

CHAPTER THREE: CRITICAL THEORY

Introduction:

This chapter proposes that a critical European theoretical tradition can be useful for informing Kaupapa Maori theoretical developments on the basis that these are used as a means to critically interrogate European power contexts. Critical Theory provides another emphasis on the need for a critical approach to text and talk. It has been included as a theoretical framework which offers 'insider' knowledge of Kawanatanga. Critical Theory is also viewed within this thesis as an oppositional and resistance bridge which has often been one of the first opportunities in which Iwi descendants have been positively exposed to contested Pakeha knowledge. This form of Pakeha knowledge is viewed as being a complex range of non-colonising knowledge paradigms.

A critical theoretical approach is applied in this thesis, to a range of contexts in which Iwi and Kawanatanga intersect. These include the structural, institutional social, linguistic and cultural spaces that are shared, but also the cultural spaces in which Iwi have retained their identities by preserving and maintaining varying degrees of political and cultural autonomy. This means that Pakeha hegemony is not always a priority of Iwi political agenda except as a political relationship which must be actively opposed, resisted and transformed. In effect the Iwi imperative is to decolonise their status and their collective human condition.

CRITICAL THEORY

Critical theory emerged out of German social theorists concerns about the rise of fascist rule by German social theorists who established the Frankfurt School in Germany. Iwi woman writer and film maker Leonie Pihama (1993) proposes that, this strand of European critical theory incorporates a number of theorists and a range of their works. The emergence of this school of thought matured within a politically volatile context in Germany during the 1920's. Theorists associated with the Frankfurt school include, Antonio Gramsci (c1972,1982), Adorno, Marcuse

and Horkheimer. It was from within the political turmoil of German Fascism that Gramsci (ibid) and his colleagues became disillusioned with the ineffective and overdeterministic approaches that traditional Marxism (1818-1883) seemed to be indicating. The Frankfurt School of theorists argued that Marxism (ibid) had failed to provide an adequate framework for analysing the existing social contradictions and was ineffective in offering up a means by which the situation of political oppression and domination they currently faced could be altered or changed (Graham Hinangaroa Smith, 1990).

German Critical Theory also emerged as a response to growing political disillusionment and the desire of European social theorists for a radical social movement which might progress a radical and fundamental change of their society. The ambition for political change was being considered in terms of requiring a revolution of the people which could be advanced by a revolution of the collective consciousness of the people.

Because a comprehensive approach to these problems was needed, Critical theorists attempted to bring together a number of theories. These theories came to be organised around a number of unifying 'principles' which centralised the claims that;

- (1) the indivisibility of theory and practice,
- (2) the engagement of concrete problems as both the subject of and justification for theorising (Rex Gibson 1986:1),
- (3) emancipatory claims to the extent that individuals and groups are claimed to be enabled to gain more control over their own lives,
- (4) an examination of the limits and possibilities of power, authority and freedom as a basis for understanding and attaining greater degrees of autonomy and agency,
- (5) a rejection of notions such as 'naturalness' and 'given-ness',
- (6) a critical interrogation of the notion of instrumental rationality (which concerns itself with means rather than ends). Critical Theory asks: why do it in the first place?
- (7) problematise the social construction of 'facts' as being humanly conceived, constructed, determined, interpreted and interested. Because of the dynamic character of social construction 'facts' are open to being changed through human action (R, Gibson, 1986:4),
- (8) Critical theory has a revealing function which enables the 'hidden' interests of individuals and groups to be disclosed,
- (9) revise traditional Marxism's thesis that 'base' (material or economic) determines 'superstructure' (the institutions within a society: law, government, education, religion, bureaucracy, the State etc...) wherein economic relationships (capitalism)

determines all other aspects of the human condition.

This macro levelled analytical approach included the important role of individual and group 'human agency' although an analysis of power was not originally incorporated. The claims of European economic reductionist theorists and deterministic theories were criticised by the Frankfurt theorists as having removed the notion of active human agency and the ability of individuals and groups to transform their positionings within dominating contexts. In their translation of Critical Theory into the complex struggles of Iwi Rangatiratanga and Kawanatanga, Iwi radical critical theorists, Graham Hingangaroa Smith (1993), Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1991), Leonie Pihama (1993) and Ranginui Walker (1990) transformed the use of Critical Theory by extending it to include, modify and re-shape this range of European theoretical approaches in positions as 'outsiders'. Gramsci's (c1972,1982) dynamic Marxist (1818-1883) concept of hegemony has also been a useful theoretical construct through which the workings of Kawanatanga have also been critically analyzed by Iwi oppositional and resistance movements.

GRAMSCI'S CONCEPT OF HEGEMONY

Antonio Gramsci (c1972, 1982) gained academic notoriety for his powerful contribution to Western Marxist (1818-1883) thought with his emerging concept of European societal 'hegemony'. This and related concepts have since been incorporated into a broader body of European critical intellectual thought that was completed during Gramsci (ibid)'s imprisonment under Fascist rule. Gramsci's (ibid) book, titled "The Prison Notebooks" was written in the context of Sardinia at a time of increasing social inequality. Gramsci (ibid) eventually determined that radical social change could only be taking up by direct political struggle.

The usefulness of the concept of 'hegemony' for Iwi analysts is that hegemony provides an analytical framework for examining the ways in which Colonial policies have been used to influence, obscure and at times to distort Iwi political sub-ordination. The concept has also enabled further deconstruction of Pakeha Colonial hegemony and opened up a wider range of perceived opportunities for Iwi

opposition and resistance struggles within and against Kawanatanga. Colonial policy making it is being argued, was established specifically to re-shape and inform the active colonisation of Iwi and to maintain this status by manufacturing what appeared as Iwi consent through ideational domination. It is acknowledged that the phenomenon of Colonial policy making as power discourses is not the only Pakeha and Kawanatanga institutional relationships which are used to achieve this outcome, but is part of a comprehensive system of ideational control and management strategically organised by Kawanatanga elites. The concept of Pakeha hegemony is also based in a view that domination and oppression occur throughout a societal structure and that Iwi Maori 'intersect' with this system of power. For this reason it is imperative that Iwi develop a comprehensive and critical structural understanding of Kawanatanga which includes the infrastructural levels of that society such as Pakeha media, Pakeha education systems and Pakeha policy contexts. Gramsci's (ibid) notion of hegemony argues that there exists a political dialectic within and between two spheres of Pakeha society. These are referred to as 'civil' society and 'political' society. Said, E. (1991) has developed this view to emphasise the ways in which 'cultures' were seen to be actively engaging in order to oppose and resist dominating processes and refers to these as what constitutes the notion of hegemonic struggle.

Gramsci (ibid) also theorised that a negative use of the term hegemony could be viewed in terms of forms of social cohesion which were constituted from not only on the dynamic use of political and actual force but also through ideological processes designed to win over popular consent and as a result, the participation of the oppressed in their own oppression. Within classical Marxism, discussions regarding the power of ideas were positioned as an adjunct to European economic theory and were seen to be wedded to the view that a structuralist approach could transform society through systematic structural changes.

Marxist analysis was developed as a European theoretical tradition which were underpinned by notions of a 'modern' and 'emerging' capitalist nation state ideal of society in which Marxism could be used as a means of disclosing various class

structures and interests. Gramsci (ibid) picked up and developed his theory from the results of a study of 'the nature and mechanisms of bourgeois class rule in a stable capitalist society' (see Smart, 1975). A major flaw of Marxist analysis has been the Eurocentric assumption that theory is an acultural phenomenon. This also assumed that all human civilisations were configured in terms of material acquisition and a European societal framework. The development of these European theories ignored the specificity of the cultural constructs that were being used and the particular societal contexts out of which the European concept of class was being forged.

In part this claim was bolstered by Marx's (1818-1883) own white racist assumptions about the superior nature of a European societal ideal. Marx (ibid) wrote at a time when European Imperialism was at its zenith and these influences are reflected in his theoretical work. Marx (ibid) had assumed that what he claimed to be a European 'stable capitalist society' would cease to function once the full extent of the internal contradictions and inequalities were revealed. According to this naive argument Marx attempted to argue that the disclosure of domination by the working classes would somehow generate a crisis and the conditions for the overthrow of oppressive structures. Following from this he argued that, of itself, the crisis within capitalism would bring about a radical transformation of European society. Gramsci (ibid) argued instead that the hegemony of ideas were so powerful that they acted to rationalise and therefore allow such situations of inequality to continue to exist long after Marx (ibid) predicted its idealistic demise. Gramsci (ibid) advanced the notion that it is also through ideational relationships within and between groups that the hegemony of ideas of others can act to mask the contradictions as 'solutions in the mind'.

A basic premise of the Gramscian concept of hegemony is based on how 'the power of ideas' is also able to successfully mute the internal contradictions of a society. A central issue is how more powerful group/s within society is/are able to win the active consent of less powerful group/s over to the world view of their dominant interests, and the ways in which this becomes re-perceived by the less powerful

as a newly formed 'common sense'. The power of ideas are set out in dialectical relationships with the more coercive role of the state 'whose role in the polity is direct domination' (Edward Said 1991:7).

CULTURAL LEADERSHIP

Said (ibid) has developed the view that it was because of notions of European cultural, technological and political superiority (therefore Imperialism) embedded within that culture which made that culture hegemonic in the first place. Said (ibid) developed the argument in which the culture of Imperialism was seen to then afford the European a "flexible *positional* superiority, which puts the Westerner in a whole series of possible relationships...without ever losing him [sic] the relative upper hand" (ibid:7).

Said (ibid) also adapted Gramsci (ibid) usage of the term hegemony to construct a notion of flexible dominant culture *positioning*. This use of hegemony also provides an analytical framework for looking at the complex ways in which Colonial policy⁵⁷ and the presumption of Colonial Paternalism to act and decide the fate of Iwi by a Pakeha 'civil' and 'political' society.

According to Gramsci (ibid) it is the 'power of ideas' which provides the context for social contradictions to exist allowing inequality to persist and dominance to be maintained. Gramsci's (ibid) concept of hegemony is used to centralise the importance of the persuasiveness and pervasiveness of dominant interest group ideas over others within that society. In the case of Iwi, Kawanatanga has historically attempted to bring under Colonial rule and the Colonial control which has been wielded by Pakeha elites.

Gramsci's (ibid) notions of organic ideology and hegemony are set within what he

⁵⁷

The term Colonial policy is defined as the framework used by Pakeha elites in the production, distribution and imposition of Kawanatanga public and social policies from a range of Kawanatanga structures and institutions of power. Kawanatanga is also recognised as the Eurosupremacist system through which Iwi continue to be subjected to British and Pakeha Colonialism.

called the State. In this view society exists at two levels, the civil, or voluntary and consensual level and the political. The political is more usually the level of coercive institutions of power although this is not always the case. In the context of these islands both Pakeha Colonials as elite power brokers and the ascendance of Colonial institutions transformed Iwi leadership. At times indigenous leadership was co-opted, but eventually they were largely usurped by an army of alien bureaucrats and the invasive power of an insidious capitalist power monopoly.

CIVIL SOCIETY AND THE STATE

In Gramsci's (ibid) analysis the state consists of two levels, the political and civil society. Each level also represented distinct spheres of influence. Political society, according to Gramsci's (ibid) view represented the more repressive and coercive institutional functions in society. Civil society on the other hand was represented by the public and private spheres in which the more consensual institutions of society were seen to be located. Civil society is also the level at which ideologies, ideas, symbols and meaning were considered to be dynamically emerging and being contested by and through dominant and sub-ordinate interests struggles.

Said (1991) categorised these levels in terms of civil and political society being;
"...made up of voluntary (or at least rational and non-coercive) affiliations like schools, families and unions, the latter of state institutions (the army, the police, the central bureaucracy) whose role in the polity is direct domination" (E. Said 1991:6-7).

Civil society is defined as those groups, such as schools, churches, clubs, journals and parties, that give support to processes which "fashion the formation of social and political consciousness" (Bates: 1975:353). It also includes the ways in which these relationships of power act to mitigate against the realisation of critical agency, consciousness and action⁵⁸. The role of Colonial schooling and the monopoly by Colonial power elites over the media are two examples of the ways in which consent can be controlled and manufactured. Colonial policy is reinforced and the mythography of Colonial Paternalism 'normalised' as Colonial elites

⁵⁸

see also Spoonley and Pearson 'Nga Take' and the proposal that colonial education was offered to Iwi from the viewpoint that a sub standard quality of education would be sufficient for their perceived needs.

collude in an historically constructed myth that Iwi gave up their indigenous Sovereignty and placed themselves under the absolute and exclusive control of an alien power. If you consider that generations of Iwi descendants were forced into Colonial schools pre-disposed to white supremacist views of the world, it is not difficult to comprehend the annihilative impact that Pakeha controlled Colonial policies of language and cultural genocide would have. When this is considered in relation to over a hundred years of territorial rape and dispossession, the real impact of Colonial policy making and what it has been able to obscure from Iwi and Pakeha at large is obscene. The pervasiveness of a Colonial hegemony of ideas is also carried into the domains of 'culture', which according to Said (ibid) is the level of civil society and culture in;

"Culture...is to be found operating within civil society, where the influences of ideas, of institutions, and of other persons works not through domination but by what Gramsci calls consent. In any society... some cultural forms predominate over others, just as some ideas are more influential than others, the form of this cultural leadership is what Gramsci has identified as *hegemony*... "(ibid).

Ashis Nandy (1982) has argued that colonisation is a 'shared' culture. The works of Gramsci (ibid) and Said (ibid) concur with this view. What Nandy (ibid) has defined as a 'shared' culture, I have defined in this thesis as an intersection.

THE ROLE OF COERCION AND 'POLITICAL' SOCIETY

For Gramsci (ibid) it was also important to draw out an analytical distinction between the ways in which control was being exercised by the State. In particular through the various 'formal' institutional arrangements, defined by Gramsci (ibid) as being comprised of those public institutions, government, courts, police and army which are able to exercise direct control. 'Political' hegemony functioned to ensure the complicity and discipline of those who may dissent. The coercive institutions were also argued to act as a conduit to state control providing a constant psychological threat which could be enacted when 'spontaneous consent' was depleted. Many Colonial policies such as the 1863 Suppression of Rebellion Act and the 1880 Iwi Prisoners Act were created by the Colonial government to serve this purpose.

Gramsci (ibid) also theorised that a resort to coercion or force was seen to be as

an outcome of hegemonic struggle and contestation between conflicting groups attempting to maintain or promote their own hegemony over others. Such conflicts, Gramsci (ibid) contended, often created opportunities for greater use of coercion precisely because the strength of the oppositions and resistances to the prevailing hegemonies acted as a catalyst for a crisis of legitimation. Coercion was therefore an imperative to suppress any threats to its legitimacy (Michael Apple 1982:25). An example of Colonial policies aimed at achieving this kind of compromise were the 1865 Iwi Representation Act. On the one hand indigenous Sovereignty was disregarded while Colonial society offered limited Iwi representation if Iwi acceded to a single political structure and system under Colonial rule. Real political power was never on the agenda.

Gramsci (ibid) also held that any resort to coercion would actually weaken the hegemonic pervasiveness, leading eventually to a hegemonic crisis. According to this theory, ideological appeals no longer serve their purpose of masking the contradictory power relations within society. For Gramsci (ibid), resorting to war was a sign of immense political weakness but if force became necessary for the ruling group/s to exercise, it had to appear to be based on the general consent of the majority. This required the enlistment of ideological institutions such as the media in the manufacture of such widespread consent. It was also a means of re-asserting a balance of consent over force. Hegemony is based on the premise that, "man [sic] is not ruled by force alone, but also by ideas". Many Colonial policies reflect two major influences which border on social control and humanitarianism. It is the latter ideational hegemony which continues to dampen Iwi resistance by appearing to go some way towards the goal of political recognition. The complexities of power discourses and their potential to manufacture Iwi consent are considered next.

DISCOURSE

Black theorist and British based Stuart Hall (1992) has defined a discourse as: a formation of languages that shapes and informs descriptions and representations of 'difference' between two distinct groups and their respective fields of knowledge

and power. Extending on this definition he has included the notion that;

"a discourse is also a coherent or rational body of speech or writing that is able to directly affect a range of ways that discourses are then able to be organised to represent these relationships" (Hall *ibid*:291)

Discourses of European expansion (Imperialism and Colonialism) provided a theoretical and textual framework through which the newly installed Tauīwi-Pakeha hegemony could be recognised and represented. Representation is further developed to include, sociological definitions of a discourse which are concerned with how discourses can act as *representations* of relationships providing a basis for particular ways of knowing about that relationship as a subject, topic and/or field of knowledge. Therefore who constructs, how the Othered are then *re-presented* back to themselves is also of key importance within this thesis.

French social theorist Michel Foucault's (1926 -1984) contribution to a definition of a discourse lies in his focus on a notion of 'power' as dynamic in the processes of production, dissemination and maintenance of knowledge and language. His contribution is also problematic to the extent that Foucault (*ibid*) does not address either Western Feminist notions of gender politics (and by implication any other notions of female ontology) nor does his critical inquiry engage in the problematics of white racism.

Hall (*ibid*:191) contends that a discourse is restrictive in terms of the ways particular topics are then understood. By using a discourse the relationships between two groups, topics subjects and fields of knowledge are able to be constructed in particular ways. Discourses of Colonial 'Paternalism' have constructed Iwi in particular ways which have subsumed their opposition and resistance to alien Colonial rule.

However, by applying a discourse analysis to these elite discourses, Hall (1992:291) argues that the hidden interests at work can trace out the interconnected relationships between the political and civil society. The contradictory character of discourses also means that discourses need to be viewed as open systems which Foucault (1926 - 1984) defines as a *discursive formation*.

According to Foucault (1926 - 1984) the production of knowledge itself through language production is a form of practice or what he coined *discursive practice* Foucault (ibid). Discursive practice, in this view is based on the claim that all social practice is embedded with meaning to the extent that all such practices can be understood as having a *discursive* function. Discourses thereby enter into and influence these social practices.

Discourses of power such as those constructed as 'Native policies' had their origins in earlier Imperial power discourses which were employed to perpetuate and maintain the subjugation of the Indigenous societies Imperialism came to control. Colonial discourses of power were also influenced by these conquests in which notions of European supremacy were traceable to the times of 'Christendom' and an emerging consolidation of a European moral hegemony (Hall; S.,1992:294). The historical genesis of the current Colonial discourses within the Colonial paradigm of British Imperialism deeply implicate British and Pakeha power elites. The interdependent historical connections between Pakeha Colonialists and British Imperialism refutes any claims by Pakeha elites that the discourses of Kawanatanga power used to undermine the efficacy of Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho, were ever innocent.

Teun van Dijk (1992:18) has made the point that the complex weave of European discourses are precisely what enables elite discourses to mask the hidden interests of dominant group politics as well as providing a reproductive framework for the politics of majority advantage. Foucault (1980) concluded that;

"...power produces knowledge... . That power and knowledge directly imply one another, that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute ... power relations" (ibid:27).

The politics of advantage means that the innocence claimed by Imperials and Colonials is not the innocence of children, but rather the innocence of those who enjoy privileged positions as benefactors of advantage.

Within the dominant society power elites play key roles in the production and

distribution of discourses of power. Hall (1992:293) also contends that discourses are never 'innocent' or 'neutral' because of the unequal power relationships which are involved. He suggests that *desire* rather than conscious 'naked greed' is also a factor in the production of a discourse of power. However he concedes, that, 'the West's' encounter with 'the Rest' could not have been innocent because they represented encounters between two grossly unequal powers. Emphasising this Hall states that;

"[the] Europeans had outsailed, outshot and outwitted peoples who had no wish to be 'explored', no need to be 'discovered' and no desire to be 'exploited'. The Europeans stood, vis-a-vis the Others in positions of dominant power. This influenced what they saw and how they saw it, as well as what they did not see' (1992:294).

Moana Jackson (1991) has posited the view that Pakeha Colonials carried with them preconceived views about what they would find in these islands. Both Imperial and Colonial forms of power discourses have coalesced within the history of Colonial policy making. Neither of the power groups had any real intentions of honouring and recognising indigenous Sovereignty in these islands. It had become a fact of British Colonialism that their entry into indigenous societies usually resulted in their demise. In many respects the usurpation of political Sovereignty and the consequent cancellation of any exercise of Iwi Rangatiratanga achieved the same ends. Colonial power discourses such as native policies were one other institutional mechanism with which to ensure Iwi resistance could never again pose a political threat to the installed Colonial hegemony.

THE ROLE OF POWER ELITES

Michel Foucault (1980) contended that the knowledge produced by discourses constitutes a power which can be exercised over the 'known'. As a result, Foucault contends that discourses of power can be used in particular ways to re-position the subject/s of a discourse. Discourses gain greater power because they are espoused by those who hold positions of power which makes it more likely that what they say is more likely to be enforced or gain legitimacy. Power elites have the power to make their statements 'true' because of their access to structural and institutional power status. Foucault (ibid) makes the claim that;

"Truth isn't outside power... . Truth is a thing of this world, it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint...And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has

its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth, that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true, the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish 'true' and 'false' statements, the means by which each is sanctioned, and the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth, the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true' (Foucault: 1980:131).

Colonial policies are also regimes of 'truth' which have emerged from a context of Colonial dominations and exploitation of Iwi as holding a territorial status ruled by its' own peoples. When the 'truth' is restricted exclusively to the constructions of the dominating power group, this is what Gramsci (ibid) has defined as ideational hegemony. Colonial policy making is occurring under these conditions. European Imperial expansion happened because it could happen, it expressed the predominance of European societies during the eighteen hundreds. To this extent British Imperialism and its extension through the physical and political takeover of Iwi territories and peoples occurred precisely because of a broader realisation of international and emerging global hegemonic dominance.

In terms of the particular ways that the Colonial State has constructed discourses relating to 'Native' policies and more recently 'Iwi policies' for example, Foucault (1980) would contend that Colonial policy as a 'public' discourse represents multiple struggles and contestations which cannot be understood outside of their broader contexts of power. Power in the contexts of Iwi and Kawanatanga continues to mean fundamentally different life stances which continue to be struggled over and contested at the intersections. Racism is a key structural arrangement through which power is being transferred and denied. It is part of the cultural baggage of an Imperial heritage.

ELITE DISCOURSE AND RACISM

The work of Van Dijk (1993) is a welcome relief from a previously consistent European literary denial that the topic and concept of racism was worthy of serious study, examination, debate and research. The radical shift signalled by Dutch critical theorist Van Dijk's (ibid) analytical framework required consistency and relevance at two levels;

- a) the discourse analysis must be developed from a framework which centralises the position of the oppressed, dominated and exploited, and,

- b) the framework must necessarily be relevant to and consistent with the perceptions of those whose experiences are directly informed by racism (in this case). Sexism and classism are also critically engaged.

Van Dijk (ibid:18) utilised a critical theoretical approach to an examination of changing forms of racism. Because of the focus Van Dijk (ibid) places on legitimatising the politics and knowledge of those whose direct experience is racism, the approach marked another significant and radical shift because it refused to subscribe to any pre-established 'school' of thought. His work challenges theorists such as Miles and Phisacklea, 1980, Spoonley; Pearson and Macpherson, 1991, who have not resolved the central dilemma that their own positions of power and location within dominant power complexes implicates their work in the reproduction and maintenance of power dominance. Van Dijk (ibid) challenges 'outsider' claims of authority in this area as being based on a false claim of neutrality and he has overcome this dilemma by developing an analytical framework derived from a "definition of the ethnic situation" provided by knowledgeable 'minority' group members within the Netherlands.

Using a problem-oriented rather than discipline-oriented approach, Van Dijk (ibid) developed a framework based on the premise that White racism is primarily a social and political problem of White, Western societies. Van Dijk (ibid) states that this approach is often disclaimed by white scholars whose academic profile is often writing about ethnic relations. Disclaimers have suggested that minority group evaluations of white group practices are cases of 'special pleading', biased, self-serving, vindictive, too angry or cases of 'reverse racism'⁵⁹. Van Dijk (ibid:18) would argue that these form part of a range of responses and statements which reveal the 'subjective' and biased interests of white scholars in keeping minority expertise on the margins. In his view these also inform the discursive practices of power elite racism represented by white academics from which such positions

⁵⁹

Philomena Essed (1987) in her book *'Understanding Everyday Racism'* makes a comprehensive case that white racism operates at an unconscious level but is identified as being learned and in many cases is premeditated. She has called this form of structural, institutionalised and cultural exclusion white racism.

construct minority evidence as 'less reliable' while re-inscribing white scholarship as central and 'authority'. White scholars can therefore proceed from the false belief that they alone are in a better 'more reliable' position based on a narrow definition of their academic culture as being more 'distant' and therefore 'objective'. Although the term anti-racism is problematic, Van Dijk (ibid:19) proposes it as a counterpower movement to white group racism. By gaining a monopoly over power roles, Van Dijk (ibid) contends that power elites are deeply implicated in the rationalisations of inequality which they manufacture. This is partly explained by the particular ways in which power elites have available to their group greater access to a range of public discourses and the control over the ethnic consensus that sustains white supremacy.

A key strength of Van Dijk's (ibid:17) approach is the centralising of a discourse analysis theoretical framework which is explicitly constructed on the basis of being consistent with and relevant to the perspectives of those whose daily experience is that of white racism. He succinctly states that;

"A critical and multidisciplinary discourse analysis thus enables us to reveal not only the discursive patterns of white elite text and talk about ethnic affairs, but also the socio-cognitive and the socio-cultural structures and strategies of their role in the reproduction of racism'.

Knowledge regarding the reproduction of racism within a context of white supremacy that is backed up by patriarchal capitalism at the societal level is vital for Iwi oppositional and anti-Colonial resistance struggles. They can provide important clues for developing counter-hegemonic statements which can 'recapture' meanings which may support rather than mitigate against the interests of the oppressed, dominated and exploited. This approach is exciting precisely because 'expertise' is relocated with the oppressed, dominated and exploited. The approach can also be viewed as emancipatory because it has been set out dialogically in order to validate the politics of experience of the oppressed, dominated and exploited.

Van Dijk (ibid:19) proposes an 'anti-racist' position is problematic on the basis that while many white scholars continue to claim strategic support for anti-racism, his

studies reveal that there is a disjuncture which exists in terms of the translation of such strategies into consistent actions which support anti-racist positions and policies. He proposes instead that this can be overcome by applying the term anti-racism at both the structural and individual levels. White racism is argued to be a White societal structure and framework of power which makes possible the abuse of power based on a self serving use of dominance which is then acted out at individual and group levels and are clearly translated as systematic exclusionary practices.

Van Dijk (ibid:17) sets out a challenge to all scholars, positing the view that political struggle needs to be supported more directly by scholarship which seeks to expose prevailing myths about the role of elites in the construction of an ethnic consensus and ethnic affairs. The term coined by Van Dijk (ibid:17) for this form of active political struggle through scholarship is 'academic dissent'. Through these kinds of processes academics would need to become more actively and directly allied to the struggles of the oppressed, dominated, voiceless, silenced and exploited in order to transform the context of power inequality. Power discourses such as Colonial policy are also reproduced by power elites.

REPRODUCTION THEORIES

In his examination of the concept, Van Dijk (ibid) contends that the biological and technical meanings suggest a: "continuity or duplication of existing objects, organisms, species, or images" (Van Dijk ibid:25). In terms of social reproduction he argues that reproduction includes maintenance of the same structures as an outcome of active processes such as a culture, a class or the entire social system (Van Dijk ibid:25). Social members actively participate and engage in these processes through whose continued compliance social structures, cultures, values and norms are therein perpetuated. Two complicit processes are argued to occur together. A bottom-up (micro-macro) process of reproduction and a top-down (macro-micro) dialectical relationship. In specific relation to the reproduction of white racism, Van Dijk (ibid:25) contends that white group members develop social knowledge about a social system of racial inequality. These are derived from a

context in which racism can be explicitly and implicitly understood as pervading an entire system of inequality that is reproduced through the structural and institutional arrangements as well as the social understandings and actions which have served to ensure its historical continuation. In terms of transforming these arrangements, Van Dijk (ibid:25) would argue that the same is also true for processes of change. However, this thesis takes the view that 'change' needs to be re-interpreted as a transitional step towards a fundamental transformation rather than as an end goal in itself.

Reproduction also includes the ways in which inaction, or failure to stand against white racism, collusion, passivity are viewed as contributing to the perpetuation of systematic racism. In terms of the access to more power, greater influence over larger groups of people through a broader range of opportunities, elites can and do have the greatest sphere of influence over opposing or supporting the reproduction of racism. This means that white group members develop a complex understanding about their power to assert dominant behaviours in particular instances based on an implicit knowledge of the dominant context in which they are enabled to and rewarded for asserting dominating power relationships.

SUMMARY:

In this chapter an overview of Critical Theory was developed and the importance of a critical approach within theory was established. Proposed as a useful tool for Iwi descendants in the development of a critical praxis when dealing with Kawanatanga, critical theory was also broadened to include theories and theorists with a common focus. With the need for a critical approach established a macro levelled theoretical framework was examined. Antonio Gramsci's (ibid) developing concept of hegemony provided useful analytical tools for looking at the ways in which Colonial policy makers use their cultural leadership and co-opt forms of Iwi leadership to serve dominant interests. A notion of civil and political society were proposed as a framework through which the roles of coercion and the winning of active Iwi consent to their ideational domination has been enabled and maintained.

This thesis focuses on Colonial policy constructors and their constructions. This is tied directly to contemporary social and public policy debates which have largely been produced and disseminated by Pakeha power elites. Iwi have rarely been included as active decision makers of the policies which have then been allocated by Pakeha elites to them. The next section examines the dynamic term power discourse and includes a discussion of dominant elite discourses in the reproduction of white racism and racist discourses. Pakeha controlled policy making forums are argued to be sites in which racist discourses are produced, negotiated, opposed, resisted and transformed. The emphasis in this examination was on the radical potential of white theorists to self interrogate, study, debate and research the phenomenon and resolution of white racism.

This chapter has proposed that selected European critical theoretical approaches do contribute as a resource to emerging Kaupapa Maori theorising. Drawing together the foci of chapter two and the continuation of Kaupapa Maori theorising and European critical theoretical approaches, the next chapter proposes that a global context of Imperialism is identifiable. It is recognised that many European countries can be readily identified as Imperial powers, although this thesis restricts its discussions to those between Iwi nations and British Imperial and Colonial power relationships.

CHAPTER FOUR: A BRITISH IMPERIAL CONTEXT

Introduction:

Imperialism has been defined primarily by its supporters in terms which often gloss over and minimise the fact that it has had holocaustic implications across the globe for Indigenous peoples. The pervasiveness of Imperialism is reflected in the realisation that no human civilisation on the globe has been able to avoid some form of relationship to it. For Indigenous peoples and territories confronted by Imperialism the impact of Imperial progress has often resulted in the annihilation of their entire human civilisation. Many other Indigenous nations continue to exist in varying states of political domination, subjugation and silence under installed Colonial elite rule. Imperialism as a historiography of the conquerors, has also been romanticised in ways which construct the Indigenes as having been passive receivers, unintelligent and in some cases, grateful for the impositions of Imperialist and Colonialist domination.

This thesis argues that a range of Crown Colony Government models were developed as the precursors which helped to infiltrate and later take over as Colonial installations within Indigenous territories. These models became the template of a new form of Colonialism whose very existence depended upon British Imperial sponsorship. Colonies led by Mercantile classes eventually emerged as the vanguards used to establish a parasitic and predatorial form of human settlement which are defined as settler Colonies. The use of a Crown Colony Government model also came to symbolise the willingness of Imperial powers to pursue their economic and political interests by invading and subjugating distant territories and its' peoples. Within Aotearoa the entry of whalers, sealers, traders, lawyers and missionaries signalled the intentions of British Imperialism more than eighty years before full blown colonisation was actually begun.

As far as Iwi had been concerned, Pakeha colonists came and settled under the auspices of their Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. In later transformations of Iwi

epistemologies the role of matakite as prophecy and 'seers' were retained. Many years before British Imperialism emerged within Aotearoa, Iwi tohunga predicted the coming of a great deluge in the 1830's, and that it would be a hundred and fifty years before it ended in 1990. Many Iwi descendants directly contested, resisted and attempted to transform their re-positioning under the illegitimate rule of Kawanatanga. It was not until the late 1960's that the full extent of the Pakeha societal disregard of Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho began to centre explicitly on the future of Iwi - their tamariki. Puao-te-ata-tu was a policy and practice of Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. It signalled the end of unquestioned political control and the beginnings of the struggle to realise true political freedom from Kawanatanga.

DEFINITIONS OF IMPERIALISM

Imperialism has been proposed as being;

"...the policy and practices of forming and maintaining an empire: in modern times, it is characterized by a struggle for the control of raw materials and world markets, the subjugation and control of territories, the establishment of colonies" (Websters Dictionary).

Couched in terms which ignore the fact that it is achieved through the immoral dispossession of another human civilisation, this definition also constructs the theft of indigenous territories without acknowledging the grossly unequal power relations which are used to make the 'struggle for control...subjugation and control of territories...[and] the establishment of colonies possible. Indigenous peoples are often silenced within definitions of Imperialism being written by its benefactors. Gikuyu descendant, Ngugi wa Thiong'o (c1938, 1986) has proposed a contrasting and emotional definition that;

"Imperialism is total: it has economic, political, military, cultural and psychological consequences for the people of the world today. It could even lead to holocaust... (ibid:2).

Imperialism is able to be totalized in the sense that it has become a pervasive force in the struggles for freedom which indigenous nations also confront. However I would argue against the view that Imperialism constitutes a totalising consciousness everywhere it has become institutionalised. Black theorist and

artist bell hooks⁶⁰(1986) develops the view that liberatory radical social theory be premised on a fundamental belief that the;

"...politics of domination as manifest in imperialist, capitalist, racist, and sexist oppression must be challenged and changed so that a new social order can emerge...a liberatory radical theory of socialism that would more adequately address interlocking systems of domination like sexism, racism, class oppression" (ibid:28).

As an African descendant whose Tipuna were forcibly removed from their turangawaewae during white slave trade in the America's, bell hooks also writes from a contradictory position as Manuhiri in the Americas. The experiences of black nations peoples are legitimate, and their struggles for emancipation unquestionable. However in her developing theoretical work hook's continues to struggle with the dilemma that it is Native American Indian Sovereignty which is unaddressed in her analysis. To this extent her writings have privileged the struggles of her people in struggle with white American Imperialism. A black/red anti-imperial struggle has yet to be proposed. Hawaiian theorist and artist Haunani Kay Trask (1986) posits the view that Imperialism is ontologically rooted within a fundamental patriarchal logos of domination which is peculiar to the West. She argues that Imperialism can be understood of as a logos of oppression is often characterised by a mental universe that is; "manipulative, aggressive, divided, and distanced from body, materiality, and feeling" (ibid:8). Kay Trask (ibid) has argued that this logos continues to be a fundamental underpinning of Imperialism which is represented as the will to power over the Natural World and its' Female cultures. She has also posited the view that patriarchy is an ontological hegemony which continues to shape and influence Western and European societies and their impact on Indigenous peoples today. Kay Trask has pointed out that within Europe an historical transformation occurred in which Western ontology shifted from being based on an imperative for the collective pursuit of the struggle for existence towards a new logos and imperative based on a view of human existence that gave centrality to a societal ideal based on the perpetual struggle for power over human and physical nature (Kay Trask ibid:4;

⁶⁰

see also *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism* 1981, *Feminist Theory: From Margin To Centre* 1984; *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black* 1989; *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics* 1990; *Breaking Bread: Insurgent Black Intellectual Life* 1991.

Ashis Nandy 1988). Nandy (ibid) has added that the Imperial World view which was eventually projected onto British India was framed by a fundamental European belief that the Colonising power could assume the right to exert Imperial power based on the new logos of the;

"...absolute superiority of the human over the nonhuman, the masculine over the feminine, the adult over the child, the historical over the ahistorical, and the modern or progressive over the traditional or the savage" (ibid:x).

These transformations within Imperialism were also identified within the Pakeha hegemony that eventually developed within Aotearoa. Capitalism was initially embraced by some Iwi from an independent and autonomous political status that Pakeha originally supported. As the ascendancy of Pakeha Colonialism became established, the earlier Pakeha support changed to direct contestation for Iwi control over their physical resources and political authority over their lands. A Kawanatanga controlled capitalist system later removed the ability of Iwi to participate or compete in the economic life of Aotearoa. More devastating than Iwi exclusion from Imperial capitalism was the subsequent negation of Kaitiakitanga and Iwi economic philosophy which tied the people to their ancestral status, roles, obligations and responsibilities. Under Pakeha Colonialism Iwi were re-assigned a status within Pakeha controlled economic systems beneath all Pakeha yet before all other 'minorities' and 'immigrants'. Within the new Colonial complex it appeared necessary maintain the Colonial system installed that Iwi be incorporated into an European dominated World economic framework. Nandy (ibid) also points out that Imperialism operates at many other levels which were reflected in the psycho-political spheres of the European psyche. Nandy (ibid) asserts that Imperialism and Colonialism were shaped and influenced by;

"The homology between sexual and political dominance which Western colonialism invariably used - in Asia, Africa and Latin America - was not an accidental by-product of colonial history. It had correlates in other situations of oppression with which the West was involved, the American experience with slavery..." (ibid:4).

In practice this meant that British hegemonies reflected the repression of male homosexuality and the possibilities for the explicit inclusion of androgyny within Imperial societies. The rise of misogyny⁶¹ within Imperial societies has been linked to this form of sexual repression. Nandy (ibid) argues that the same

⁶¹

Misogyny is defined here as the male power abuse of females.

rationales were also carried over into the domains of politics. He argued that this process drew support from the denial of psychological bisexuality in men in large areas of Western culture which served to legitimize Europe's post-medieval models of dominance, exploitation and cruelty as if natural and valid.

As a satellite for the British Empire, Pakeha Colonialism also emerged as a policy which structured and institutionalised for Pakeha their practices in support of their co-option and complicity with their Imperial sponsors. The establishment of Colonies as social and economic settlements often signalled the first phase of Colonial invasion of Indigenous territories. In many cases the eventual ascendancy of Colonial settlements as the dominant system of rule initiated a second phase of Colonialism. In this latter phase and with political and economic control over Indigenous resources and peoples, Colonialists have arrogantly set their sights on political independence from the controls of the Empire sponsors. Colonialism operated as neo-Empires which were often placed in the heart of Indigenous territories. They represented outposts of Empire, with the external threat of Empire used strategically to intimidate their subjugated captives. The implications for Iwi are that our political future will be subject to our Colonisers Pakeha society and their system of Governance, Kawanatanga. British Colonialism, according to Nandy (ibid) brought its own forms of misogyny within the European political and cultural baggage of Colonialism. He also posits the view that this "produced a cultural consensus in which political and socio-economic dominance symbolized the dominance of men and masculinity over women and femininity" (ibid:x). Colonialism also operated in other ways to undermine Indigenous peoples. Ngugi (ibid) theorised that;

"The real aim of colonialism was to control the people's wealth: what they produced, how they produced it, and how it was distributed to control, in other words, the entire realm of the language of real life. Colonialism imposed its control of the social production of wealth through military conquest and subsequent political dictatorship" (ibid:16).

Colonialism was identified within Africa as a means of controlling their Indigenous wealth. Their colonisers recognised that in order to control the peoples wealth it would also necessary to control the peoples tools of definition. That is the way they see themselves and the ways in which they conduct their lives with others.

The definition of Colonial policy which became the standard for Pakeha control over 'Native' policies is developed from these conceptual linkages. Colonial policy includes the legal framework of Westminster law and the infrastructure of documents and reports which are disseminated from the structures and institutions of Kawanatanga. At times this includes Iwi descendants. Within British India Nandy (ibid) contends that a modern form of Colonialism was won not only from military and technological dominance but also out of the;

"...ability to create secular hierarchies incompatible with the traditional order. These hierarchies opened up new vistas for many, particularly for those exploited or cornered within the traditional order. To them the new order looked like - and here lay its psychological pull - the first step towards a more just and equal world" (Nandy ibid 1988:preface).

It would be the pervasive influence of British missionaries in the lives of Iwi which would eventually transform their indigenous hierarchies. Many Iwi Rangatira were targeted by early missionaries for recruitment as key role models for Christianisation of their group. Missionaries were also influential in laying the foundations for British hegemony, often acting as religious and political advisors to their indigenous converts. It was not always the case. But the influence of missionaries to open up Iwi lands to systematic British settlement came with a lethal legacy. While their souls were being transformed for the policy of 'civilising the natives', the obscenities which came to mark out the contours of Colonial invasion were not fully expressed until the wholesale removal of Iwi from their lands and the cancellation of their ability to fully exercise Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho seemed inevitable. Nandy (ibid) has put up the argument that in the context of British Colonialism there emerged a shared psycho-political state in both the coloniser and the colonised out of which he argues that;

"...the first differentia of colonialism is a state of mind in the colonizers and the colonized, a colonial consciousness which includes the sometimes unrealizable wish to make economic and political profits from the colonies...but the crudity and inanity of colonialism are principally expressed in the sphere of psychology" (Nandy ibid:2).

The definition of the manufacture of Iwi consent is developed from these conceptual principles. Consent is defined as a construct which is never totally removed from the potential to resist. Under the political framework of Kawanatanga hegemony the notion of 'consent' has been corrupted. It is defined as manufactured to the extent that Iwi are never recognised as a Sovereign

nations peoples, their actual consent is never required and their resistance against such impositions is usually silenced or marginalised.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM AND THE ENGLISH PEASANT CLASS

A stubborn contemporary Pakeha myth continues to persist which suggests that British Imperialism has existed forever as the definitive narrative of all Europeans. This historical fiction is contested here. The complexities, contradictions and ironies of Empire are presented as a complex and often contradictory set of European tensions and struggles informed and shaped throughout its' own diverse histories by its' own legacies of subjugated Indigenes and Colonised opposition and resistance struggles.

As far back as the time of Christ, it has been suggested that individuated land ownership rights were non-existent. Livestock was the most dominant symbol of material wealth. Up until the 11th Century, the Welsh lived communally on commonly held village lands. Scottish Clans and their practices of communal land tenure were still apparent in 1745 when British colonization began to mobilise against it and erode it as a viable economic and political human civilisation.

Ancient Athenian clans continued to hold property collectively. This was transformed only after the rise of surplus grain, oil and wine in later years and as the Athenian economy began trading for profit. The phenomenal growth of surplus produce and commodities caused rapid transformations to the previous economic system. A new economic system emerged, and it was the prospect of land as commodity and private property which helped to realise the fundamental changes. The notions of collectivism were historically stronger than the rise of capitalism. Colonisation has also been defined as the taking over of indigenous territories and lives to serve the project of Empire.

These fundamental changes in the social and economic philosophies throughout Europe also supported the rise of a capitalist class structure. A mercantile or bourgeoisie class was supported to emerge and contested for a third tier in the

existing social power arrangements. These classes are recognised today as the middle and bourgeois classes. Many of these processes signalled the rise of a world wide system of Imperialism and Colonialism. The histories of Imperialism and Colonialism which swept through most European societies continues to be a status from which many indigenous peoples are struggling to be freed.

Imperialism was originally contoured from disjunctures within English society and a strengthening of the value of private property as a form of wealth accumulation. This notion had not always existed within a European context, according to Steve Talbot (c1981:80-83) who cites Engels (1942) classic text '*The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*' as a key demonstration of this argument. Talbot (ibid) suggests that, the genesis of this form of economic philosophy came from the transformation of European societies from non-material to material centred social power frameworks.

The Imperial elite development of infrastructural and ideological supports within England were crystallised around the initial introduction of Imperial policies such as the Enclosure Acts. Through the Enclosure Acts all land rights of the English peasant classes already questionable under the aristocracy, were effectively extinguished. In practice this meant that any rights English commoners previously held in common lands, pastures woodlots and other commonly held resources were cancelled. A fundamental shift was signalled by this transformation and the roots of contemporary class poverty as it has become known today were sown. The Enclosure Acts reduced the English peasant classes to a status of 'tenants' in their Sacred ancestral lands.

The expansion of Imperial projects which could support an English elite agenda for the realisation of Empire also signalled the emergence of Colonial settlements. Colonies as they became known, were used to assist in the phenomenal growth and acquisition of wealth by the British Empire where they were used as satellite installations for the Empire. An economic laundering structure was created by an emerging European power elite that has continued to be transformed even while

it has remained in the service of a number of constantly shifting and contesting European Empires. Opposition and resistance by Indigenous peoples also shaped and influenced the extent to which Imperialism and Colonialism could be translated in the transformations of many Indigenous lives. Many forms of resistance, direct defence, opposition, compromises and at times complicities have been strategic and at times unconscious responses Indigenous nations have instituted in order to survive their status as Colonised peoples and territories.

Imperialism also entailed a strategic infrastructural deployment of a mercantile dominated Colony and the establishment of 'political, military, economic and ideological fetters' on those re-defined by the colonisers as the 'conquered'. With the rise of a world system of Colonialism, the model of expropriation was often implemented directly by the Crown. Spain was an exemplary role model of this strategy. Imperialism was served by and in turn came to serve, the interests of an expanding mercantile elite class. A waning Imperial elites class later turned to the mercantile classes who became adept as colonists in establishing a capitalist infrastructure as colonies. In most cases of Colonialism, Imperial powers entered into indigenous territories only after the first wave of mercantile, settler, religious and sometimes military invasion had become an established presence and confident threat to the existing power base. It became immortalised as a form of settler sponsorship between a centre Imperial power and a periphery Colonial base.

As the project of Empire was expanded, advancing technology throughout Europe supported a notion of economic expansion through the 'discovery' of new sources of wealth. That this 'wealth' belonged to the Sovereignty of indigenous nations was neatly overlooked. Using the case of the Americas to highlight this Steve Talbot (c1981, 1985) contends that, where Colonial encroachment occurred across the Americas was in some respects irrelevant. A wholesale and blatant disregard for Native Americans persisted, as the theft of native American lands were used to increase the super wealth of Imperial nations such as Holland, and later Britain. British Imperialism came to ascendance by applying Crown colonies and

their sponsored Governments. It was through the theft of Indigenous wealth that Britain eventually emerged to take centre stage as one of the 'new' worlds richest political economies. By the 1900's, 90% of Africa, almost all of Te Moana Nui A Kiwa and approximately 57% of Asia had been incorporated into the world wide system of European Colonialism.

In 1910 Colonialism reached its peak. At its height, Colonialism commanded the political fate of 70% of the Worlds population. Indigenous wealth was then brought under the aegis of a world wide system of Imperial power structures and into markets where they could be laundered into the fortunes of existing European power elites. European elites closed out all possible competition to, what they new considered as, 'their' markets. The global theft of indigenous wealth and their enslavement as Colonial economies for Europe, also paid for the development of the English factory system and the consequent explosion in growth of a British industrial revolution.

The establishment and eventual rise of mercantile forms of capitalism occurred simultaneously with the shift by European elites from non-material to material acquisition societies. Mercantile classes emerged and came to ascendance over time and eventually began to contest the control of Imperial elites such as the established ruling elite and monarchies within the Imperial centres. In important political respects Imperialists encouraged the external growth of Colonies to alleviate the tensions which the emerging Mercantile classes represented to the Imperialists internal maintenance and control of political power. Steve Talbot (c1981) contends that, it was not until the end of the white American civil war that the power of the European capitalists classes was finally able to be consolidated. It was a situation in which the notion of a Crown Colony Government model of invasion had been used across the Americas, and the economic base on which British colonists were finally enabled to assert an independent political power base from their Imperial sponsors.

Within Aotearoa, a model of Crown Colony Government occurred in different

phases. The role of incremental settlements set up the context in which invasive Pakeha settlement was enabled. Iwi had no reason to fear the arrival of the first settlers. Our numbers were larger than the manuhiri who respectfully aligned themselves to our ture⁶². It was a honeymoon period until the 1830's. This status was utterly changed in the 1840's, as the full blown intention of British Colonialism began to be enacted. There were some restraints, cautions and concessions acceded by a section of Imperialists back in the British Empire. However, the tenuous character of the Empire centred sponsor and periphery Colony meant that the model of Crown Colony Government finally observed by Pakeha elites gave greater privilege to elites in the new Colony on matters of local politics. In some cases, the recommendations of the British parliament could be ignored. With Governor Grey in particular, the truth was often elusive. However Grey was adept at concealing his abuse of his Colonial Office. He was a perfect example of a Crown Colony dictatorship which ended only when the new army of Pakeha Colonialists and their imposed Government refused to support his recommendations for war on Iwi unless they controlled the decision making in such matters. Before he finally relinquished control, Grey left an appalling legacy of Iwi destitution, poverty, deprivation and demoralisation.

TE KARAUNA ME TE KAWANA⁶³

Iwi have referred to the Colonial Office and its functionaries as, te Karauna and te Kawana respectively. Each were understood to represent different but related institutions of a parent British Imperial power base located in the territories of Iwi. Whether it was explicit or not, the British Governors and their Pakeha settlers brought a Westminster Government and authority structure with them. But an Imperial presence came earlier. Its symbols were Iwi engagement in a developing capitalist power structure. Other signs of Empire arrived with the first

⁶² Ture is defined here as the binding ancestral laws of Iwi Maori.

⁶³ Te Kawana is the Iwi term which was coined for anyone who held the office of British Governor within their territories. Te Karauna is a transliterated rendering of 'the Crown'. Each were recognised at the hapu level as interdependent on the other. That is they implied each other.

whalers, sealers and traders. The first Pakeha Missionaries and their families and a steady flow of settlers continued under what appeared to be a recognition of Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho but which in fact was a reluctant acknowledgement of a lesser status which is problematically posited here as a Pakeha defined notion of 'limited and transferable Indigenous Sovereignty'. The explicit exercise of British power and authority systems originally gave way to acknowledgement that this was not yet a British controlled territory. In time British hegemony was enabled to be asserted with the external forces of British troops called in and military might used to defeat Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. Pakeha colonials were complicit in this agenda. The prize would be absolute rule over the wealth of Iwi territories and the distasteful rule of the natives. Contemporary Colonial discourses regarding the Pakeha decided interpretation of 'the Treaty' have been instrumental in creating a mythography for 'nationhood'. Key to the Pakeha elite argument is the unquestioned legitimacy of their interpretation of the misrepresentation of an attempted interpretation. Discussions which focus on what the indigenes wrote and orally supported have been consistently avoided. No proof of the Pakeha claims to absolute Sovereignty in these territories exists except for the gross political fact of tyranny and the infrastructural manufacture and production of political consent. Legal Imperialism, that is the creation of legal fiction, and Colonial policy 'for Maori' are two examples of the Pakeha Colonial manufacture of Iwi consent. Colonial schools, Colonial media and information sites are also sites in which the strategic and orchestrated manufacture of Pakeha hegemony is being reproduced, opposed, contested and resisted. Colonial academies, parliamentary Offices, state bureaucracies and Pakeha families are also included as co-opted and complicit sites of Colonial consent.

TE KAWANA⁶⁴

The roles and functions of British Governors varied with each personality. While public Office and representation of Crown interests was a general guide as to the role of a Governor, the role gained sweeping powers in the dual roles of Protector

⁶⁴

Te Kawana in this instance is defined in terms of the office and role.

of Aborigines and Land Purchasing Officer. A Department of Native Affairs was established under the sponsorship of the British Crown. It was unilaterally headed by the British Governor of the day and was accountable directly to the British House of Parliament for its legitimacy. Established under a contradictory framework which failed to conceal that its primary foci were, (a) ideological pacification, and (b) consensual hegemonic support, the role of te Kawana in the political subjugation of Iwi remains a powerful one. Britain, through the Governor, represented a real external threat to Iwi. A threat that Britain and its Colonial elites were willing to use to achieve the aims of Colonial rule. The two Colonial Offices established reflect this agenda. They began life as; (i) The Land Purchase Officer, and (ii) The Protectorate of Aborigines were delegated Offices of the Governor from 1840 until 1852.

During its brief existence, the Offices of Land Purchase Officer and Protectorate of Aborigines had the potential to develop policies directly from this developing resource base. Recognising this potential when he came to power, Governor Grey disbanded the Offices. Grey eventually replaced the Protectorate with the less powerful Office of 'Native Secretary' run by a Secretary answerable to the Governor. Under Grey's governorship, the clerk was directed towards a focus primarily on the execution of 'land' settlements. It was an Office which imposed alien land tenure in a politically volatile context which saw Iwi pushed into armed resistance to defend their territories.

Mercantile and private Pakeha interests signalled the entrance of economic invaders in 1840, and the New Zealand Company attempted to establish itself as the Colonial Government based at Poneke. The New Zealand Company had been actively promoting colonisation and the re-settlement of Pakeha as a new Colony here. Private Pakeha interests and Colonial representative Governor Hobson, contested the right to rule both Pakeha and Iwi. Hobson represented the Imperial interests which viewed the potential wealth of the Pakeha Colony as part of the Imperial spoils for sponsorship. Private Pakeha interests were based in a different agenda, and one which did not necessarily include Britain as the controlling power

base. In his Imperial arrogance, Governor Hobson claimed Te Ika a Maui for Britain. He was pivotal in constructing the mythography that the basis for all Imperial and Colonial claims rested on 'the Treaty'. He proceeded to claim Te Waipounamu on another Colonial mythography that Captain Cook 'discovered' it. These Colonial assertions were followed by a growing Pakeha dominance which became reflected in the arrogant process of renaming these islands and the ancient stories of their indigenous peoples. Colonial provinces emerged in W[h]anganui, New Plymouth, Nelson, Christchurch, Otako and Invercargill.

In 1841 a Colonial Land Claims Ordinance was put in place to ensure that the sale of Iwi lands was 'above board'. A Colonial Commissioner was assigned to ensure Pakeha law was observed, although his findings in favour of Iwi were never upheld. In cases found in favour of Iwi claimants, their lands were never returned but were kept by the Crown. The Crown usually meant Pakeha politicians and bureaucrats. These same Pakeha also had private business interests which often coincided with questionable political practices where the sale of Iwi lands became concerned. Iwi opposition and resistance was also part of this Colonial era. It was in during the 1843 Wairau 'incident' that Te Rauparaha and Te Rangihāeta successfully upheld their Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. In 1845, Hone Heke and Kawiti defend their Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho when a House of Commons Select Committee opened up supposedly 'unoccupied' Iwi lands to Pakeha for Pakeha settlement.

By 1844 a Colonial Native Trust Ordinance initiated a model for Colonial Trust Boards, a model which continues to thwart Iwi political independence struggles in the present. The Trust Board consisted of Colonial Government and Pakeha Church Officials who were given sole responsibility for the administration of Iwi lands alienated from Iwi by Colonial land sales. Pakeha elites at the time had arrogantly assumed the unilateral right to earmark the capital assets on behalf of Iwi they never consulted or gained a mandate from and voted the assets towards the establishment of Colonial Native schools, relief of the sick, religious instruction in the racist belief that this would help Iwi towards social and political

‘progress’ in the European image. The arrogance of Pakeha elites during this time reflected a social Darwinist mindset which argued that the Pakeha elite decided role of Native Pakeha schools would be to provide "instruction in the English language, and a systematic course of industrial and moral training in English usages and English arts". From these white racist assumptions were sown the seeds of assimilation, integration and Pakeha mainstreaming Colonial policies.

Between 1846 and 1853, Governor Grey purchased 32 million acres for 50,000 pounds. This included most of the South island. The deal fell short for Tangata Whenua because Grey never paid the full purchase price, and he never followed through on his commitment to establishing schools or hospitals that was part of the agreement. Tangata Whenua of Te Waipounamu had very little choice in the context of the day. They could not refuse as Settler society was prepared to go to war where legislation failed to acquire Tangata Whenua lands. Reserves were negotiated for one-tenth of their original land holdings. Instead they were reduced to ten acres per person.

The 1847 Education Ordinance voted monies towards church schools. Governor Grey’s agenda for Tangata Whenua children was to remove from what he called, ‘the demoralising influences of their villages’ and to promote their assimilation into a Colonial Pakeha male controlled social organisation and hierarchy. Imperial economics and Colonial society and State, it was believed, could assist in the assimilation of Iwi. Iwi aspirations for the retention of their languages, culture, religious expression, political identity, status and independence were cancelled. Te Tiriti o Waitangi of 1840 and the 1835 Declaration of Independence had both been breached. Iwi opposition and resistance used the power of their social cohesion against Colonialists encroachment and demands. Iwi, hapu and whanaungatanga came in for direct assaults as Iwi resolve against Pakeha Colonialists strengthened through Iwi consolidations. Contemporary Iwi commentators make the point that;

"Since the 1850's when Maori and Pakeha first began to shape up to each other in cultural terms right down to the present tribalism has been the focus of Pakeha hostility. It was early identified as the primary source of Maori social strength, the thing which stiffened resistance to settler ambition" (*Puao-Te-Ata-Tu* ibid 1986:1).

The 'tribalism' framework in question was that of Iwi, hapu and whanaungatanga within rohe⁶⁵. Rohe-a-iwi are contributive power frameworks which link under the term 'Te Iwi' or the Maori as iwi peoples. The term 'tribalism' held different meanings for the Colonialists. For them, 'tribalism' in the European imagination was a negative social and economic which Pakeha perceived of as being 'primitive'. Tribalism, as far as Pakeha were concerned, was a construct which the Imperialists and Colonialists had escaped and wanted no part of. For the Imperialist and Colonialist, modern and European defined capitalism offered a route out of that 'simple' stage and this was telescoped into the emerging Colony and neo-Empires. Out of these Colonial disjunctures Pakeha elites emerged with Missionary zeal and assigned to themselves the responsibility for 'reforming' the supposed backward and 'primitive' Natives.

Paternalism, Pakeha elites continue to argue, is necessary for such a 'primitive' and 'uncivilised' peoples. Colonial Paternalism was rationalised by Pakeha elites from the white racist assumption that the 'Natives' needed to be eased into their 'modern' upbringing. These ideologies were remnants from earlier Imperial experiences within India, Africa and the Americas. Whether they wanted to or not, Britain assumed a moral 'duty' to 'civilise' the globe in its image. 'Tribalism' was constructed within this great project as a 'stage' on an imagined eurosupremacist evolutionary scale. Paternalism is a euphemistic term for political impotence. As a framework of power it has meant that Iwi nations have been subject to aspirations decided upon for them by an army of Colonial bureaucrats acting in the role of 'benevolent Father coloniser State'.

In 1852, the Office of Native Secretary held by the Pakeha Governor was disbanded. The two roles served by the Office were later re-activated by the fledgling Pakeha Settler Government and the two contradictory Colonial foci of Iwi lands and Iwi social well being were retained. The untidy transfer of these roles from the Governor to the Colony reflected the competing interests of Empire and

⁶⁵

Rohe is used here to refer to a geo-political territory, authority, place of origin and rights.

Colony. While the Empire held pre-emptive land monopolies which Pakeha settler interests could gain access to the role of Governor served a useful purpose. However, as Iwi resistance to this process of alienation hardened, the role of Governor became an impediment to Pakeha settler expansion into Iwi territories. Blind disregard of Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho was met by direct Iwi military defence. In the explosion of Pakeha settlement, expansion and forced invasion into the last areas of Iwi territories the Pakeha Colony Government abandoned any exercise of the Colonial Offices in order to safeguard Pakeha interests in Iwi lands. As stakeholders themselves, the Offices were deeply implicated in the alienation of Iwi from their ira Atua and ira Whenua. In effect it diminished the real potential for Iwi to exercise their Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. The institutionalisation of Colonial power was clearly operating from out of the Colonial Office of the Native Secretary.

In anticipation of Iwi political defeat, a Colonial Government was formed in 1852. This was later formalised between the British parliament and the Colonial settlers with the passing of the 1852 Constitution Act. The Westminster framework of Government which was finally installed in 1852, excluded all Iwi women and Iwi men not yet incorporated into a British land tenure title. The assertion of the Constitution Act also signalled the beginnings of an independent, if relatively autonomous Pakeha Colonial power base of Kawanatanga.

KAWANATANGA.

During this historical period Iwi, hapu and whanaungatanga came under attack, as Pakeha looked to consolidate their rule over the country. The deliberate intentions of early Colonial elites were clearly aimed at undermining Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho as a legitimate political structure and institution. In their minds;

"...early Pakeha power-brokers understood very clearly what they were doing. It was summed up by the distinguished 19th century politician, Sir Francis Dillon-Bell, when he said, "The first plank of public policy must be to stamp out the beastly communism of the Maori" (*Puao-te-ata-tu* Appendix II).

Pakeha elite, Francis Dillon-Bell implies that Iwi, hapu and whanaungatanga, are 'impediments' to the realisation of Colonially defined 'progress' and 'civilisation'.

These sentiments were to be echoed in the next hundred and fifty six years of Colonial policy impositions which followed.

Kawaratanga underwent radical changes, expansions and internal transformations during these early Colonising years. Kawaratanga shifted from the Te Tiriti o Waitangi context and hapu definition of 'limited authority' and gave to itself through British Parliament the mandate of absolute political authority over Aotearoa as a Government and State through the 1852 Pakeha Constitution Act. Kawaratanga then defined its' status in terms of both an historical fiction and the contemporary realisation of political dominance and control. This latter status accorded by Britain to its' Colonial settlement disregarded and negated formal recognition of Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho, the mana of Te Tiriti o Waitangi as the prerogative of the hapu who supported it and the ongoing Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho of those Iwi who never made a commitment to British settlement or felt compelled to reaffirm their status of Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho by signing Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Today Pakeha elites have come to define not only what can count as History and Truth but also what Te Tiriti o Waitangi constituted in 1840 and today. Te Tiriti o Waitangi was/is the prerogative of Iwi to extend. Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho means exactly that 'I Tuku Iho'. Pakeha rule in Aotearoa is illegitimate, imposed and needs to be decolonised.

In 1892, the original role of the Colonial 'Native Department' shifted from one which half-hearted focused attention on Pakeha notions of minimal health for Iwi recently dispossessed by Colonisation. The Pakeha elite focus on Iwi in the 'Pakeha Welfare system' emerging and 'largely Pakeha mediation on behalf of Pakeha for Iwi lands' under Bryce gave increasing emphasis to supporting the latter role and the interests of Pakeha who were being served by the Colonial Native Land Court. The Office of the Colonial Native Department became instrumental in undermining Iwi land tenure systems as legitimate exercise of Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho and Tino Rangatiratanga. In turn this affected the ability of Iwi to exercise their political authority and control and this impacted on the confidence of Iwi throughout their human civilisation in terms of their status

and their ancestral confidence, integrity and positioning as Tangata Whenua with their Whenua Rangatira status intact. For many Pakeha elites, this was an expected conclusion to what Pakeha have termed the 'Native question'. While Pakeha settler society awaited the final demise of the dying Maori race, Iwi refused to die out so that from 1896 the Iwi population recovered sufficiently to almost replace those who had succumb to Pakeha Colonisation through imported diseases, warfare, and orchestrated political and economic destitution.

It took the Crown Colony Government model of invasion less than fifty years to undermine Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. Iwi were transformed during this time from being Whenua Rangatira to the newly assigned Colonial status of 'tenants' in their ancestral and Sacred Whenua. Many Iwi were rendered destitute and 'homeless' as a result of Pakeha Colonialism. That situation was enabled if you consider that Iwi were systematically undermined from the 1800's onwards. Iwi were forcibly removed from their status and birthright as Kaitiaki over Aotearoa, an estimated 66 million acres in Pakeha terms in the early 1800's which was diminished through Pakeha Colonialism to around 4.7 million acres at the close of that period. Butterworth (1972:160), and King (1981:285), cited in O'Malley (1992:24) contend that this figure is also misleading because 4.7 million acres of this figure included long term leases forced onto Iwi by Pakeha imposition of Westminster land tenure and laws. Those lands which had been redefined by the Colonialists as 'uneconomic' were then transferred to the Crown. In 1900's Pakeha Colonialists invented a Colonial Maori Councils Act and prepared themselves once again to witness the final extinction of the 'dying Maori race'. Iwi have refused to die out or to forget the legacy of Pakeha Colonialism.

Iwi populations made an unexpected recovery and placed renewed pressure on their colonisers for political legitimacy. Under the Liberal Colonial Government in 1906, the Colonial Native Department was resuscitated and given a face lift. The department was created to assist Iwi as a 'special needs' case in the broader climate of expected Iwi 'integration' into a Pakeha 'mainstream'. The political framework for policies which emerged for Iwi remained shackled to Colonial

Paternalism, and the focus hardened on the further alienation of whatever Iwi lands remained. It was not surprising that forums in which legitimate Iwi leadership could be exercised within the Colonial State arrangements were politically impotent. In time Iwi male leadership gained entry, but it would remain on Pakeha terms. Iwi leadership was also radically altered and transformed by the context of the Pakeha Crown Colony Government system which was finally set up.

Between the period of 1910-21, an estimated 2.29 million acres were alienated as 'sold'. The forced alienation of Iwi territories continued until the 1920's when Colonial Native policy began to be treated with, 'a mixture of ignorance, apathy, and, occasionally sympathy for a people who would soon cease to exist' (cited in O'Malley, V. 1992:23). Iwi were expected to die out. Pakeha elite Colonial policy control and development of Iwi is contexted by this political backdrop. The intentions of Pakeha Settler society as a Colonial power complex was clear;

"...early Pakeha power-brokers understood very clearly what they were doing. It was summed up by the distinguished 19th century politician, Sir Francis Dillon-Bell, when he said, "The first plank of public policy must be to stamp out the beastly communism of the Maori". (ibid: Appendix 1:58)

Colonisation carried the agenda of Empire within its' policy institutions and constructions. The two central goals were underpinned by policies of land thefts and europeanisation. Europeanisation had been redefined within the documents as 'civilisation, assimilation and integration'. They all shared the social goal of europeanisation of Iwi descendants into the lower rungs of the Colonial order.

Raupatu were imposed following the end of wars which Imperial and then Colonial elites orchestrated. These land dispossession were re-named by the colonisers as 'land confiscations'. They were obscured behind the illegitimate framework of crimes against the Crown. The confidence with which the Crown Colony were prepared to assert British authority reflected a strengthening political confidence by Pakeha power brokers. As the larger Iwi territories began to be seriously eroded by this form of Colonial strategy, the imposition of a Colonially controlled 'Native Land Court' seriously undermined thousands of years of peaceful civilisation as it insidiously eroded the economic and Spiritual basis which had

sustained Iwi, hapu and whanaungatanga social power relations. The history of our colonisation is also replete with opposition and resistance struggles to retain our Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho status as a society. Iwi commentators have stated that;

"Since the 1850's when Maori and Pakeha first began to shape up to each other in cultural terms right down to the present tribalism has been the focus of Pakeha hostility. It was early identified as the primary source of Maori social strength, the thing which stiffened resistance to settler ambition" (ibid: Appendix 1:58)

Iwi, hapu and whanaungatanga were being ideologically constructed as impediments to what Pakeha had come to decide for Iwi would be their ideal of 'progress'. Rooted deep in their own traditions of peasant class domination within England and despite the appalling experiences of Imperialism which had affected their own lives, many Pakeha colonists failed to recognise their complicity in the colonization processes. Many of the nations peoples of Te Moana Nui a Kiwa and Asian nations also occupy these contradictory political positionings regardless of the fact that they are also being oppressed and exploited by their sponsors. They are here as uninvited guests of Tangata Whenua. In their insightful and comprehensive review of the Department of Social Welfare (1971), The Maori Advisory Unit to the Colonial Minister of Social Welfare, Anne Hercus, introduced the report by stating that;

"[T]he history of New Zealand since colonisation has been the history of institutional decisions being made for, rather than by, Maori people. Key decisions on education, justice and social welfare, for example, have been made with little consultation with Maori people" (*Puao-Te-Ata-Tu* 1986:18).

Iwi, the report pointed up, were unanimous in concluding that their Tino Rangatiratanga and Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho were understood as having been historically abrogated firstly by the Crown and successively by Pakeha settler society. Iwi consultation had revealed a consensus amongst Iwi that the perceived role of Kawanatanga had been one historically littered with;

"inappropriate structures and Pakeha involvement in issues critical to Maori have worked to break down traditional Maori society by weakening its base - the whanau, the hapu and the iwi" (ibid:18).

In summing up this argument, the report cited that politico-economic, social, cultural and moral Colonial impositions had served to undermine and actively contest Iwi efficacy and legitimacy in terms of the ancestral relationships and responsibilities of Iwi, hapu and whanaunga to their own members. The report

also pointed out that the issues affecting Iwi needed to be viewed as multi-issue concerns that were necessarily larger than specific focus on Iwi in the Pakeha Social Welfare structures and institutions allowed for. Iwi writers and researchers argued that there were broader political factors which explain the systematic deprivation and crisis which placed Iwi as a disproportionate statistic on the negative Pakeha indices for health, welfare and education. As a means of bridging this, the Maori Advisory Unit included an historical analysis in the appendix to the report. Pakeha Colonisation had been exposed for the first time through this small yet significant Iwi capture of a previously Pakeha defined and determined Colonial policy initiative.

Summary:

This chapter opened with the argument that definitions of Imperialism have usually been proposed by its supporters without the full extent of dehumanisation, human suffering and political repression guiding that writing. Instead it has often been clinically removed from these outcomes and romanticised the premeditated erasure of human civilisations who were not European. The negation of Iwi narratives and the visibility of Iwi as a distinct human civilisation are argued to have been deliberate processes of the Pakeha Colonisation of Aotearoa. The muting of Iwi opposition and resistance to Pakeha Colonisation has been argued to have an older legacy in Imperial histories which have assumed the right to enter into and appropriate civilisations which it has deemed 'primitive' and 'uncivilised' based on an arrogant European ideal.

In this chapter I have recovered indigenous writers conceptualisations of the terms Imperialism and Colonialism. They have been drawn out of their particular experiences and contexts of Imperialism and Colonialism from the vantage point of peoples whose sacred stories have been silenced, dismissed or rewritten by their colonisers. English Indigenes have been included in this global definition of Imperialism and the obscene policy and practices of Empire. They have been included to highlight the disfigurement of an English sacred narrative shown by the willingness of the English elite to dehumanise their kinspeople in the name

of Empire. So the project of Empire is not a global statement about every Pakeha. It is a commentary on the rise of psychotic greed and the mask of global 'superiority'. Psychotic greed which lay waste the Celtic language nations and telescoped the nightmare of Empire into Te Moana Nui A Kiwa. The new face of Empire came as Colonialism. For Iwi, the mask of domination and oppression came as Pakeha settlement, trade, religion, disease, warfare, law and authority.

Eventually Pakeha hegemonies emerged in the symbol of a Crown Colony and then Government. Te Karauna was accorded Sovereign recognition by Iwi. Te Kawana was also treated with political hospitality and diplomacy. The symbol of Kawanatanga came to be recognised by Iwi as the intention of Britain to take political control over their territories. This historical context is the backdrop for Iwi political struggles today. Iwi political struggles which have been forged here long before 1840 when the history of Pakeha began here. The active political struggles of Iwi revealed the dishonesty of Pakeha elites to assume control over their territories, resources and the status of authority to represent Aotearoa at an international level. These tensions helped to initiate, shape and inform a dynamic legacy of Iwi opposition, Resistance and decolonisation struggles.