CHAPTER FIVE: INDIGENOUS RESISTANCE

Introduction:
This chapter develops Indigenous focused definitions of Resistance. This framework will then be used to develop key principles of Indigenous Resistance held in common with Iwi. In terms of Iwi Resistance knowledge, the importance the legitimacy and centrality of te reo Rangatira and Tikanga-a-Iwi remain our epistemological resource base. However, added to this base have emerged Maori English idioms which have been used to bridge language and cultural imperialism. Silences have been extended in this section to include the active use of silence to exclude ‘outsiders’.

Intercultural spaces are referred to here as ‘intersections’ and are defined in this thesis as the actual sites of Indigenous Resistance against Pakeha colonialism and Kawanatanga. Emphasis is placed on the conscious decision to enter, create, struggle over and at times to strategically withdraw from direct struggle and action. Iwi Resistance is argued to be differently configured from anti-colonial struggles which focus on a radical transformation of anti-capitalist, racist and sexist movements. These spaces are important, however it is argued here that they are less important than the recovery of Indigenous Resistance paradigms and the ancestral possibilities for Iwi struggles. The importance of Iwi descendants in asserting the politics of their own legacies of oppositional and Resistance struggles is that they are argued to offer a radical critique of imperialism and colonialism. Iwi Resistance struggles include the need to de-construct deposited White mythologies which would claim privilege for Pakeha decided power discourses, race and gender relationships. This section concludes with an examination of the notion of Colonial Paternalism as an expression of structured and institutionalised White racism and power domination.

DEFINING RESISTANCE
In chapter two it was argued that the efficacy and legitimacy of Iwi epistemologies
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and their continuation as a range of Kaupapa Maori theories, is fundamental in the development of Iwi Resistance theorising. Resistance, as a process of informed political struggle, has been theorised within all human civilisations. Iwi also have their own forms of resistance struggles, and these are not always constructed from the assumption that they are anti-imperial or anti-colonial.

Resistance is also defined in terms of two diametrically different, although not mutually incompatible, human epistemological frameworks. The differences between the two confronting frameworks, I propose, can and do insure that an ‘insider’ privilege is able to be maintained. The underlying principles of a number of Sacred Iwi narratives as an inner corpus of Iwi epistemologies is an example. With the emergence and imposition of an increasingly dominant and centralised Pakeha controlled Colonial education system came overt and covert forms of colonisation. Overtly Pakeha education gradually called into question the efficacy of Iwi education centred on the principles of Tikanga-a-Iwi and the educative roles of Iwi Kainga by creating education settings in the image of the Colonisers. Within the Colonial school covert Pakeha knowledge, assumptions, norms and values eventually contested and later negated the value of Tikanga-a-Iwi. As a result of these tensions the colonisation effectively forced the previously fundamental corpus of Iwi knowledges into an over privileged position as ‘elite’ and inaccessible ‘insider’ knowledges. The three World views, the fundamental and Sacred inner corpus of Tikanga-a-Iwi, the conjoint dimensions of te ira Atua, te ira Whenua and te ira Tangata each provide important Iwi Resistance knowledges against colonisation. Resistance, in the context of Aotearoa, begins from the confidence of an Iwi identity. Another sector of Iwi Resistance definitions is derived out of the context of Colonial schooling, education and the reproduction of text and talk.

Indigenous Resistance is also informed and shaped by what occurs at the intersections of power. Many Iwi descendants have entered Colonial academies in a conscious effort to create spaces from which to struggle. As an Iwi descendant, this thesis is an example. Textual interventions, the deconstruction
of White mythologies and the positive assertion of Iwi epistemologies are some of
the key strategies of Resistance being applied in these spaces. The development
of Iwi female forums are also important in the development of these spaces. While
the maintenance of these spaces is often enhanced by Pakeha support, that
support is not a contingent factor in the creation or success of such spaces. Where
Iwi women come together to develop critical emancipatory praxis is less important
than the fact that Iwi women come together and meet with each other. These are
often luxurious moments for many hopelessly overburdened Iwi women. Such
spaces can provide an opportunity to rest, to be heard and sometimes it is the first
time that their whole lives are made visible. They are sometimes healing spaces,
places of challenge, places to learn Pakeha elite ‘speak’ as well as opportunities
to develop the existing languages of opposition and resistance or to be reminded
how far from Iwi Kainga and Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho Pakeha education still is.

For a growing number of Iwi women, Resistance has come from a focus away from
themselves and onto the lives of their future - their tamariki. In particular the
phenomenal growth of language re-assertion, language immersion and language
development initiatives. In this sense, Resistance is coming full circle and
returning to the ancestral wisdom and the Sacred inner corpus knowledges
embedded within te reo Rangatira. Initiatives such as Atarangi, Kainga Mo Te
Reo, Iwi wananga, Te Kohanga Reo, Te Kura Kaupapa Maori and Kura Tuarua
each represent an amalgam of Iwi Resistance strategies. They are all attempts
to recover the Sacred narratives, the Tikanga-a-Iwi of an Iwi three World
orientation. This Iwi orientation places Iwi descendants as the youngest
descendants of te ira Atua, te ira Whenua and te ira Tangata.

INDIGENOUS RESISTANCE
For millions of Indigenous nations, their peoples and ancestral homelands, the
policy and practice of Empire has too often resulted in their extinction. Across the
Americas, the ‘curse’ of Christopher Columbus is recorded by the Indigenous
nations as a bloodbath. His legacy is referred to as the ‘blood and bones’ of
Columbus. Millions of indigenous peoples vanished forever during the extension of Spanish imperialism across the Americas. While Indigenous nations recorded the events as a holocaust which began in 1492, five hundred years after their rise to power, European imperialists and colonialists constructed Columbus as a cultural icon - a founding figure for the White American ideal. Throughout the ancient civilisations of Africa, imperialism and colonialism deployed the constant threat of ultimate cultural genocide underpinned by the dictum of Empire to "accept theft or death" Ngugi (1986). The policy and practice of Empire is a multi-levelled human process. While economic expansion and theft remained key agenda, there were other aspects which were lethal to Indigenous nations. Black writer Barbara Burris and Frantz Fannon (1973) also emphasise that colonialism was also recognised by its recipients as a political process which was; "prevented from self-determination by another group - whether it has a national territory or not" (ibid:334). Imperialism had economic and political contours. These were also recognised as the hegemonic extension of colonialism through patriarchal hierarchies of power. Patriarchal power is often symbolised by the pyramid and locates the natural world and females underneath a repressive moral hegemony base on compulsory heterosexuality. Burris (1973) develops the view that; "...psychological and cultural mutilation is particularly intense and the colonialism more brutal when the group that colonizes and the group colonized have different defining physical characteristics that set them clearly apart. All of the above definitions apply to the subjection of women, as a sex" (ibid:335).

Female oppression, according to Burris, is a problematic of every civilisation. However this problematic is argued to have been exaggerated under imperialism and colonialism. Hawaiian activist, Haunani Kay-Trask (1986:2-14) develops Simone De Bouvoir's contention that there exists within European ontologies an 'imperial' male consciousness. Kay-Trask (ibid) stated that the form of female oppression and exploitation which helped to establish the hegemonies of European imperialism and colonialism were peculiar to Europe. She has maintained that an 'imperial' male consciousness, is underpinned by a logos of domination. The will to power over nature and women. These were very important disjunctures
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within British imperialism which shaped and informed the ways in which Kawanatanga served to transform and be transformed in their engagement with Iwi during the historical period of the eighteen hundreds.

Kay-Trask (ibid), Said, E.(1991) and Nandy, A.(1988) also posit the view that, their respective Indigenous epistemologies were previously based in quite different male and female ontologies from those promoted by imperialism and colonialism. Said (ibid) develops the view that the European (male) was enabled to impose Western constructs as a direct result of the emerging economic and political ascendance imperialism had gained in and over the ‘Orient’ it later reinvented as its own. The imperial paradigm was also reflected in the appropriation of the ‘ideal Oriental women’ which imperials constructed, and in which;

"she never spoke of herself, she never represented her emotions, presence, or history. He spoke for and represented her. He was foreign, comparatively wealthy, male, and these were historical facts of domination that not only allowed him to possess Kuchuk Hanem physically but to speak for her and tell his readers in what ways she was "typically Oriental" (ibid:12).

The lives of Iwi men and women were also reconstructed under Kawanatanga. First through imperial documents, reports, law, settlement, war and economic incorporation. As Pakeha elites moved into Iwi territories, Iwi were being textually removed. The Pakeha mythography of Cook’s ‘discovery’ of Aotearoa is an example of the ways in which Pakeha have re-defined and attempted to erase all historical memory of Iwi existence here. The larger processes of Pakeha colonisation were also recorded textually as Pakeha elites eventually assumed the right to textually represent the presence and absence of Iwi. Colonial policy structures and institutes this process under the euphemistic yet White racist title of Pakeha ‘Paternalism’. Pakeha defined ‘Paternalism’ assumes that the ‘Natives’ are only intelligent enough to sign away their newly bestowed and Pakeha decided ‘Sovereignty’ to their Colonisers. Pakeha defined ‘Paternalism’ is a mechanism for the maintenance and perpetuation of British and Pakeha Colonial rule over Iwi.

At the outset there were a number of European Imperial powers prepared to invade and appropriate Aotearoa. One example is recorded in the Pakeha adopted imposition of the Dutch Imperialist term van Diemans Land and later the
arrogant fiction and imposition of a Pakeha decided and British sponsored ‘New Zealand’ State. There were also local and arrogant Pakeha assumptions of the right to re-name Iwi territories in their ambiguous self image as co-opted and complicit British Colonisers. During 1885 Pakeha artist John Tallis re-imagined Aotearoa and with his colonizing gaze arrogantly imposed European names which negated Te Ika A Maui and imposed the term ‘North’ and negated Aotearoa by imposing the term ‘South’ island. He also used the British names of ‘New Ulster’ and ‘New Munster’ to artistically reflect the agenda of Colonialists throughout that period. These impositions reflected the ways in which Pakeha were prepared to enter the cultural and Sacred spaces of another human civilisation and arrogantly appropriate re-name and change it. An offshoot of the Pakeha Colonisation process for Iwi was the simultaneous attack on their language and cultural integrity upon which the physical dispossession of Aotearoa and Te Ika a Maui Sacred narratives of Iwi relied. The Colonisation of Iwi territorially and economically also served to mute their struggles and their attempts to bring to the forefront of International attention the Colonial orchestration of their demise. These political processes are what Gramsci (1971) has referred to as ideational domination and hegemony. Said (ibid:12) theorised that Western imperialism carried within it;

"...a distribution of geopolitical awareness into aesthetic, scholarly, economic, sociological, historical, and philological texts; it is an elaboration not only of a basic geographical distinction... but also a whole series of "interests" (ibid:12).

Cultural imperialism developed new cannons of taste, redefined whole sectors of epistemological thought and production. At its foundations, imperialism was being reflected in the re-positioning of Iwi as a fading image in the background of Kawanatanga hegemony. Nandy (1988), analyzes the ways in which antagonistic dichotomies were being imposed and expressed within indigenous Indian cultures because dominating Western ontologies gave new privilege to the argument for 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).

The fading image of Iwi within early Colonial documents and reports also reflected the contestation of Iwi epistemological constructs such as te ira Atua, te ira Whenua and te ira Tangata. The three World view which underpins Iwi
epistemologies were directly challenged. Pakeha Missionaries, with their new moral hegemonies and patriarchal world views were blind in their agenda to ‘civilise’ what they considered a ‘Native’ race. It was a commonly held view of Empire descendants, and especially its benefactors.

Capitalism was the economic framework which made imperialism and colonialism possible. It was founded on the theories of European socialists such as Jeremy Bentham and James Mill, as a ‘necessary step to progress and a remedy for feudalism’. Marx’s theory viewed pre-material European societies as locked into a stage of ‘childhood innocence’. It fitted neatly with the sister concept of ‘primitive communism’. According to this view: society needed to be moved from a ‘primitive’ state, and from pre-history, towards an imagined ‘history proper’; from, ‘infantile’ to ‘adult’ (and male controlled) Communism. Indigenous peoples have maintained their defiance against these arrogant Imperialist and Colonialist rationales which seek to justify and legitimate the imposition of Colonisation. According to Marx, this was ample proof of his thesis that ‘whatever the crime of England she was an unconscious tool of history’. The policy and practices of Empire were neither ‘innocent’ or always ‘unconscious’. These complex weavings of history contributed to the ideas of ‘development’ which Nandy (1988) contends that it is;

"Thus, the theory of social progress was telescoped not merely into the individual’s life cycle in Europe but also into the area of cultural differences in the colonies" (ibid:243).

While it cannot be confirmed as being conspiratorial, imperialism and colonialism are proposed here as being premeditated and systematically applied policies and practices of Empire. The consistent experiences of Indigenous nations across the globe attests to this. In the context of Aotearoa the full import of Colonial repression began to emerge early in the 1800’s.

For thousands of years Iwi nations lived in relative peace, although it was predicted by Tohunga that Aotearoa and Te Ika a Maui would undergo a hundred and sixty years of Te Po or ‘darkness’ at the hands of external forces. That Great Darkness would come from outside the Te Moana Nui A Kiwa, and it was foretold
that it would be ended in the year 1990.

Even with the explicit assertion by Iwi through the 1835 The Declaration of Independence, Britain still proceeded with its policy of extending British rule into Aotearoa. This agenda was at times obscured, as sections of Iwi became willingly incorporated into a developing world system of Capitalism. It was less well understood by Iwi that other Indigenous nations were being systematically subjugated in order to feed the insatiable drive of imperial powers for material wealth. The seemingly non-threatening presence of whalers, sealers, traders and settlers was a harbinger of the suffering, resistance and struggles which would soon confront the very existence of Iwi nations.

Originally Pakeha placed themselves cautiously on the outskirts of Iwi territories. These early relationships with Pakeha were mainly cordial, with Pakeha recognizing they were here as foreigners under the political structures and institutions of Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. Back in Britain, aggressive private interests were supported through political inaction to systematically establish a British Colony. No negotiations was originally attempted between the British Crown and Iwi. Instead, the artifice of a Treaty controlled by British hegemony was seen as the cheapest option. Imperial powers had an appalling history consistently disregarding, redefining and extinguishing treaties they had entered into with Indigenous nations and peoples. In the case of Aotearoa Pakeha Colonialists came into the motu through a range of Iwi decided relationships. Te Tiriti o Waitangi was only one of the political frameworks which was made available for limited Pakeha settlement within specific areas of Aotearoa. For many Pakeha elites Te Tiriti o Waitangi was viewed as a political opportunity which could eventually be employed by Pakeha elites to establish British supremacy and a Pakeha Colony. Pakeha elites and settlers failed to honour their side of Te Tiriti o Waitangi which required that they abide by the hapu conditions laid down. Because of this transgression by Pakeha many hapu who originally sanctioned it no longer bind their Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho to it. Pakeha elites disregarded the Iwi political context in which specific arrangements of hapu
involved with Te Tiriti o Waitangi were set aside. Today those hapu have realised that Colonisation rather than peaceful and honourable settlement was the Pakeha agenda.

Pakeha elites also attempted, and eventually succeeded, in replacing this compact with a Pakeha text which bears no resemblance to the political integrity of its time. British power elites had forcibly removed Indigenous nations from their territories already. While there may have been some reservations about this case concerning Iwi, it was never sufficient to halt the project of Empire or the consequential dehumanising which had to be applied in order to get Iwi physically off their ancestral homelands.

TE TIRITI O WAITANGI
This section begins from the statement that there has never existed any form of Iwi political mechanism with the status or power to transfer Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho and Kaitiakitanga. This thesis asserts that there has never existed anywhere within the Sacred or fundamental corpus of Iwi knowledges any Iwi moral framework, rationale or practice that provides any basis for the arrogant Pakeha assumption of the right to establish or extend British power into Aotearoa. What has occurred in the Colonialist period of Iwi histories has been the uninvited and morally questionable setting up by Pakeha of a British Colony and the cumulative undermining and overthrow of Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. The only basis on which Pakeha can legitimately claim a right is the prerogative of Iwi. Where Pakeha continue to live here without Iwi sanction carries the status of alien and unwanted British Colonisers. Decolonising this status would mean the removal of all the power structures which Pakeha Colonialists have imposed upon the Iwi Universe and its’ peoples.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and I acknowledge only that which was cloaked in the Sacred power of te reo Rangatira, is a symbol of the hapu desire for peace. It lays out a plan for the recognised political presence of a group - Tauiwi, within the existing political sovereignty of Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. This peace time pact was
never conducted between select hapu and the British Crown. It was not between Pakeha and Iwi as many contemporary Pakeha and uninformed colonised Iwi descendants contend. Like all political compacts it also carried limits and the power to veto where agreements were broken. For those hapu who gave their support to te Tiriti, in their terms, it also bound the honour of their respective Iwi and their whanaunga. It was not a political mechanism to create Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho, it was exercised from the political position of Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. Because Pakeha have dishonoured their status bestowed selectively by Te Tiriti o Waitangi the original hapu commitment no longer binds them. Pakeha elites continue to live under the delusion that Iwi seek to have the Iwi mana of Te Tiriti o Waitangi restored based on a limited Pakeha belief that Iwi need Te Tiriti o Waitangi more than Pakeha. What is also at stake for those hapu and Iwi who were bound into a commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi is based on honouring the integrity and good faith of those many Tipuna who placed their Moko on that Sacred agreement. Pakeha elites fool themselves in a shallow belief that an Iwi process of reconciliation with regard to Te Tiriti o Waitangi is for their shallow benefit.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi did not create Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho, rather it reaffirmed the status of Iwi made explicit for Pakeha internationally in the 1835 Declaration of Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. The Declaration of Iwi Independence and Authority over Aotearoa did not create Tino Rangatiratanga but rather reaffirmed that status. The new status created out of Te Tiriti o Waitangi was the concept of kawanatanga, and it was designed specifically to give existing Pakeha Taniwha a political status in their territories. It was never a mechanism for extinguishing the legacy, status, roles, responsibilities, obligations and ties with which to exercise of Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho nor did it transfer Iwi power over to Britain or the Pakeha Colony that was emerging. The assumed right of Pakeha to rule and Kawanatanga to represent Aotearoa has no Iwi moral legitimacy. This is the political context and problematic in which Colonial policy by Pakeha for Iwi continues to be struggled and contested within.
The context for Pakeha control over Iwi lives has emerged from the imposition of a Pakeha controlled Colonial power complex. Early Colonial legislations were designed for Iwi in particular ways to co-opt rather than include Iwi on their own terms. Where Iwi were included this inclusion was/is based on Pakeha Colonial terms in which Iwi are more often constructed as social, economic and political 'impediments' to what Pakeha still consider is their right to theft of all remaining Iwi physical resources and political representation. Pakeha constructed and monopolised Colonial policy for Iwi also came to signify the disappearance of Iwi as nations and their re-appearance under pseudonyms like 'the Native question'. Over time Iwi were oversimplistically re-defined and their diversity collapsed under the definitive Colonising term of 'Maori society'. As noted earlier in this chapter it is imperative to gauge the political debates between Iwi, Britain and Pakeha Colonialists as interdependent historical struggles rather than as single issue considerations exclusively. The ways in which Colonial policy constructions have historically been worked through in terms of Iwi interests reflects a consistent pattern of Pakeha elite and at times broader Pakeha societal mitigation of individual and collective Iwi interests.

As the nineteenth century drew to a close and following the rabid Pakeha takeover of most Iwi territories, a new phase of Pakeha colonialism emerged. Ngugi (1986) points to the complexities which mark out this phase in terms of the co-option of the colonized as 'formal intellectuals' in Gramsci's (1977) terms and the transformation of new forms of cultural leadership. Kupapa or Crown loyalists, is a condescending Iwi term for co-opted Iwi leadership.

CO-OPTION OF IWI
Co-option is a term used to describe the taking over of representation of one group by another. Co-option can be viewed negatively or positively. In a negative sense co-option is a one sided event, often to the detriment of the side which is co-opted and left silent and/or invisible. In a positive sense, co-option represents the possibility of a mutually beneficial arrangement where each party may take on aspects of the other for mutual benefit. Co-option of Iwi as a definition to control
Iwi is a negative use of the term. Where ignorant, colonised and uncritical Iwi individuals are willing participants in such negative arrangements, co-option is considered to be negative in this sense.

The current 'Iwicorp' mindset of Colonial power elites has enabled, if not encouraged, colonised forms of Iwi structures to seriously compete and contest traditional frameworks. Developing their criticisms of this trend the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare claimed;

"The [colonial] government approach to Maori in the 20th century was one of increasing institutionalisation. The decade of the 1900's saw Maori Councils and Maori Land Councils (later Maori Land Boards) established (1900) and a decision taken to abolish the Native Land Court or Maori Parliamentary representation. The Department of Native Affairs was also established in 1906" (ibid:61).

These were later followed by Offices of the Native Trustee in 1920, the Maori Purposes Board in 1924 and the inauguration of seven Pakeha decided 'Tribal' Trust Boards. Each had been created as institutions by Pakeha in an effort to stagger the impact of colonisation on Iwi and to mediate Iwi demands which might threaten the full blown establishment of internal Colonial rule from being completed. They were each assimilationist mechanisms, although Iwi continued to oppose and resist many forms of Colonial invasion from completely taking root. Puao-Te-Ata-Tu (1986) Appendix 1 also reported that; 'between 1895 and the late 1930's, the [colonial] government's Maori policy was a curious blend of assimilation, paternalism, integration and exploitation'. It was a period of Iwi history when the Pakeha dream of Empire finally descended into a nightmare for Iwi descendants. Commentating on this stage of Iwi political subjugation the 1986 report contended that;

"[It was during the period between the 1890's and the 1930's that the structural strain on Maori society and the levels of deprivation revealed themselves at their worst... 6" (Puao-Te-Ata-Tu ibid:62).

It was a startling contrast to the confidence of Iwi defining their development up to 1867 a period in which; "Maori enterprise was so successful that it could, ultimately, only be defeated by war, defeat and the imposition of Pakeha institutional structures" (ibid: Appendix 1:63).
The formal exercise by Iwi of their Tino Rangatiratanga was brought to a grinding halt in the late nineteen hundreds when Tuhoe were brought under the control of the Crown Colony Government and a Pakeha decided Urewera District Native Reserve Act was passed. To ensure Tuhoe Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho was seen to be completely crushed two Colonial Acts followed closely behind it. The Colonial Maori Lands Administration Act and the Colonial Maori Councils Act of 1900.

On the surface, Colonial legislation appeared to grant Iwi the same rights and privileges as their Pakeha counterparts. However, in practice the political controls exerted by Pakeha elites who controlled the structural and institutional life of the dominant Colony infrastructure ensured that restrictions within the Colonial Native Land Court, the office of Native Minister and the Maori Councils were psychological coercions which attempted to ideologically subvert any attempts by Iwi to re-assert the confident exercise of their ancestral status and Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho.

COLONIAL PATERNALISM
Paternalism is structured on White racist assumptions of superiority. It means the cancellation and repression of Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. On first glance the concepts seems a reasonably harmless concept. Colonial policy is derived from the political structures and institutions established by Pakeha Colonialisation. One of the institutional results of this imposition has been the installation of Pakeha elite power blocs which have been cloaked under a Eurosupremacist guise which would claim to be a benevolent if distorted Christian based 'Patrialism'. The practice Pakeha Paternalism imposed on Iwi was/is constructed from a European view that 'Natives' are too 'primitive' and therefore incapable of conducting their own political lives nor do they have sufficient European decided 'intelligence' with which to operationalise their 'self determination'. Paternalism has been used by European powers where it has imposed itself to appropriate and distort, silence and attempt to co-opt Indigenous opposition, resistance and struggle from it. For generations of Iwi descendants Paternalism has been a symbol of dehumanisation,
demoralisation and political mockery. Te Tiriti o Waitangi as it has become re-defined by Pakeha elite determined interpretations, is the basis from which Pakeha and Kawanatanga falsely claim ‘the’ sole right to rule Iwi today. There is no moral basis for this political claim within Tikanga-a-Iwi. It is a stubbornly persisting Pakeha historical and Colonising fiction.

Colonial policy production is a political site of struggle in which Iwi continue to contest the right that Pakeha have assumed through the Colonisation process. In particular the unilateral Pakeha assumptions which have invented the view that: (1) All ‘the Maori people’ invited the extension of British authority and rule over them, quoting the failed Pakeha attempts to translate the Indigenous text as ‘evidence’ that it is in Te Tiriti o Waitangi; (2) the British Parliament had a unilateral right to legislate for the establishment of a British Colony within Aotearoa without the political consent of Iwi; (3) Te Tiriti o Waitangi which safeguarded hapu in the Indigenous text can be ignored in favour of the Coloniser, even though is contravenes International Pakeha law and the Contra Proferentum ruling which states that where there is disagreement in terms of Treaty texts that the decision should go against the drafting nation and protect the Indigenous text. Pakeha politicians have chosen to ignore their own International Pakeha law in this matter; (4) British sponsored Pakeha rule created Tino Rangatiratanga and extinguished Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho; (5) ‘The Maori’ people gave up their Pakeha decided capacity for ‘limited Sovereignty’ to a motley group fresh off the boat and insecure Pakeha settlers; (6) Iwi have no future right to exercise their Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho and (7) Iwi have never opposed, resisted or attempted to transform their status as a Colonised and politically subjugated human civilisation. These fundamental contradictions were recognised by Iwi and this statement emphasises the view 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 c1971, 1986:18).

No single event in the histories of Iwi opposition, resistance and transformations brought about the radical potential for Iwi struggle which emerged in the 1970’s. Perhaps the entire spectrum of Colonial repression, subjugations, exclusions and
institutionalisation provided the explosive elements of the seventies. Globally it was a memorable year for Indigenous struggles, as Indigenous peoples rose to the forefront during the growing struggle against White racism in Africa, nuclear testing in the Te Moana Nui A Kiwa and an emerging continuum of Iwi activists who ignited the call for the return of Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho using the problematic political of ‘Maori Sovereignty’.

The period leading up to the seventies was particularly important in shaping the political climate made possible in that decade. It was a period in which Pakeha hegemony was being directly challenged by Iwi, at all levels of the Colonial infrastructure. The catalyst which opened up this potential was the future of Iwi - their tamariki. In particular, the systematic removal and institutionalisation of Iwi tamariki into the Colonial Welfare system. It was a critical turning point in Iwi politics because it had only one focus - their tamariki and their return.

My own whanau experienced this phenomenon. It was a period in our whanau history in which four of our whanau were ‘removed into care’. It was Colonial Welfare care. It was a situation in which almost every Maori, and increasing numbers of Te Moana Nui A Kiwa children, were removed from their homes and into Colonial Welfare institutions. In my case the pretext was ‘to provide care and control’. I, and many other Iwi descendants, made spasmodic attempts to go to the Colonial school. On this basis our whanaunga were constructed as ‘useless and neglectful’. This ignored the practical realities of our whanaunga who had a sole parent working two jobs that were living outside and away from their Iwi support base. These years preceded the allocation of a Domestic Purposes benefit. Iwi parents, and single ones in particular, were branded as unreliable, immoral usually promiscuous. Colonial Welfare agencies were avoided by our parents because the likelihood of denigrating racism was the common experience.

SUMMARY:
This chapter argues that notions of Resistance have been embedded within Iwi epistemologies for thousands of years. What are presented as additions to these
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traditions are anti-imperial and anti-colonial paradigms. Resistance has also been defined as an Indigenous framework which has included active self censorship of knowledge and often the deliberate exclusion of ‘outsiders’ as a means of preserving the internal integrity of those knowledges. It was also proposed that other forms of Iwi Resistance occurs at the intersections between Iwi and Tauiwi Pakeha power intersections. Some of these are identified as Colonial schools, academies and bureaucracies. Within a range of sites of struggle such as these, I have also argued that Iwi women like myself, are being encouraged to create spaces of Resistance from which to develop critical praxis. An important emphasis is placed on Resistance as a conscious process from which critical action can emerge. Increasing numbers of Iwi women are also emerging in the struggles of Iwi to recover, preserve, maintain and confidently reproduce te reo Rangatira. Iwi women are also key participants within and outside these movements. Resistance has seen the shift of Iwi Resistance from a macro beginning at the structural and institutional levels of Kawanatanga, towards a focus on the future of Iwi - their tamariki. This is a key shift.

This chapter also takes in a broad consideration of global Indigenous Resistance struggles. There exist key parallels between these broader struggles and those of Iwi. The right to tell their own stories of imperialism and from the politics of their own experiences parallels an imperative of whakapapa theory to trace the descent to its epistemological beginnings. The development of anti-imperial and anti-colonial struggles are also secondary to the struggles to recover or preserve and maintain their ancestral languages and the only tangible links Indigenous peoples have to their ancestral wisdom. Recognising the absence of a Sacred narrative within imperialism and colonialism have been important Resistance clues. It has been used to comprehend the imperial and Colonial paradigm in terms of being premeditated and systematic human processes which have not ended.

The political context of Aotearoa is then particularised from the view that Colonial discourses enjoy a privileged position as the sole manufacturer of ‘public’
knowledge. From this context it has been enabled to invent White mythologies which trample the mana of the actual Sacred pact which was laid down between many hapu and the existing Pakeha settlers represented by the Governor and the Crown. Britain has not and does not have any moral jurisdiction in these territories. The moment it claimed political control over these territories it abrogated any existing political agreements. Regardless of this fundamental contradiction, colonialism supported by Britain is continuing to co-opt Iwi leadership. Kawanatanga is also attempting to capture the concept of Iwi from the racist historical position it gave to itself as a ‘Paternal’ power base.

Iwi continued to struggle against the excesses of Kawanatanga. During the decades of the 1960’s, and especially during and since the 1970’s, Iwi Resistance was utterly transformed. The systematic Pakeha Welfare removal of Iwi tamariki and their placement into Colonial residential institutions was picked up by many concerned Iwi and some Pakeha during this time. The issue culminated in 1971 in a range of Iwi consolidated and at times reluctant Pakeha support to bring this issue into the forefront of political debate. Historically rooted demoralisation and increasing deprivation were powerful forces that fell on fertile and building Iwi political momentum. It was a time in which Iwi identity had gained some currency and a period when calls for the decolonisation of Aotearoa became key symbols of Iwi political activism. The struggles of Iwi were grounded in mixed calls which collapsed the sentiment for political autonomy under the terms Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho, Tino Rangatiratanga. Initially the call was articulated as a call for the return of ‘Maori Sovereignty’ however problematic the and paradoxical the term itself presented to those struggles. Over time it has been re-shaped and today the recovery of Te Reo Rangatira has re-instituted the first two terms. These were important contributions by Iwi activists despite the limited usefulness of the Pakeha terms.
CHAPTER SIX: RANGATIRATANGA I TUKU IHO

Introduction:
This chapter privileges the development of an Iwi focused political framework and analyses. I look specifically at the problematic contexts of Iwi political activism within and against Kawanatanga in which Iwi subversion of the Pakeha agenda of Colonialism will be viewed as legitimate and justified. The inhumanities enacted upon Iwi by Pakeha determined policies will be considered as a part of the systematic imposition by Pakeha of policies and practices aimed to Europeanise Iwi descendants. The particular Kawanatanga structural and institutional framework for Colonial policy will be identified in terms of the broad and deadly Colonial terms of ‘assimilation, integration, bi-culturalism and mainstreaming’ are contested as part of the overall Pakeha Colonialist project. In practical terms these are designed to erase the collective historical memories of Iwi descendants. They form an important component of the Colonial arsenal whose aim is to conquer in order to control the Indigenous mind through cultural and linguistic genocide.

In this chapter I also signal an analytical shift away from a primary focus on Pakeha dominance and exploitation as a central impetus for Iwi oppositions and resistance to one centred by ancestral adherence and protection of the status of Whenua Rangatira and Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. The transformational influences of Colonialism are analyzed in terms of Iwi attempts to work within and against Kawanatanga. Another transformational period of Iwi struggles is located during the 1950’s and the 1960’s and it is proposed here that this latter period saw the strengthening re-emergence of political activism which rallied around the two political symbols; Iwi women and tamariki mokopuna.

---

67 Whenua Rangatira is defined here as a sacred framework for Kaitiakitanga. It was an ancient pact accepted by Maui Tikitiki to always keep the sacred covenant between te ira Atua and te ira Whenua to te ira Tangata.
In 1986, a radical intervention into the way in which Iwi would come to engage Pakeha policy emerged out of the struggles and contestations over the findings of the Ministerial Advisory Report on a Maori Perspective in the Department of Social Welfare, Puao-te-ata-tu. The Report indicted the Colonial State and Welfare structures and institutions in particular, for over a hundred years of consistently failed ‘policies’ related to Iwi interests. The Report set out a template in terms of the ways in which Iwi were prepared to openly challenge the right that Pakeha elites had historically assumed in deciding the political future for Iwi. The Pakeha elite manufacture of Iwi consent was fundamentally challenged and policy making forums have continued to be vigorously contested on this basis ever since.

THE ROOTS OF IWI POLITICAL ACTIVISM
The invasiveness and pervasiveness of the dominant ideas of Others is how Antonio Gramsci (1973) developed his dynamic notion of hegemony. For Gramsci hegemony could be established through formalised institutional arrangements such as governments, courts, the police and the army. These sites he argues, were deployed in the exercise of direct political control.

The first phase of Imperial invasion was signalled by mercantile and private business interests in the form of the early Pakeha whalers, sealers, traders, itinerant Pakeha settlers and Missionaries. The New Zealand Company and other settlement companies were used as a political pretext for the assertion of a British Imperial presence. Britain was motivated more from the threat of French and Spanish interests in what were considered an open territory of potential resources and wealth, than any genuine intention to safeguard Iwi Rangatiratanga. Britain was strategically positioning itself in a role as a benevolent power; in practice it was establishing its own hegemonic claims. While Iwi were seen to be open to the setting aside their territories to Pakeha settlement British power elites appeared to concede a limited recognition of their status as a Sovereign power.

However when Iwi began to actively oppose and resist any further land alienations, the shallow facade of British benevolence was replaced by military and
institutional coercion. It is recognised here that the processes of establishing a British hegemonic presence was complex, uneven and often unconscious. However, it is also recognised in this thesis that, the policy and practice of Empire had been perfected in England itself (see Chapter Four). Britain was never innocent and its presence in Te Moana Nui A Kiwa deeply implicates Pakeha in a premeditated and systematic political domination process with Kawanatanga. This process has since been re-defined by Indigenous peoples globally as Imperialism and Colonialism and recognised as political processes which have served to mute the fact that political domination is the basis for a Colonial presence while muting the rights of Iwi to the exercise of their Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. The Colonial land wars were used to establish the foundations of a Pakeha Colonial hegemony. The Colonial land wars were strategically resourced by Imperial troops transported from Britain. This was based on a British and Pakeha hegemonic understanding that any future attempts by Pakeha to achieve ideational domination over Iwi would be weakened if Pakeha were to take up arms against Iwi and lost. A more pressing reason for using British Imperial troops had to do with the numerical inferiority of the Pakeha at the time. It was in Britain's political and economic interests to support Pakeha appropriation of Iwi territories and resources. Both Britain and Pakeha need each other in order to acquire the vast wealth and resources which informed the Colonial gaze at the time. As a result of the dual relationship between Empire sponsor and fledgling Colony, Britain aided Pakeha settlers by maintaining a British Resident whose primary role was the acquisition of Iwi lands through the less obvious processes of the Colonial Native Land Court with; "an imperative to suppress any threats to its legitimacy" (Gramsci:1973).

Contemporary Pakeha political fiction is supported by the view that; Kawanatanga came to power in 1840. Iwi 'consent' to this is located by Pakeha elites in the contested view that; British hegemony was/is the basis for any examination of the Treaty, its contextual reading and contemporary interpretations. The report of the Colonial Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Colonial Maori Land Court of 1980 boldly asserted that;

"When British Government was established in New Zealand in 1840, Captain Hobson, the Governor elect was instructed to treat with the Maoris for their recognition of the Queen's
sovereignty in exchange for the rights and privileges of British nationality, and for the right of pre-emption over their lands" (ibid:10).

Contrary to liberal Pakēka views, statements such as this one indicate that at the level of State power elites Britain and its Colonials have pursued an arrogant extension of British rule since at least 1840. From this viewpoint written in 1980, it is clear that Pakēka Colonials assigned to themselves the right to set about the political extinguishment of ‘Native’ rights at 1840. It was a British agenda which was reflected in all of the political intercourse conducted during this period between British and Pakēka elites and Iwi. Considering the position of Kawanatanga as holding a dominant power monopoly, Gramsci (1973) has argued that hegemony as the power of ideas is also able to enlist the support of ideological institutions such as the Colonial government, courts, media and bureaucracy in, "the manufacture of" political support. A direct outcome of Pakēka Colonialism has been the manufactured and strategically orchestrated pervasiveness of the view that Iwi consent to their political domination under imposed Colonial rule.

THE MANUFACTURE OF IWI CONSENT
Incorporation, amalgamation, assimilation, and integration are all Colonial terms for policies and practices of genocide. Incorporation defined under the Colonial paradigm was a policy of bringing Iwi under the controls of British Imperialism. Amalgamation signalled a renewed attack on Iwi territories, with the addition of bringing Iwi under the social power controls of the emerging Pakēka Colony and its hegemonies. Assimilation has been one of the enduring Colonial policies designed to Europeanise the identity of Iwi descendants. Assimilation was derived from the eurosupremacist view that a European cultural consensus was superior to and should be used to achieve the ‘civilisation’ of the ‘natives’ subjugated by the Colonies. Integration was a policy constructed from the desire of Colonial elites to absorb Iwi and especially their territories, into and under their political controls. All of these Colonial policies are active components of the Colonial policies Pakēka designed and delivered to Iwi right up to the present day. While Iwi were caught in their struggles to retain remaining Iwi Whenua Rangatira Pakēka elite discourses continued to mythologize their assumption of
power over Iwi, especially their claim that Iwi ‘consented’ to the new deal.

WHITE MYTHOLOGIES

White mythologies have also served to privilege Pakeha elite productions of monocentric historiography. Pakeha elites have enjoyed linguistic dominance of text, as authors and as largely apologetic liberal critics. Van Dijk (1993) makes the point that, elite discourses are instrumental text and talk tools in the manufacture and reproduction of power discourses which often mask the hidden interests of dominant individuals and groups. Pakeha elite discourse analyses can also provide important clues regarding the reproductive framework and key players who utilise that political complex to secure positions of majority culture advantages.

Pakeha elites have encouraged the myth that Iwi en masse ceded their ancestral power to a fragile minority and alien human group. By turning the mana of ancestral Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho and the Mana of the 1835 Declaration of Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho and Te Tiriti o Waitangi against themselves, Pakeha elites have attempted to rewrite Iwi history. What has been added and rejected, is the Colonial elite view that Iwi transferred their ancestral obligations and responsibilities of Kaitiakitanga. According to the Colonial mythologies Iwi are also supposed to have ‘consented’ to the wholesale claim of Pakeha to their ancestral Whakapapa, Turangawaewae, Papakainga - the basis of their political identities. Pakeha elites have insulted the mana of those hapu whose tipuna made a sacred and binding commitment with the existing Pakeha settlers. Te Tiriti o Waitangi was never a political mechanism for the transfer of Iwi self rule.

No such record of the Iwi transfer of Tino Rangatiratanga to Te Karauna or Pakeha settlers exists. Tino Rangatiratanga was re-affirmed, Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho was recognised and acknowledged. The only new arrangement in this political context of hapu Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho was the recognition of Kawanatanga in their terms as 'limited authority' carrying the added expectation that the Queen of England would provide political oversight to her subjects -
Tauwi Pakeha. Despite this context British Imperialism was still actioned. The political struggles between Iwi and Kawanatanga are based in a fundamental power struggle. For Iwi this has included their growing activism to achieve the political freedom and the formal recognition of their rights to exercise Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho.

From 1820’s onwards Iwi struggled to assert and gain recognition of their Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. Many of their Resistance attempts were framed by a desire for Kotahitanga and a collective framework which could give voice to their Tino Rangatiratanga. The desire for the external recognition of Iwi as a Sovereign territory was borne of the realisation that the Pakeha Colony; meant to take political control of their ancestral homelands. The foundations for Pakeha hegemony directly implicate Britain and the Pakeha Colony; in the theft of Iwi lands. A key agenda in the construction of Colonial policy in 1847 was the intention;

"to part Maori from their land as quickly, quietly and cheaply as possible in order to make way for European colonisation" (M Henare 1988:232).

Both land theft and the physical removal of Iwi from their turangawaewae, paved the way for Pakeha settlement and the establishment of a British Colony. Kawanatanga is the contemporary structure and institutional framework of that Colony. A catchery of Colonial policy constructions during the 1840’s included the term ‘Amalgamation’. Colonial policy constructions designed by Pakeha elites for the incorporation of Iwi into a Pakeha controlled Colonial hegemony was based on a very different view of Iwi collectivism. The sentiments of Pakeha elites was captured by the term ‘Amalgamation’. This was a parasitic view of Iwi nations which assumed that the Europeanisation of Iwi into the structures and institutions of the new Pakeha hegemony was now inevitable. Amalgamation was a racist policy which also assumed that Pakeha hegemony also had the right to select out those aspects of Tikanga-a-Iwi that would facilitate the speedy Europeanisation of Iwi into Kawanatanga but positioned below Pakeha in the new arrangements of power. The success of Iwi to institute and bring into realisation an Iwi wide political consensus drew on the ancestral notion of Kotahitanga. Kotahitanga continued to provide a broad political framework which acted to unite
Iwi against their Colonisers;
"...despite the attempts of settler governments to colonise, subjugate, and bring about the amalgamation of the Maori" (M. Henare 1985a:12) cited in Puao-Te-Ata-Tu, Appendix 1, 'Historical Perspective', 1986.

When Iwi controlled the rate at which they transformed themselves in relation to Capitalism, Iwi, hapu and whanaungatanga appeared able to adapt and stabilise to their rapidly changing situation. While there may well have appeared some initial settler reluctance by the end of the first forty years, that gave way to the prospect that the Colony would eventually rule the Indigenous territories. The fate of the indigenes was spasmodically considered and even then Colonial policy constructions reflect a view of Iwi as 'obstacles' and 'impediments' to the larger goals of unquenchable Imperial and Colonial greed. The perversity of the Colonial desire for control of Iwi territories; and eventually Iwi bodies, was symbolised by the policy and practice of Paternalism.

**COLONIAL PATERNALISM**

In basic terms Paternalism was a codified term for the cancellation of Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. It was a way of talking about the taking over of political decision making and political representation glossed by a framework of 'fatherly' control. In practice; Paternalism meant Pakeha hegemonic control over all decisions which affected the political lives of Iwi. Iwi 'consent' was never authentically sought by Pakeha elites. This is what defines the Colonial process as one in which Iwi consent has been manufactured. Pakeha elites have historically and continue to assume the right to define Iwi existence and attempt to regulate this political arrangement through direct economic exclusions such as Pakeha Welfare benefit access, the cancellation of all rights to exercise Kaitiakitanga over their ancestral economic resources, the fettering of Iwi rights to represent themselves at the International level. Kawanatanga operates this coercive and ideological matrix through an army of Colonial bureaucrats and elites who are often unconscious of their own co-option and complicity in the Colonisation processes. Colonial Paternalism was/is the Pakeha construct through which Pakeha elites have manufactured an ideological illusion of docile Iwi consent.
Derived from the annals of Imperial and Colonial paradigms of political invasion; Paternalism was a political concept used to obscure the realities of Indigenous repression and subjugation. It was a racist Colonial policy underpinned by a Pakeha elite sentiment that Iwi must never come to political power again. These political contours were deeply embedded in the cultural baggage of the Colonists although they were often denied, and silenced by disfigured British patriotism.

Paternalism also emerged for Pakeha elite and settler insecurity. Early in the periods of Pakeha settlement the confident engagement of Iwi within the emerging capitalist system, came to be viewed by Pakeha as a threat. Iwi success also stood in the way of a Pakeha takeover and eventual control and monopoly over Iwi territories and their wealth. Iwi efforts to advance their level of well being of their members at this time revealed underlying tensions within Pakeha hegemony based on a recognition of Iwi economic success that Pakeha became committed to undermining. Pakeha historian, Tony Simpson (1986) argues that Pakeha defined Iwi economic success as a threat to what they perceived of as their right to economic supremacy so that;

"...this prosperity... carried the seeds of its own disaster. The Maoris farmed their land collectively and as a result the settlers found they could not compete" (ibid:112) cited in Puao-Te-Ata-Tu, 1986.

The emerging Pakeha hegemony were effectively non competitors. The seizure of economic and political power from Iwi was to become the means by which to silence and halt any future threats the 'Natives' might pose. The contours of contemporary struggles have changed very little. The fiasco of Kawanatanga attempts to privatise lands stolen by the Crown by shifting them under the jurisdiction of a Colonial State Owned Enterprises structure reflect similar sentiments in the 1980's. The scandal of the Waitangi Tribunal findings against the Crown and their evasion by a majority Pakeha consensus are also examples of this deeply ingrained Colonial mindset.

The machinery of settler government, the structures of law, the economy and religion, all came under tightening Pakeha elite and majority consensus controls. While Iwi Resistance could be contained another White racist policy construction
to emerge was termed 'Assimilation'.

COLONIAL ASSIMILATION

The policy glossed over the fact that practices of 'assimilation' usually resulted in linguistic and cultural genocide of the peoples being 'assimilated'. It assumed that the motley straggle which Iwi had defined as Pakeha were a superior and more civilised race. The policy construction ignored the violence and psychological terrorism this framework of policies imposed on generations of Iwi descendants. The abuses are still being denied. It was used as another Colonial ideological support. While a wholesale conspiracy theory would oversimplify the situation of Colonialism in this country, the policy and practice of Empire are embodied in the statement that;

"[As the deprivation of the Maori became unacceptably obvious, solutions were sought in the "modernisation" of a backward people in need of "development". Policies aimed at redefining land ownership, converting a communal culture to an individualistic one, fostering new forms of leadership and educating Maori children out of their essential Maoriness were rooted in the concept of "assimilation" (ibid:Appendix 1:57)

The roots of assimilation sown in the 1800's, renewed in the 1960's and persist well into the 1990's in the guise of 'bi-culturalism, multi-culturalism' and 'mainstreaming'. Each of these Colonial concepts assumes that Pakeha hegemony and Europeanisation are the desired outcome. The use of the concept in the 1860's targeted Iwi tamariki. Colonialism added to the arsenal of the Gun, the Colonial school. Henare (1986) has made the point that the Colonial policies constructed between 1895 and the 1930's were a perverse blend of; "...assimilation, paternalism, integration and exploitation" (ibid:62). Before the nineteenth century came to a close, the institutionalisation of Iwi descendants had become an instrument of standardisable repression and control.

IN DEFENCE OF WHENUA RANGATIRATANGA

Iwi who took up arms to defend their papakainga were labelled by their antagonists as 'rebels'. With blatant disregard that Aotearoa is the power context of Iwi Pakeha Colonialists utilised the threat of external British military support and the numerical superiority they now enjoyed over Iwi, to put down dissent. Many Iwi had fought collectively and individually against Crown and Colony
impositions and in 1858, Iwi refocussed their struggles based on the development of kotahitanga. The political conception of the Kingitanga emerged and gained wide Iwi legitimation. Many Iwi were not compelled to join. A key kaupapa of the Kingitanga was Pupuri Whenua68. The Kingitanga also provided a much needed Iwi voice in matters which had to be taken to Kawanatanga. Grievances over Whenua have remained a major source of political tension between Iwi and Kawanatanga.

Other Iwi struggles for political unity and solidarity also emerged out of hardening Iwi Resistance to the Pakeha theft of their turangawaewae. In 1863 the Iwi prophetic movement of Pai Marire emerges in response to the contestation of Pakeha Missionaries and Iwi sacred narratives. The Missionaries are eventually viewed with caution by many Iwi and the possibility of their complicity with Pakeha settler greed and Imperial land wars gains some credence. Te Kooti Rikirangi began te hahi Ringatu in 1865 after being persecuted by Imperial troops for defending his Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. Te Kooti is exiled to Te Wharekauri but later returns to Matawhero to exact utu. He then turns his attention to the Imperial troops keeping up a vigil of active anti-colonial warfare.

In 1868, the great Rangatira Titokowaru is forced into a war to defend the remaining Taranaki Whenua. Titokowaru had already sought peaceful and non-violent solutions to the problems of Pakeha greed for lands. The Ngati Ruanui are impressive in their stand against the Colonial militia. Their decision not to engage in any bloodshed; even where they had every opportunity and the upper hand in the war, is rarely commented on. It remained consistent with their earlier tikanga of peaceful and non-violent solutions. A point many Pakeha historians have consistently failed to mention.

Te Whiti o Rongomai and Tohu Kakahi found another peace centred Resistance movement at Parihaka in order to halt the taking of any more Iwi lands. The

68 Pupuri whenua is defined here as an ancient kaupapa of holding to ancestral obligations and responsibilities founded in the land.
settlement gains wider Iwi support, and many Iwi move onto lands and live at Parihaka. Parihaka is eventually attacked by a troop made up of armed Colonial constabulary. No one at Parihaka has any arms, and the troops are met by children singing. Many Iwi Rangatira attempt to take their grievances directly to the Crown, in the belief that the Queen of England has ‘real’ power. The monarchy has no power and the British parliament gives no real credence to our Rangatira and the grievances they put.

WITHIN AND AGAINST KAWANATANGA
From 1894, Iwi begin to infiltrate the power positions within Kawanatanga. Iwi descendants begin to excel within Colonial schools in which they predominate. Iwi leader Princess Te Puea, boycotts Iwi conscription into the Pakeha war. In 1918 T. W. Ratana founded te hahi Ratana. In 1924, Ratana attempts to take a deputation to England and is blocked by the Pakeha government from seeing the King or the Prime Minister there.

During the 1920’s Apirana Ngata attempts to create some benefits for Iwi based on land development. He is seen by Pakeha elites as too supporting of Iwi and is summarily excluded through White backlash. He resigns from his office as a Colonial Minister. In 1939, the recovery of Iwi is signalled be the emergence of the First Young Maori Conference organised by a politicised Ngata. By 1951, the problematic yet responsive, Maori Women’s Welfare league is founded. During the 1950’s many Iwi women were instrumental in the establishment of Urban marae projects and a range of social well being initiatives which emerged from a renewed focus on Iwi identity and pride. The importance of continuing Iwi Resistance traditions was clearly shown by the strategies which led to the inception of: the Kotahitanga movement; the Kingitanga; the Tohunga and Hahi movements led by Ti Tokowaru, Te Kooti, Te Whiti and Tohu, Rua, and Ratana. These strategies were not new to Iwi but were based in ancient Kaupapa and Tikanga.

By the end of the nineteenth century the last of the great Iwi territories of Tuhoe
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was brought under Colonial control in the 1890's. To commemorate the defeat, a Colonial Urewera District Native Reserve Act was passed. After this period Colonial policy constructions were tempered by a gloating Colonial society who had succeeded in closing Iwi out of their ancestral homelands, repressing any attempts to assert their ancestral status of Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho or the exercise of their more recent International status of Tino Rangatiratanga. Out of this political backdrop of growing Iwi grievances against the Crown, the Colonial system and its Pakeha benefactors Iwi politicization was developing a critical mass.

Perhaps because of blatant Colonial disregard of Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho Iwi oppositions and Resistance responses began to explicitly include the struggle for their political autonomy, independence and legitimacy. At the other end of the political spectrum many Iwi held the view that, assimilation, compromise and concessional positions under the dominant Pakeha system could be transformed to meet the needs of Iwi. They were survivalist responses in a context of political and economic terrorism. A key proponent of this view was a young Apirana Ngata. In his latter years he was to radically modify his views. Iwi political activism also became fuelled by successively undermined Iwi attempts to exercise their Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho.

THE SEEDS OF IWI INSURGENCE
The thin veneer of 'harmonious race relations' was also embedded within a lofty assumption held by many within Iwi that supporting the Pakeha war effort would somehow transform the Colonial complex. In the Waikato insightful Iwi leader Te Puea Herangi boycotted the Colonial conscription of Tainui descendants. She had accurately analyzed the blatant contradiction of the Pakeha theft of Iwi lands through internal Colonial wars and the arrogant proposal of the Colonists that Iwi now go to fight a war in support of their colonisers. There were also other forces at work which fuelled the political momentum of the 1960's and volatile seventies.

Described within Ireland as 'internal Colonialism' the forced removal of entire
communities from their lands and into industrial centres which fuelled the Empire, aptly reflects the phenomenon coined the ‘urban drift’. It was hardly a drift as generations of Iwi forced from the security of their ancestral lands through warfare, legislation, legal fiction, economic boycotts which has impacted in terms of a collective demoralisation and generational traumatisation of Iwi descendants. Through the deliberate processes of Pakeha Colonialism Iwi occupy the second most disproportionate negative statistics rating in the World for Indigenous peoples. Iwi descendants are those most likely to be in Pakeha prisons, Pakeha structural unemployment, Pakeha poor health, housing, and educational ‘failure’ statistics. All of these statistics is explained by the presence of Pakeha Colonialism and the continuation of structural, institutional, cultural and linguistic Colonisation.

Pakeha Colonialism instigated the demise of Iwi economic confidence and this forced the internal migration of generations of Iwi into Pakeha controlled and re-defined ‘urban’ centres. These centres also brought into sharp contrast Iwi and Pakeha where the tensions of political struggle have become latent forces in contemporary Iwi political struggles. The practical implications of over a hundred years of systematic Colonial invasion, political repression, exclusion and White racism were potent forces which found renewed expression in what Ranginui Walker (1987, 1990) has described as, "the angry years" of the sixties and seventies.

Iwi women also came into focus during this period and moved to positions at the forefront of our political struggles. Iwi Activists such as Donna Awatere (1984) emerged. Her articulation of an Iwi wide political struggle for ‘Maori Sovereignty’ opened the way for a renewed focus on the basis of Pakeha rule of Aotearoa. This historical period was also preceded by radically transforming political processes throughout Iwi which led up to the eventual publication of the report Puao-Te-Ata-Tu in June 1986. The Iwi groundwork for the report actually began following Iwi rejection of the racist Hunn report of the 1960’s and the recognition by Iwi that they faced an urgent political crisis. Puao-Te-Ata-Tu differed dramatically
from earlier Colonial Reports in important ways. It signalled the return by Iwi to a focus on the importance of their future - their tamariki.

It was the first time Iwi throughout the motu mobilized per force against the tide of Kawanatanga impositions into their lives. It also brought to the forefront of Pakeha consciousness an explicit view of the underside to Pakeha rule. The Report also provided the forums in which many Iwi were politicized often for the first time, about the true history of colonisation. These were crucial developmental periods within contemporary Iwi political activist movements. They ushered in and paved the way for the further emergence of a wider range of multi-strategic approaches which gave voice to highly publicised Iwi political dissent. More positive outcomes from this period came to include language recovery initiatives such as Te Atarangi, Te Kohanga Reo, Te Kura Kaupapa Maori and Te Kura Tuarua. The two key symbols which have emerged as a political focus since then have been; (1) the Iwi future - our tamariki, and (2) the role and status of Iwi women.

**RANGATIRATANGA I TUKU IHO**

This chapter departs from a framework which lines up the offending policies and then discredits its authors and benefactors. Instead this chapter concentrates its focus on Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho as a centralising theoretical framework. It is important to remember that Kawanatanga is not the sole preoccupation of Iwi his/her stories struggles and aspirations. This recognition is made despite the fact that colonisation has succeeded in disfiguring a positive self concept and regard being developed by many Iwi descendants. Regardless of these Colonial outcomes this thesis argues that all Iwi descendants are the recipients of Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho.

---

69 Rangatiratanga i tuku iho is approximately defined here as: Sacred descent lines. It is based in a three World Iwi Maori self perception that, Iwi Maori are directly descendants from their ira Atua (Creator Gods), ira Whenua (Primal Parents and descendants), and te ira tāngata - their human descent groups.
Although contemporary Pakeha elites have resorted to obscuring their dominance by dispensing with the term 'Colonial', whakapapa as a theory gives emphasis to transparency of descent. Kawanatanga is identified by the re introduction of the qualifying term 'Colonial'. While Pakeha elites attempt to invent their anonymity by removing the term 'Colonial', the Parent structures and institutions cannot be escaped. The focus which is placed on Colonial policy construction is foregrounded by the central position of Iwi as a distinct political complex.

The application of whakapapa as a theoretical tool operates from a number of principles. Two basic questions of whakapapa are (1) no hea koe/au/ia? The question which is asked first is where or what is your/my/its origins? (2) ko wai koe/au/ia? The second aspect as a question relates to specific human descent. When this basic framework is applied to the production and distribution of policy within Aotearoa today, the answer is Kawanatanga and Pakeha power elites. Whakapapa is an important tool of Kaupapa Maori. In the first instance it affirms the efficacy and legitimacy of Iwi epistemological constructs. As an analytical tool it is used to discern key social power configurations. When applied to Kawanatanga structures and institutions of power the management and control by Pakeha elites over power positions within Kawanatanga can be revealed. In some cases a Whakapapa framework approach can be used to trace out the configurations of power which might be available to Iwi. It is also an important navigational framework, which Iwi descendants can apply when their lives intersect with Kawanatanga.

The shift in emphasis from a privileged analysis of Kawanatanga is a conscious decision to move out of an intellectual and psychological terrain of struggle constructed by dominant Pakeha hegemonies. This shift retains the central positionings of Iwi priorities in terms of our own struggles, human narratives and ancestral aspirations. As a result of these fundamental shifts, Kawanatanga discourses are examined only to the extent that they may have intervened in, imposed upon, sought to transform and continue to obscure the continuation of Iwi Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. The need to shift the focus of Kaupapa Maori
theorising is based on the premise that; everything less than self determination is assimilation.

OUR SACRED STORIES
When the sacred narratives of Iwi descendants were forged over seventy generations ago our stories were based in narratives of Rongomarae Roa\textsuperscript{70}. A central foci of Iwi opposition and Resistance. An important addition to the sacred narratives of Iwi re-emerged from the powerful influences and symbolic kaupapa of Puao-Te-Ata-Tu\textsuperscript{71}.

PUAO-TE-ATA-TU
The Ministerial Report Puao-Te-Ata-Tu is an atypical example of a Colonial policy document. The cover represents the sharp differences between the undertaking and completion of this report and all previous Colonial documents and reports regarding Iwi which preceded it. Interpreting the cover; the Report sets out this sacred depiction;

"The shining rays of Ra, the Sun
glistens upon the bosom of
Hine Titanata, Goddess of the dawn
and day break

Tamanui a Rangi, the Sky God
brightens Puao-te-ata-tu
upon the fish and canoe
of Maui" (Puao-Te-Ata-Tu, 1986).

In June 1986 the first comprehensive and Iwi conducted Colonial Report entered the Pakeha controlled 'public' debate arena. Ngati Porou commentator Harry Walker (1995) proposes that it represented for him, an exciting and frustrating period for Iwi descendants working within Kawanatanga. Exciting because he posits the view that;

"...a Department of State was mature enough to acknowledge its racism...it was a time of the policy of Matua Whangai and the desire by Maori to stop the institutionalisation of Maori children...it was a time of 'Whanau Decision Making' as a distinct [Colonial]Social

\textsuperscript{70} Rongomarae Roa is the name of the Creator force of Peace. The term 'roa' can be translated as 'long'.

\textsuperscript{71} Puao-Te-Ata-Tu has been rendered 'Day Break'. The meanings encoded symbolise the inevitable movement from one point to another, a sacred point in the day, a symbol of renewed hope and the possibilities for transformation.
Work Practice" (H. Walker ibid:12).

Walker develops the further contention that this period was exciting because it appeared that the proposed "Competency Project" held out the prospect of being a bi-structural negotiation process and vision. An air of optimism prevailed with the creation of a Colonial Social Welfare Commission and Colonial District Executive Committees. There were also reasons for caution. The sceptre of White racism was not yet critically understood by Iwi. During this fierce historical period many uncritical Pakeha found the transformation of Iwi political consciousness overwhelming. A range of responses within Pakeha bureaucratic circles included genuine attempts to grapple with these debates, liberal apologia, conservative Pakeha resentment and rejection of the claims and a White backlash which co-opted highly colonised Iwi descendants.

The document laid out in historical terms a complex social and political analysis which indicted the rise of a monocultural Welfare State ethos. It went further than any other report since, in providing a macro level analysis of internal Colonial rule and placed the contemporary situation of Iwi as Colonial State 'economic' dependents within the broader historical context of British Imperialism and Colonialism. Contemporary Colonial Welfare institutions, according to the report Puao-Te-Ata-Tu, were institutionally racist. That is, monocultural Pakeha bias was argued to be entrenched within the structure of power relationships and these structural relationships were then seen to be transmitted as societal rather than dominant Pakeha cultural 'norms'. The Ministerial report was the first of its character to be undertaken by Colonial power elites and Iwi. Conducted using hui as a key research framework, leaders such as the late John Rangihau of Ngai Tuhoe, were able to gauge a comprehensive and consistent range of views across the country. The views of many of Iwi contained recurring messages of anger, frustration and resentment. Institutional racism was a consistent theme of most of the hui feedback.

After a hundred and fifty five years of Colonial arrogance the Ministerial report Puao-Te-Ata-Tu helped to confirm that, the Colonial Welfare State had been
established from the theft of Iwi territories and resources. In explicit cases Pakeha legal Imperialism had been instituted to insure Iwi remained politically and economically excluded from participating in a growing Pakeha domination of their ancestral economic base. The report listed seamless Colonial policies and legal fictions; which formed a political context that drove Iwi into cycles of deprivation.

A deepening crises emerged in the 1970’s. The report opened its summary with the view that since at least 1960, Iwi descendants were being recorded in disproportionate numbers within the Colonial Welfare system. This was set in comparison to the frequency of Pakeha within their Welfare system and the numbers of Iwi descendants stood at 12% in the total population. These trends were then related to the over-representation of Iwi descendants in the lower rungs of the Pakeha controlled economy. The summary also stated that the socio-economic status between Pakeha Colonials and Iwi had remained unchanged for decades.

A Maori Advisory Unit within the Department of Social Welfare was been established in 1984, and in its 1985 report stated the Department was institutionally racist. This was qualified by the further claims that the bureaucratic practices reflected a privileging of Pakeha values, attitudes, beliefs and practice ‘norms’. It argued that Maori input into policy production and decisions was non-existent. Maori were positioned as the ‘receivers’ of Pakeha policy decisions for them. The report also argued that the insistence of Pakeha exclusive definitions of ‘Professional qualifications’ also reflected a monocultural assumption of superiority. The same qualifications were proposed as a credit for ‘competence’ based in the earlier assumptions that ‘professional’ meant European Pakeha.

The Colonial Welfare State was directly challenged by the Ministerial report. It was a report of over a hundred years of dominant culture invasion which had deliberately undermined the validity and legitimacy of Iwi, hapu and
whanaungatanga as viable social power relations for Iwi nations peoples.

Iwi attempts to have the Treaty of Waitangi included in the Colonial Children and Young Persons and their Families Act 1989 failed. A lack of Colonial elite support for an Iwi controlled ‘Maori’ Social Work Unit and an explicit Pakeha elite directive to stop a training workshop on "Whanau Decision Making" organised for Pakeha Social Work Advisors working on the development of the Children, Young Persons and their Families Act 1989 undermined earlier Iwi optimism. Negative Pakeha elite reaction against attempts by Iwi working within Kawanatanga actually gave further force to Iwi political activism and insurgence. Pakeha elites could not have realised that their White racist entrenchment as well as limited Pakeha support was a catalyst more potent than the deliberate under resourcing of Iwi, hapu and whanaungatanga or their discouragement and often dismissal by Colonial bureaucrats. A qualification is made here in terms of the reclamation and recovery of Iwi tamariki from out of Colonial residential institutions. The qualification is that it would be naive to suggest that the problematic removal of Iwi tamariki from Pakeha residential centres, foster homes and boarding school arrangements is solved simply by the returning of these tamariki to their Kainga. Rather, it is important to remember that the political conditions which made their removal possible in the first place continues to mitigate against all Iwi descendants in ways which have deeply wounded and traumatised Iwi. This acknowledgement is left as a tohu and recommends a return to the healing practices which kept our own Tipuna holistically well. For me it is part of the realisation of Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho.

As the negotiations over the Pakeha "Competency Project" evolved White racism emerged when Iwi proposed the development of a parallel structure. In reaction some Pakeha elites redefined this proposal as a negative form of ‘separatism’. Hardening Pakeha bureaucratic and elite White racism also resulted in the disbanding of the Colonial Social Welfare Commission and the District Executive Committees which were supposed to have taken power to the people. Walker (1995) is legitimate in his cynicism which suggests that Pakeha elites will capture
and appropriate the hard won Iwi contributions left in the body of work which constitutes the Iwi components in report Puao-te-ata-tu. In particular he cites the recent publication of ‘Te Punga’ as a symbolic reflection of the current Kawanatanga position regarding Iwi. Te Punga symbolises an anchor and the probability that the canoe of Puao-te-ata-tu will not be allowed to move anywhere. Puao-te-ata-tu is exceptional because as Walker states, "It is truly a policy of the people" (ibid:13).

The processes of conducting a nationwide Iwi consultation framework of hui these processes enabled oppositional and resistance stratagems to be legitimated and the emergence of key political debates to be actively renewed. As a result of the report Puao-Te-Ata-Tu earlier views of Iwi as passive policy makers was turned on its head.

Summary:
In this chapter Pakeha political hegemony has been woven into the argument that the roots of Iwi political activism is over seventy generations old in this motu. What is new in the fundamental narratives of Iwi, is the problematic presence of predatory alien strangers who hailed from outside Te Moana Nui A Kiwa. These were an alien peoples who have denigrated the early hospitality and support Iwi extended to them. These were an alien peoples who had forsaken their forebears, made an enemy of their Mother, their kinspeople and their neighbouring family of nations. Their coming had been foretold many years before they finally arrived. The sign of Tu Matauenga; it was foretold, would sear the land and bring to a close the Story of peace which had reigned within Aotea Roa - the Waka of the Atua and Te Ika A Maui - the Sacred Stingray of Tangaroa fished up by Maui.

In its place emerged the establishment of a British sponsored Pakeha hegemony. It carries within the seeds of its own destruction. This chapter has also posited the view that the manufacture of Iwi consent to their political repression has been maintained and controlled through ideological domination. I have cited the use
of White mythologies and the Colonial constructions of policies such as ‘Paternalism’ and ‘Assimilation’ as key examples of these arrangements.

The analytical focus of this chapter begins to deliberately shift towards the impact of Colonial policies on Iwi oppositional and Resistance traditions. In particular the shifting focus from a desire for kotahitanga and the later emergence of pro-assimilationist and accommodationist stances. This period in the transformation of Iwi opposition and Resistance struggles with regard to Kawanatanga are argued to be those undertaken within and against Kawanatanga. These tensions are also argued to have shaped the ways in which the seeds of Iwi insurgence, political dissent, ugly public protests and activism were eventually ignited.

In this chapter Pakeha hegemony is deliberately de-centred. Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho - the ancestral descent of Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho is developed as the political context in which this thesis is emerging. In particular this chapter focuses on the emergence of the Ministerial Report Puao-te-ata-tu. In contrast to Pakeha commentaries such as that posed by David Pearson which have tried to dismiss the claim of institutional racism which was proposed, Puao-te-ata-tu is claimed to be an explicit return by Iwi to supporting the legitimacy and efficacy of their Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. This was evidenced in the way in which the Report was brought to the attention of Iwi by Iwi within and outside of Kawanatanga. It was also affirmed by the Iwi control over and conduct of a nationwide marae focused Iwi process which restored the visibility of Iwi as active participants and important Sacred Stories to tell. The Report was pivotal not because it brought White racism into the forefront of political struggles but because it brought Iwi to the realisation that Kawanatanga would never deliver their Rangatiratanga I Tuku Iho. In this important respect the self perception of Iwi; and especially the challenge to Pakeha elites in the manufacture of Iwi consent, was turned on its head.