CHAPTER FOUR

THE MAORI PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

Notes to My Self

By the time I had reached teenage years, my Mum was no longer able to protect me and my brothers from our fate as Maori children. My brothers and I were good half-caste kids at school, especially by the time we got to high school. We all excelled at sport - both my older brothers got the cup for being the 'best all-round Maori pupil'. In those days it never occurred to me to ask - why isn't there a cup for the best all-round Pakeha pupil? My oldest brother who was the warrior on the rugby field was told by the Pakeha principal that he would never be anything but a 'chippie'. He did become a 'chippie'. I was the one with the brains. I was also the one who had ceased being a Maori - by the time I was 15, I was Pakeha. When I got my University Entrance accredited to me the headmaster came up to me and congratulated me because as he said, I was the first Maori pupil to be accredited with University Entrance since that school had been opened. Well, it was a big shock to me - him saying that to me. Years later, when I told people, I told them that I was annoyed at him because he was implying that Maori pupils were not as smart as Pakeha. He was patronising me whilst congratulating me. But the truth is that I was really annoyed at him because he called me Maori. He was actually insulting me. It had taken me all those years in that Pakeha system to wipe the brown traces from my skin, to be Pakeha in order to succeed and he turned around and called me Maori. When later I learnt about this thing called the 'internalisation of colonisation', I think back to that day and yes, I know now, that there definitely was something wrong with me.
Despite the on-going counter-critique that Maori have provided to being constantly regarded as 'the problem' in education; Maori still live with the consequences of early Pakeha research which was written within the context of colonisation, evolutionary theory or deficit and cultural-deprivation theories. The reality for Maori is that we, as a people, as an indigenous people, have been one of the most researched people in the world. Merita Mita expressed it succinctly in 1989:

We have a history of people putting the Maori under a microscope in the same way a scientist looks at an insect. The ones doing the looking are giving themselves the power to define and describe.
(Mita 1989 New Zealand Listener, October 14, pg. 30).

Linda Smith 1986, a Maori writer who has written several counter-critiques in response to Pakeha research-obsessed imperialism; has stated that "while being considered 'primitive', Maori society has provided fertile ground for research". (Smith 1986:47).

In Aotearoa the yardstick, by which academic achievement is measured, is the Pakeha yardstick. In Aotearoa, Pakeha culture, theories of Knowledge, and pedagogy have been the yardsticks by which Tikanga Maori and Mataruranga Maori have been measured.

In view of the assumed superiority of Western forms of Knowledge which underlie Pakeha culture in Aotearoa; Mataruranga Maori has been subsumed. The end result of this ideological take-over, after decades of research 'for the sake' of research, is that Maori has been posited as the problem.

In any scientific experiment there is a 'control' group and the variables are changed, rearranged, juxtaposed and 'tested'. In this instance, Western forms of Knowledge, and the Pakeha Education System has remained the 'control' group. The System itself has mostly been viewed as unproblematic, intact, in control. The Maori variables however have been changed, rearranged, juxtaposed ad infinitum.
Kaupapa Maori Theory/Praxis seeks to banish the Spectre (kehua) of Maori non-achievement in the Pakeha Education System; this Spectre which has been characterised, legitimated and dominated by Pakeha culturalist explanations, victim-blaming, deficit theories, deprivation theories and self-esteem theories. Tuini Ngawai’s dance-poem of the 1950s addressed the kehua.

Te matauranga o te Pakeha  
He mea whakato hei tinanatanga  
Mo wai ra?  
Mo Hatawhi? (Satan).

A major project of Kaupapa Maori Theory is to transpose the question, invert the dilemma of Maori underachievement so that it becomes one of Pakeha non-achievement. Thus, the Pakeha Education System is required to acknowledge its dismal failure to educate Maori.

Educational policy towards Maori has been ethnocentric in its approach, based on assumptions of the cultural superiority of the Pakeha. This approach has extended into the related issues of research, evaluation and policy making. The policy has become practice. The practice, devoid of praxis, has revealed its shortcomings.

How can Maori succeed in an Education System that was set up in order to fail Maori? In 1986 Linda Smith reminded us:

It should not be forgotten that the original agenda for education was to destroy Maori Society. An educational system was created especially to carry out this function and even though it has been absorbed into a larger bureaucracy its agenda is still part of that system....The original aitua (evil spirit), is still there.  
(L.Smith 1986:10).

The Maori problem in education did not begin with the ‘black-listing’ statistics that emerged from the Hunn Report in 1961. My own mother’s supposed educational failure attests to this. She began her schooling in the Pakeha education system in the early 1930s as a fluent Maori-speaking child. Along with many other Maori children
at that time she was punished for speaking Te Reo Maori. For me, she epitomises the
positing by Pakeha, of Maori, as the problem in education. In the 1940s she was
finally expelled for smoking and ‘mucking around with boys’. Her story is not
unique. One only needs to read the 1986 Report of The Waitangi Tribunal On The Te
Reo Maori Claim to read of other Maori kuia and kaumatua who experienced the
racism of the Pakeha education system. My mother’s response to being identified as
the problem, was not unique either. She described it to me:

To get back at the school and the Pakeha kids, whenever I had kutu, (head
lice) me and the other Maori kids always sat next to the Pakeha kids in class,
real close, so they would hop off us onto them.
(Personal communication with Kura Te Aroha Renata).

My mother’s strategy in the 1930s, epitomises for me the notion of resistance in
Maori education. If Maori have become the problem, then for many the solution is
to ‘opt out’ of the System. The problematic System remains. Pakeha have yet to deal
with their own problem.

The inscribing of Maori as a problem in education can be seen in Thomas Kendall’s
account of his effort to introduce European schooling to Maori children in 1816.
Kendall wrote to his fellow missionary Wood, in 1916.

When a teacher amongst the heathen (for it could not be endured in civilized
society) is surrounded by a number of children, and perhaps while one is
repeating his lesson, another will be playing with his feet, another taking away
his hat, and another his book, and all this in a friendly manner, he cannot be
angry at them, yet it requires some study how to introduce a salutary
discipline.

Kendall relates that the children could not be collected together every day or kept at
school without constant supplies of food. (ibid:43). The suggestion is that Maori had
to be bribed to be educated. In April 1817, the roll of Kendall’s school had reached
seventy children who initially slept in the school house in their "own filthy raiment".
(Kendall, cited in Binney 1968:41).
The meeting of European knowledge and Matauranga Maori posed many problems for the missionary who sought to civilise the heathens. The biggest problem was seen to be the primitive nature of Maori culture itself. The habits, personalities and idiosyncrasies of Maori children were considered problems. Kencall's pedagogy, his Knowledge was deemed unproblematic.

MAORI AS THE OBJECT OF STUDY

Kapunga Dewes in 1968 was one of the first Maori educationalists to 'site' the Pakeha Education System as the 'problem', as inadequate for the education of Maori children. For him the basis of the under-achievement of Maori in schools rested with the 'linguistic imperialism' practices by the schools. Richard Harker (1973), reiterates Dewes' view:

The Maori child who speaks his mother tongue or who might want to master his mother tongue is discriminated against by headmasters and educational authorities who are complacent, indifferent, or prejudiced against Maori language.

Pakeha researchers have provided an endless barrage of documentation in their search to the discover the source of the Maori Problem in education. In a sense they have 'fed' of the notion of the problem. Numerous dissertations, academic papers, Masters Theses, Doctor of Philosophy Theses attest to this.

One such collation of academic studies, in the form of a bibliography, titled - The Retention of Maori in Schooling (1993), written by Josie Lander, Karen Burnett and Jim Marshall from the University of Auckland, gives a comprehensive account, of the extent to which, Maori have been the Object of Research.
BLAMING THE VICTIM

In 1985 Linda Smith made the contention:

The ideology of "blaming the victim" was implanted in the very creation of schools for Maori children and served as a powerful self-fulfilling prophecy. (L. Smith 1985:1).

David Ausubel's effort to explain the Maori problem in education in 1971, can be seen as an indictment on Maori Culture; in particular the credibility of Maori parenthood.

In his methodology Pakeha parents are the 'control' group, the yardstick of measure. Maori parents fare dismally in his analysis. His proposition was that Maori parents did not place as high a value on education as Pakeha parents. Maori parents "are unable to appreciate its value or see much point in it". (D. Ausubel 1970:56). He suggests that Maori parents are much more permissive than their Pakeha counterparts. They have "significant loss of parental control over adolescent children". (Ibid:57). Indeed the Maori 'problem' relates directly to "relatively poor parent-child communication", between Maori parents and their children. In his view, the children tend to emulate their parents' pattern of "hedonistic self-indulgence, procrastination, and lack of long-term striving". (Ibid.)

The Maori practice of 'adoption' and casually undertaken marital arrangements compound the 'problem' in his view. He alludes to the schizophrenic existence of Maori children who "lead two almost entirely discrete lives". In the 'pa' they relapse into "casual, lackadaisical, and unpunctual ways". At school they "conform reasonably well to pakeha standards". (Ibid.).

His indictment on Maori parenthood continues. Maori parents are either ignorant or "totally confused about the availability and procedures of applying for Government and tribal trust fund scholarships" for their children. (Ibid:58). Of special mention in Ausubel's account of the Maori 'problem' is the fact that Maori parents have too
much "late adult entertainment" in the home. They even allow their children "excessive visits" to the cinema. The unusually large size of Maori families is a major feature of Ausubel's indictment. Indeed, the Maori 'problem' in Ausubel's account is caused by the fact that Maori parents have too much sex! He turns his attention to peer group influences.

The negative effects of the peer group on educational achievement are greatly enhanced under conditions of social demoralisation, especially when bodgieism and juvenile delinquency flourish.

He writes of the sullen defiance of the Maori boys. Their racial pride having a somewhat chauvinistic and anti-Pakeha flavour.

After paying lip-service to the venerable tradition of learning epitomised in the Whare Waananga in former times, he laments the lack of guidance from Maori kaumatua who would provide academic-successful role models for Maori youth. The Pakeha yardstick rule of measure glares at us from this statement by Ausubel:

Inevitably, therefore, the cultural level of the Maori home, the degree of intellectual stimulation it offers Maori children, and the standard of English spoken by Maori parents must progressively improve until they approach or equal pakeha standards.

He suggests that the Maori have lost the intellectual stimulation of their indigenous culture, but have not yet learned to replace it with the appropriate intellectual stimulation from Pakeha sources. The suggestion is of course that Maori must change, because they are the problem. The system itself is beyond reproach.

Ausubel posits Maori students as being "undoubtedly" handicapped in academic achievement because of a lower average of intellectual functioning as compared with the Pakeha control group. Why are Maori retarded? Let me rephrase the question in
a language that I have been familiar with in my lifetime - Why are Maori dumb? Ausubel answers:

Intellectual retardation among Maori children is attributable to two main factors: (a) the status of the Maori people as a generally underprivileged and rural lower-class minority group with unusually large families, and (b) special disabilities associated with problems of acculturation.

To rewrite it for Ausubel - Maori are dumb because we are poor, hard-up; we live in the sticks, having it off all day. We are also dumb because we can't be Pakeha! This is how you blame the victim, under the pretext of actually saving them.

Another writer R.S. Adams, writing in the 1970s attempts to differentiate Maori from Pakeha. His view is that:

If Maoris are disadvantaged in this way, it is either because of some built-in propensity for disadvantage or because certain factors in their way of life contrive it.

Once again, we witness Pakeha arrogance - the Maori way of life or some "built-in propensity for disadvantage" is the cause for Maori failure in schools. Adams acknowledges the reality of Maori disadvantage but is sceptical of the notion of special provisions for Maori. Like many colour-blind Pakeha, he denies that disadvantage has anything to do with race. He wrote:

Our problem is to alleviate the disadvantage that exists, and that problem is not, of itself, an ethnic problem at all.

Eric Schwimmer writing in the 1970s also had much to comment on 'Maori Aspirations in Education'. His thesis was that the basic Maori schooling problem was 'confusion of identity'. He was only one of many Pakeha writers who put the 'Maori
identity' under the microscope. In his review of the 1962 Currie Commission he relays the point that the Commission:

... stresses that the ultimate future of the Maori language lies not with the intervening European, nor with institutions such as the school, but entirely with the Maori himself, in the Maori home and the habits of the Maori family. (E.Schwimmer 1970:81).

After European intervention had attempted to extinguish Te Reo Maori, Maori people were left to pick up the blame for their own language loss.

The Currie Commission of 1962 arrived at the clear conviction that Maori education must become an area of special need, requiring special measures and inevitably increased expenditure. The notion of 'special needs', like the notion of biculturalism is problematic. Indeed the notion of Taha Maori in schools has been seen by Maori to be no more than an attempt to indigenise Pakeha. It serves only to make Pakeha appreciate their own culture by comparing it with an older 'traditional' stone-age culture.

The notion of Maori requiring special needs, whilst appealing to the egalitarian, humanitarian myth of educational equity in Aotearoa, represents the patronising nature of Pakeha educational discourse. By positing Maori as special, as in need, the strategy acknowledges inequality, but does not accept any responsibility for that inequality. This lies at the basis of all deficit-theories, cultural-deprivation, self-esteem, and identity-crisis theories which have been employed by Pakeha to legitimate the Maori problem.

Leonie Pihama (1994) notes that one of the most succinct usage of cultural deprivation theory in Aotearoa was that offered by J. Forster and P. Ramsey (1973) in their article - "Migration, Education and Occupation: The Maori Population 1936-66". They cite poor socio-economic conditions, including factors as occupancy rates, social attitudes, poor living conditions and a "different" cultural upbringing. However D.G. Ball, (cited in Forster and Ramsey 1969), speaking for the Maori Education
Foundation in 1965 believed that of all these factors, which contributed to the Maori 'problem', it was the "maoriness" of the child which was the greatest handicap. (Forster, Ramsey 1969:211). Need we say more?

The notion of objectification is crucial in our understanding of the Maori problem in education. Maori have been posited as the Objects of discourse. The dominant monocultural Education system has remained the control group; Pakeha culture has remained the ‘norm’. Whilst the Maori variables have been changed, rearranged and juxtaposed indefinitely; the system itself has been posited as the Universal. Maori are left with no other option but withdrawal; leaving the problem squarely at the feet of Pakeha.

The following chapter provides further insight into the ways that European discourses have sought to undermine Kaupapa Maori. The notion of culture invention is explored in detail. I address the contention, made by Pakeha, that both Maori and Pakeha construct Maori culture, in the framework of traditional, modern, postmodern and postcolonial paradigms. I discuss the processes by which Pakeha historians, ethnographers and researchers have posited Maor: as a malleable, submissive, disoriented people. In short, the validity of Mana Maori Motuhake comes under attack.
CHAPTER FIVE

CULTURE INVENTION

INTRODUCTION

Maoridom is a load of bullshit because there is no ‘d’ in the Maori language. (Charles Manawatū Renata).

In this chapter I address the notion of culture invention and construction. Specifically it discusses the notion that Maori culture has been constructed within a traditional context, a modern context, a Postmodern context and a Postcolonial context.

I also describe the ways that Pakeha historians, ethnographers, researchers and writers, have posited Maori as a malleable, disoriented, submissive people. The suggestion implicit in the discourse discussed is that Mana Maori Motuhake has no validity.

The proposals, implicit within the discourses, are that Pakeha and Maori have both dabbled in the invention of Maori culture. The first contention I make is that there is no such thing as Maori culture. The notion of culture is suspect. Culture, within the Pakeha theoretical paradigm, has no bearing on Kaupapa Maori reality.

In Aotearoa, culture is something that is tacked onto the notion of Maori. Maori culture is something that Maori people are seen by Pakeha to do. It consists of activities such as waiata, haka, and poi. The reality for Maori is that we don’t actually do our culture - we live it! In the Pakeha attempt to inscribe, define, control and compare Maori identity with their own identity; the reference of culture serves as a
homogenising label, similar to Maoridom. If Maori do practise anything at all, then it is Tikanga, which we live.

The notions of ‘cultural studies’, ‘ethnic studies’, and ‘minority studies’ are also problematic. European researchers who assign these labels invariably exclude themselves or their own cultural identity from such categories; their identities are unmarked. An unmarked race, is a sign of Racism unaware of itself, a blanked-out Racism.

The writer Richard Mulgan provides several examples of the positing of Maori as a ‘disoriented’ people. In his text - Maori Pakeha and Democracy (1989), he addresses the question of how Maori and Pakeha can live in a democratic society. His thesis is that Maori have been largely "dispossessed of their ancestral land and driven to join Pakeha society where they form a disoriented and underprivileged minority". (R.Mulgan 1989:2). He suggests that Maori should seek to advance themselves economically and professionally within modern western-style societies; should not reject their heritage but take pride in it and build on it. (ibid.). However Mulgan expects us to deny our past, our heritage. He writes:

> What is truly threatening to Maori culture is to seek to fossilize it by identifying it with pre-contact culture. (R.Mulgan 1989:62).

His contention is that the past is past and not present. He stresses that Maori should avoid any attempt to "freeze time at the point of original settlement ". (ibid:56). We need to recognize the significance of the distance which now separates us from the original colonial settlement, "in the course of which the country and its peoples have been transformed". (ibid.).

His views can be seen to represent the views of many Pakeha that Maori should stop living in the past; disregard the validity of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. The degree to which Maori people have been ‘transformed’ by Pakeha society and culture is a recurring theme in Pakeha discourse. These views stress the degree to which Maori have
themselves acculturated themselves into Pakeha society. The allegation of transformation implicit in the discourse disguises the linguistic imperialism of the Pakeha to deny the reality of Mana Maori Motuhake. Mulgan attempts to speak for Maori. He writes that some Maori may be described as traditionalist, but that this is very much a relative term.

'Traditional' for a present day Maori is more likely to mean what is practised by today's older rural Maori rather than what was done in previous centuries. (R.Mulgan 1989:13).

He suggests that the Maori ability to critique the dominant Pakeha superstructure was acquired by Maori thinking in the Western mode of thought.

In Aotearoa-New Zealand, for instance, although there has been continuous Maori opposition to Pakeha culture and occupation from the beginning, the most reasoned and articulate expression of this opposition, at any rate in English, has been the product of western modes of thought, especially those of anthropology, the discipline in which Maori studies was originally located in the universities. (R.Mulgan 1989:45).

He suggests that separated nationhood for the two peoples, even if it were desirable, would not be practicable. "Maori sovereignty, in the literal sense of a separate Maori state or states (for individual iwi), is not a serious political possibility". (ibid:23). We should avoid using terms such as 'sovereignty' of 'self-determination' which suggest complete political independence. (ibid.). Yet he makes the contention:

No people, particularly one which is being asked to surrender voluntarily part of its power, can happily accept a view of itself which denies its own self-respect and legitimacy. (R.Mulgan 1989:22).

This is precisely the predicament that Te Iwi Maori have been presented with. Mulgan cites ad nauseam the extent to which he believes Maori identity has been 'transformed' by Pakeha culture. Maori identity, he suggests, has become much more a "matter of individual choice and personal commitment". Individual Maori can
choose to remain Maori, or become Maori, or cease to be Macri in a way which would have been incomprehensible to pre-contact Maori.

Maori social life today is considerably less collectively oriented than in earlier pre-European contact times. Maori today, even whilst they live in rural areas, in the traditional marae context, do not "subordinate" their individual lives to the survival of the group as ruthlessly as in the past. Maori individuals today are accorded much greater personal freedom and rights.

His exposition of the modern Maori identity is 'framed' entirely within the ignorance of his knowledge of the 'traditional' and 'modern Maori' identity. The over-riding contention is that Mana Maori Motuhake is in the hands of the Pakeha -

Only if the Pakeha accept the fact of cultural diversity and the need to make room for the Maori in New Zealand is there any chance that the Maori people can survive.
(R.Mulgan 1989:2).

Mulgan's portrayal of the modern Maori seeks to validate many Pakeha-centric views that posit Maori as a malleable, disoriented people. The Pakeha rationalisations abound: -

There are no 'real Maori' left today; nor is there a 'real' Maori culture.
Maori have become brown Pakeha.
Maori have forgotten their past, their traditions and culture.
Maori accept being slaves in their own country.

In 1973 James Ritchie, commenting on Maori 'recognition' stated:

But there is no Maori culture as a unified pattern, no universal Maori traits or behaviour patterns, no traditions borne by all who claim or protest Maoriness. One must be concerned with particularities not generalities when seeking to recognise what it is that makes this Maori, Maori.
(J.Ritchie 1973:70).
Bernard Gadd, writing on 'Cultural Differences in the Classroom' (1976), states that Pakeha civilisation has "almost - but not quite - buried traditional Maori kinship terms beneath the names of Pakeha relationships". (B.Gadd 1976:12).

In his "masterly" treatise on the study of the New Zealand Maori: Graduate in 1977, Thomas K.-Fitzgerald was compelled in the first paragraph of his masterly treatise to ask the question - "Is there a Maori Culture?". (T.Fitzgerald 1977:1). Into the 1990s, the same inscriptions on Maori are heard. Anne Maxwell (1991), commenting on Maori Cannibalism to Biculturalism, states that:

In at least one sense there can be no going back. The original culture of the Maori no longer exists, and cannot be recovered. Consequently, there is no 'authentic' voice of the Maori - no repressed identity against which Pakeha can define themselves. Even the concepts of a Maori language and history lack authenticity; they too are the result of a series of cultural exchanges with Europeans. (A.Maxwell 1991:104).

Michael Jackson's M.A. thesis (1967), concentrated on the study of the meaning and effect of literacy in the early nineteenth century on Maori society. His arguments 'parrot' the 'dying race' projection on Maori society and identity. His discourse suggests that Maori are left with no ability to resist the dominance of Pakeha hegemony and Pakeha power. Literally, European writers have written Maori identity 'out of existence'.

At the introduction of print literacy into Maori society, Jackson contends that Maori were confronted with the question of the "relative truth or falsity of traditional values on the one hand and European values on the other". (M.Jackson 1975:31). He suggests that by pushing traditional lore and values to the margins, the Maori "lost much of the traditional system of knowledge and belief and never fully regained it". (ibid:36).

His thesis is that reading and writing skills, replaced the acquisition of traditional knowledge. Maori people, he contends, assigned more prestige to the Maori who had become 'bicultural'. In his view the 'cult' leader, Papahuriha, is credited by Jackson
as "dreaming up a new world-view, and a novel ritual scheme". (ibid:38). Jackson would have us believe that Maori ‘created’ and ‘re-created’ their own traditions. He writes:

The fact remains, however, that in an oral culture it is much easier to rework traditions deliberately or indeliberately so that they effectively rationalise contemporary social life. (M.Jackson 1975:40).

However, he makes the further contention that:

... once the Maori accepted the authority and value of written records he sought to use literacy as a means of ‘freezing’ his traditions in a form which, however subtle, could unfortunately never contain all the original elements. (M.Jackson 1975:40).

These contentions by Pakeha beg the question - Why would Maori seek to ‘freeze’ their traditions when Kaupapa Maori relies entirely on living traditions? Why would Maori seek to ‘freeze’ Mana Maori Motuhake? What Jackson would have Maori believe is that Maori bought into the Western-philosophical self-obsessed activity of the creation of an objective/subjective Self; the creation of a third-person persona, who is capable of standing above and outside of past, present and future reality. This is the essence of the Philosophy of the Subject.

Jackson, like many of his European peers, projects his Western philosophical Modern and Postmodern fixations onto Maori and Maori society. He suggests that that literacy enabled legends to be ‘frozen, to assume the authenticity of European-style history. By accepting print literacy, Maori were seen to be objectying themselves to the point that their identity was detached, displaced, left floundering in some timeless Other space.

Literacy enabled detachment from the traditional past and the creation of a future which did not necessarily conform to past configurations of beliefs and values. (M.Jackson 1975:46).
The major assertion Jackson makes is that literacy displaced rather than replaced traditional forms. Consequently, Jackson arrives inevitably at the Maori problem in education. He writes:

Maori society today continues to steer a course between two cultures, the literate and the oral...By investigating some historical and anthropological implications of the transition to literacy among the Maori I hope to have stimulated interest in problems that are part of our contemporary social life. These problems are mainly educational. It is never easy for a person with preliterate sensibilities to grasp the meanings inherent in a literate culture or subculture. (M.Jackson 1975:48).

Jackson's account of the impact of literacy on Maori society leaves Mana Maori Motuhake floundering in some timeless, 'frozen' space. In choosing to parrot the 'blame-the-victim' Pakeha rationale, Jackson contends that Maori have chosen to be tearless mourners at their own Tangihanga.

The writings of Donna Awatere (1984) are significant here. She reiterates that "mechanical, spatial time in white culture really got off the ground with print". (D.Awatere 1984:60). The written word allowed communication and information carrying that did not depend on oral tradition. However, she also relates that the tasks and skills of writing remained in the hands of the rulers.

So that real time, the past, present and future, was written from the rulers' and the churches' point of view. With the written word there then came a cleaning up of the past. Reality was distorted, prettied up, injustice made just, inhumanity made human...white culture got in the habit of living therefore in a distorted reality, one of the rulers' making. (D.Awatere 1984:60-61).

Her assertion is that Pakeha transposed the intimate, reciprocal relationship that related Maori to their ancestors, their physical world/being/reality; with the "frozen" mechanically measured dimension of time which constitutes Pakeha reality and identity construction.
The emphasis of my analyses so far in this chapter is that Mana Maori Motuhake is under siege. The denial of Mana Maori Motuhake is ‘part and parcel’ of Colonisation. The continuous denial of Maori integrity and identity is expressed in numerous educational discourses that posit Maori as a submissive, malleable, disoriented people. The proliferation of such discourses serves to undermine the ability of Maori to retain their cultural identity; the Kaupapa by which they live and have lived since Pakeha arrived to these shores.

INVENTION OF TRADITIONAL MAORI SOCIETY

In 1991 Anne Salmond wrote that "'Traditional Maori society' was, in any case, a colonial creation". The pre-European past was idealised, and the 'Maori as he was', was recorded for posterity in "an a-historical mode". (A.Salmond 1991:432). Earlier in 1983 she had written of the 'Western strategies of explanation and "Traditional Maori Society". She discusses many of the ways that Western European scholarship, in typical Euro-centric fashion, has described their own version of 'traditional Maori society' and how they have compared their own findings with 'the works of the ancestors'; with Maori of Matauranga. Salmond's analysis is succinct:

The implicit equation of "traditional" with a "precontact" way of life is based on an assumption that the key event in Maori history was the arrival of the European.

Western Anthropology, in its assumed epistemological superiority equates/creates 'traditional' with pre-European. Thus European scholarship in the social sciences credit the existence of a 'modern Maori' with their own print-literate pronunciation. This Western ideological mechanisation of Time seeks merely to validate ages-old distinctions that are legitimatied in Western philosophical discourses: the totalization of a world history; the emancipatory, enlightenment model which 'projects' savagery towards civilisation; the redemption of Humanity through 'rational', 'progressive' endeavours. This is the European anthropological endeavour in its attempt to identify Maori. Hegel's Master/Slave dialectic seems all powerful. The notions of Maori
culture and identity construction are further discussed here under the term the Post-
Maori.

THE POST-MAORI

The writings of the Pakeha New Zealander, Simon During, are pertinent here. In his
article ‘What Was The West?’ (1989), he accepts as problematic, the differences that
have been posited between the modern and the non-modern. However, he writes that
these shifts are difficult, "if not impossible, to avoid". (ibid:759). He proposes the
creation of new sets of oppositions - the cultural versus the postcultural, the modern
versus the postmodern and in his later writings, the notions of colonial and
postcolonial take centre-stage. His first major contention is that:

Little dialogue is possible across the difference between the Maori and Pakeha
when it is supposed that Maori identity is still grounded in the aura of a
sacred, rather than a historical, time.
(S.During 1989:764).

He ‘buys’ into the argument (proposition), that Maori themselves have invented or
re-invented their own culture, indicting Maori culture as being a ‘copy-cat’ culture.
His example:

...when the Maori crowned their own ‘King’, miming an imperialist institution
to resist the imperialist project. It helped frame them as ‘pre-modern’ in
modern terms.
(S.During 1989:765).

The question to be asked is - Who did the framing? The prophet Rua, he states,
‘copied’ Pakeha architecture in his construction of Maungapohatu. Maori are seen by
During as constructing themselves and their own culture in the ‘newly traditional’.
Eva Richard is seen by During as constructing herself in the ‘newly traditional’ by
gaining the "the return of her ancestral land under the direction of what she called
'Maori spooks' as 'a person in touch with wairua - the spiritual world which is
watched over by the tupuna - the ancestors". (ibid:769). Of Makerei, During ponders:
...did Makereti live in traditional Maori time, pseudo-traditional Maori time, modern Maori time or occidental time?
(S.During 1989:767).

Alas, During posits that "she had to act out the role of a genuine Maori caught on the wrong side of modernity, to preserve a past that, in turn, was available only in an already voyeurised and anthropologised form". (ibid.). Needless to say, the question I ask is - who is the voyeur here? During posits Maori as living in a world where 'simulacra' replace what he calls 'the sacred'. (ibid:770). Maori are said to inhabit a space where:

Post-culture belongs to the 'newly traditionally meaningful in the present-becoming-future'.
(S.During 1989:768).

Whereas Kaupapa Maori Theory would insist that Maori people have sought to deconstruct European ideological constructions of Maori identity and culture, (included in this work is the work of Anne Salmond); what During and other Pakeha theorists would have us believe is that Maori have willingly aided and abetted in the re-construction of their identity, and in Steven Webster's words, availed themselves of the "image of their culture emerging in postmodernist theory". (S. Webster 1993:2).

In 1989, the American Anthropologist Allan Hanson caused 'quite a stir' when he jumped on the 'culture-invention' bandwagon with the publishing of his article - 'The Making of the Maori: Culture Invention and Its Logic'. In regard to his credentials, I quote one of his followers, Steven Webster from the University of Auckland Anthropology department. Webster writes:

Allan Hanson is an accomplished American cultural anthropologist whose research has long been Polynesia. In New Zealand, he has carried out research with his wife Louise on traditional Maori culture for over a year in the late 1970s as a Fulbright Scholar, and again in a visit of a few months in the mid-1980s, and published the results of his research in an important book and several papers on the Maori.
(S.Webster 1993:3).
Despite the extremely limited time that Hanson had actually spent living in Aotearoa, and consequently his limited 'acquired' knowledge of Kaupapa Māori; never-the-less, Māori are expected to credit his research speciality with validity. His contention was that the invention of Māori culture had been going on for more than a century (A. Hanson 1989:890). Furthermore Māori or "half-Māori" (to quote Hanson) anthropologists, had accepted 'distortions' in the invention of Māori culture.

He discusses specifically, the debates surrounding the ‘Great Fleet’ tradition and the concept of Io and the "esoteric cult" dedicated to worship of this supreme being. It is not my intention here to comment on the truth or untruth of either of these traditions. My intention instead is to de-construct the ideological hegemony involved in Hanson’s questioning; that Māori comply with the negation of their cultural identity. Here, Māori are not only caught in the theoretical cross-fire; they are under attack. Hanson’s rationale goes something like this:

If Māoris have always been willing to accept any qualities of racial greatness that Pakeha scholars might attribute to them, it was not so much to believe themselves worthy of assimilation into the White population and culture as it was to bolster a sense of their own ethnic distinctiveness and value. (A. Hanson 1989:893).

He pronounces further that "the Māori tradition that Maoritanga invents is one that contrasts with Pakeha culture, and particularly with those elements of Pakeha culture that are least attractive". (Ibid:894). The representation of Māori culture, as constructed by Māori, in Hanson’s view, is seen as the ideal counterbalance to Pakeha failings.

Māori cherish the dead, speaking to them and weeping freely over open caskets, while Pakehas mute the mourning process and hide the body from sight. (A. Hanson 1989:894).

Hanson, never-the-less credits Māori with some ‘logic’ in the invention of their own culture. The present image, he contends, has been invented for the purpose of
enhancing the power of Maori in New Zealand society; being composed largely of
those Maori qualities that are posited as being more attractive than Pakeha aspects
of culture.

What Hanson is asserting is that Maori have chosen to 'buy' into some of the most
powerful Western-European philosophical paradigms in human history. Kaupapa
Maori is seen to submerge itself within the Hegelian Master/Slave Dialectic. Maori
are credited with the 'logic' of negation; the 'logic' of Power. His writings betray his
epistemological arrogance; of which his ignorance of Kaupapa Maori bears witness
to.

In 1989 also, Steven Webster 'co-opted' the notion of Maori constructing their own
culture and particularly the construction of the Maori Renaissance. His article was
titled - 'Maori Studies And The Expert Definition Of Maori Culture: A Critical
History'. He writes that the definition of Maori culture which prevails in the Maori
Renaissance ignores the reality of the Maori working class; "Maori culture, or the
abstraction 'the Maori', has become a theory which obscures rather than informs its
practice". (S.Webster 1989:35). "The crux of his argument is that Maori intellectuals,
(opportunists in the Maori Renaissance), have high-jacked the notion of Maori culture
to the detriment of the Maori working class. Furthermore, this living historical culture
is trivialised in favour of a chimera.

This mystified definition of Maori culture has increasingly come to be wielded,
even developed, in authoritative hands; there it serves the purposes of
domination and decisionism rather than those of emancipation.

Webster’s ‘arguments’, like A. Hanson’s ‘arguments’ are framed entirely within
European philosophical paradigms; of which Karl Marx was one of the greatest
contributors to; himself being informed by perhaps the greatest ‘inventor’ of dualistic
thinking, the creator of the Master/Slave Dialectic, Hegel. Maori are seen by these
writers, to seek nothing more than Power and domination over Pakeha.
The last section of this chapter on the Post-Maori addresses the notions of the Maori as Postmodern and the Postcolonial. The relevant question to be asked is -

*Do Maori posit themselves as Postmodern or Postcolonial?*

As Maori, do we position ourselves as Post-anything? Of crucial significance is the question - have Maori even positioned themselves as Modern or Traditional? These questions have considerable bearing on Kaupapa Maori Theory.

Throughout this thesis, I have provided an extensive critique of the extent to which Pakeha writers, academics and theorists, have attempted to ‘theorise’ Maori identity into and out of existence; those existences being posited as either pre-modern, modern, postmodern, or colonial and postcolonial. There is much at stake here and the stakes are high. My contention is that the issue is one of underlyng Power and the continued ideological hegemony on the part of Pakeha theorists, to deny the ability of Maori to ‘name their own world’.

In the introduction of his article - ‘Islands of Culture: The Postmodernisation of the Maori’ (1993), Steven Webster makes the comment:

> Anthropology is one of the historical roots of what has come to be called postmodernisation, and the anthropological notion of other cultures has become central in postmodernism’s logic. Meanwhile, ethnic movements avail themselves of the image of their culture emerging in postmodernist theory. In New Zealand, the role of Maori culture in postmodernist theoretical interests needs to be explored. (S.Webster 1993:2).

The first, and maybe the only contention I will make about Webster’s thesis here is that the last sentence of his introduction should be inverted, to read thus:

*In New Zealand, the role of postmodernist theoretical interests in Maori culture needs to be explored.*
Webster states that "'Maori culture' as an ideology must be distinguished from Maori culture which is lived by the majority of Maori in New Zealand". (Webster 1993:2). His contention of course presupposes that Maori themselves have been compliant accomplices in the idealising of their own culture as an 'ideology'. In his paternalistic mode, he states that the expert definition of their (Maori) postmodernised culture is all the more at the disposal of influential others. His perceived objectivity seems to deny any part that he himself might play as an "influential other".

From his perceived objective anthropological stance, he posits the creation of the Maori Renaissance, (of which he credits the time period of the last twenty years or so), with Postmodernism; the historical roots of which lie at the hands of the benefactor, the discipline of Anthropology. From my perspective, the only valid comment that Webster makes is this:

...the real thing (Maori culture) remains in the hands of those whose culture it is.
(S.Webster 1993:23).

Before I attempt to address the question that still begs an answer - Do Maori see themselves as Postmodern of Postcolonial - I will discuss some of the more recent developments in the notion of Postcolonial, as illustrated in the writings of two Pakeha academics, Paul Spoonley and Simon During.

During in 1992 discusses the spirit in which postcolonialism has emerged as a topic in the Western academy. For him, it is possible to describe the world by a single term - as postcolonial, despite the proliferation of binary oppositional terms such as West/Non-West, core/periphery and developed/under-developed. (S.During 1992:339).

The prefix 'post' gestures at a historical break where struggles between oppositions will disappear. In this sense postcolonialism contains a promise of liberation. It clears the way for non-European peoples and cultures to speak for themselves within the
academy. However he doubts seriously that we can never be entirely free from the entrenchment of white supremacism.

It is as if the postcolonial moment will allow previously diverted or repressed traditions, desires, life practices and beliefs to be fully enacted. (S. During 1992:339).

For During postcolonialism is the need in nations or groups which have been victims of imperialism, to achieve an identity "uncontaminated by universalist or Eurocentric concepts and images". The postcolonial desire is the desire of decolonised communities for an identity. Here he casts Maori as postcolonised and dispossessed by colonisation, and some Pakeha as the postcolonisers. The crisis of postcolonialism is not only confined to the victims of imperialism. It is a crisis to those agents of colonisation, who, once colonisation has lost its validity (once they have gone), find themselves without strong ethical and ideological support (the redundant soldiers once the army has left).

He also reminds us that the postcolonial paradigm appeals largely to whites and diasporic Indian intellectuals working in the West. Interestingly enough, he does not think there is a Maori word for postcolonialism. Also Postcolonial discourse does not always serve the interests of the communities most damaged by colonialism (the victims). It remains in the service of the already established white supremacism of which it is also a critique. One last point to mention concerning During's rendition of postcolonialism is that the notion of postcolonial overestimates the impact of Western colonisation. It assumes that colonisation has worked.

The recent writings of Paul Spoonley depict a rather emotive call for Maori and especially Pakeha to pick up the 'Challenges of Post-colonialism'. Firstly he elucidates a rejection of colonialism. For him, postcolonialism is an attempt to get out of what he terms "binary cultural politics" or "bifurcatory politics", which have emerged as a direct result of the Maori critique of colonisation.
Postcolonial politics have been constructed around the binary distinction between Pakeha and Maori. (P.Spoonley 1995:61).

For him postcolonial discourse seeks not to replace colonialism; rather it seeks to engage with it, to explore postcolonial alternatives. As in During’s writings, Spoonley’s notion of postcolonialism is driven by the desire to restore the integrity of colonised peoples, to create space for their institutions, practices and values. He ‘claims’ the term for a particular set of politics.

His focus, directed mainly towards Pakeha, is to encourage Pakeha to create, to construct an alternative identity and politics "for the majority group in a way that then positions them as a contributor to debates about what constitutes post-colonialism". (ibid:53). The task is how best to define Pakeha as a "fictive ethnicity"; a self-critical notion of Pakeha which can define itself as assisting in the restoration of the rights of Tangata Whenua. (ibid:52).

The project is very much Pakeha-centred - the title of one of his articles (1995), being - 'Constructing Ourselves: The Post-Colonial Politics of Pakeha'. His creation, the paradigm of the Postcolonial Pakeha argues for the importance of a self-critical, celebratory conception of Pakeha as a precondition for an effective bicultural, "bi-sovereign state".

Both writers, During and Spoonley have no doubt "that the very name New Zealand, and its différend, will pass one day, the nation coming to call itself Aotearoa. (S.During 1993:460). In choosing to call himself Pakeha, Spoonley sees this, as a political statement that is a response to, and a way of beginning to negotiate with Maori. In essence he is crediting Te Reo Maori with validity. From the margins, the question itself screams out at me -

Where does that leave Te Iwi Maori? What does all this ‘Postism’, have to do with Maori?
In order to answer these questions, I have to retrace my steps, to return to the notion of the construction of the Subject/Object within Western-European philosophical traditions. The notions of the Same/Other is crucial to our understanding of these philosophical paradigms. I will relate to a particular question that was asked of me recently by a Pakeha academic. The question he posed to me was this - Do Ngapuhi see Tainui as the Other?

The question was a provocative one which requires deconstruction; not only provide an answer but to question the question. The suggestion underlying this question is that Maori have bought into the Other, to the extent that we have internalised this thinking and by internalising it, we allow it to rule our world, to change our world view. Underlying this question is the notion that Maori regard Pakeha as their Other. Coinciding with this analysis is the suggestion that Maori will do unto Pakeha, what Pakeha have done unto Maori.

In essence the question suggests that Kaupapa Maori has subsumed itself within the ideological supremacy of Western-European dialectical philosophical superstructures that reduce all knowledge to the notion of Power.

These forms of Knowledge involve the construction of people as Subjects and Objects. The further notions of subjectivity and objectivity reduce any notion of difference to Other, to an act of Power and control that seeks to incorporate, expropriate and thereby dominate. Maori have not bought into the dualistic thinking of the West. We do not seek to subjectify or objectify anyone. These forms of Hegemony lie beyond the reality of Kaupapa Maori.

In answer to the question - Do Ngapuhi see Tainui as the Other? The answer can only be no. The identity of Ngapuhi is not predicated on the appropriation and expropriation of the identity of Tainui. Furthermore, my identity as Maori; Kaupapa Maori, is not predicated on the negation of Pakeha. In short, I am not the Subject nor the Object of anyone's discourse.
In answer to the wider question of the positioning of Kaupapa Maori within the paradigms of the Postmodern and Postcolonial; I attempt an explanation.

Periodization is a uniquely modernist tool. By using the prefix - 'post'; postmodernists are invoking periodization and thus are invoking modernist philosophical tendencies. Whilst postmodernising theory seeks to 'get out' of the Dialectical bind which has characterised Western-European philosophy; it never-the-less sets itself up as merely another Grand Narrative, positioning its rationale above previous legitimising rationalities. In short, it annihilates itself.

In suggesting that Maori have bought into Postmodernism, Pakeha writers are suggesting that Maori have bought into the philosophical paradigms of Modernity; the greatest of which manifests itself in the construction of human beings as Subjects. The notion of the Other, as witnessed in the philosophical proposition of Hegel's Dialectic, the construction of the rational, autonomous, individual same/self; these have been Modernity's legacies.

How can we be positioned as postmodern when we ourselves have not prostituted ourselves to the dualistic narratives of Modernity. The Modern episteme and its accomplices, positioned Maori as a heathen, savage, irrational, unenlightened people.

Theorizing is an intellectual activity that Maori can ill afford. The intellectual positioning of the Maori as postmodern or postcolonial can be seen to be of no consequence to Maori. Postmodern theorising has little or nothing to offer in the form of praxis. It merely theorises Maori into some nameless, timeless ideological space; our power to critique the construction of the construction is literally ripped away from beneath us.

Equally so - Why should Maori position themselves as Postcolonial, when many of us still live in the reality of Colonisation? In short, we, as Maori have not finished with Modernity nor with Colonialism. Linda Smith (1992) wrote:
The indigenous argument can also be seen, then, as an attempt to reclaim the agenda on colonisation as 'unfinished business' rather than see the legitimation of dominant views currently being represented in post-colonial discourses. For many colonised people colonialism does not finish simply because the former colonial masters have said it has finished or have physically withdrawn their presence and patronage. (L. Smith 1992:iii).

The positing of Maori as Postmodern or Postcolonial can be seen as yet "another attempt by academics to shift the ground and thus maintain control of what counts as the cutting edge of theory and practice". (L. Smith 1992:iv).

With regard to the writing of During, Webster, Hanson and Spoonley, it is my contention that the fate of the Post-Maori rests entirely beneath their fingertips; the bases from which their theories are formed, lie within ideological frameworks that seek not only to justify themselves, but seek also to 'name our world, for us, for Maori.

The paradox is that whilst the theoretical notion of the Post-Maori is posited as one of empowerment, it never-the-less disempowers Maori in the sense that Pakeha theorists have already claimed the phrase as their own. The notion of the Postcolonial would itself have no legitimation, if it were not for the existence of Maori. Whilst we lie passive at its conceptual level, we choose not to engage with it. Whilst we are, in essence, the victims of colonisation; Pakeha theorists have chosen to cash in on our victimisation. Therefore, the Pakeha claim to a postcolonial identity, as posited by During and Spoonley can be seen to take my power of critique away from me. Whilst colonisation is not the centre of my world, reality as a victim is legitimate.

Finally, in answer to the question - do Maori see themselves as postmodern or postcolonial or Post anything? The answer from Leonie Pihama (1993) - "No, I Will Not Be a Post...". The following and last chapter in this thesis attempts to answer the question - What is Kaupapa Maori Theory? Whilst it is not a definitive explanation, it attempts to answer many of the questions that I have raised throughout this thesis. In short, How do we, as Maori see ourselves?