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ABSTRACT

The notions of identity construction and discourse as violence are elaborated upon in this thesis. It discusses the theoretical processes by which the European dualistic philosophical heritage constructs the European Identity as a Subject. It further illustrates how that dualistic heritage facilitates the construction of Maori as the Other. European Subjectivity is seen to project itself onto Maori, rendering Maori as the Object of study, the Problem, the malleable, submissive, Post-Other. I contend that Kaupapa Maori Theory is a resistance against European dualistic paradigms; which challenges, critiques and poses alternatives to the discourse of violence, allowing Maori to define themselves.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This thesis explores avenues of thought which have been constructed as modes of Theory. The overriding dominant Western-European ‘spectre’ of Theory permeates all discourses of Western academia that we know of; permeating all societal institutions that have been set up in order to construct, constitute, educate, define, and indeed, to confine us as human beings. The pivotal contention here is that Western-European modes of Theory construct human beings as Subjects.

Essential here is the relationship between politics, power and Theory; and the effects that Western modes of Theory have had upon Maori in Aotearoa since the colonisation of this country by Pakeha. Despite the fact that I have ‘named’ or labelled Kaupapa Maori as a Theory, it is in fact, a praxis as well as a written discourse. Within the Western-European literary world the written language, constructs Theory; Knowledge is constituted and Power is accessed. What connections do these concepts have: Language, Theory, Knowledge, Power? What connections do these concepts have for us as Maori today and for Maori people since colonisation of Aotearoa? What connections do these concepts have to the Self?

For me the concepts of Language, Theory, Knowledge, Power and the Self are all interdependent. They all converge at the apex; the English language, which I propose, has been positioned as the Master2 Language of Aotearoa. One of the dilemmas of this thesis is that it is written in the English language and yet it
seeks to ‘speak’ in Te Reo Maori. Herein lies the personalized, tragic enigma of the thesis.

Notes to My Self

_It was my ritual. I’d arrive home from high-school, head straight for the shower, throwing off my uniform. Literally I would ‘wash’ school away from me. It was a cleansing process; the false layers peeling away, bringing me back to My Self. I didn’t understand what the problem was then. I only knew something was not right. I was not right! It was so soulless; the whole experience was soul destroying. My only achievement was being able to retain stupid information in my head, only to spew it out again, come exam time._

TINO RANGATIRATANGA IS THE METHODOLOGY

What is the kaupapa here? Firstly the thesis is about the ‘me’ that is writing. This thesis is also about the concept of ‘thesis’ itself. Specifically it addresses the notion of writing as a violence; it speaks to the linguistic violence that has been inflicted upon Maori.

Coupled with the notion of linguistic violence is the starkness of pain; pain inflicted by the dominant English language in Aotearoa. The thesis speaks of the pain of being half-caste, the pain of being Maori, the forgiving of myself for being Pakeha, the re-awakening of my Mana Motuhake. Of necessity, I write about conflict, anger, racism, the co-opting of languages, the validation of Te Reo Maori, the naming, claiming, and validation of Kaupapa Maori.

Naming my own language and indeed my own world in this thesis, I have the strongest desire to tear asunder all the constrictions that my identity as half-caste implies. This duality, inherent in the thesis, inherent in society today in Aotearoa, dichotomizes Maori and Pakeha. It is this dualism, this dichotomy, that I seek to tear
asunder, leaving my own identity in some space elsewhere. This thesis is not only about Tino Rangatiratanga. It is my Tino Rangatiratanga.

Theory, as the embodiment of thought, originates at the site of the individual and yet contemporary notions of Western Theory today take us far away from the individual. In the Western World the distance between Theory and Praxis ever-widens. I stress the imperative: the personal is and always was the political, Kaupapa Maori is the praxis and I place myself and Te Iwi Maori at the forefront of a battlefield, at the cutting edge of Theory. I believe there was a time in our human history when we did not compete for Theory, for Knowledge or for Power; the Power that we associate with Knowledge today. It is poignantly obvious, as exemplified in the massive proliferation of discourses today, that indeed, the race for Theory has begun.

In the arena of educational theory, words such as discourse, pedagogy, epistemology and methodology abound. As a student attempting to write a thesis I am initially bombarded with the pronouncement - "You must have a methodology!". "Every thesis has a methodology!" The concept of a methodology is a European-academic-based, taken-for-granted constriction upon my thinking processes as a Maori. To answer the admonishment addressed to me, I name Tino Rangatiratanga as my methodology and Kaupapa Maori as the relevant epistemology.

To be born Maori is to think critically. As Maori we live on the edge of critical thought. Kaupapa Maori however was alive and kicking in Aotearoa before the discourse of 'Critical Theory' arrived, before Paulo Freire's 'pedagogy' arrived or Antonio Gramsci's 'hegemony'. As Maori academics we co-opt Western educational theories of reproduction, resistance, cultural capital, habitus, post-colonial and post-modern; always mindful of the fact that Kaupapa Maori was here before the Western spectre of Theory arrived.

The historical analysis embedded in the thesis is my own historical educational experience. In this country the notion of history and its associated historical amnesia has been used against the interests of Maori. To write about racism, colonisation or
oppression, is to write not only about events that occurred two hundred years ago. Colonisation happens everyday in Aotearoa at the site of the body and the site of the mind. Racism occurs daily in our classrooms, 'in the faces' of Maori children, to Maori people all around this country. Maori are daily oppressed beneath the fingertips of well-intentioned and not so well-intentioned Pakeha writers, academics and social commentators.

The other consideration in writing a thesis is - "Who are your sources?" Kaupapa Maori pays tribute to all Maori who have written, to Maori who have chosen rather to speak, to Maori who have yet to write. It is the Maori voice or wellspring deemed most valid and necessary for the completion of this work.

As other Maori writers have commented, (L-Smith 1992 and C. Smith 1994), the University and the University thesis itself, are part of the European colonisation process. In pursuing the degree of Master of Arts in Education, I am participating in my own colonising process. The thesis therefore necessitates a self-critique in that I willingly participate in my own oppression. In this sense, every Maori child who attends a mono-cultural school in this country participates in their own oppression. I ask the question - Who benefits from Maori oppression?

What is a thesis? The Concise Oxford Dictionary states that a thesis is a "proposition to be maintained." A proposition is a "statement, an assertion". I collect together the seven theses that I have before me and I read each 'Abstract'. Not surprisingly, I read phrases like: "this thesis argues that..." or "this thesis proposes that..." or "it is argued that..." or "this thesis has as its primary objective ..." or "a major argument is that..." and so on. Now my gut instincts scream out! Why this entrenchment in the notion of thesis as argument, as assertion, as proposition to be maintained? This Western Euro-centric notion of a thesis postulates knowledge as brute argument, dictates thought processes as oppositional elements in some theoretical battle.

Consequently, the argument presupposes a quest for control over knowledge; setting up the dichotomy of knowledge deemed superior, knowledge deemed inferior,
perpetuating indefinitely the ages-old opposition of the winner-loser, master-slave dialectic that this thesis critiques. Implicit in this Western Euro-centric notion of the thesis is the postulation of knowledge as the will to power.

How do I counter-think, counter-write and indeed counter-act this Western Euro-centric notion of thesis? The notion of my thesis as different, or the notion of difference encapsulated within Kaupapa Maori Theory does not give way to separatism; does not presuppose opposition. Difference, as understood in many non-Western contexts is not opposed to sameness, nor synonymous with separateness. If I adhere to Kaupapa Maori as being my methodology in this thesis, then my methodology does not subsume itself within dominant theoretical epistemologies. This is the essence of Kaupapa Maori Theory as being ‘different’.

My notion of thesis is one of tautoko (support). I do not ‘assert’ Kaupapa Maori Theory as new, as dead theory exhumed. However, Kaupapa Maori theorising proposes new ways of thinking, writing and validating Theory which is conducive to Kaupapa Maori; Te Reo Maori and Tikanga Maori. My intent is to support the academic and non-academic work that has been done, that has been achieved by Maori writers, academics and non-academics; the ground that has been shifted, in the pursuit and maintenance of Tino Rangatiratanga. I give sustenance to their production; our kete are overflowing.

Education, for many Maori people is about nourishment; about giving sustenance, so that we as a people can reach our utmost, scale the heavens. This is Tane-nui-a-Rangi’s legacy to Maori. The education process that I participated in at Primary and Secondary school levels barely nourished my body and literally starved me of my taha wairua. Part of the process of Kaupapa Maori Theory is that Maori people do take the Pakeha education system to task, do seek accountability. Why has the education system in Aotearoa failed to educate Maori? Why was I starved of my taha wairua?
Notes to My Self

When I was at primary school there were four ‘tribes’ for sporting activities. These were: Ngapuhi, Arawa, Maniapoto and Whatua. Ngapuhi was yellow, Arawa was green, Maniapoto was blue and Whatua was red. Just four incomplete words condensed Te Iwi Maori in Aotearoa. Despite the fact that I and my brothers were Ngapuhi, we spent our primary school years competing for Maniapoto. Unfortunately, if you were in Whatua, you stank!

The ‘master’ Language of Aotearoa - the English Language, has constructed Maori as the Other. What is the relationship between Maori and the English language? Simon During, a Pakeha, has written on issues of post-colonisation and Maori. He has made the comment that “a choice of language is a choice of identity”. (S.During 1993:458). I take his point further to contend that language is identity. For Pakeha, it has been a matter of choice; indeed a matter of luxury because English has not been under threat of extinction. For Maori, Te Reo Maori is an integral part of our identity; the loss of Te Reo Maori would make us ‘dead as the Moa’. To speak thus of the relationship between language and identity is to speak of the relationship between Maori and Pakeha.

What is my relationship to the English language? Firstly, I am writing this thesis in English. I am capable of writing it in Te Reo Maori but one of my earlier supervisors would be unable to read and understand it. There are few Pakeha that I know personally, who are capable of understanding written Maori in the academic and non-academic world. During further writes that:

For the post-colonial to speak or write in the imperial tongues is to call forth a problem of identity, to be thrown into mimicry and ambivalence.
(S.During 1993:458).

Am I thrown about in mimicry by writing in English or am I merely doing my fellow Pakeha New Zealanders a favour by writing in their tongue? Indeed, the mimicry
that During refers to high-lights the failure of the education system to educate Pakeha in Te Reo Maori. Maori are left with no choice but to accommodate the colonisers. The Maori commitment to bi-culturalism stands.

KO TE KUPU TE MANA

My own relationship to language, to English and Te Reo Maori can be summed up in the following whakatauki:

Ko te kupu te mana
Toi te kupu, toi te whenua, toi te mana.

It was one of my tupuna, namely Hone Heke, who was the first rangatiratanga to sign Te Tiriti o Waitangi in 1840. He ‘sealed’ his identity with the moko despite the fact that he and other Maori signatories were print literate in English and Te Reo Maori. For my tupuna, Te Tiriti was likened to a new covenant. It was understood as a special kind of covenant with the British Queen. It was a bond with all the spiritual connotations of the biblical covenant, the New Testament: there would be many tribes including the British, but all would be equal under God. In choosing to sign Te Tiriti, my tupuna, as a representative of his hapu and iwi, ‘bought’ into the power of print literacy. Hone Heke co-opted the mechanism of print literacy for the benefit of his iwi.

He was not participating in the demise of his Reo, nor his Tikanga. For him, for Maori, our Tino Rangatiratanga was never in dispute. For Maori today, our vision for Te Tiriti is no different to the vision that our tupuna held. Denise Henare puts is succinctly: "their legacy to me is to continue to argue the Treaty". (Henare 1994: 121). Indeed for Ta Henare - "Tai Tokerau are left the burden of arguing the Treaty". (James Henare, cited in D. Henare 1994:129).

My whakapapa speaks for, and to me. As a ‘document of civilisation’, Te Tiriti is accountable for its words. As a document of ‘print literacy’ it is associated with
civilisation; therefore why would it be a falsehood? I am accountable for my words; accountable to my Iwi and to Pakeha. This accountability, I contend, extends to Pakeha writers who have exercised ‘academic imperialism’ over Maori. There is no safe haven from the domain of Tumatauenga. The French writer Michel Foucault once wrote:

We must conceive discourse as a violence that we do to things or at all events as a practice we impose upon them, it is in this practice that the events of discourse find the principle of their regularity. (M.Foucault 1972:229).

Foucault’s contention of ‘discourse as a violence’ epitomises for me the ‘linguistic imperialism’ that Pakeha writers have imposed on Maori. This is a contention I elaborate upon in Chapter Three of the thesis. Specifically it concerns the ‘writing’ of Maori as the Other; the describing and inscribing of Maori identity as the Other, as the Problem in education, the Object of discourse. His contention of discourse as a violence, for me, alludes to the suppression and commodification of Te Reo Maori. The violence perpetrated on Te Reo Maori is the violence perpetrated on Maori identity. Cherryl Smith (1994) has written that:

This is what thesis writing is about for many Maori students, ‘writing back’ whilst at the same time writing to ourselves. (C.Smith 1994:13).

I am in agreement with Hélène Cixous in her belief that:

One can only begin to advance along the path of discovery, the discovery of writing or anything else, from mourning and in the reparation of mourning. In the beginning the gesture of writing is linked to the experience of disappearance, to the feeling of having lost the key to the world, of having been thrown outside. (H.Cixous, cited in S.Sellers 1994:xxvi).

As Maori students and academics, we ‘answer back’ to the violence of Colonisation, finding a voice that bespeaks pain and anger. The tikanga of mourning and loss is
one of the paramount tenets of Kaupapa Maori Theory. My academic Kaupapa has been informed by the whakatauki - *Kimihia te mea ngaro* (Seek what has been lost).

Maori educational historical experience to date has shown that Maori are wary of the written word, especially the English word. The fact that a signature or resemblance of one on a piece of paper, can have far reaching consequences, than the writer has ever imagined, has been more than adequately exemplified for us since the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in 1840. Regarding the issue of cross-cultural phenomena, James Marshall has made the comment that:

... while for instance we know that Te Reo Maori as an oral language, was reduced to English alphabetic and syllabic forms and Maori culture thereby exposed to writing and print technologies early in the colonising process, we do not know the wider implications of these changes for an oral culture; the deeper effects of the shift from acoustics to optics, from sound to visualisation and the possible restructuring of consciousness.

The possible restructuring of consciousness is an area of considerable debate; however, my particular focus here centres on the witnessing to power involved in the hegemonic process whereby the oral medium of Maori was transposed to a written medium. The consequences of this hegemonic process we have witnessed in the subsequent devastation of the Te Reo Maori. To transpose or transform a language is in effect an effort to transform a culture or to alter a ‘world view’.

A kaumatua recently made the remark to me - "Why should I send my moko to the kohanga reo? Why should Maori have to pay to learn their own language?" On enquiring if I could learn Maori at high school I was told it would be too cumbersome for the school to arrange correspondence. I later paid, at great expense, to learn my mother’s tongue at university. The kaumatua's remarks cut to the bone; in the sense that he highlights the violence expressed in the suppression and later commodification of Te Reo Maori. This may be viewed in the wider context of the dominance of the English language and the denial of Te Reo Maori in public spheres.
As the Commissioner for Maori Language, Timoti Karetu, points out:

Since 1 August 1987 when Maori became an official language of this country, there has been opposition to its active promotion and to its use in the media and the public place. (S. Karetu 1990:56).

In 1990 he doubted that there would be one hundred Pakeha who would be fluent in Maori. In agreement with Timoti Karetu, I believe "no more need be said regarding their (Pakeha) attitude to the language". (S. Karetu 1990:60).

Despite James Marshall's concern about the "restructuring of consciousness", I believe we do know the wider implications of the changes from an oral culture to a written culture. These wider implications, implicit in the transposing of an oral culture to a written culture, are the topic of this thesis. Implicit in these implications is the struggle that Maori academics participate in, in the process not only of thesis writing, but in the process of theorising Kaupapa Maori. The praxis of Kuni Jenkins' work highlights Kaupapa Maori Theory. Specifically, her work illustrates the 'Power' of the Englishman to impose a 'particular' written form on the Maori language.

NAMING OUR OWN WORLD

Kuni Jenkins is the only Maori writer who has written on the topic of literacy and colonisation. Her academic text is titled: Te Ihi, Te Mana, Te Wehi O Te Ao Tuhi, Maori Print Literacy form 1814 - 1855, Literacy, Power and Colonization. Kuni Jenkins' methodology is informed by Kaupapa Maori. She writes:

... writers about early Maori print literacy do not flesh out the process from a Maori point of view. Shuker (1987) in making reference to the growth and progress of Maori literacy in this early time frame does not emphasize the drama and impact such a transformation process as literacy would have had on Maori society. Nor does Binney pay any major focus to this impact in her historical account of the life of Thomas Kendall. (K. Jenkins 1991:21).
Jenkins' text "fleshes out the process from a Maori point of view", because she is writing from a uniquely Maori perspective, in that, she is Maori. In her text, she substantiates her theory with primary Maori sources of data, hence her engagement with Maori manuscripts. As she began reading the manuscripts she realized that her Maori cultural background was an invaluable source for interpreting the data that she was dealing with.

For this Maori writer, the events and reactions surrounding the Maori writers in their plight for literacy, were "really meaningful to me because of the reality that I was able to perceive within such detail, and that I could feel from my having grown up and being a part of the culture". (Ibid.).

For Jenkins the writing and exploration involved in her text facilitated a process of conscientization. To actually touch the manuscripts was an emotional experience, a journey back into a real history. In attempting to engage in interpretation of her forebears, she felt a great sense of responsibility.

Her text outlines the argument that print literacy became a powerful tool at the hands of the colonising missionaries and later colonists of the new government; a tool of cultural transformation that sought to bring about the destruction of traditional Maori society. In her opinion, as a result of acquiring print literacy, Maori did not gain control over their lives and the continuation of Maori Tino Rangatiratanga was halted. For Maori, print literacy led to suffering and disempowerment; the results of which we witness today, well over a century later.

Through her analysis of the manuscripts, she concludes that Maori emerged from their programmes of literacy able to communicate in English and Maori but also as uncritical, mystified, passive readers with a non-empowered view of their changing world.

The significant point she relates to is the "power of the Englishman to impose a particular written form on the written language". (Ibid:56). The Maori language was
learnt by the missionaries, for the instrumental purposes of seducing Maori into print literacy. Indeed, the teaching of languages, both Maori and English, entailed not only the desire for communication, but also the desire for transformation of the heathens. The mission was an evangelical one. Jenkins' discussion of the missionary Kendall is particularly useful in scrutinizing the desire of the Englishman to come to terms with the Maori language and Maori world view.

Kendall settled with the Maori community in Rangihoua where he began learning the customs and language of the Maori. He was not only interested in the language, he was bent on discovering more about spirituality. Jenkins discusses his quest thus:

Could Maori society offer him the vital understanding of who God was, how God created the earth, where God could be found, what power God had over Maori people and how people could get to God? (K.Jenkins 1991:29).

One of Jenkins’ most disturbing and illuminating accounts of the process of colonisation through the printed word is her discussion of the "New Zealand Gazette". The Gazette began publication in the 1840s and it was the only official way of advertising the state business of the new government. Jenkins asks the question - Why was the Gazette printed only in the English language? This publication dealt with legal information related to the control and ownership of land, land sales, court proceedings and meetings. In Jenkins’ opinion, a Maori orthography was sufficiently established by the mid 1830s when William Colenso’s printing press arrived, to have provided a standardized form for official purposes. The printing of the St Lukes gospel during the 1830s showed that the orthography was capable of dealing with the Maori language very efficiently.

The ultimate effect of the use of the English-only agenda was to restrict negotiations to those who could deal in the English language; those being the colonisers. The 'master' language assumed prominence in essentially acting as the voice of the new nation. The Gazette became one of the first gate-keeping mechanisms of print literacy that controlled the interests of the colonisers in this country.
In her text, Jenkins’ exposition on Hongi Hika’s participation in the literacy process is expansive. Kendall had taken the chief Hongi to England so that he could help the English write an orthography. I wholeheartedly agree with her opinion that the true power of the print journey that Hongi began “still lies within the alphabet he laboriously produced right back then in 1814”. (ibid:67). That power, for Jenkins, is still to be realized, still awaiting to be harnessed by a properly literate Maori society.

For me, Jenkins’ text is an example of that ‘harnessing of power’. Her writing and her research is informed by her identity as Maori. Her own historical reality is imbedded in her analysis. As such, her theorising and writing is a praxis of conscientization. Kuni sets up the discussion that as an oral culture, our history was constructed from the basis of inferiority. The ramifications of this, we as Maori experience every day, in the mono-lingual education system. Kuni is one of many other Maori who have harnessed the power of print literacy beneath their fingertips. Kaupapa Maori Theory is the product of a truly literate Maori society and the name of the product is Tino Rangatiratanga.

OUTLINE OF THE CHAPTERS

In this introductory chapter, I have set up the discussion, inherent in the thesis which concerns the creation of Theory and the effects that Theory have on Maori and Pakeha.

The methodology I am employing in this thesis is one termed Tino Rangatiratanga. It is unique to Kaupapa Maori Theory. As such, it is both a response to and a critique of dominant Western-European forms of Knowledge which construct Theory. It provides an alternative to the dominant dualistic thinking mode of theorising that leads to Subjectification, Objectification and the creation of the Other.

Explicit in the introduction and throughout the thesis is the notion of linguistic violence; discourse as a violence. This concerns the writing, describing and inscribing of Maori identity as the Other by Pakeha.
Kuni Jenkins' work provides an example of Kaupapa Maori theorising. Her work is particularly relevant as it centres on the period in our history when Te Reo Maori was transposed from an oral language to a written language. The implications of the altering of a World View are addressed throughout the thesis.

The following chapter, I have titled - The Pakeha Problem. It is a contestation of Western-European culture. As part of Kaupapa Maori Theory, it is an analysis and a critique of Pakeha identity. Specifically it is addressed to the Pakeha reader. My purpose in this chapter is to illustrate to Pakeha that their realities have been informed by a uniquely dualistic European philosophical heritage; one that they cannot ignore. The purpose of the chapter is to remind Pakeha that they are not removed from their colonial, historical, philosophical roots. Their identity can no longer be taken for granted!

In Chapter three I elaborate extensively on the notion of discourse as a violence. The theoretical positioning of the Maori as the Other is illustrated in Pakeha discourses that have situated Maori as the savage, child-like, invisible Other. The doubly-oppressed reality of Maori women is explored in written and visual discourses. The reason why Pakeha have written so much about Maori is also elaborated upon, including the role of anthropological imperialism.

The Maori Problem is the 'Subject' of discourse in Chapter Four. Here the notion of Maori as the Object of Pakeha research and Theory is explored in depth. The continuous positioning of Maori as the 'bottom of the heap' in educational institutions is seen as a specific practice of Colonisation; one that seeks to deny Kaupapa Maori any validity.

My discussion in Chapter Five addresses the notion of Maori culture as 'invention' within a traditional, modern, postmodern and postcolonial context. The problematics involved in the postmodernisation or postcolonisation of Maori are elaborated upon. I describe the ways in which Pakeha researchers, historians and writers have sought
to deny Mana Maori Motuhake; 'creating' Maori as a disoriented, malleable, submissive people.

Chapter Six explores the dynamics of Kaupapa Maori Theory. He aha teenei mea? Whilst it is not a definitive account, I provide some insight into this growing body of Knowledge which is unique to Maori. Whilst Kaupapa Maori can be seen just as a counter-force to Pakeha hegemony, its dimensions are limitless.