CHAPTER FOUR
KAUPAPA MĀORI THEORY

Maori society has its own distinctive knowledge base. This knowledge base has its origins in the metaphysical realm and emanates as a Kaupapa Māori 'body of knowledge' accumulated by experiences through history of the Māori people. This Kaupapa Māori knowledge is the systematic organisation of beliefs, experiences, understandings and interpretations of the interactions of Māori people upon Māori people, and Māori people upon their world.¹

Introduction

There is a growing literature about Kaupapa Māori theory. For many Māori people who have actively sought out theoretical explanations for our experiences, Kaupapa Māori theory provides a culturally defined theoretical space. There is resistance from many sectors of the university and from some educationalists. However, in spite of these things, Kaupapa Māori theory continues to thrive. Kaupapa Māori theory is a field that can no longer be denied or ignored within academia. The origins of the term Kaupapa Māori theory is worthwhile exploring in that it recognises the historical developments that have contributed to its current usage. It also serves to recognise those writers, who in the initial voicing and struggle over the theoretical domain, were key protagonists in the recognition of Kaupapa Māori theory in both the academy and wider societal institutions. The need to convince Māori of the existence of such a paradigm was a part of the development that did not require the same intensive political lobbying. That is not to assume a heterogenous response, nor to assume that all Māori have equal access to mātauranga Māori, Māori knowledge². The point is that for many Māori acting to bring about positive, creative and innovative changes that would move from the dominant deficit based paradigms, the recognition within Kaupapa Māori theory that there does exist particular Māori cultural ways of operating serves to affirm their own beliefs. This Chapter focuses on some key discussion in regard to Kaupapa Māori theory, beginning with a discussion of 'Kaupapa Māori' and 'theory' as two notions that are aligned in the expression of Kaupapa Māori theory.

Kaupapa Māori

Kaupapa Māori is not new. What is relatively 'new' is the academic terminology of Kaupapa Māori research and theory. It is the development of a framework as a means of informing our

¹ Nepe, Tukana Mate, 1991 E hao nei e tenei reanga:Te Toi Huarewa Tupuna, Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland: 4
² The term 'knowledge' refers not to singular knowledge forms but to many forms. The multiple knowledge(s) that derive from whānau, hapū, iwi and our experiences of colonisation must in my mind be emphasised as if they are not then we are all too easily lulled into simplistic, universalist explanations.
practice that has been articulated clearly in the struggles of the past twenty years. Kaupapa Māori is itself extremely old, ancient in fact. It predates any and all of us in living years and is embedded in our cultural being. Mereana Taki expresses this with her comment in regard to Kaupapa Māori theory

Kaupapa Maori theorising is not a new phenomenon. Configured within the living ancestry of Iwi, hapu and whanaungatanga, the dynamic foundation concepts of Kaupapa and Tikanga continue to inform the reproduction and transformations of nga Tikanga me nga Ritenga as Iwi laws today.3

Within te reo Māori there are indicators of cultural philosophies and ways in which meanings can be gauged. For example the word ‘kaupapa’ is defined as philosophies or ways of thinking about issues. It can be further read in its specific parts, those being ka u papa. Mereana looks at the ways in which these relate to each other. ‘Ka u’ can be defined in a range of ways, the term ‘ka’ can represent tense and in particular present tense. ‘U’ can be seen as a woman’s breast, a process of holding firm, to arrive, to reach a limit, bite. In the context of the word kaupapa I view ‘ka u’ as a process of holding firmly and connecting to the foundation of our existence, to Papatūānuku. Mereana writes that the term ‘kau’ also relates to the notions of seeing for the first time or disclosure.4 The term ‘Papa’ also has a range of possibilities, including reference to Papatūānuku, the earth, and to layers or foundations. Henry Williams gives a range of definitions in regard to kaupapa, including; level surface, floor, stage, platform, layer, plan, scheme, proposal.5 Te Taura Whiri, the Māori Language Commission, extend on this and provide additional definitions to relate to further contemporary usage of the term such as; policy, scheme, subject, theme.6 Each of these definitions connects to the notion of kaupapa as philosophy and foundation. The term kaupapa can be seen as a process of holding firmly to ones fundamental foundations.

Tuakana Nepe7 emphasises that Kaupapa Māori knowledge is distinctive to Māori society and has its origins in the metaphysical. Kaupapa Māori she states is a ‘body of knowledge’ accumulated by the experiences through history, of the Māori people.8 For her, this knowledge form is distinctive to Māori in that it derives fundamentally from Māori epistemologies that include complex relationships and ways of organising society. She argues that this distinctive nature of Kaupapa Māori is seen in the ways in which Māori conceptualise relationships:
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4 ibid.
6 Māori Language Commission, Te Taura Whiri 1996 Te Matatiki: Contemporary Māori Words, Oxford University Press, Auckland: 175
7 Nepe, Tukana Mate 1991 op.cit.
8 ibid:4
the concept of the relationship between the living and the dead; life and death; the Māori concept of time, history and development; the relationships between male and female; individual and group; and the implication of such relationships for social power relations. These knowledge types and their functions are the content and product of the interconnection of the purely Māori metaphysical base and Māori societal relationships.⁹

Tracing further the origins of Kaupapa Māori knowledge Tuakana places its origins in Rangiātea which she stated makes it exclusively Māori. Rangiātea is the first known Whare Wānanga located in Te Toi-o-ngā-Rangi, the home of Io-Matua-Kore, the creator.¹⁰ Tuakana writes that from Io-Matua-Kore comes the gift of mātauranga Māori¹¹ brought by Tāne to the earthly realms in three kete, Te Kete Tuauri, Te Kete Tuatea, Te Kete Aronui alongside two kōhatu¹² Hukatai and Rehutai. Within these kete was held knowledge of both the celestial and earthly realms and that knowledge provided for the teaching within Whare Wānanga.¹³ Through various Whare Wānanga knowledge and culture was transmitted. Numerous Whare Wānanga, each connected to particular knowledge, are known to have made a complex educational system through which knowledge was retained, maintained, developed and transmitted.

To explore in depth the complex systems of Whare Wānanga is beyond this thesis. However it is necessary to recognise and acknowledge that our people have always maintained structures and systems of knowledge development and transmission. Some Whare Wānanga identified are; whare-wānanga, whare-kura, whare-maire, whare-puni, whare-takiura, whare-tatai, whare-pora, whare-mata, whare-takaha and whare-porukuruku¹⁴ In the Whare wānanga two teaching divisions were located

(i) kauwae runga - restricted to celestial knowledge, this included

- cosmogonic genealogies, rituals, waiata, narratives and exceedingly difficult, cryptic and elliptical karakia¹⁵
(ii) kauwae raro - concerned with terrestrial knowledge.

Relating to the origins of ‘te ira tangata ki te Ao marama’, that is, from the conception of life within the mother’s womb into the World of Light; through the genealogical descent, ‘mai i Rangi Tuhaha ki a Papatuanuku, ki a Hine-hau-one¹⁶, from the twelve heavens to Papatuanuku the Earth Mother, then to Hine-hau-one the first woman.¹⁷

Knowledge has always had a central place within Māori society and the complexities of knowledge
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⁹ ibid:5
¹⁰ Te Toi-o-ngā-Rangi refers to the uppermost domain of the 12 domains that exist in the spiritual realm.
¹¹ Mātauranga Māori refers to Māori knowledge and ways of knowing.
¹² Kōhatu are stones
¹³ Whare Wānanga are house of higher learning.
¹⁴ These are different types of wānanga named by Tuakana Nepe op.cit:18
¹⁵ ibid.:18
¹⁶ Hineahuone is another name used for Hineahuone
and knowledge transmission recognised in the structures of the Whare Wānanga. Kaupapa Māori is, Tuakana argues, the conceptualisation of Māori knowledge transmitted through te reo Māori.18

Mercana Taki argues that Kaupapa Māori derives from a networking of iwi knowledge frameworks.19 This identifies the diversities that are a part of Kaupapa Māori and which must be maintained if we are to ensure the recognition of whānau, hapū and iwi complexities, which I argue are essential to Kaupapa Māori theory. The bringing together of iwi knowledge in Kaupapa Māori is further premised on a world view that is grounded in notions of te ira Atua, te ira Whenua and te ira Tangata. Mercana states that Kaupapa Māori bodies of knowledge, provide both a historical context and a cultural orientation that is founded upon a three dimensional framework of human existence based in te ira Atua, te ira Whenua and te ira Tangata.20 Mercana identifies these notions as follows;

Ira atua is defined here as the seed descent of Iwi Maori creation from the Creator Gods. The usage of the term Gods is restricted to this range of indigenous knowledges and the meanings imputed to them exclusively by Iwi Maori nations and their descendants.

Ira whenua is defined here as the seed descent of the planet and its siblings environs. Ira whenua is often associated explicitly with the primal power of Papatuanuku the Earth Parent of all Iwi Maori nations.

Ira tangata is defined here as the seed descent of human life according to Iwi Maori belief systems. This is a gender neutral concept.21

Where Mercana speaks of atua, whenua and tāngata in relation to the notion of 'seed descent' that is ira. Others talk of these elements in relation to mana, that being mana atua, mana whenua and mana tangata.22 Māori Marsden regards mana as a form of divine authority.23 In this respect there is a direct relationship of mana to all things. Te Kawehau Hoskins writes that mana ātua is identification with tūpuna and atua from creation, all things are accorded a relationship particular ātua. Mana ātua connects us to celestial realms. Mana whenua is the relationship of all things to the land. Te Kawehau notes that it is often said mana whenua relates to peoples authority over territory, however she argues that it is the land that bestows mana on the people. Mana whenua is often a term utilised to related to the people of a particular place, therefore there is a recognition that we are of that land. Mana tangata, is our relationship as people to each other, it is Te Kawehau

17 ibid.
18 ibid.
19 Taki, M. 1996:16
20 ibid:8
21 Taki, M. 1996:8
writes our collective relationship, and is power derived from working in relation to each other and to tupuna and atua.24 Mana tangata can be seen as our fundamental humanity, our human-ness and in this context our tāngata whenua state. Annette Sykes also indicates the importance of the matrix of Mana Atua, Mana Tangata, Mana Whenua, noting,

The hierarchy of this matrix must also be respected so that it is the intrinsic values and principles (Mana Atua) which will drive the political organisational frameworks of our peoples (Mana Tangata) and which will then seek appropriate economic models to sustain us (Mana Whenua).25

In regard to Kaupapa Māori within the Māori Education sector this is defined by the Māori Education Commission as distinct in that its basis in within mātauranga Māori and the philosophical underpinnings are Māori.26 Taking this further, Graham Hingangaroa Smith has identified six elements that are evident in Kaupapa Māori education; tino rangatiratanga, taonga tuku iho; ako Māori; kia piki ake i ngā raruraru i te kainga; whānau; kaupapa.27 Graham argues that these elements provide a solid basis for Kaupapa Māori theory.28

Where these elements require further explanation I have located that discussion in chapter five as they have provide a solid foundation for the development of Kaupapa Māori theory. Furthermore, he states that Kaupapa Māori initiatives are held together by collective commitment, philosophies and visions. The vision, which Graham relates to Habermas’s notion of the ‘utopian vision’ may have within it elements such as conscientisation, resistance and praxis. I use the term ‘may’ deliberately here as not all expressions of kaupapa embrace a politicising element explicitly. On many occasions I have heard the statements ‘this is not political’ or ‘leave politics out of this’, the belief inherent in such statement is that Kaupapa Māori is not in itself inherently political. In political terms ‘being on the kaupapa’ is an indication of a political philosophy being inherent in someone thinking. Kaupapa in these terms is very much about wider aspirations that are cultural and political. However, given the hegemony of colonisation many Māori people now reduce the political or deny its existence. We need to be clear, everything that is about struggling for the position of Māori is political. As a whanaunga,29 Mahinekura Reinfelds, so eloquently retorted to a statement that politics were not welcome “For some Māori people to get up in the morning is a political act!”30

Kaupapa Māori is a transformative power. To think and act in terms of Kaupapa Māori whilst

24 ibid
25 Sykes, Annette (n/d) Agents For Change, Unpublished Paper, Rotorua:10
27 These elements are discussed in depth in Chapter five.
28 Smith, G.H. 1997 op.cit.:pp466-473
29 Whanaunga refers here to a tribal relation
experiencing colonisation is to resist dominance. This is not something that Māori alone are engaging. It is the experience of vast numbers of Indigenous Peoples across the world. Native woman writer Rayna Green, reflecting on Indian notions of leadership in their communities writes,

In Indian country, maybe the most radical change we will ever have is a return to tradition.\textsuperscript{31}

What is clear in discussions regarding Kaupapa Māori is that Kaupapa Māori can not be understood without an understanding of mātauranga Māori and the ways in which we as Māori engage knowledge and forms of knowing. As noted in the brief discussion on Kaupapa Māori research in Chapter Two, Te Ahukaramū Charles Royal outlines mātauranga Māori as theory and whakapapa as research methodology. In posing a number of possibilities in what he refers to as theory in 'embryonic' form, Te Ahukaramū gives the following working definition;

He mea hanga te mātauranga Māori nā te Māori. E hāngaia ana tēnei mātauranga i roto i te whare o Te Ao Mārama, i runga anō hoki i ngā whakaatūranga o te whakapapa kia mārama ai te tangata ki tōna Ao.

Mātauranga Māori is created by Māori humans according to a worldview entitled 'Te Ao Mārama' and by the employment of methodologies derived from this worldview to explain the Māori experience of the world.\textsuperscript{32}

Mātauranga Māori is created by the use of whakapapa. Whakapapa is regarded an analytical tool that has been employed by our people as a means by which to understand our world and relationships. In such a framework it appears that whakapapa is both vehicle and expression of mātauranga Māori. The assertion through whakapapa of the origins of mātauranga Māori returns us to Papatūānuku and Ranginui.\textsuperscript{33} Rapata Wiri also locates mātauranga Māori as essential to the construction of what refers to as a Mana Māori model. Mātauranga Māori provides a distinct Māori epistemology and ways of knowing and draws upon a range of both verbal and non-verbal forms for its expression. Rapata highlights the complexity of definitions of mātauranga Māori and its multiple elements as follows;

Māori epistemology; the Māori way; the Māori worldview; the Māori style of thought; Māori ideology; Māori knowledge base; Māori perspective; to understand or to be acquainted with the Māori world; to be knowledgeable in things Māori; to be a graduate of the Māori schools of learning; Māori tradition and history; Māori experience of history; Māori enlightenment; Māori scholarship; Māori intellectual tradition.\textsuperscript{34}

In identifying non-verbal forms of mātauranga Māori Rapata highlights some examples as;

\textsuperscript{30} Reinfields, M. 2000 personal communication


\textsuperscript{32} Royal, T.C. op.cit.:83

\textsuperscript{33} ibid.

whakairo, raranga, hangarau, hanga whare, and verbal forms as; whakapapa, kōrero, whakatauki, waiata, kupu whakaari.\textsuperscript{35} Each of these forms and others contribute to the immense knowledge that is mātauranga Māori. Rangimarie Rose Pere discusses the necessity of seeing the interrelationship between forms of mātauranga Māori.\textsuperscript{36} In the following model for Māori education she presents us with a clear example of the many interacting forms that contribute to mātauranga Māori.

\textsuperscript{35} Rapata defines these as whakairo - carving, raranga - weaving, hangarau - technology, hanga whare - house building, and verbal forms as; whakapapa - genealogy, kōrero - oral narratives, whakatauki - proverbs, waiata - song, kupu whakaari - proverbial sayings. I would add that the term whakairo in its wider sense relates to the process of making shape.

\textsuperscript{36} Pere, Rangimarie 1991 \textit{Te Whēke: A Celebration of Infinite Wisdom}, Gisborne, Aō Ako Global Learning New Zealand
According to Rangimarie, in a Māori educational framework each institution merges together. This can also be said of mātauranga Māori and Kaupapa Māori where the many elements that are explored are continually in relationship and do not sit isolation.37

**Defining ‘theory’ and its place in the thesis**

The appending of the term theory to Kaupapa Māori and Mana Wahine may for some be literally a contradiction in terms. Both Kaupapa Māori and Mana Wahine are conceptually based within Māori cultural and philosophical traditions. Theory, however, may be said to be conceptually based within European philosophical traditions. To query this relationship is not unfamiliar to Māori. Theory, like other academic traditions, has rarely been ‘Māori friendly’. In fact theory often provided the justification for the ongoing perpetuation of violence on Māori. Theories of racial inferiority, deficiencies and cultural disadvantage have been key in the denial of Māori people access to our land, language and culture.38 It is clear that theories can be used both for and against Māori. Graham maintains that Māori, as a subordinate group, must critically engage theory as a site of struggle.39 As a tool theory is not inherently oppressive just as it is not inherently transformative. As African-American intellectual bell hooks writes

> Theory is not inherently healing, liberatory or revolutionary. It fulfils this function only when we ask that it do so and direct our theorizing towards this end.40

All theories are socially constructed and therefore the worldviews and philosophies of those who participate in their construction inform all theories. In terms of Kaupapa Māori theory, Graham Smith argues that the deliberate cooption of the term ‘theory’ has been an attempt to challenge dominant Pākehā notions of theory and provide “counter-hegemonic practice and understandings” in terms of how theory is constructed, defined, selected, interpreted and applied.41 Thomas J. Ward in his article ‘Definitions of Theory in Sociology’ gives an extensive overview of the use of the term ‘theory’ by a range of sociologists. Utilising a content analysis, Ward draws on the writings of 27 sociologists as a basis for determining key concepts used in regard to defining theory.42 What is
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37 ibid. Also for further discussion of concepts in the model refer to Pere Rangimarie, 1982 Ako: Concepts and Learning in the Maori Tradition, Hamilton, Department of Sociology, University of Waikato, Reprinted 1994, Te Kōhanga Reo Trust, Wellington
38 Smith, G.H. 1997 op.cit.:132
39 hooks, bell 1994 Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom, Routledge New York, pg 61
40 Smith, G.H. 1997 op.cit.:455
41 Ward, T.J., 1974 ‘Definitions of Theory in Sociology’ in Denisoff, R.S., Callahan, O., Levine, M.H. (eds) Theories and Paradigms in Contemporary Sociology, F.E. Peacock Publishers Inc., Illinois. Wards process of analysis included (i) identification of conceptual categories through a “tentative compilation of categorical referents” (ibid.:33); (ii) examination of each category in some depth; (iii) count of number of entries in each
evident in Ward’s analysis is that sociologists may use a variety of terms for similar concepts dependent upon the context and the perceived formality of the context. For example, Ward notes that in more formal contexts statements regarding theory may distinguish between a range of concepts, such as “axioms, postulates, premises, and theorems”, whereas in less formal statements these concepts may be located under a more general rubric of proposition. The complexities of attempting to provide a definition of theory is highlighted most significantly in Ward’s attempt to answer the question, What is theory?

Using language that reflects at least some areas of consensus, a theory is a logical deductive-inductive system of concepts, more selected aspects of phenomena and from which testable hypotheses can be derived. Theories in sociology are intended to be descriptive, explanatory, and predictive of phenomena of interest to the discipline and to its individual practitioners.\textsuperscript{43}

Abbott and Wallace\textsuperscript{44} note that given that all people engage in acts of thinking and having ideas then we are all theorists. We are all able to theorise and analyse what is happening around us, in fact we all participate in common-sense notions that are a part of our engaging with processes of theorising. There is, however, a need to distinguish between common-sense notions and sociological theorising. Drawing on the work of Stuart Hall they identify that in the social sciences theories are expected to be open-ended, open to new evidence, capable of modification and improvement, and clear about the way its concepts are formed.\textsuperscript{45}

Social theories are expected to be more systematic in their explanations and ideas, try to take account of the ‘facts’ presented and be coherent in its explanations, and be open to refutation. These expectations make social theories quite distinct from common-sense assumptions. Taking the discussion of theories a step further, Abbott and Wallace then explore elements that constitute a ‘theoretical perspective’. The following five points are identified as necessary in a theoretical perspective:
1. provides us with concepts to use in our analysis and accounts
2. suggests what questions to ask and informs our direction to certain aspects
3. provides ways of answering questions through orienting certain assumptions
4. informs how we interpret and our perceptions
5. involves judgements about the use and application of knowledge.\textsuperscript{46}

Where theories seek to explain, organise and summarise what is happening around us, theoretical perspectives then acknowledge how we position ourselves with particular theoretical frameworks.
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\textsuperscript{43} ibid.,:39
\textsuperscript{44} Abbott, P. and Wallace, C., 1997 Introduction to Sociology - Feminist Perspectives, Routledge, London
\textsuperscript{45} Stuart Hall cited in Abbott and Wallace, ibid.:25
\textsuperscript{46} ibid.
This is a recognition that 'theory' is not singular and that by locating ourselves within a certain theoretical perspective we are naming where we are and the types of analysis that we are bringing to our discussions. It may be that in light of such a contention that the juxtaposition of ‘Kaupapa Māori’ to 'theory' is appropriate in that such process overtly identifies the theoretical perspective within which analysis is located. This is affirmed by the process of identifying our position ‘up front’ so to speak. To position ourselves clearly as Kaupapa Māori theorists is to identify ourselves, to place before others where we are coming from so that there is no guise of neutrality or assumed objectivity.47

The possibilities of theory are multiple. Theories are not solely descriptive or explanatory or predictive, but can be all of these simultaneously. Focusing on the explanatory nature of theory Coxon et al.48 note that theories may be viewed fundamentally as collections of general principles that provide explanations for events and experiences. Theories can provide ways of explaining the world through the use of given understandings. Given the diversity of world views, of cultural ways of seeing, understanding and therefore explaining the world it is expected that a range of theories may exist simultaneously for any given event or to explain experiences. Theories are, and must be, more.

Having looked at some of the literature here that presents theory as prescription, description, explanation and analysis it is clear to me that theory can not only be about these things but must be rooted in practice. To use a term from the work of Paulo Freire, theory and practice must exist in ‘dialectical unity’.49 Dialectical unity, as a term, acknowledges the interdependence of theory to practice and vice versa. One cannot act fully without the other but that there is a process of constant reflection and reshaping as each part of the unity informs the other. Theory and practice are not closed entities, they are open to each other and therefore we, in our practice and our theorising, need to be open to the possibilities that come with such a process of reflection.

The shifting of a definition of theory from the descriptive mode, within which it is positioned by Ward, to one that is related explicity to practice and therefore is informed by the politics and social realities within which the practice is located, makes theory worthwhile for Māori. Without the unity of theory with practice, theory has little to offer. The idea of theory as a means of describing and explaining what is happening around, and more often than not ‘to’ us, and its relationship to transformative practice, is explored in some depth by bell hooks in her piece 'Theory as Liberatory
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Practice’. Coming to theory was for hooks

because I was hurting - the pain within me was so intense that I could not go on living. I came
to theory desperate, wanting to comprehend-to grasp what was happening around and within
me.50

bell hooks’ exploration of theory as liberatory practice is helpful in that her discussion engages with
some issues that are central for African-Americans, of which many also have direct relevance for
Māori. Where theory has on the whole been imposed upon Māori experiences and events, there has
emerged an often deep resentment and dismissal of the idea that theory could be at all transformative.
Reflecting on similar responses within her own community, hooks identifies the difficulties that such
responses pose for the black intellectual, in particular the ways that dismissal of intellectuals and
theory can silence the black academic. The silencing noted by hooks can equally be felt by Māori
academics in this country. It is a process that I have felt and seen on many occasions. The dismissal
of Māori academics and any notion of theory, through utilising anti-theory discourses, has become a
means of silencing or of capturing ground within a debate.

Barbara Christian, an African-American woman literary critic, offers much to this discussion.
Christian gives an articulate and powerful critique of the developments in literary theory.51 A key
point of concern is what she considers the ‘race for theory’ and the ways in which new literary
criticism is being constructed. Whilst it is important to engage and develop theory, she states, it must
be grounded in experiences and practice, without which theory becomes “prescriptive, exclusive,
elitist”.52 Further, she challenges the notion that new theoretical developments will make change for
black women writers, she writes;

These writers did announce their dissatisfaction with some of the cornerstone ideas of their
own tradition, a dissatisfaction with which I was born. But in their attempt to change the
orientation of Western scholarship, they, as usual, concentrated on themselves and were not in
the slightest interested in the worlds they ignored or controlled.53

For theory to be invented in ways that have little or no relevance to people's lives because of its

Massachusetts

50 hooks, b., 1994 'Theory as Liberatory Practice' in Teaching to Transgress, Routledge: London.59
This article is one that I use in a Graduate course I teach, as it promotes discussion about the possibilities of
theory. It has become increasingly obvious to me that many Māori hold a deep distrust for anything that is
called 'theory'. That distrust has been well earned. As Linda Tuhia Smith relates in regard to research,
Māori have been at the receiving end of being 'researched on' and 'researched by' the coloniser.50 As Māori,
our experience of theory, like our experiences of research have been as the object who is studied, and theorised
about. Our lives, our whānau, our culture, our language, our entire being has been theorised by Pākehā
academics and researchers over the past 200 years. Our world has been theorised through paradigms that bear no
resemblance to the ways in which we would explain and understand ourselves.

51 Christian, Barbara 1990 'The Race For Theory' in Moreau, C. & Anzaldua, G.(eds), 1983 This Bridge Called
My Back, Kitchen Table Women of Colour Press, New York, pp335-345

52 ibid.

53 ibid:339
prescriptive, exclusive and elitist foundations is of no use to Māori. Any theoretical framework must be located within our experiences and practices. Equally, I would argue a strong Kaupapa Māori theoretical framework must be cognisant of our historical and cultural realities, in all their complexities.

Struggling with and over the notion of theory is a part of Kaupapa Māori theory. We need to both recognise and critique those theories that have reconstructed our experiences as a means of maintaining the colonisers dominance. Equally we need to acknowledge that if theory is about providing explanations about the world that are derived from certain sets of principles then it is clear that our tupuna did engage in theory as a part of our own knowledge constructions and ways of understanding our experiences. In this light we can see the possibilities for theory, as bell hooks names it as 'liberatory' practice.

However, just as not all theory is oppressive, not all theory is liberatory. Theory is constructed by groups of people through their own cultural and political understandings. Theory is as with other social constructions, both socially and culturally bound. Liberatory theory can only develop from a political positioning that acknowledges that injustices and oppression exist. Without that acknowledgement the need for liberatory theory would not be evident. It seems to me that bell hooks is calling for the recognition of the potential for theory to be liberatory, and that such recognition is realised through active critical reflection that is located in an understanding of oppression, of pain, of struggle. Theories that develop from these concrete and known experiences bring possibilities for transformation. The relationship of these ideas to the development of ‘new’ feminist theorising is explained by hooks;

Personal testimony, personal experience, is such fertile ground for the production of liberatory feminist theory because it usually forms the base of our theory making, while we work to resolve those issues that are most pressing in daily life... we engage in a critical process of theorizing that enables and empowers.51

A further source of rejection of theory is related to accessibility. Many theoretical frameworks that espouse a focus on transformation are themselves inaccessible. If theory is inaccessible because of the language chosen by academics then the potential for that theory to transform the lived realities of oppressed groups becomes limited. A common complaint by Māori students is regarding the inaccessibility of some theoretical discussions. bell hooks expresses her amazement at the limited number of feminist theoretical texts that actually ‘speak’ to women, men and children about transforming our lives. By ‘speak’, she is referring to the meanings and theories being accessible. The academy does little to support the development of accessible texts.
As Māori academics we are often caught in the bind between our communities and the academy. Māori thesis students often voice the position that their thesis must be able to be read by their whānau and the wider Māori community, if it can’t then it’s potential for offering information and knowledge is, in their minds, diminished. This can create a dilemma for Māori students in that the expectations of the university, and what constitutes a thesis and theory, can differ significantly from the expectations of the Māori student and their priority audience.

As in other areas of our existence in the academy, as both teachers and students, the use of theory, and how we use theory are sites of contestation. There are ways to present theory in understandable language and this is something that many Māori academics seek in their own writings. This is especially relevant to Kaupapa Māori theory as its sustainability is dependent on its reproduction by Māori for Māori. To write in ways that deny access to the majority of Māori people is in my opinion bringing closure rather than ensuring ongoing debate and evolution. I agree with Graham Hingangaroa Smith’s contention that theory is a central problematic in the development of literatory processes which Smith refers to as “transformative action in the interests of subordinated groups.”

For Graham, theory is a definite site of struggle between interest groups and the struggle for theoretical space, to support Māori to critically analyse our experiences, is a worthwhile struggle. This struggle is about contesting theoretical space. As with all forms of contestation the underpinning power relations require challenge. This is a threat to those who argue the dominance of Western theories. It is also about Māori constituting theory within our own terms. Sheilagh Walker argues that Māori academics engage in theory because of our engagement in the struggle for Kaupapa Māori. In her terms “our struggle becomes our Theory.” Furthermore, she suggests that Kaupapa Māori theory is not defined within Western philosophical traditions but through Kaupapa Māori praxis. It is worth outlining this argument more fully by referring directly to a statement made in her Masters thesis.

I conclude that Kaupapa Maori is not a Theory in the Western sense; it does not subsume itself within European philosophical endeavours which construct and privilege on Theory over another Theory, one rationality over another rationality, one philosophical paradigm over another paradigm, one knowledge over another knowledge, one World view over another World view of the Other. Kaupapa Māori Theory is rather Kaupapa Māori Praxis. My problematic continues. I de-construct the title further; what remains is simply KAUPAPA

---
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Maori.\textsuperscript{58}

This raises again the necessity or otherwise of appending the word ‘theory’ to Kaupapa Māori and Mana Wahine. The problematic being in the dominant conceptualisation of theory in Western terms. I would argue that the use of the term theory in resistance terms is one that validates more directly the underpinning intentions of Kaupapa Māori and Mana Wahine theories, but as with any concept that derives from a Western base the issues raised by Sheilagh Walker must be continually present and be central to our ongoing reflection on the terms that we choose to use.

Locating Kaupapa Māori theory in the thesis

This chapter focuses on Kaupapa Māori theory. Kaupapa Māori theory is the fundamental framework of this thesis. There is no other theoretical framework that can ensure a cultural integrity is maintained. It provides both tools of analysis and a means by which to context the various discourses that the thesis engages with. Kaupapa Māori theory is the critical theory alongside which all other theories will be located. Current expressions of Kaupapa Māori theory are expanded upon through an assertion of Mana Wahine as a Kaupapa Māori theoretical framework and methodology. This research is about knowledge and analysis as related to Māori women. It seeks to provide analysis and critique that will raise frameworks for analysis of critical issues for Māori women. In order to undertake such a task a strong theoretical foundation is necessary. That theoretical foundation must, in my view, be built from here, from Papatūānuku, not from the building blocks of imported theories. Kaupapa Māori theory provides such a foundation.

In an analogy of a wharenu,\textsuperscript{59} Kaupapa Māori theory is the poutokomanawa for this research.\textsuperscript{60} Margie Kahukura Hohepa draws upon the wharenu as a means of highlighting the interrelationships that occur within Māori Education.\textsuperscript{61} The wharenu is an appropriate symbol for discussing Māori Education and Kaupapa Māori theory as it is the embodiment of our being. The wharenu as a representation of selected tūpuna, both female and male, is itself a storehouse of knowledge. The wharenu also serves as shelter and protection, whilst holding within the space generations of stories and images that remind us of our place in the world. A number of writers position the wharenu as a form of understanding particular forms of Kaupapa Māori theory or

\textsuperscript{58} ibid.

\textsuperscript{59} The wharenu is the large meeting house that provides as a collective gathering place for our people. As a metaphor the whare embodies and personifies our ancestral connections and provides a cultural space that authors such as Ranginui Walker have referred to as one of the few bastions where Māori can ‘be’ Māori.

\textsuperscript{60} The poutokomanawa is the central post within a wharenu, as such the manawa or the heart of the wharenu is supported by this very central post.

\textsuperscript{61} Hohepa, M., 2001 personal communication
Kaupapa Māori research. Hirini Melbourne draws on the whare whakairo as a means of contextualising Māori world views. Takirirangi Smith notes the whare provides a whole representation of Māori worldviews and stands as a symbol of our validity in the world. Frances Goulton discusses the wharenui as a form for depicting key concepts in their Teacher Education programme. In her discussion the tahuhu represents wairua, the papa is whānau, and four pou represent ako, tikanga, Kaupapa Māori and te reo.

Kaupapa Māori theory is not the ‘only’ theory that will appear in this thesis, others that allow a critical analysis and reflection are included. I have no intention of adhering to an academic addiction that promotes ongoing injections of work from ‘dead white men’. This is not to undermine the contributions of many who fit this category, but is a response to the constant deluge of ‘important’ theorists that I am told I ‘should’ read. The majority of those ‘important’ theorists have absolutely no understanding of how Māori experience the world, or the complex cultural relationships that are a part of our experiences. Sheilagh Walker also highlights this as an issue when she writes;

the majority of ‘Dead White Males’ who have created and perpetuated European philosophical discourse, have done so, for the benefit of other White Males.

Those ‘other’ theories that appear in this thesis do so for three key reasons (i) they provide an analysis that is affirming of the wider theoretical drive of the thesis; (ii) they require a Kaupapa Māori critique; or (iii) they provide a Pākehā or European analysis of a Pākehā or European ideology. I write more fully about this in Chapter four which discusses the role of Western theories alongside Kaupapa Māori theory, but it is necessary to state at this point that I do not intend throwing out all Western theories solely because of their cultural origins. As both bell hooks and Lee Maracle
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64 Tahuhu refers to the ridgepole of the whare, that is seen as the backbone of the ancestor that the whare represents.
65 Goulton, Frances, 1999 Te Huarahi Ako: Pathways to Learning: The Academic and Cultural Self-efficacy of Māori Student Teachers’ in Te Pūmanawa Hauora, 1999, Proceedings of Te Oru Rangahau: Māori Research and Development Conference, School of Māori Studies, Massey University, Palmerston North
66 Walker, Sheilagh 1996 Kia Tau Te Rangimarie: Kaupapa Māori Theory as a Resistance against the Construction of Māori as the Other, Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis, University of Auckland:26
67 Here I am identifying that there are both Pākehā and European ideologies in existence in Aotearoa. I am not inferring an interchangeability between the two terms as I don’t believe that they are in fact interchangeable. When I refer to Pākehā I am meaning those of some form of European background who have settled in Aotearoa, this can be from first generation migrants through to those who have lived here for a number of generations. European however refers to those who are of European background and still choose to see their home as elsewhere, not Aotearoa.
68 hooks, b., 1994 op.cit.
69 Maracle, L., 1996 op.cit.
would say that would be absurd, as it would deny that there are theories of Western origin that can be
of use for oppressed groups. This position is clearly taken by Māori academics such as Linda
Tuhiriwi Smith, Graham Hingangaroa Smith, Margie Kahukura Hohepa, Patricia Maringi
Johnston and Kuni Jenkins in their recently completed doctoral theses.\(^{70}\) Māori women theorists
such as Ngahuia Te Awekotuku, Kathie Irwin, Merana Taki and Cherryl Smith, have also been
highly influential in my own theoretical development and have encouraged the utilisation of
theoretical frameworks that will support Māori aspirations.\(^ {71}\) A range of Māori organisations and
Māori women in ‘the movement’ have also been influential in shaping ideas and analysis.\(^ {72}\) Given
that I have a tendency to critique certain theoretical frameworks with some vigour, I have a need to
continually remind myself not to blatantly deny that there may be things that are useful in such
theories. My position however, remains that the foundation for analysis will be Māori. In
considering Kaupapa Māori theory I am working toward an articulation of Mana Wahine as a
means of theoretical analysis. My proposal is that for insights into Māori experiences there must be
explicit statements for and by Māori women; this, in my argument, is critical if we are to ensure that
Kaupapa Māori theory does not become yet another ‘malestream’ theoretical framework.\(^ {73}\) This
point constitutes a major section of my theoretical positioning and therefore informs the research
analysis significantly.

It is necessary to acknowledge that Kaupapa Māori theory is not a theoretical framework that
provides answers by following a set recipe. Where there are recognisable elements within Kaupapa
Māori theory, as is presently being defined, these are not seen to be deterministic or exclusive. This
is not an attempt to close or define the parameters of Kaupapa Māori theory in such a way that
would prevent those who draw upon Kaupapa Māori theory the ability to be flexible and in fact
adaptable to the ever changing contexts of Māori collectively and whānau, hapū and iwi as distinct
units. To promote closure would in my mind be the antithesis of what is proposed within Kaupapa


\(^{72}\) Whānau mō ngā wāhine o te Moana nui a Kiwa, a support group for Māori and Pacific Women Lesbians was particularly influential in terms of issues and analysis. The Hawke whānau of Ngāti Whaatauki Orakei have been nurturing of many Māori women in terms of coming to understand issues of mana whenua and land struggles in Tamaki Makaurau. Te Rapunga o Pouhana work and education trust operated from a whānau base from its inception in 1986 and continues to provide programmes for rangatahi in inner city Auckland. These are a multitude of Māori individuals, and some Pakeha although to a lesser degree, who contribute to my understandings of the world, and they know who they are.

\(^{73}\) The term ‘malestream’ is used by Pamela Abbott and Wallace Claire 1997 op. cit. They coin this term as a recognition that historically male theorists have been privileged within sociology with little if any recognition of
Maori Theory. The term theory itself is multiple in the definitions associated with it and some exploration of that provides some understanding of the need to ensure against a closure of Kaupapa Maori theory.

Much of the strength of Kaupapa Maori theory comes in the ability of many Maori to ‘see’ the relevance of such theoretical engagement, and to recognise much of what is said in their own practices. What is also important is the recognition that Kaupapa Maori theory is not set in concrete, in fact it is very much a fluid and evolving theoretical framework. The complexities of what this means is evident in my own struggle to find ‘a’ word that does not in itself express a reductionist view. I have chosen to use the term ‘framework’ in that it provides a notion of environment and setting as opposed to terms such as ‘model’ or ‘paradigm’, which for me, imply notions of patterns that are set in place. In a wider sense this is a part of a realisation that it is dominance that seeks to set cultures in concrete, to hold us in a construction that is static and unchanging and which is often relentless in its denial of growth and change. We can’t afford for this to be the case.

In developing, drawing upon and refining Kaupapa Maori theory we need to be a part of a process that is accessible and fluid, not something that is controlled by a few or static and unchanging. The evolving of Kaupapa Maori theory is long-term and requires intense reflection. The process itself is as important, if not more so, as the outcome. It is through the process that we are able to engage more deeply with Maori knowledge, with te reo Maori me ona tikanga, in ways that can reveal culturally based frameworks and structures which will provide a foundation of Maori Indigenous analyses.

In identifying the evolving nature of Kaupapa Maori theory it is also important to acknowledge those who have been instrumental in its articulation. Much is owed to the foundational work done by Linda Tuhiwai Smith and Graham Hingararoa Smith in providing key elements for exploration in terms of what Kaupapa Maori theory might look like. This is also indicated in the area of research where Kaupapa Maori research has been carefully developed alongside Kaupapa Maori theory. What is most impressive in the works of both these writers is their desire to be a part of collective and open development of Kaupapa Maori theory with other Maori academics such as myself. More recent works by Margie Kahukura Hohepa, Patricia Marangi Johnston, Kuni Jenkins, Tuakana Nepe, Fiona Cram, Cherryl Waerea-i-te-rangi Smith, Merenea Taki, Kathie Irwin, Huia Jahnke,
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Taina Pohatu, Hine Waitere-Ang and Russell Bishop show the expansiveness that is Kaupapa Māori theory. It also highlights Kaupapa Māori theory as evolving.

**Kaupapa Māori Theory As Evolving Theory**

As a theoretical framework Kaupapa Māori theory is still developing. However, we can be assured that development comes from a philosophical tradition that is as longstanding as any Western philosophical tradition. The idea that Kaupapa Māori theory is still growing is an important aspect to consider as it would be easy to stay with what has been written and not build on, critique and reshape Kaupapa Māori theory. To ensure the diversities of Māori experiences and an inclusion of whānau, hapū and iwi knowledge Kaupapa Māori theory must be reflective, and we as its proponents open to an evolving process. In one of the most depth discussions of Kaupapa Māori theory, Graham Hingangaroa Smith establishes Kaupapa Māori theory as an evolving theory of transformation that can be understood through an analysis of Kaupapa Māori intervention initiatives. Graham locates the genesis of Kaupapa Māori theory very securely within the political initiatives driven by Māori. More recently we established the phrasing of the term ‘Kaupapa Māori theory’ was a collective event, having been articulated through theoretical discussions that took place in a Māori Education graduate paper in 1990. I recall the kinds of discussions that took part in that group and the strength of debate surrounding the ‘usefulness’ or otherwise of the focus on the Frankfurt School Critical Theory. A question that was constantly raised was ‘where are our theoretical terms?’ This remains a crucial question for Māori. It is important to note at this point that the term Kaupapa Māori theory was phrased in line with existing developments of Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori, and with the idea that we can and should develop our own theoretical frameworks based within te reo me ōna tikanga. Kaupapa Māori theory was not, as appears to be the belief of some, based upon Critical Theory.

Kaupapa Māori theory may be viewed as a theoretical movement that has its foundation in Māori community developments. These developments are epitomised in the Māori education initiatives Te

---


78 Smith, G.H. 1997 op.cit:457

79 Graham Smith personal communication

80 Rapata Wiri argues that Kaupapa Māori theory is based on Critical Theory and is a 'bicultural' approach. The relationship to critical theory is discussed in this chapter however it is necessary to restate that Kaupapa Māori theory is based upon Kaupapa Māori. In these terms Kaupapa Māori theory is more akin to what Rapata terms Mana Māori. Refer Wiri, R., 2001 op.cit.
Kōhanga Reo\textsuperscript{81} and Kura Kaupapa Māori. Both Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori are initiatives that originated from Māori communities. They were, and are, driven primarily by the motivation of Māori for initiatives through which te reo Māori could be regenerated for our people and which would intervene in the crisis of Māori educational underachievement that had been the experience of generations of Māori children and whānau. The development of these initiatives brought a need for Māori people to reflect on and draw upon our own cultural knowledge. Te Kōhanga Reo, the first of the Māori Education initiatives to develop, is a prime example. The history of the development of Te Kōhanga Reo has been well documented by Māori people involved in the movement. Māori women such as Margie Kahukura Hohepa, Arapera Royal-Tangaere, Tania Ka’ai and Mere White have documented Te Kōhanga Reo and identified key elements that contribute to the success in terms of language revitalisation.\textsuperscript{82}

What is key to this discussion is that Te Kōhanga Reo was an initiative through which to explore Māori knowledge in a concrete and focused manner in terms of education. Moreover, it meant that we needed to clearly articulate the types of values, understandings, beliefs and norms that we wanted for our tamariki and to bring forward te reo Māori me ōna tikanga so that those aspirations could be reached. I don’t intend romanticising Te Kōhanga Reo, as there are struggles that are inherent in processes of reclamation for Māori, but it is important to note that the development of Te Kōhanga Reo has had a profound affect on Māori Education more generally and on the growth of Kaupapa Māori theory.\textsuperscript{83}

My own relationship with the term Kaupapa Māori theory has also been one of constant reflection for precisely the reasons that have been raised. I am keenly aware of the coinage of such phrases by Māori as a process of opening space. There is no doubt that the coinage of the term Kaupapa Māori

\textsuperscript{81} In 1979 a gather of elders at the Wānanga kaumatua affirmed te reo Māori "Ko te reo te mauiri o te mana Māori" the language is the life principle of Māori mana. This was followed in 1981 with a resolution from another hui, Waananga Whakatauranga for the development of bilingual education at pre-school level. These were taken further to a proposal for immersion pre-school programmes. In April 1982 the first Te Kohanga Reo opened at Pupeata Kokiri Centre Waiohumin. The overriding goal being the fluency of te reo Māori which would address the priority concern for the revitalisation of te reo. Refer Hohepa, M.K 1990 Te Kohanga Reo Hei Tikanga Ako I Te Reo Māori, Unpublished Master of Arts thesis, University of Auckland. pp 7-18

theory has been precisely that, a process of engaging the academic community in a way that will create cultural and theoretical space for Māori within the university. This has also meant a reclaiming of the possibilities of theory, as I have discussed earlier in chapter two, where theory is not constrained to those dualistic oppositions and contests that Sheilagh Walker has alerted us to. This is critical, as Kaupapa Māori theory is not constructed in the competitive, hierarchical nature that is often the case in the assertion of Western theories. Kaupapa Māori theory, as explored in this thesis, is not dualistic or constructed within simplistic binaries. It is not about asserting the superiority of one set of knowledge over another or one worldview over another. It is not about denying the rights of any peoples to their philosophical traditions, culture or language. It is an assertion of the right for Māori to be Māori on our own terms and to draw from our own base to provide understandings and explanations of the world.

Asserting a right to argue Kaupapa Māori theory has been an ongoing struggle. In universities across the country Māori academics are drawing upon the growing body of Māori literature that is engaging Kaupapa Māori theory. The historical dominance of Western theorising is being challenged at a very fundamental level, that is at the level of relevance to the Indigenous people of this land. For many Pākehā academics this challenge is viewed as a threat. The possibility of Māori taking control of our own theoretical frameworks is a threat to the survival of many of those Pākehā academics who have spent the best part of their academic lives theorising ‘about’ and ‘on’ Māori. Māori students across the country have been told that it is not sufficient to reference Kaupapa Māori theory as their theoretical framework, or to rely solely on the writings of Māori academics when discussing issues regarding Māori Education. It is clear that those Pākehā academics, some of which are supervising Māori students at Graduate level, are unable to accept that Kaupapa Māori theory is a valid theoretical framework or that Māori are able to develop theoretical frameworks that have origins in te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. This is a particularly ethnocentric notion, yet it continues to pervade the academy in ways that can seriously disadvantage Māori staff and students.

In spite of the resistances to the assertion of Kaupapa Māori theory, we continue seeking ways to claim ground in the framing of our own theories. We do this with the knowledge that theory is not in itself transformative, that it is a site of struggle, and that it must be located in direct relationship with practice. Theory is a term that has a tenuous relationship to Māori. It is my hope that Kaupapa Māori theory will bring to the fore the possibility that we no longer have to adhere to an idea that theory belongs only to the coloniser, but rather that we can as Indigenous people once again
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83 This is explored further in the following section on the organic development of Kaupapa Māori theory.
acknowledge that we have always theorised about our world and that our theories, that are grounded historically on this land, are valid. Kaupapa Māori theory is I believe a theoretical framework that is organically Māori.

**Organic Development of Kaupapa Māori theory**

The organic development and nature of Kaupapa Māori theory is perhaps one of its strongest aspects. Having already noted that the coinage of the phrase came within a university context it is vital that we do not then assume that Kaupapa Māori theory is only about academia, as that is not the case. Kaupapa Māori theory has in very real terms developed from Māori. Given that te reo Māori me ōna tikanga is central to Kaupapa Māori theory we have an established foundation that can be described as nothing other than organic.

Kaupapa Māori theory is a part on a wider resurgence for Māori, it is a part of what is often termed the Māori Renaissance. That renaissance is an outcome of the struggles by many Māori to regain the fundamental rights guaranteed under Te Tiriti o Waitangi. The struggles of groups such as Ngā Tamatoa and Te reo Māori Association were instrumental in the maintenance of Māori struggles for te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. The Wai 11 case to the Waitangi Tribunal has provided an ongoing thrust for Māori who are active in the struggle for the revival and retention of te reo Māori. From these struggles have emerged the Māori Educational initiatives of Te Kōhanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori, Whare Kura and Whare Wānanga. The political and historical development of these initiatives has been recorded by those involved directly with these initiatives. It may be stated in more general terms that the development of these initiatives has come about from a basis of the need for Māori to take control of our own educational processes and in doing so of our own destinies. Fundamental to this is the revival, maintenance and development of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga for present and future generations of Māori. Discussion surrounding the context within which Te Kōhanga Reo emerged highlights these general intentions.
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85 Ngā Tamatoa and the Te Reo Māori Association were radical Māori groups that were instrumental in the assertion of Māori rights to Māori language and culture.

Margie Hohepa\textsuperscript{87} describes the development of Te Kōhanga Reo as having developed as a part of wider concerns in regard to te reo Māori. The concern for the potential loss of te reo Māori has been located with various movements and petitions of the 1970s. Perhaps one of the most understated events in the revival of te reo Māori as been that of the work done by Hana Te Hemara in her instigation of the te reo Māori petition in 1970. In the publication ‘Mana Wahine’, Hana speaks of her life and the inspiration to take on the development of the Māori Language petition. Having been raised in a whānau where her mother had been beaten for speaking Māori, Hana’s own experience was one of hearing te reo Māori but not being able to speak Māori. Gaining a political understanding of this was essential and the move toward the petition was further influenced by hearing others speak of the position of te reo Māori in education.\textsuperscript{88} Furthermore, Hana states her involvement with Ngā Tamatoa was because of their commitment also to te reo Māori. The petition was presented to parliament on September 14, 1972 and consisted of 44,000 signatures.\textsuperscript{89}

Where the early 1970’s is undoubtedly the time where there was a growing radical assertion that intervention must take place, Hana also notes that it is necessary to recognise that there were concerns expressed much earlier in regard to the positioning of te reo Māori within Aotearoa. She stated;

Many Māori people pushed for the retention of our language and I want to acknowledge stalwart people like Lou Tawhai from Te Arawa, who left here broken-hearted because of insufficient support in the fifties and sixties. We were just one of many groups like the Māori Women’s Welfare League, who since 1952 had passed remits at their annual conferences to retain the Māori language. It was really an idea whose time had arrived.\textsuperscript{90}

Linda Tuhiwai Smith also identifies the significance of the 1970’s period in the revitalisation of te reo Māori. It was a time when significant actions were being undertaken in regard to land issues including actions such as the 1975 Land March, the reoccupation of Bastion Point by Ngāti Whaatu,\textsuperscript{91} the occupation of the Raglan Golf course by Eva Rickard and her whānau, the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal. Māori movements of the time were not removed from wider international movements. Ngahuia Te Awekotuku places the American Civil Rights movement of

\textsuperscript{87} Hohepa, M., 1999 op.cit.
\textsuperscript{88} Brown, A. & Carlin, J. (eds) 1994 ‘Hana Te Hemara’ in Mana Wahine: Women who show the way, Reed Publishing (NZ) Ltd., Auckland pg 51
\textsuperscript{89} ibid.:52
\textsuperscript{90} ibid.:52
the 1960’s as a key influence in Māori politics at the time. Equally the American Indian Movement (AIM) was also gathering momentum struggling for Indigenous rights in their lands.92

What is clear from documentation in regard to the struggle for and establishment of Te Kōhanga Reo is its organic nature. Māori people instigated Te Kōhanga Reo. Māori people defined the need for Te Kōhanga Reo. It is Māori people that are ultimately responsible for the nurturing and maintenance of Te Kōhanga Reo. This can also be said for those things that have grown out of Te Kōhanga Reo, such as Kura Kaupapa Māori and Whare Kura. The movement into Kura Kaupapa Māori was a necessity in terms of maintaining the foundations that were put in place in Te Kōhanga Reo. In research regarding the transition of Te Kōhanga Reo children into existing state schools, Tania Ka’ai observed that Te Kōhanga Reo children who went in to mainstream English-speaking or bilingual classes experienced a rapid loss of fluency of te reo Māori.93 There is little doubt that within education, and particularly in the formal context of schooling, Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori have been key initiatives in the revival and retention of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga, and that from these initiatives has emerged a growing body of literature as to what may be considered success factors for Māori in education. These factors are equally viewed as key factors in terms of Kaupapa Māori theory. Graham Hingangaroa Smith has noted that these initiatives in Māori education are themselves Kaupapa Māori praxis.94 Graham’s research in Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori brought to the fore the ways in which Māori activate tikanga within a formalised setting of schooling.

At this point it is important to note that we need to be careful not to assume that Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori are the only sites where Kaupapa Māori is articulated. There are numerous sites through which Māori people are actively engaged with Kaupapa Māori. These sites are often distinctly Māori, such as the many marae around the country, but can also include the development of Kaupapa Māori initiatives within a whole range of sites including mainstream institutions.95 Both Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori are now firmly entrenched under
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93 Ka’ai, T., 1990 op.cit.
94 Smith G.H. 1997 op.cit.
95 There are many examples of Māori seeking to implement Kaupapa Māori initiatives within the mainstream institutions that they work in. The Māori Education department, of which I am a member, is one example. Within the University of Auckland we have sought to provide space, both physical and theoretical, for Māori staff and students to engage more fully in Kaupapa Māori pursuits. This is no easy task and is fraught with institutional difficulties, however the outcome has been that Māori students have been provided with a much wider selection of choice across the curriculum and have been able to be Māori within that site. The following references give more depth discussion on the need for, and processes of, creating space for Māori in Pākehā settings. Moko Productions & Research Unit for Māori Education 1993 Te Aratiaiatia: Māori and Postgraduate Study (Video), University of Auckland, Auckland; Smith, G.H. & Hohepa, M. (eds) Creating Space in
the state and therefore are expected to undergo the evaluation processes, and other requirements, as defined by the Ministry of Education. This means that certain criteria must be met in order to maintain state funding. This may also be said for Whare Kura and Whare Wānanga, who also are required to fulfil criteria as determined by the state. It has not been all clear sailing for these initiatives. Some have argued that the subjection of Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori to state requirements is an indication of the attempt by the state to appropriate Māori initiatives in order to undermine their radical potential. For example, Patricia Maringi Johnston argues that the structure of Te Kōhanga Reo changed considerably once incorporated into the state apparatus. She notes that the unique characteristics of Te Kōhanga Reo are being re-defined by the state, through policy, legislation and practices. Patricia states that Te Kōhanga Reo has been captured by the state through those processes. An example of the impact of the state on Te Kōhanga Reo is that of the role of the Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust.

Its key role was to protect and nurture te reo Māori. However, in taking on the role of administering Government funding, the Trust’s role has changed, and a report commissioned by the Minister of Māori Affairs (written by Rose Pere and Kara Puketapu in 1990) titled ‘The Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust, Review of Trust Operations’ outlined some of those changes. A major problem related to the fact that the Trust was not set up to administer Government funding but had become responsible for that task… This also means that the original kaupapa of the Trust – to care for and nurture the kaupapa of the Te Kōhanga Reo movement – has become subverted.96

Issues of cooption and capture are a part of what Graham Hingangaroa Smith defines as a ‘war of position’ that is waged by the state with Māori interests. That war of position has multiple strategies which include such things as; importing selected experts; capturing theoretical discourse; renaming; cooption; control of curriculum and definitions of knowledge; rewriting of history; underfunding and manipulation of funding; divide and rule tactics.97 These are critical issues that face Māori education more generally and the Kaupapa Māori initiatives specifically. Having said that we should not be deterred. The fundamental assertion of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga within these initiatives means there remains the real potential for bringing about change for Māori in education and beyond. What we need to ensure is that the resistance and struggles that led to the development of these initiatives remains as a key element of Kaupapa Māori in order that both the cultural and structural issues are engaged with. It is also essential that such developments are located within wider social, economic and political contexts that both acknowledge and engage power relationships.


96 Johnston, P.M 1998 op.cit.:318. The reference for the Trust review discussed here is: Pere, R and Puketapu, K 1990 The Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust, Review of the Trust Operations, Report commissioned by Minister of Māori Affairs

97 For depth discussion of each of these strategies refer to Smith, G.H. 1997 op.cit:478-481
Kaupapa Māori theory as having derived from organic community processes, such as Te Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori, provides us with a theoretical process that ensures those struggles, and the inherent power relationships within those struggles, are a conscious part of our analysis. Given the unequal power relations that exist, between Māori and the State, the recognition that the organic developments are the outcome of Māori aspirations and a subsequent struggle for the realisation of those aspirations means that there is a clearly articulated political agenda that sits alongside cultural aspirations for te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. The organic nature of Kaupapa Māori theory also means that there are many ways in which Kaupapa Māori theory can and is articulated. Kaupapa Māori theory is, by nature of its development, multiple.

**Kaupapa Māori theory: Multiple Expressions**

Kaupapa Māori theory is not singular. There is no set formula that we can use to say ‘here this is what it looks like’. Kaupapa Māori theory is undeniably linked to te reo Māori me ona tikanga, and these are not expressed in a singular form amongst Māori. What has highlighted, most recently, for me the possibilities in Kaupapa Māori theory has been the thought of moving back to my own iwi area, Taranaki. There is something about being home. Home as in tūrangawaewae.⁹⁸ Having a place to stand and to know that it is a place you belong and that the people there, irrespective of the many differences, are a part of you and you are a part of them. That is how I feel in Taranaki. I know that I am of that whenua and that while I am away from it there is a detachment that is deep inside myself and my tamariki. There are those that leave home and there are those that stay. Those of us who leave have at least some time in our lives that we consider if we ‘should go back’, those who stay keep that possibility alive for people like me. For without those who keep the ahi kaa⁹⁹ I would have no where to return to. From a distance I hear and see what our people refer to as ‘ngā piki me ngā heke’, the ups and downs. To be home is to take on what that means through active involvement. It means to be a part of the whānau, hapū and iwi dynamics that exist. To put oneself amongst that is to know that the place of whānau, hapū and iwi in Kaupapa Māori theory is not only in the ways that relationships are explored conceptually. These groupings can, and do, derive multiple ways that Kaupapa Māori theory can be discussed.

Taina Pohatu directs his theoretical discussions in relation to his own whakapapa grouping, his kāwai whakapapa.¹⁰⁰ Taina writes that there are particular cultural signposts that must be read from
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⁹⁸ Tūrangawaewae relates to a standing place, where we come from.
⁹⁹ Ahi kaa refers to the home fires and is a figurative term that recognises land occupation.
a position of cultural knowledge. Furthermore, Taina notes that there are particular developments that occur as a result of being a part of a specific whakapapa grouping. This relates to the point made earlier in regard to specific whānau, hapū and iwi possibilities within Kaupapa Māori theory. Taina explains that it is necessary for him to express his ideas through knowledge that begins from within kāwai whakapapa. That in turn gives him a location from which to articulate his ideas and views on the Māori worldview. This also has wider implications, as Taina writes;

I am constantly returned to my cultural upbringing, my cultural experiences, my internalised reality. As I give more time and energy to this image, I go through a process of recreating the place, the people, the time, the parameters of my cultural world as a whakapapa person return to a position that uniquely belongs to my kāwai whakapapa, am moved to a site where I am able to address issues, from within a grouping that I am responsible and accountable to.¹⁰¹

Te Ahukaramū Charles Royal in his discussion of Kaupapa Māori Research also locates the importance of whakapapa and of definitions being developed organically within hapū and iwi. His discussion relates specifically to work being done in Te Wānanga o Raukawa in developing theories of mātauranga Māori.¹⁰² Merenea Taki positions herself as an iwi woman and argues for whakapapa as a theoretical framework, again linking iwi knowledge as an important aspect of her theorising.¹⁰³

There are many possible forms for Kaupapa Māori theory, just as there are many possible forms of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. Being from Taranaki constantly reminds me of the range and diversity of being Māori. I have no doubt that this is the case for many Māori. The iwi dialects within te reo Māori example the diversity. The ways that tikanga are framed highlight the diversity. Many Māori know this and are able to move in and with a range of tikanga and kawa. Equally many are able to recognise both the similarities and the differences. As we move around marae throughout the country we see these. It is not only the diversity of whānau, hapū, iwi, Māori expressions of te reo, tikanga and kawa that illustrate the many potentialities of Kaupapa Māori theory, but also the many varied concepts within te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. A vast array of Māori concepts and notions of how to be in the world, are theories in themselves.¹⁰⁴ The form of Kaupapa Māori analysis that can be undertaken is varied. This is, in my opinion, an exciting potential in Kaupapa Māori theory. The notions of multiplicity and diversity are not new, and therefore the idea that there can be many expressions of Kaupapa Māori theory seems appropriate.

¹⁰¹ ibid.:50
¹⁰² Royal, Te Ahukaramū Charles 1998 ‘Te Ao Marama – A Research Paradigm’ in Te Oru Rangahau: Māori Research and Development Conference 7-9 July 1998, Te Putahitā-ā-Toi, School of Māori Studies, Massey University, Palmerston North pp78-86
¹⁰³ Taki, M., 1996 op.cit.
¹⁰⁴ The range of Māori writings referenced in this Chapter provide many examples of the ways in which particular concepts provide explanations and understandings of the world and our experiences.
Something that I have become increasingly aware of is the potential of \textit{Kaupapa Māori} theory in contributing to much wider theoretical discussions, whilst also holding firmly to the notion that \textit{Kaupapa Māori} theory is itself highly contextualised. In a society that prioritises binary relationships these are often viewed as conflicting agendas however it is in my opinion necessary that these agendas are a part of \textit{Kaupapa Māori} theory. They are neither conflicting nor contradictory. They are recognition of the cultural place of such a theory for Māori and in terms of wider Indigenous communities. \textit{Kaupapa Māori} theory is simultaneously local and international. Local, in that it is necessarily defined by Māori for Māori, drawing on fundamental Māori values, experiences and worldviews. International, in that there are many connections that can be made through a process of sharing Indigenous Peoples' theories.\textsuperscript{105} The multiple expressions of \textit{Kaupapa Māori} theory are important to recognise so that the theoretical frameworks that develop are not universalised in ways that ignore the complexities of our experiences. The differences that exist within Māori communities are marked and that in turn requires theoretical analysis that can engage the various influences that impact on our lives, whilst simultaneously providing tools to reflect and act as Māori. It also requires that there be an exploration of key elements that are seen to be critical to \textit{Kaupapa Māori} theory.

bell hooks reminds us that theory can be liberatory if we seek to use theory in that way\textsuperscript{106}. Transformation is one of the driving elements of \textit{Kaupapa Māori}. How that transformation is defined and brought is determined by how the issues are understood, theorised and engaged. Therefore it is necessary, whilst avoiding a formulaic development, to indicate what may be considered some specific elements that are inherent within \textit{Kaupapa Māori} theory and ways in which a range of Māori people are articulating methods of analysis. The transformation or emancipatory intent of \textit{Kaupapa Māori} theory may be viewed as a decolonisation process, however it is not solely about the theorising for transformation but is also directly related to the development of practical interventions. Again \textit{Te Kōhanga Reo} and \textit{Kura Kaupapa Māori} are clear examples of the emancipatory intent of \textit{Kaupapa Māori} theory. Graham Hingangaroa Smith takes this aspect of \textit{Kaupapa Māori} theory a step forward in drawing upon the theorising of Jurgen Habermas.\textsuperscript{107}

\textsuperscript{105} A clear indication of this came recently on a trip to Samoa. There I met with Maria Kerslake the Head of Department, Sociology, at the National University of Samoa. The Indigenous Pacific connections are evident. As Māori we have ancient links with Samoa. In our discussion about the development of Indigenous theories we were able to recognise the similarities and differences in our theorising and our context. For example, the state of the Indigenous languages and our experiences of colonisation are considerably different and therefore the centrality of \textit{te reo Māori} as located within \textit{Kaupapa Māori} theory is not necessarily the priority focus of theoretical developments that Maria is involved in. The process of conceptualisation of theory from a cultural base is however a clear meeting place and is one that we need to engage more fully with in terms of what is happening in the Pacific and with other Indigenous Peoples.

\textsuperscript{106} hooks, bell 1994 op.cit.

\textsuperscript{107} Smith, G.H. 1997 op.cit.
Graham argues for a need to include a utopian vision within the development of *Kaupapa Māori* theory, which serves to highlight the transformative potential of *Kaupapa Māori* theory.

**Kaupapa Māori theory and Critical theory**

Graham Hingangaroa Smith argues that *Kaupapa Māori* theory is a localised Critical Theory. More recently Kuni Jenkins has questioned the centrality of Critical Theory within *Kaupapa Māori* theoretical discussions and asserts that where Critical Theory is useful, it does not form a basis for *Kaupapa Māori* theory. Both these discussions promote a need to assess the relationship between *Kaupapa Māori* theory and Critical Theory, which in turn raises the wider issue of the role of Western theory in theorising Māori experiences. My approach to this dialogue is to view Critical Theory and *Kaupapa Māori* theory as two quite separate entities. *Kaupapa Māori* theory does not depend on Critical Theory for its existence just as Critical Theory does not depend on *Kaupapa Māori* theory for its existence. *Kaupapa Māori* theory is founded in this land, Aotearoa. Critical Theory is founded in Europe. *Kaupapa Māori* theory is driven by whānau, hapū, iwi, Māori understandings. Critical Theory is driven by European sourced philosophies and understandings. They are without doubt distinct theoretical forms. However, they are able to inform and support each other, and this has clearly been the case. In taking a middle ground I would argue that that any Western analysis drawn upon alongside *Kaupapa Māori* theory needs to be located in a role of what Taina Pohatu refers to as ‘hoā mahi’, that is a friend that works alongside and that the defining parameters of that relationship are negotiated from a *Kaupapa Māori* framework.

My argument for a *hoā mahi* relationship with Western theory is based upon the idea that radical Western theories can be drawn upon by Indigenous Peoples to engage colonialism. This is seen in the fact that forms of Critical Theory has heavily influenced a range of radical Māori critiques of the oppression of Māori people. Marxism for example provides a critique of capitalism and modes of production and has established a foundation for many forms of sociology to build upon. The centre of Marxist analysis may be identified as issues of class struggle and in particular control of the mode of production and the implications for the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the ruling classes and the working classes. From this centre Marxist analysis is then expanded, reinterpreted, ‘neo’-ised (that is becomes various forms of ‘neo-marxist’ analysis), or certain aspects of Marx’s work is coopted into other frameworks that may include other issues at their centre. One powerful example of this can be
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seen in the work of Angela Davis.\textsuperscript{111} As a Black woman, activist Angela Davis advocates analysis that is expansive, that has no boundaries in terms of challenging oppression. She calls for analysis that engages capitalism, patriarchy, racism, homophobia, ageism, and notes that we must challenge all forms of oppressive structures.

However, as it has been argued in Chapter two we need to be both aware of and wary of the potential of Western theories as yet another form of oppression. It is not enough to locate analysis of Māori issues within a Western framework, as Western frameworks are not able to engage Kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori. For example, Kuni Jenkins in her call for a construction of history whereby Māori are active participants rather than passive receivers of oppression, argues that Marxist analyses continue to cast Māori as victims and Pākehā as actors.\textsuperscript{112} Kuni posits that such approaches nullify Māori voices and that the possibilities for Māori become defined by dominant sociological explanations. This is very much the case in education. Māori experiences of the education system have, on the whole, been located within dominant theoretical frameworks. Māori voices have been marginalised as policy developments are constructed upon other peoples understandings of our experiences and needs.\textsuperscript{113}

The inadequacy of some academics and researchers to provide more full explanations for issues related to Māori Education, has led to calls for theorising that is more complex and which includes both a structuralist and a culturalist element.\textsuperscript{114} Graham Hingangaroa Smith asserts a need for Māori analysis to include both structuralist explanations, that is an analysis of social and economic structures and their role in the production and reproduction of social conditions and social relations, and culturalist explanations, including the everyday lived reality of people and how they engage and make sense of the social arrangements within which they are located.\textsuperscript{115} Critical theory can provide both structuralist and culturalist explanations. As with other theories there is not one Critical theory that could be said to be used in a wholesale way, rather various explanations are drawn from a range of theorists who locate themselves under the umbrella of Critical theory. Perhaps this is what has drawn Māori educationalists to use Critical theory, or more appropriately Critical theories, in their work. Critical Theory is intrinsically global and historical looking to the big picture in particular

\textsuperscript{111} Davis, Angela Y., 1984 Women Culture and Politics, The Women’s Press Ltd. London
\textsuperscript{112} Jenkins, K. 2001 op.cit.
\textsuperscript{114} The most recent example of this appears in the work of Chapple, S. et.al 1997 op.cit.
constructions of capitalism and potential transformation to socialism, however its proponents have avoided economic reductionism by seeking to link economic structures with politics, culture, psychic and an idea of relative autonomy of the superstructure.\textsuperscript{116} The link between these areas is the basis of the notion of ‘mediated totality’, which Kellner explains as

a theory... which described various relations between spheres of reality, rather than reducing all society to the dynamics of the economy.\textsuperscript{117}

As a Māori woman academic I have drawn upon Critical Theory alongside Kaupapa Māori theorising. What has become evident through the process of this thesis is that like Kaupapa Māori theory, Critical Theory is grounded within particular cultural, social and political foundations. The literature outlining the history of the Frankfurt School highlights a range of political engagement by its members, it also highlights the point that exponents of Critical Theory do so from a base of their own worldviews, understandings and cultural, social and political context.\textsuperscript{118} Members of the Frankfurt School draw upon a range of both historical and contemporary Western philosophers as the basis for arguing their theoretical positions, which indicates the importance of cultural context in the development of theoretical frameworks. This is an important point in the recognition of theory as culturally and socially produced. Kellner identifies this as a strength of Critical Theory, in that the preoccupation with theory then necessarily brings a need for critical reflection on the role social theories, as social practices, in the reproduction of dominance.\textsuperscript{119} Furthermore, he argues that where traditional theory that is not aware of its origins in social practice that can reproduce dominance, Critical Theory is conscious of that potential and therefore strives toward transformation.

There is an idea that theory/ies are a part of the way in which we interact with the world. This idea arose from a belief that theory and practice are inseparable. That the interactions that we have within society are each informed by theory. Practices is informed by and informs theory. Paolo Freire articulates this relationship as being one of ‘dialectical unity’.\textsuperscript{120} Dialectical Unity, in Freirean terms, asserts both a relationship and a distance between theory and practice. When looking at the relationship between theory and peoples lived realities the idea that theory and practice are indivisible and must be viewed in a dialectical relationship is useful for Māori. It is seen as both necessary and
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critical to creating change. Māori do not have, and never have had, the luxury of theorising for the sake of theorising. The impact of colonisation has meant that by necessity theory and practice must be continually informing each other. Recently Andrew Vercoe has reminded us that Māori academics do not have the privilege of spending our time in an ivory tower mentality but that we must be actively involved in the developments within our communities.\textsuperscript{121}

Critical Theory positions theory and practice as being in relationship. What this does is that it places theory up front and therefore challenges the idea the practice alone is neutral. To challenge a common-sense notion that we merely ‘do’ because that’s ‘what we do’ and to acknowledge the role of theory in shaping our actions means that dominant group actions can not be located as merely the ‘way that it’s done’ but that they are grounded in certain theoretical world views. Henry Giroux argues that central to the work of the Frankfurt School is to examine the degree to which domination extends in everyday life. He notes that what Critical theory offers educational theorists is both method of critique and a language of opposition.\textsuperscript{122} As Henri Giroux has commented:

Theory must be celebrated for its truth content, not for the methodological refinements it employs ... theory is informed by practice; but its real value lies in its ability to provide the reflexivity needed to interpret the concrete experience.\textsuperscript{123}

In the introduction to Theodor Adorno’s ‘The Jargon of Authenticity’ Trent Schroyer\textsuperscript{24} privileges the focus of Critical Theory in revealing those actions that have been reified within society to the extent that unequal power relationships are hidden in the misrepresentation of social relations. Furthermore, locating Critical Theory within the paradigm of the class struggle appropriately identifies the neomarxist origins of Critical Theory. However, in their move beyond an economic determinism the Frankfurt School provide in the theoretical framework possibilities for use that extend further.\textsuperscript{125} The call to reconcile people with their historical possibilities is inherently a call for emancipatory outcomes, an aspect that is key in Critical Theory. This is further supported by Henry Giroux who identifies Critical Theory as the theoretical legacy of the Frankfurt School, and notes that whilst there is no one singular universal theory, all examine capitalism and domination, and seek to highlight notion of human emancipation.\textsuperscript{126} Critical Theory, moves beyond being purely a theoretical paradigm, as Giroux notes Critical Theory is both

a school of thought and a process of critique.\textsuperscript{127}
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Henry Giroux views Critical Theory as referring to the theoretical legacy of the Frankfurt School, noting also that where there is no one singular universal theory, all look at growth of capitalism and domination, and seek to reconstruct the notion of human emancipation. Kellner writes that in part the term Critical Theory was used as a means of masking the Marxist underpinnings of their work given an often hostile response to Marxism (as associated with socialism and the Soviet Union) in America. Critical Theory he argues involves a set of ways for looking at theory that involve investigative, research, textual and political practices. As such it provides a comprehensive theoretical development and a methodology for relating social research and theory to radical politics. As Henri Giroux has stated, one of the central values of Critical Theory is;

a commitment to penetrate the world of objective appearances and to expose the underlying social relationships they often conceal. In other words, penetrating such appearances meant exposing through critical analysis social relationships that took on the status of things or objects.

Kellner locates Critical Theory as ‘supradisciplinary’ challenging the notion of interdisciplinarity. He argues that the Critical Theory project included the working together of individuals from a range of disciplines to develop social theories. According to Kellner this process differs from one of interdisciplinary work which is described by Leo Lowenthal as maintaining existing disciplines whilst fostering an ‘acquaintance’ between them without any challenge to the fundamental boundaries that claim a self-sufficiency between disciplines. A supradisciplinary approach attacks the notion of separate disciplines and provides a critique of the divisions constructed between disciplines that prevent an integration of a range of disciplines. This is helpful for Kaupapa Māori theory in that it recognises the inter-relationship between disciplines in a way that affirms an approach that is not limited by disciplinary boundaries. Perhaps the clearest way to sum this up is through Martin Jay’s assertion that Critical Theory is essentially open-ended, probing and unfinished. An open-ended nature of analysis was important in that the changing historical context and social realities meant there was a need for the development of analyses that were different from earlier forms of traditional philosophies and which moved beyond the tendency of vulgar Marxists to elevate materialism to a theory of knowledge which claimed absolute certainty the way idealism had in the past.

It seems to me that what draws Māori academics to Critical Theory are the values, assumptions and
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characteristics which underpin the work. Henry Giroux highlights that one of the central values of Critical Theory is the commitment to

penetrate the world of objective appearances and to expose the underlying social relationships they often conceal.\(^\text{134}\)

This value is one that is imperative to a process of revealing ways in which social relationships are constructed. It assumes that in such construction there are subjective processes that are hidden by notions of objectivity. It is precisely these subjective processes that when revealed enable us to engage more fully with the social relationships that exist. For Māorí people who are working to both reveal the injustices, both of the past and the present, in this country and to bring about change the value of Critical Theory is most evident in Giroux's statement.

Rex Gibson\(^\text{135}\) highlights that where there are a number of major concepts that underpin the development of critical theory, key elements in the assertion of Critical Theory are the notions of emancipation and transformation. These notions assert an expectation of those who utilise Critical Theory, that they will be moved to action, to the development of some intervention or practice that is emancipatory and interrupts the structures of oppression. This indicates it is not enough to merely be a student of Critical Theory but that we must engage in practice in ways that challenge the inequalities and injustices that we theorise about. The participation of Critical theorists in acts of social changes does however vary. There is an assumption that because Critical Theory is a politicising theoretical framework then those who provided the foundations for Critical Theory must equally have been politically active. Where such a belief is understandable it is also idealistic. For example in Wiggershaus’s discussion of the institute Horkheimer is presented as having a depth analysis of the exploitation and oppression of the working classes, however he did not necessarily bring together the notions of theory and practice in terms of transformative action.\(^\text{136}\)

Furthermore, Kellner writes that Critical Theory is motivated by a need to construct theories that confront social and political issues, and therefore is informed by a critique of domination and also by theories of liberation.\(^\text{137}\) However, he writes that in regard to the Frankfurt School although they

\(^{134}\) Giroux, H. op.cit.:8
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\(^{136}\) Wiggershaus, R. 1994 op.cit.:134 noted The constant policy of the Institute under Horkheimer’s direction continued to be abstainence, not only from every activity which was even remotely political, but also from any collected or organized effort to publicize the situation in Germany or to support émigrés. In the 1970s Jürgen Habermas asked Herbert Marcuse, 'Did the Institute ever, let us say, take up a position in relation to the more strongly politically organized groups among the émigrés?' Marcuse replied, 'That was strictly forbidden. Horkheimer insisted from the start that we were the guests of Columbia University, philosophers and academics. Also in reference to Karl Wittfogel, one of those active in political movements, Martin Jay 1973 op.cit.:16 notes; His activism they found somewhat of an embarrassment: he was no less scornful of their political neutrality.
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called for a revolutionary transformation of society, they themselves became increasingly distanced from political struggles.  

Both Gibson and Coxon et al. stress the importance of emancipation noting that Critical Theory seeks not simply to describe or explain problems but provides tools for resolving them by enabling people to gain more control over their lives.

It is my view that a role of the Māori theorist is to support the movements for change in society, change that seeks to intervene in the growing 'underachievement' levels of Māori children and young people in both compulsory and non-compulsory sectors of education. Theory for Māori must ultimately provide frameworks for change, just as the idea of emancipation or transformation has a central role in critical theory. Critical Theory is then a framework that can work theoretically for Māori, given that it is located within the experiences and knowledge of Māori. Critical Theory is not in itself transformative for Māori, what provides the transformative potential is when Māori ourselves utilise Critical Theory as a tool for alongside our own tools. For Kaupapa Māori theory there is a potential for liaisons or collaborations with radical theories that engage the complexities of the impact of colonial imperialism, however those relationships need to be defined from a clear Māori theoretical base. Where Critical Theory provides values and intentions that are beneficial for Māori analysis, it is not in Kaupapa Māori terms able to engage our values and understandings for the specific reason that Critical Theory is itself grounded within its own cultural and political arrangements.

Just as Critical Theory exists in its own rights so too does Kaupapa Māori theory. Kaupapa Māori theory can and does exist without Critical Theory. That does not mean that Kaupapa Māori theory is not radical and political in its expression as it is. Kaupapa Māori theory must be about challenging injustice, revealing inequalities, seeking transformation. These are all aspects expressed within Critical Theory. They are also elements that have been expressed by our tūpuna throughout the struggle for our land, through the assertion of tino rangatiratanga, through the generations who have fought the Crown against continued colonial injustice, by those who have been visionary in the reclamation of our language and culture, and of all who continue to hold to the teachings of our tūpuna in spite of colonial oppression. These are acts that exist in our history, in our stories, in our struggles. They are acts that highlight Kaupapa Māori praxis, from which current expressions of Kaupapa Māori theory draw inspiration and definition. Given the ownership of the term 'Critical Theory' by predominantly Western theorists and theorising perhaps it is more apt to refer to Kaupapa Māori theory not as a localised Critical Theory but as a theoretical expression of our aspirations as
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Māori. Just as earlier in this chapter I argued that the term ‘theory’ has been useful in creating theoretical space for Māori, so too has Critical Theory had a role in opening theoretical grounds for more radical thinking, that has without doubt supported the articulation of both Kaupapa Māori theory and Kaupapa Māori research within the academy and beyond.

Summary
This Chapter has opened the discussion in regard to Kaupapa Māori theory. The key intention was to outline some of the broader philosophical context within which Kaupapa Māori theory needs, in my view, to be considered. What is important in this chapter is the understanding that Kaupapa Māori theory is founded within knowledge that derives from the learnings, experiences, understandings, worldviews, values and beliefs that are ancient. Those forms have been handed down through generations, and although disrupted and disregarded through colonial impositions they have survived to continue to inform how we are in the world. Kaupapa Māori theory is developed from a foundation of Kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori. Its base is firmly entrenched on this land, on Papatūānuku and that holds Kaupapa Māori theory as a distinctive framework. Theory is considered to hold possibilities from liberation however there is a wariness that remains in Māori communities as a result of the imposition of theories that have historically worked against how interests.

Within the academy Western theories have been privileged. Indigenous Peoples theoretical voices have been rarely heard let alone engaged with the same status as those of the West. This is not a surprise to Māori academics given the ongoing marginalisation of Māori knowledge. Māori knowledge has been under attack since the arrival of colonial settlers to our lands. Within the colonial education system Māori knowledge has been through processes that have denied the validity of our own knowledge and worldviews. Kaupapa Māori theory it is argued provides us with the potential to continue a tradition of thinking about, explaining and understanding our world that is not the domain of the colonising forces, but has been a part of Indigenous Peoples worlds since creation. Kaupapa Māori theory is a theoretical framework that is evolving. It is evolving from a base of being Māori, from whānau, hapū, iwi and from collective Māori movements. As a theoretical framework Kaupapa Māori theory is engaged in a site of struggle within the Academy. It struggles for the recognition, the validation and affirmation of our cultural worldviews as Māori. It asserts that we have always been researchers, have always engaged in theorising our lives, our experiences, our context. The organic and multiple nature of Kaupapa Māori theory is a powerful force in the future.

140 Coxen et. al., 1992 op.cit.
creation of a range of Kaupapa Māori theoretical expression. Theory itself is multiple, whether that be Māori theory or Western theory. Critical Theory is one expression of a radical change theory that has developed in the West. It too, however, is shown to be culturally bound and therefore the argument for Kaupapa Māori theory as a culturally defined and driven theory is not new.

Critical Theory is often utilised alongside Kaupapa Māori theory. It is a theoretical framework that engages injustice and seeks transformation through the interrelationship of theory and practice. The praxis orientation of Critical Theory is central to its use by Māori academics. Kaupapa Māori theory is however not dependent upon Critical Theory for its existence. Critical Theory has supported the creation of radical space within the Academy and in doing so has supported the growth of Kaupapa Māori theory. Where some argue for Kaupapa Māori theory as a localised Critical Theory while others argue that Kaupapa Māori theory can not and should not be seen as grounded in any Western framework, critical or otherwise. Whatever position is taken by Māori academics the role of Critical Theory in supporting the further prising open of theoretical space can not be disregarded, hence the inclusion of a discussion of Critical Theory in this chapter. This chapter has laid the broader foundation for an exploration of key elements that are expressed within current articulations of Kaupapa Māori theory that are outlined in the following chapter.