrine. Furthermore, she raised the notion that the promotion of women’s, supposed, inferiority is in the interests of men. Her argument was one that men benefit from the ongoing subordination of women and that this is reproduced in a range of ways, originating in Christianity and maintained through notions of physical and intellectual inferiority. What becomes clear in the discussions of the Victorian era, as an age of transition in material and economic structures, is that the definitions of what constituted appropriate positioning of British women did not necessarily equate to the realities of their actual experience. What is significant in the defining of the Victorian-defined woman is that those ideologies were not limited to expression within that era but extended beyond to reach into the 19th and 20th Centuries, creating major changes in the roles of women both in Britain and in the lands colonised by the British. These shifts are a consequence of patriarchy and capitalism adjusting to each other in the creation of sets of hierarchy that enables the domination of women. For this discussion the notion of patriarchy in collusion with capitalism, in a British/Victorian context, is the key focus. What is needed is an analysis that incorporates the many faces of oppression for women, there is worth in exploring the patriarchy/capitalism alliance as it was played out in the Victorian era, as it enables us to recognise some of the colonial/male dynamics that have taken precedence through colonisation.

It may be argued that the influence of the economic shifts through Industrialisation, combined with Christian discourses became a potent force in the oppression of women. It is evident from the writings of both Oakley and Wollenstonecraft that it was not one ideology alone that brought change for women but the interdependency of both Christianity and the economic situation. In order to ensure societies adherence to the dependency of women in the home the Christian ethic, which was previously marginal because of the economic need for women to produce, gained favour. This was supported by the notions of privatisation and domestication. The idea of privatisation grew as the separation between work and family increased. Work became identified with the public sphere and home as the private sphere. Because of its separation from the public sphere and the realm of ‘work’, the home became a site within which the various ideologies could be reproduced. As Sandra Coney notes the ideal Victorian woman was deemed a self-less woman. Her role as ‘the angel of the house’ was maintained through the Christian ethic of woman as virtuous. To be virtuous was to be a ‘good’ wife and to be following the
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‘naturally ordained’ order. These combined ideologies were soon to be imported Aotearoa as the colonisation of this country began to take full force in the late 18th century as colonising countries were seeking expansion to both release their own internal pressures and also to facilitate the expansion of capitalist intentions into the colonies.

Colonial ideologies located women as chattels, the property of men and therefore inferior to them. The espousal of Christian doctrine and biological theories, rather than debunking each other, became a combined force. Women were now both spiritual and biologically devoid. All that remained was the positioning of women as intellectually devoid in order to ensure an holistic argument for the continued subjugation of women. This is further expanded by Ruth Fry who highlights the debate surrounding what was considered as different levels of intelligence of women and men. This development was connected directly to the biological assertions of Darwinism and much of the argument for the intellectual inferiority of women was grounded firmly in a mind-body relationship. That is biological arguments became the foundation for ideals of intellectual inferiority.

For many years, there had been fascination with theories concerning the different mental capacities of men and women. The ‘cranium theory’ which had, through elaborate measurements, set out to prove that women’s brains were smaller, lighter and less convoluted than men’s were now [1880s] out of date. More fashionable were the gynaecological theories which dwelt on the dangers of upsetting bodily functions in adolescence.

**Capitalist oppression: Structuring Class**

Class structures, like the ordering of race and gender, came to Aotearoa as yet another unwelcomed element of Western ideology. Like other coloniser beliefs the notion of class and the Western organisation of capitalism has assumed a universality that is reflective of the fundamental imperialist belief espoused by colonising nations that they exist as a superior form. The term ‘class’ tends to gain its contemporary usage from the writings of Karl Marx. Arnold Kettle in his discussion of Marx’s role in the development of ‘modern communism’ states that class in Marxist terms refers to a grouping of people that have a common relationship to the mode of production. In expanding this definition he writes:

The capitalist class is a class because all who belong to it are owners of productive enterprises who live by exploiting the labour of those they employ. What makes a person a member of the working class is not that he [sic] works or that he is comparatively poor... what makes a worker a worker is that he sells his labour-power for wages.
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Avril Bell and Vicki Carpenter in their discussion of social class issues in education in Aotearoa note a similar definition. Social class, they write, is related to the economic and social relationships that exists for differing groups in relation to the economic system, the mode of production. What is evident in discussion pertaining to the works of Karl Marx is that the construction of class relations and the notion of class struggle are central.

Karl Marx in the three volumes of 'Capital' outlines complex ways in which the capitalist system establishes and maintains itself through the fundamental exploitation of labour-power in order to gain surplus-value or profit. The mechanisms of capitalistic manipulation have been, as a part of the colonial process, an imposition on Indigenous Peoples and have their origins not in Aotearoa but in the struggles that have been engaged in Europe, in particular France, Germany and Britain. In order to understand the origins of capitalism, and the internal opposing forces of the bourgeoisie and proletariat, Marx indicates that bourgeoisie society has grown from the 'ruins' of feudalism establishing new classes, new forms of oppressive order and new forms of struggle.

In the 'Communist Manifesto' Marx and Engels identify the fundamental premise of capitalism in its intention to exploit through a process of controlling the means of production and reducing all people to a source of wage labour. The control of the means of production is essential to an ability to control social relations. They state;

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society.
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The proletariat in this equation is thereby reduced to a commodity in the market, which is a critical contribution to the bourgeoisie condition that is the formation and augmentation of capital. This essential process of capitalism is outlined in more depth in the three volumes of Capital. Here Marx identifies key tenets of capitalist systems and engages the relationship between such tenets. Beginning with a discussion of commodity, Marx identifies a commodity as that which value is determined by use, consumption and through exchange. A commodity therefore has both use-value\(^{92}\) and exchange-value, the exchange value being a quantitative relation in value of one article for another.\(^{93}\) He outlines that exchange value must be able to be expressed in terms of something common, between those things being exchanged, which may be expressed in greater or lesser quantities.\(^{94}\) Further to this the exchange-value is reliant upon labour-time or labour-power. The value then of a commodity is determined Marx writes by;

The amount of labour socially necessary or the labour-time socially necessary for its production.\(^{95}\)

Therefore in simple terms those things that require more labour, for example by virtue of production or because they are scarce, are considered more valuable. Hence, the social division of labour is constructed through differential value being accorded to differing forms of what is viewed as 'useful labour'. Marx describes this process of differentiation as including both value of the commodity and use-value;

All labour is 'expenditure of labour-power' and in its character of identical abstract human labour, it creates and forms the value of commodities. On the other hand, all labour is the expenditure of human labour-power in a special form and with a definite aim and in this, its character of concrete useful labour, it produces 'use-value'.\(^{96}\)

Given that a full discussion of Marxist theories of class is beyond this thesis, the importance of this discussion is to identify the complexities through which capitalism expresses notions of value. This is clearly evident in the writings by Marx and Engels. What is fundamental to the expression of value, in particular when in search of surplus-value, or profit, is the role of labour-power. Marx argues that in a capitalist system the labour-power of the labourer is exploited in order for the bourgeoisie to gain profit or surplus-value, which is the fundamental intention of a capitalist system in the accumulation of capital.\(^{97}\)

In regard to the value of a commodity Marx argues that there is a process of establishing relative form and equivalent form in determining exchange value, that is the value of a commodity can be established
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in its relativity to a commodity of a different kind or in its exchange value to a commodity of a similar kind. So fundamentally what is argued is that a commodity can only be given exchange value when it is viewed relative to another commodity. The example given throughout 'Capital' is that of 20 yds of linen being of equivalent exchange value to coat. Here the linen and coat are placed in relativity to each other as commodities, then an exchange value is determined in terms of quantity of linen to quantity of coats. The expansion of this equation leads us to a discussion of value determined relative to a range of commodities, this Marx identified as leading to a commodity assuming a 'universal equivalent form', which in turn enabled monetary exchange to be entrenched.98 However, important to Marxist discussion of monetary form is that it is not money that gives commodities value but it is labour-power that gives value, both use-value and exchange value, which is represented in the form of money. Money itself is also a commodity that can become the private property of an individual, whom in turn can accumulate money or as Marx terms it 'hoard' money as private property. So in returning to what constitutes or determines value, the fundamental defining factor is that of labour-power. Those things that are produced from exploitation of labour-power and represent labour-power in the abstract, such as commodities, money and capital are accumulated and circulated in particular ways to ensure the interests of the capitalist system are achieved.99 The fundamental being the accumulation of profit, surplus-value by the capitalist. David Bedgood outlines the notion of class and the complex relationships between value and labour in relation to social relations as follows:

Class is used in no other sense than to mean relations of production. This is the economic base or infrastructure with a mode of production. It is the base because it is production which creates the material means of subsistence and therefore determines all other forms of social life. It is the base because class relations organise and develop the forces of production and therefore the whole 'progress' of human social evolution. In other words, human labour alone is capable of producing use-values, and the control of the labour process is the basis of the distribution of wealth, power and status. He [sic] who controls labour-power controls the use values of surplus labour and can expropriate the value produced.100

What David Bedgood identifies is both the determination, accumulation and circulation of value. Where each of these elements are important to understand in terms of capitalist exploitation, what is most critical is that each relies entirely on who controls the means of production and the labour-power expended in the production of commodities, and ultimately in the production of surplus-value. The capitalist buys labour-power from the worker or labourer, who is productive in producing surplus-value for the capitalist and Marx notes is a part of the process of the expansion of capitalism.101 The labourer
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is a participant, however Marx is clear in the assertion that the capitalist cares little for the labourer outside of what they can produce:

Capitalist cares nothing for the length of life of labour-power. All that concerns it is simply and solely the maximum of labour-power, that can be rendered fluent in a working day... The capitalistic mode of production (essentially the surplus-value, the absorption of surplus-labour), produces this, with the extension of the working day, not only the deterioration of human labour-power by robbing it of its normal, moral and physical conditions of development and function. It produces also the premature exhaustion and death of its labour-power itself.\textsuperscript{102}

Marx outlines that the need for, and exploitation of, labour-power is a key point of contradiction in the capitalist system of social relations, whereby the bourgeoisie is regarded as their own 'gravediggers', and thereby the victory of the proletariat was he believed inevitable.\textsuperscript{103} The contradictory nature of capitalist systems produces the possibility for crisis through which the proletariat can engage in struggle for change. The struggle for change will be driven by the proletariat in becoming conscious of the exploitation of their labour. Class then is both a definition in terms of social relations and how groups are positioned in terms of labour-power and is a potential movement in terms of the potential for class struggle.\textsuperscript{104} Marx argues that once the working class identifies the contradictions inherent within, and the exploitative nature of, a capitalist system then class struggle is inevitable. Class struggle he notes is a political struggle, therefore there is always possibility for change, hence the reference to the bourgeoisie as being their own 'gravediggers'.\textsuperscript{105}

In seeing class struggles as political acts Marx also views the political context as critical in the understanding of class oppression and exploitation. However, his analysis is one of its time and illustrates much of the fundamental racist and sexist assumptions that dominated the society within which his work is located. This does not come as a surprise given the dominance of social Darwinism and the strength of Victorian ideologies. Statements regarding 'primitive' societies appear through the texts of the 'Communist Manifesto' and the volumes of 'Capital', as too do references to the 'discovery' of the Americas;\textsuperscript{106} descriptions of China and Eastern nations as 'barbaric';\textsuperscript{107} 'half-savage hunting tribes';\textsuperscript{108} and clearly anti-Semitic references appear within the text.\textsuperscript{109} Kettle writes that Marx viewed
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primitive societies' as not having developed to produce much more than needed, therefore there is no commodity exchange, this is however located as a form of inadequacy in 'tribal' communities;

Marx pointed out that the main characteristic of primitive [sic] society is that men [sic] have not yet learned how to produce much more that what they need, their simple personal requirements. There is no commodity-production on a large scale for sale or exchange, for there is as yet very little division of labour, except perhaps within individual families. Therefore, although primitive societies may produce leaders – the strongest and most skilful men [sic] – and other individuals, like witch-doctors [sic], who because of their real or imagined cleverness have a special authority among the tribe, they do not produce class divisions until such a time as the people have learned how to produce a surplus above their immediate needs.110

In Kettles interpretation of Marx, there is a 'lack' in the 'primitive' tribal societies in terms of production the outcome of which is the need for class based systems of exploitation are not a necessity in such societies. The extension of that into racist descriptions of societal structures that differ from those of Western capitalist societies. The basis for interpretation of comparison is that of Western understandings, which indicates a eurocentrism that assumes a superiority of the West as argued within social Darwinism and racial ideologies of Western nations. It is not only issues of race and colonial supremacist constructions within Marxism that gain critical attention. Mike Game notes that Marx avoids the issue of the gendered nature of the working class and therefore falls short of identifying the act of the feminisation of labour-power.111 He argues that Marx gives little to the discussion of gender and while in Capital Volume One there is an indication that the labour of women and children was sought by capitalists in terms of the use of machinery, Marx does not engage this issue in any depth. As such Game argues that Marx continues to construct the working classes as male, when in much of the period that Marx was writing the dominant participants in the working class were in fact European women. The construction of the proletariat as male meant that Marx did not then interrogate the role of industrialisation in the changing roles and exploitation of women. Game indicates that this may also be attributed to the need to show the proletariat as masculine, which may have been viewed as more conducive to the assertion that a working class revolution would lead to the overthrow of capitalism. What is evident is that the notion of class systems is not new however Marxism argues that a particular organisation of class is manifested under capitalism that differs from earlier feudal structures. It is this construction of class that was imported and transplanted,112 or using a term from Marx, immigrated, to Aotearoa.

110 Kettle, A 1963 op.cit.: 54
Summary

This chapter has provided analysis of forms of race, gender and class ideologies that were transported to Aotearoa through the act of colonisation. An exploration of race, gender and class explanations prior to colonisation are important to this thesis as they provide the basis for how structures have been developed here by our colonisers. It is my view that in order to understand more fully the existence of unequal power relationships in Aotearoa there is a need to understand the ideological underpinning of those inequalities and the source of the ideologies.

Each of the ideological constructions discussed in this chapter have clearly been developed, maintained and reproduced as means for the justification and ongoing perpetuation of oppressive systems. Those systems have been based within constructed categories that themselves have been defined by those most likely to be served by such categorisations. In Western thought, white men have been instrumental in the instigation and maintenance of power structures in regard to gender with a range of reasoning utilised to justify the positioning of women both as inferior and to be controlled by men. White nations more generally sought to position themselves as superior races and ensure enslavement, genocide and holocaustic actions against Black and Indigenous Peoples around the world. They have also been instrumental in the global assertion of capitalist systems of abuse and exploitation.

The categorisation of race as locating white men, followed closely by white women, at the pinnacle of racial hierarchies is not a surprise to those of us located further 'down the ladder' in such a process of societal organisation. Just as forms of christianity were used to validate the position of white men in gendered order so to do have they been utilised to legitimise white peoples place in the hierarchy just next to a white male god. In discourses of race it is the 'barbaric' 'savage' 'inferior' 'Other' that is racialised, being white is not engaged, rather being white is viewed as the standard from which all other peoples are measured and defined. Adding class to the mix has provided the fundamental economic justification for the foundation and continuance of processes of capitalism that maintain processes of commodification of all things. When value is located solely in terms of capital those who have been unable to accumulate value take their place in the inferior ranks by virtue of an ideology that is based within monetary systems of greed and exploitation.

This chapter is a brief overview of some underpinning beliefs in regard to race, gender and class. It is evident that just as the assertion of the inferiority of some groups is necessary to the maintenance of societal inequalities, so too is the non-assertion of the privilege of other groups, those who benefit, whose interests are served. In these paradigms women are measured in their inferiority to men; Black and Indigenous Peoples as inferior to white; working classes as inferior to the middle and upper classes.
These positions of inferiority are not explained in relation to the benefits accrued to the dominant groups but are located within the idea that such inequalities are part of either [white] 'god-given forms' or as part of a 'natural' order. The importation of such beliefs was a part of what David Bedggood identifies as the 'vertical slice' of British society that was transplanted to Aotearoa. That vertical slice included ideologies that would serve to benefit the colonising forces and justify their means of operation on Indigenous Peoples lands. In Aotearoa the impact of that ideological transplantation has had immeasurable effect of Māori people and served to provide the foundation for ongoing acts of colonial oppression that continue to this day. To identify the strength of this ideological combination I move in the next chapter to look at examples of how race, gender and class notions support the maintenance of colonial assumptions and practices through the documentation of early ethnographers.