

Chapter Eleven

The Beginnings of *Taha Maori*

Introduction.

Prior to *Taha Maori* being incorporated into official discourse through the 1984 Review of the Core Curriculum, it was a term used by *Maori* in a number of different ways. It was also not the first term to be applied to those aspects of the curriculum which had a '*Maori* theme', nor did its 1984 introduction signal something which was not already in place in many schools. In this introduction I intend to discuss some contextual issues in order to situate *Taha Maori* as a formal curriculum item and *Kura Kaupapa Maori* as an alternative schooling initiative. Although referred to in previous sections, I will discuss the concept of '*Maori*' and its related concept of '*Maoritanga*'. I will also discuss the significance of the Hunn Report on *Maori* Affairs, 1960, in relation to shifts which occurred in state policies for *Maori*. This is linked in with a brief discussion of the demise of the Native/*Maori* school system and the mainstreaming of *Maori* children and of *Maori* education. As a point in passing, the period covered in this section is the post Second World War years to the present period. Much happened to *Maori* in this period and yet in many ways it is a forgotten period of *Maori* history. Metge's work is related to the urbanisation issues of *Maori* and there is emphasis on the changing economic situation of New Zealand after the war, but there is still work to be done in terms of *Maori* history from this period.¹ As with other sections of the thesis this will not be a chronological narrative of how and when this *Maori* topic or that *Maori* topic was included in the social studies, art or science curriculum. There are, in my view, much deeper questions which relate, for example, to the following issues; (i) the politics

¹ Metge, J., 1964. *A New Maori Migration: Rural and Urban Relations in Northern New Zealand*. London, University of London, Athlone Press.

and processes of selection, (ii) the implications for *Maori* notions of 'authenticity' when topics are deemed as worthy of selection, (iii) the ways in which innocent topics represent *Maori* in not so innocent ways.

In this section *Taha Maori* as a curriculum 'subject' is viewed as being in opposition to *Kaupapa Maori*. However, I begin by arguing that what is now called *Taha Maori* was once also positioned on the outside of the official curriculum and its appropriation by the state has implications for the legitimisation of *Kaupapa Maori*, that is the same process of appropriation could happen to *Kaupapa Maori* curricula. By using Bernstein's formulations on pedagogic discourse I show in chapter eleven how *Maori* knowledge can become appropriated or recontextualised into official discourse, which is dislocated from its roots in *Maori* world views.

What is the *Maori* in *Taha Maori*?

Lets turn now to a brief discussion of the term *Maori*. This term is central to the colonisation of *Maori*. Although an indigenous term which literally means 'normal or ordinary', it was used as a means of totalising and homogenising the *tangata whenua* in nineteenth century contacts between the aboriginal inhabitants of this land and Europeans. In the earliest of contacts we were called either natives or New Zealanders. There are several ways of regarding this naming process. It was a name that was coined by *Maori* and introduced into colonial discourse. If used in the sense of being 'normal', of belonging to the normal and ordinary people here in *Aotearoa*, then it was used to differentiate us from the other (Europeans/occidentals/*Pakeha*). If used in the sense of being an ordinary person without special rank or status, then it was used to differentiate the person concerned from *rangatira*, from *tohunga* or people of high status, as well as from *taurekareka* and other people of low status. In either sense, the shift from being in control of determining the norm, of defining the 'other' and of controlling who counts as a New Zealander, has been incredibly dramatic.

The significance in colonial policy of having a totalising 'idea' such as *Maori* was that policies could be framed and promulgated with a high degree of consistency. As Margaret Stewart-*Harawira* has argued, 'the question of who is, and who is not deemed to be a New

Zealand *Maori*, is one which has been used to define rights, ownership of land, entitlement to education and entitlement to cultural heritage'.² Until the 1940s both terms, *Maori* and Native, were in fact used in Government policies. There was still official recognition, however, that underneath the label of *Maori* there still existed *iwi* or tribal structures and *iwi* diversity. Specific policies need to be understood alongside the wider colonial agenda variously known as europeanisation, racial amalgamation, civilising, assimilating and modernising. This agenda was consistent with the larger project of imperialism, and was informed by particular views about race and notions of progress and development. 'Half-castes', for example, were sometimes specifically excluded from entitlements and rights to *Maori* policy provisions and sometimes included. Full *Maori* could also be reclassified as European by the Governor. Census data recorded *Maori* separately until 1951, and *Maori* were required to record the actual fraction of *Maori* blood they possessed in the census until the change of definition which occurred in 1976. One rationale for this was that the more diluted people were of their *Maori* 'blood', the more it signalled that they were becoming civilised and modern, and the less *Maori* they were. This was also linked to Social Darwinist ideas about the survival of the stronger, 'more superior' race and the need to intermingle with the stronger gene pool of Europeans.³ A third discourse was far more political and that was the alienation of *Maori* land. According to Stewart-Harawira, '*a primary agenda for the Settler Government was the Europeanisation of the Natives in order to facilitate access to Maori land. One effect of declaring persons who were less than half-caste Maori to be European, was that land held by such could be, and often was, deemed to be European land*'.⁴

The Post-War Shift from 'Native' to '*Maori*'.

The term 'Native' is still regarded by *Maori* as abhorrent because of the depth of negativity which is attached to this word. It was apparently in response to *Maori* that Peter Fraser, as

² Stewart-Harawira, M., 1993. 'Maori, Who owns the definition?', in *Te Pua*, v.2, pp.27-34.

³ Pool, I., 1977. *The Maori Population of New Zealand 1769-1971*. Auckland, Auckland University Press, Oxford University Press.

⁴ Stewart-Harawira, p.28.

Minister of Native Affairs and Prime Minister of a Labour Government, introduced legislation changing the name 'Native' to '*Maori*' in all Government affairs.⁵ This may also have had something to do with the crest of positive feelings which had been generated by *Maori* during the Second World War. The focus on development and advancement after the war appeared to favour the collectivising of *Maori* under the single label, although there were still *iwi* structures at work and 'tribal' committees being developed to enhance Government policies. Increasingly, however, there were other structures being asserted over the top of traditional *Maori* concepts of *whenua*/land and *rohe*/region. There were, for example, seven *Maori* Land Board Districts, each of which contained other subdivisions. The seven districts were arbitrary, conforming more to the needs of administration than to the ways *Maori* people saw themselves as geographic and *iwi* regions.⁶ There were policies to ease the resettlement of Returned Servicemen and social policies for housing, welfare support and employment. Many of these policies implicitly encouraged the movement of *Maori* people away from their *iwi* base and into urban subdivisions. This became a more explicit policy through the work of the Committee of *Maori* Education and Employment and through wider policies related to the economy and its requirements for a larger labour force.⁷ The 'urban drift' which was a popularised account of *Maori* moving into the cities was not so much a drift, aimless and self-driven as a deliberate policy of resettlement. This policy was facilitated by a wide range of social policies which made it difficult to build houses, for example, on communally owned land or get access to day secondary schools.⁸

By the 1950s most of the 'hard work' involved in colonising New Zealand and building a nation had been achieved.⁹ Most of the land had been legislated away from *Maori* control

⁵ Butterworth, G.V., H.R. Young, 1990. *Maori Affairs, A Department and the People Who Made It*. Wellington, Iwi Transition Agency, Government Print.

⁶ Such 'administrative' convenience or 'imagination' kept cutting across *Maori* ways of seeing and organising ourselves.

⁷ Barber, K., 1986. 'Employment and Race Relations Policy in New Zealand: A Critique', PhD. thesis, University of Auckland.

⁸ See Metge, 1964.

⁹ This 'hard work' included the alienation of *Maori* land, the marginalisation of *Maori* socially and economically.

and what land was left for *Maori* was being forced into economic use.¹⁰ More significantly perhaps the New Zealand economy had become much more diversified. More workers were needed particularly on the factory floor, in development projects such as the hydroelectric dams and in the processing industry. Fewer workers, conversely, were needed on the land, as farm management practices had also changed. Recruiting a labour force required an increase in the population. Whilst the *Pakeha* population had increased in natural terms, it was not at the rate which was required by the post-war economy. An aggressive immigration policy was proposed in order to make up the numbers of workers which could not be filled by natural increase.

The *Maori* population had also increased dramatically but, unlike the *Pakeha* population, *Maori* families remained large and the *Maori* population remained predominantly youthful and rurally based. This demographic distinction was seen as being particularly problematic. There had already been concern expressed in Britain and New Zealand during the 1940s at the apparent imminence of a stationary European population and a series of remedial measures such as family and marriage allowances, had been made to encourage reproduction and parenthood.¹¹ With the demands of the economy changing, however, *Maori* adults came to be seen as another source of workers and were actively encouraged, by a series of policies, to immigrate to urban areas where the jobs were located. Some *Maori* commentators have referred to this period as one of forced migration to be seen as simply another phase of land alienation.

Up until this period *Maori* communities had been marginalised in rural centres away from the 'public' view and *Pakeha* consciousness. At the end of the war, for example, three-quarters of the *Maori* population still lived in the country where there were few *Pakeha* and by the mid-1970s three-quarters of the *Maori* population lived in urban areas.¹² In reality, these 'rural' areas were tribal centres, the political and social domains of a *Maori* world-view.

¹⁰ *Maori Affairs Act, Part XXV, The Statutes of New Zealand, 1953, Wellington, Government Printer, pp.1251-1257.*

¹¹ Dunstall, G., 1981. 'The Social Pattern', in *Oxford History of New Zealand*. Wellington, Clarendon and Oxford University Press, pp.397-429, p.399.

¹² Dunstall, p.403.

Through urban migration these tribal areas were de-powered further by the loss of the middle and younger generation of people. This was one sure way of completely breaking up what was left of the *papakāinga* which early colonists had so fervently wished to destroy.

By the end of the 1950s the New Zealand economy entered a new phase of development. *Māori* people had been enticed, but not yet absorbed into the labour force, and with their larger families had created a demand for a new settlement in the way *Māori* Affairs were conducted, especially as it related to the delivery of social services such as housing, health and education. The colonial conditions by which race relations had previously been formulated and dealt to by *Pakeha* interests no longer existed. New myths had been forged by the war, new international trading links were being established, there was a significant increase in external immigration particularly from the Pacific Islands, and the indigenous minority had become more visible. This context stimulated the testing of the relations of race, or more specifically, of the relations between *Māori* and *Pakeha*. By the mid 1950s a crisis in race relations was being predicted as the outcome of the change in the conditions and the location of *Māori* people. As in the past, this crisis was defined by dominant *Pakeha* interests as a set of problems caused by the continuing '*Māori* problem'.

The Hunn Report: Reformulating Race Relations Policy for *Māori*.

The 1960 Hunn Report on the Department of *Māori* Affairs can be viewed as a Government response to reformulate New Zealand's race relations and to legitimate a new set of ideologies on race. These ideologies hinged on the shift in policy from one of assimilation of *Māori* people to the policy of integration. However, this new policy was one which was very much *for Māori* people as defined by the state, it was a new way of constructing *Māori* people as a politically and economically controllable group. The terms of reference for this report called for 'a new look from every angle' and a stocktaking of the affairs pertaining to *Māori* people. This was no doubt a way of meeting the challenge of a *Māori* population expansion and of *Māori* migration to urban centres. It has also been argued, by Barber, that forced or encouraged migration to urban areas was a way of legitimating the integration of *Māori*

labour more effectively into New Zealand's developing capitalist economy.¹³

Although *Maori* education had long since been administered through the Department of Education, the Hunn Report made a number of recommendations on *Maori* education and posited the notion that 'school is the nursery of integration'. The natural evolution of integration was viewed as the most ideal option for New Zealand and was seen in highly moralistic terms as a 'lesson (to) South Africa'.¹⁴ The report attempted to define integration in simple terms as the combination, but not fusion, of *Maori* and *Pakeha* elements to form one nation wherein *Maori* culture remains distinct.¹⁵ However, this definition was complicated by an expressed belief that policies can not, and indeed should not intervene in an evolutionary process.

Education thus remained a critical element of policies directed at *Maori*. It remained also the most significant long-term solution to the '*Maori* problem' and was portrayed as the main access to modernity, employment and general economic well-being. The Hunn Report signalled an end to what was seen as separate, and therefore segregated, development of *Maori* people. The urbanisation of *Maori* people was viewed as an evolutionary or natural way of 'avoiding a 'colour' problem from arising', and rural living was marginalised by its definition in the report as 'rural segregation'.¹⁶ The *Maori* educational crisis of 1959-1960 was defined by the Hunn Report in terms of a 'statistical black-out' of *Maori* students in post-compulsory schooling. This was, for the main, put down to parental apathy, *Maori* indifference and *Maori* people 'debaring themselves of their own volition'.¹⁷

¹³ Barber, p.35. Barber argues that the racial policy of 'integration' was linked to the 'integration of *Maori* into New Zealand's industrial development'.

¹⁴ Hunn, J.K., 1960, The Report on the Department of *Maori* Affairs, Wellington, Government Print.

¹⁵ Hunn, p.15.

¹⁶ Hunn, p.14.

¹⁷ Hunn, pp.22-25.

The Hunn Report and the End of Native/*Maori* schools.

In this reformulation of *Maori* Affairs policy, what chance then was there for *Maori* Schools? Up until this period these schools had existed in predominantly rural areas and had been established to fulfil the policies of a crisis of another kind. The Hunn Report had noted that what now remained of *Maori* culture after 'the onset of civilisation was only the fittest elements (worthiest of preservation), the chief relics of which were language, arts and crafts and the institutions of the *marae*'.¹⁸ The report announces the completion of assimilation as an active policy, but does not discard it as the ultimate outcome of further trends and evolutionary developments. Urbanisation was regarded as the instrument which would assist in the gradual 'passing away' of the *Maori* Schools.

Quite clearly, the Hunn Report was not the first or only report to call for the merging of *Maori* Schools into the mainstream. Department of Education policy in the mid-fifties was becoming more explicit about the desirability for the *Maori* Schools to change over. This was seen as part of a need to reframe *Maori* educational policy, especially as the majority of *Maori* children were located in schools under education board control. By 1955 it was stated as policy that new *Maori* Schools were being established only in exceptional circumstances.¹⁹ The Committee on *Maori* Education (NACME), chaired by D.G. Ball, recommended in 1956 that it was not beneficial to have a Board school and a *Maori* school in the same community. It also stated that the basic educational needs of *Maori* and *Pakeha* were identical.²⁰

Whilst bureaucrats began to talk about and prepare for the disappearance of *Maori* Schools, the communities in which these schools were located did not necessarily share that same view. The Committee (NACME) had noted in 1956 that the 'general feeling of the *Maori* people (was) that the time is not yet opportune for any full-scale abolition of *Maori*

¹⁸ Hunn, p.15.

¹⁹ Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives, 1955, E-1.

²⁰ Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives, 1956, E-1.

Schools'.²¹ The committee also suggested that criteria needed to be established before the *Maori* Schools could be handed over. *Maori* Schools had become not just schools but *our* schools for *Maori* communities. The early intention of having native school teachers become the authorities for a range of non-educational activities had led to expectations that the school, through its teachers, would become a central institution of a village. This administrative function could not be replaced so easily. Native School teachers had come to be perceived as being somewhat sympathetic to *Maori* people, even if they were patronising and in some cases vicious in the delivery of corporal punishment. *Maori* people had been trained in slowly increasing numbers through the 1940s and were teaching in the schools through the 1950s. The curriculum had also been gradually changed to allow for the teaching of selected aspects of *Maori* culture such as the 'relics' named in the Hunn Report.

In 1957 there were 160 *Maori* Schools with 13,084 pupils of whom 11,990 were *Maori*.²² Many schools had simply gone out of existence as people moved away from the district. Where some *Maori* communities had actually expanded, such as in *Murupara* with the expansion of the timber industry, a second school which was under board control was sometimes requested. Although this was often stimulated by *Pakeha* parents, it is also clear that *Maori* parents were also beginning to see a distinction between *Maori* Schools and *Pakeha* schools. *Maori* Schools were associated with things *Maori* and these were seen by many *Maori* people themselves as being inferior and a disadvantage. Other parents saw the move to Board Schools as a sell-out, and the beginnings of a struggle within *Maori* families over what counted as appropriate schooling for *Maori* children became manifested in debates about the local school.

The Hunn Report acknowledges this latter viewpoint but appears to characterise the people with this more resistant perspective as, '*Group C: another minority complacently living a backward life in primitive conditions*'. The intention of policy, according to the report, was to 'eliminate Group C'. The report goes on to exhort those, '*Maori who resent the pressure brought to bear on them to conform to what they regard as the pakeha mode of life (that) it*

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² '*Native*' or '*Maori*' Schools had always been available for *Pakeha* children who lived in the area.

is not in fact, a *pakeha* but a modern way of life, common to advanced people'.²³

There are many contradictions in the way in which *Maori* Schools were viewed by *Maori*. School experiences have been so powerful in determining identity that they have formed a cathartic core of the literature written by various *Maori* writers since the 1950s. In the words of one fiction writer Arapera Blank:

*Yes. When I was being educated my parents were proud of me. I liked them. I liked being at school. I was a missionary in embryo too. A kind of ambassador for my race. All the Rs (you realise there are four) were hammered into me. The teachers fashioned me and formed me. Like that man who breathed life into statue after he fashioned it. I was allowed to keep my *Maori* leg-- the attractive part of it-- action songs, the *haka* and how to write in my own tongue. They said that's what *maoritanga* was. It's no wonder that my *Maori* leg is rather clumsy.*²⁴

The power the schools had to fashion and form, and ultimately to distort, *Maori* social and political relations was recognised by *Maori* parents even as they were sending their children to school. By the 1950s the practice of punishing children for speaking *Maori* had almost ceased, but then *Maori* parents had helped to prevent that from happening by actively discouraging their children from learning to speak *Maori*. As Richard Benton's research on *Maori* language in the mid seventies was to uncover, the language had been virtually wiped out in some areas, particularly those areas close to urban centres.²⁵ The most resistant areas in terms of *Maori* language were in the far North, the Bay of Plenty and on the East Coast. These became the pockets of communities who were later able to move into bilingual schooling by being able to prove that *Maori* language was still a community language.

In 1958 the school committees of *Maori* Schools were brought in line with other school

²³ Hunn, p.16.

²⁴ Blank, A., 1968. 'One Two Three Four Five', in *Maori People in the 1960s*. ed. E. Schwimmer, Auckland, Blackwood & Janet Paul, pp.85-96, p.94.

²⁵ Benton, R.A., 1978. *Can the Maori Language Survive?* Wellington, New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

committees through the Education Amendment Act 1957. In the Ministerial report it was considered that the new, 'status of the committees was a further recognition of the ability of the *Maori* people to shoulder the full responsibilities of New Zealand citizens'. However, it was also stated that, 'in some districts it was necessary to allay suspicion that the change in the status of the committees was merely the first step towards handing the *Maori* Schools to board control'.²⁶ The constant reference by officials to *Maori* concerns about their schools, and their apparent sensitivity to this message, did not hinder the relentless move towards wresting these schools away from the control of the *Maori* division of the Department of Education and of the communities themselves.

The struggle to maintain the local school as a *Maori* school was seen by many local communities as a struggle over the very relationship of the particular *whanau* or *hapu* with the land on which their school stood. This land had been donated, often by significant local *tipuna* for the establishment of the school. *Maori* people had become astute in reading the signals of further land alienation, and moves to simply transfer schools to Education Boards was viewed in the same light as moves to consolidate land titles, bring idle lands under control or vest increasing powers in the *Maori* Trustee. The relationship in policy between *Maori* land dealings and *Maori* education had been well learned by *Maori*, and so schooling policy was not seen simply as part of an education grand plan. It was and continues to be, part of the policies related to all things *Maori*.²⁷

Maori Schools had also come to be seen as the only hope for *Maori* cultural survival. The support from the *Maori* division of the Department of Education for *Maori* programmes and the increasing number of *Maori* teachers in the service meant that some *Maori* curriculum content could be sustained. The Department itself had produced booklets and readings on *Maori* topics. One of the first texts for teaching *Maori* language to primary school children was produced in the late 1950s. Links between the various *hapu* in which a school was located and other links between teachers and sporting groups, contributed to a consciousness

²⁶ *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives, 1959, E-1.*

²⁷ *For example, Maori education continues to be part of the briefs and strategic plans of both the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Maori Development.*

that the *Maori* Schools system was a system based on a lived reality, and not just an administrative or policy driven convenience. Furthermore, it was a system in which generations of children were still being taught. The significance of genealogical descent and its relationship to the institutions of a particular area and the *tipuna* who had founded the school helped form a strong emotional attachment to the schools. It was one thing for a school to come to an end because there were no longer children to attend, it was quite another thing for the school to be coveted by an external bureaucracy who had no track record with the people.

The Hunn Report and the Imposed Internal Migration of *Maori* to Urban Centres.

The Hunn Report suggested that the move of *Maori* children into Board Schools would 'result in a swing of the *Maori* education problem from *Maori* Schools to schools under Board control'. This shift was seen as presenting a set of problems for teachers in Board Schools who had not been especially equipped to deal with, let alone teach *Maori* children. The *Maori* Schools had come to be recognised as a potential source of knowledge and expertise for dealing with *Maori* children. As mentioned earlier, the move by *Maori* workers into towns and cities had not only depopulated a rural area, it had also shaken the human resource base of an *iwi*. Very few *iwi* were located close enough to urban centres to be able to commute. It was expected that those who remained at home would maintain the traditions of the *iwi*. The children of this migration were enrolled in Board Schools which had little in the way of *Maori* curriculum content.

Changes in housing policies had led to the development of low cost housing suburbs and the rise of suburbs such as *Otara* and *Porirua*. It was into suburbs such as these that *Maori* people migrated. Although many started out in the city by staying initially with relatives, the move to the city was also a move away from the full range of *whanau* support.²⁸ This included formal and informal, individual and institutional levels of support. The rising social problems caused by poverty, frustration, a youthful population and poorly resourced housing areas created the conditions for a series of social problems. This led to the creation of newer

²⁸ Metge, 1964.

forms of social organisation; the urban *Marae*, sports clubs and *Maori* organisations which had a pan-*Maori* emphasis such as the RSA, church missions and the *Maori* Womens' Welfare League.²⁹ *Iwi* structures, in many instances, were confined to the activities of government defined Tribal Trust Boards and the work of tribal and *marae* committees.³⁰

The *Maori* school was viewed nostalgically by many of these city people as an institution associated with 'home'. However, like the *marae*, the village schools became bereft of community energy. The shifting focus in the 1960s away from *Maori* Schools to Education Board Schools, which had significant *Maori* numbers, to *Maori* preschool activity, to *Maori* trade training and secondary schooling, took parents, mostly the mothers, into the playcentre movement or into supporting children at secondary schooling or in their hostel accommodation in the big cities.³¹ This refocusing of attention was actively supported by the *Maori* Education Foundation, which had been set up as a recommendation of the Hunn Report. Scholarships were given in increasing numbers to secondary and tertiary students.

The Currie Commission on Education, 1962, had added yet another nail in the coffin of the *Maori* Schools by recommending that 'every endeavour be made to complete the transfer of *Maori* Schools to the control of Education Boards within a period of ten years'.³² The Currie Commission actually visited some thirty four *Maori* Schools in the course of its travels. It was disappointed that there was such a slow transfer rate.³³ In the same year the first report of the *Maori* Education Foundation had also noted that there was, 'increased interest among

²⁹ Metge, J., 1976. *The Maoris of New Zealand*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp.151-200.

³⁰ Not all *iwi* had Trustboards as many Trustboards had been created with compensation money. Trustboards are governed by the Trustboards Act.

³¹ Pre-school education for *Maori* at this time was largely an outcome of the emphasis on deficit theory (requiring compensatory education). See McDonald, G., 1973. *Maori Mothers and Pre-School Education*. Wellington, New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

³² Currie, G.A., 1962 *Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand*, (The Currie Report), Wellington, Government Printer.

³³ Openshaw, R., G. Lee, H. Lee, 1993. *Challenging the Myths, Rethinking New Zealand's Educational History*. Palmerston North, Dunmore Press. Openshaw et al., analysing data gathered by Ramsay, show that less than half of the *Maori* Schools which did transfer over to the Education Board did so 'as a direct result of agreement between the *Maori* people and the Department'. Most of the schools were forced into consolidation. p.76.

Maori people to the transfer of schools and noted that there was a distinctly more favourable attitude towards the change'.³⁴

Although the *marae* is the traditional site of *Maori* political life the issues which concerned *Maori* people, the contexts in which these issues arose, the venues in which they were discussed, and the medium and mode of the debate had begun to reflect the urban shift. Community centres, Church halls and private homes became the city substitute for *marae* until the later development of urban *marae*. Some of these venues had been established by earlier generations of city migrants, such as the *Maori* Community Centre in Freeman's Bay and *Ngati Poneke* in Wellington. The advent of *Maori* political affiliations which were based in urban centres saw the initiative of *Maori* politics emerge from a younger and generally more schooled group of people.

The *Maori* Leadership Conferences, convened in 1959, assembled a younger generation of *Maori* to debate a wide range of issues. These and other 'pan-*Maori*' fora took up education as a central concern, and the topic of education was critically discussed throughout this period. While land issues still absorbed *Maori* attention, educational and other social issues were becoming much more dominant in *Maori* political life as the significant sites of cultural and political struggle. *Maori* schools which had initially been established as key sites for cultural domination in the nineteenth century, had by this time become a significant but marginal and diminishing site for *Maori* cultural survival. The political site of struggle, however, its raw edge in particular, had been transferred to schools in which *Maori* children were not only a minority but were also not the *only* ethnic minority. They were immigrants in their own land sharing a space with other migrant groups. The struggle for *rangatiratanga* which slowly unfolded became one of a number of competing race relations projects.

The gains previously made in the Native Schools, especially in the area of curriculum and in the degree to which the community had some autonomy in schooling, were of no consequence in the wider system. Teachers who had gained experience and some sensitivity through teaching experience in *Maori* schools were a minority within the teaching profession itself,

³⁴ *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives, 1962, E-1.*

and often the city born *Maori* children they encountered were a quite different kettle of fish from the rural children they had previously taught. The paternalistic relationships on which the *Maori* Schools system was founded did not apply in the urban context. This different relationship unlocked both the schools and also the families whose children went to those schools, from the historically and structurally determined arrangement of participation, obligation and responsibility which small villages had vested in their local *Maori* school. Issues of truancy, vandalism and lack of respect for authority and property were renewed as manifestations of *Maori* educational under-development.

By 1969 *Maori* Schools had all been transferred to the control of various Education Boards. This meant, at one level, the merging of the old *Maori* Division of the Department of Education into the existing structure of the Department.³⁵ *Maori* Schools, which were still part of active communities, continued much as before. What was it then that had changed? What had been lost or gained by the process? What was lost consciously by some communities was a system of *Maori* education which had been institutionalised and which had come to be seen as belonging to specific *Maori* communities, despite its early history. What was seen to have been gained was real equality and a fully integrated society. This ideology was powerful enough at this time to legitimate the on-going cost to *Maori* of glaring injustices and of continuing cultural erosion. It also legitimated further assimilatory patterns in the way *Maori* educational policy was formulated and carried out.

The transfer of *Maori* Schools has frequently been portrayed, either as the natural consequence of modernity for *Maori*, or as a conscious move by *Maori* to better themselves. Their demise has been linked quite clearly to the rapid urbanisation of *Maori* people in the post-war years. The notion of 'urban-drift' conceals the role played by policy makers and the changes in economic development which were pursued by the state. Shuker, for example, talks about the *Maori* population 'transferring itself' to urban areas.³⁶ *Maori* people have

³⁵ Although a *Maori* Schools Officer was appointed to advise on *Maori* and Island education. This position became a Director of *Maori* and Island Education before being restructured into oblivion under the 1989 Education Amendment Act.

³⁶ Shuker, R., 1987. *The One Best System? A Revisionist History of New Zealand Schooling*. Palmerston North, Dunmore Press, p.199.

reacted to this as a convenient ideology for blaming the victims of poor urban planning and short-sighted economic development. The reluctance of *Maori* people to hand over their schools was obvious and was acknowledged by the policy makers involved. However, that did not stop these committees and key individuals from making the necessary preparations to facilitate the changeover as efficiently as possible.

The Hunn Report's significance in this process was that it set in place a new ideological framework which made the very idea of a *Maori* School system abhorrent. This, and the rural isolation of these schools, helped to put the supporters of *Maori* Schools "out of step" with the rest of *Maoridom*. The importance of these communities as the 'keepers of the homefires' (*ahi kaa*) and the *kaitiaki* (guardians) of tribal knowledge was diminished in terms of *Pakeha*-defined, *Maori* political reality. The '*Maori* people' were in urban centres and as predicted by the Hunn Report the '*Maori* problem' had moved with them. Put from a *Maori* perspective the problems the *Pakeha* state had with *Maori* people had shifted and multiplied, and this meant that a new discourse of race relations policy needed to be formulated.

Like the former discourse of assimilation, *Maori* educational policy assumed that *Maori* educational needs could be disconnected from *Maori* aspirations and *Maori* cultural capital and could be met by filling in the gaps left by a disadvantaged childhood or homelife. The state, through both the Departments of Education and *Maori* Affairs, continued to play a paternalistic role in determining the direction of *Maori* development. The *Maori* Schools were no longer considered by these paternalistic authorities as a valid or desirable focus for *Maori* educational policy. They were transferred, consolidated or closed despite the reluctance and resistance of *Maori* communities.

Reframing Ourselves as *Maori*: the Possibilities and Limits of *Maoritanga*.

In summary then, the term '*Maori*' was about 'a single people', dislocated from ancient and outmoded social systems, increasingly disconnected from their lands and identities, living literally on the margins of New Zealand, a potential labour force who could be moved, settled and manipulated as part of a grander narrative. There were different sorts of consequences for the extent of the dislocation which occurred in *Maori* society. One was the development of

'concerns' about *Maori*, manifested in the psychologising of the impact of acculturation, and the development of pathologies which explained our attempts to survive, as *Maori*, in the world being constructed for us, a world which was dehumanising. The other rested in the attempts by *Maori* to remain as *Maori* as possible in the circumstances, that is, a struggle for our humanity or *rangatiratanga*. What had to be retrieved and shaped in this context by *Maori* people was a notion of '*Maoritanga*', or a permissible, manageable and generic *Maori* culture. These two tendencies are interwoven into the curriculum through the development of *Maoritanga*.

Maoritanga.

In educational policy, the notion of *Maoritanga* is framed by the official ending of assimilation as an explicit state policy for *Maori* and the beginnings of the policy of integration. The report which signalled this shift was the Hunn Report on *Maori* Affairs. In this report the purpose of integration was, 'to combine (not fuse) the *Maori* and *Pakeha* elements to form one nation wherein *Maori* culture remains distinct'.³⁷ It has been argued, however, that while assimilation seemed to have been put an end to 'officially', much of its intent was continued under the guise of integration. In schooling this was justified in terms of the 'problems' associated with the *Maori* child. Educational research had by now been able to name these problems and develop a pathology of *Maori*, a 'cycle of cultural deprivation'.³⁸ *Maoritanga* was incorporated into the school curriculum as a response to compensatory education, a way of fitting *Maori* children into the system, so that they felt comfortable, and then intervening in their educational deficiencies. These deficiencies could be listed, some of these for, example, were identified as:

- (i) cultural identity crisis
- (ii) maternal rejection
- (iii) extrinsic motivation

³⁷ Hunn, p.15.

³⁸ See Forster, J., P. Ramsay, 1969. 'The *Maori* Population 1936-1966', in *Social Processes in New Zealand*. ed. J. Forster, Auckland, Longman Paul.

- (iv) 'Maori-English'
- (v) sibling upbringing
- (vi) poor parenting

One study connected to the *Rakau* Study tested Maori children on twenty separate variables using the Rorschach and the Thematic Apperception Test (T.A.T.).³⁹ These variables were; *indulgence, rejection, threat orientation, love needs, non-involvement, anxiety, mild extraversion, aggression, hostility, depression, sexuality, achievement, conformity, passivity, intellectual limitation, perceptual limitation, practicalness, control, orientation, sex differences.* Maori adolescents in the '*Rakau*' community were administered these two tests, the results of which supported in general the hypotheses posed by the researcher that compared to *Pakeha* adolescents, Maori adolescents were 'deficient'. A further examination of the hypotheses and the categories tested indicate more than the 'context of the times' approach to research. They also show the extent to which Maori participated in experimental systems of psychology which were fixated on science at the expense of common sense, for example, what sense is there in the category of 'mild extraversion'?

One of these 'deficiencies', as reported by Schwimmer, was in relation to the 'confusion of identity' suffered by Maori children.⁴⁰ He argues that the 1962 Commission of Education took as a basic premise that the education of Maori children required a 'double task'. This required that 'the Maori pupil has the same body of learning to master as the non-Maori. But such elements of his Maori background must be included in his schooling as will give him still the sense of belonging to a race of known and respected culture'.⁴¹ The inclusion of 'selected' Maori topics in the school curriculum, according to Schwimmer, was supposed to provide Maori children with some opportunities for the child to do something he or she 'was good at', given the official belief that they were not good at 'real' educational activities. It was also supposed to affirm, from time to time, the group focus of Maori children, and

³⁹ Mulligan, G., 1976. '*Maori Adolescence in Rakau*', in *Adolescence in New Zealand* ed. R.A.C. Stewart, Auckland, Heinemann Educational Books, pp.82-86.

⁴⁰ Schwimmer, E., 1973. '*Maori Schooling and Confusion of Identity*', in *Polynesian and Pakeha in New Zealand Education*. eds. D. Bray, C. Hill, Auckland, Heinemann, pp.75-95.

⁴¹ Cited in Schwimmer, p.75.

thirdly to improve self-discipline by developing more positive attitudes towards education.

Those aspects of *Maori* culture deemed to be acceptable for inclusion in the curriculum at this time fell mostly into arts and crafts field, performing of action songs and *haka* and some 'history' topics relating to the 'coming of the *Maori*' (or how *Maori* people came here and then how *Tasman* and *Cook* 'discovered' us), the '*Maori* wars' (or how we started and caused the wars by being unfriendly and being rebels) and 'famous/infamous *Maori* people' (usually the ones who helped and supported *Pakeha* with a few rebels, 'infamous *Maori*' included). School texts and bulletins supported this programme and *Maori* Advisors were also employed to give support to schools. Also by the 1960s there were a number of *Maori* teachers in the school system.⁴²

Maoritanga and Biculturalism.

Maoritanga generated its own literature, academic and imaginative. *Maori* writers writing either in English or *Maori* were published.⁴³ Academic writing focused increasingly on issues arising out of urbanisation and the loss of culture. The concept of 'biculturalism' recast, in a positive mode, what modern *Maori* culture meant for *Maori*. In fact, any notion of biculturalism would not be possible without reducing the importance to *Maori* of *iwi* identities.⁴⁴ There are two separate strands in the way biculturalism is defined and posited as social policy. One strand emerged from *Maori* people articulating what *being Maori* in a colonised society means, what it 'felt' like. What it might mean to 'fuse' two cultures together had already been addressed by previous *Maori* 'leaders' such as *Apirana Ngata*. His poem is the most well known articulation of what *Maori* needed to do to retain their '*taha*'

⁴² From this era for example, have come some of New Zealand's foremost *Maori* artists, writers, art educators and art administrators; *Arapera* Blank, *Selwyn Muru*, *Para Matchitt*, *Cliff Whiting*, *Selwyn Muru*, *Katarina Mataira*, *S.M.Mead*, *Arnold Wilson*.

⁴³ For example, *Te Ao Hou* (*The New World*) was a *Maori* magazine which provided a forum for publishing work by *Maori* authors, many of whom became very well known outside the *Maori* world. It also published news and discussions about *Maori* issues. It was bilingual in its presentation. *Te Ao Hou* was published by the Department of *Maori* Affairs for the *Maori* Purposes Fund Board.

⁴⁴ For example, when I talk about being bicultural I usually mean that I come from two different *iwi* which prescribe different ways of behaving, which situate me in different sorts of relationships, have different histories, have different landscapes!

Maori while taking hold also of the '*taha*' *Pakeha*:

E tipu e rea mo nga ra o te ao,

Grow up O tender child in the days of your world,

Ko to ringa ki nga rakau a te Pakeha,

(In) Your hand, the tools of the Pakeha,

Hei ora mo to tinana.

For your well-being.

Ko to ngakau ki nga taonga a o tipuna Maori,

(In) Your heart the treasures of your ancestors,

Hei tikitiki mo to mahunga.

As a plume for your head.

A, ko to wairua ki te Atua,

Your spirit given to God,

Nana nei nga mea Katoa.

The source of all things.

This concept was reinforced by other *Maori* writers who attempted to reconcile, through literature, what it meant to be *Maori* after the Second World War.⁴⁵ *Maori* writers emphasised the reassertion of *Maori* perspectives and the affirmation of *Maori* culture. This reassertion examined the positive aspects of being *Maori* and defined those institutions which were still significant for *Maori* people if we were to survive as *Maori*.⁴⁶ As John *Rangihau* claimed, 'One of the important things we are passing on this way is that *Tuhoe* will make no concessions whatsoever in things that happen on their *marae* because we have given way in every other area of *Maoriness*'.⁴⁷

Writers such as *Rangimarie Rose Pere* and *Timoti Karetu* were also defining what counted

⁴⁵ For further discussion on the development of *Maori* literature read, Pearson, B., 1968. 'The *Maori* and Literature 1938-1965', in *The Maori People in the Nineteen-sixties*, ed. E. Schwimmer, Auckland, Blackwood & Janet Paul, pp.217-256.

⁴⁶ These included the *marae*, the *tangi*, the language, the land, the Treaty of Waitangi, our views of the universe, our histories, and our stories.

⁴⁷ *Rangihau, J.*, 1981. 'Being *Maori*', in *Te Ao Hurihuri, The World Moves On*, ed. M. King, Auckland, Longman Paul, pp.165-175, p.170.

as 'Maoriness'. *Pere*, using the metaphor of the *parapara* leaf which has five 'fingers', identified, spirituality, ancestral ties, kinship ties, humanity, and land as her '*Taku Taha Maori*'.⁴⁸ *Karetu* identified, belonging to a tribe, a place, a language, a *whakapapa*, people, a religion and the ability to share.⁴⁹ These views emphasise the strengths of *Maori* culture and the need for cultural survival. While there were many other *Maori* writers who emphasised similar cultural values other *Maori* writers had focused on the impact of urbanisation on *Maori* identity and the loss of language, kinship ties, a place to stand, and values in the urban young which was disrupting *Maori* society.⁵⁰

Biculturalism was taken up by writers such as Eric Schwimmer and reframed as a platform for wider social change. In Schwimmer's view, '*Biculturalism is a Maori aspiration which is still - though to a diminishing extent - resisted by Europeans*'.⁵¹ He argued, that biculturalism 'within limits' was a way for society to be more inclusive of *Maori* values and practices. After acknowledging that *Maori* people had made the most cultural compromises, Schwimmer suggested that a key problem was '*in what measure each of the groups can make a contribution to the overcapping value system which makes national existence possible*'.⁵² Education was seen as a critical site for the development of a 'bicultural' society and biculturalism was the mode through which the goal of integration would be achieved. This ideal had generalised appeal to *Maori* and *Pakeha* but 'within limits'.

Maoritanga in the Classroom.

Bernard Gadd, a teacher active in promoting *Maoritanga*, referred to *Maoritanga* as 'modern

⁴⁸ *Pere*, R.R., 1979. '*Taku Taha Maori*', in *He Matapuna, A Source, Some Maori Perspectives*. Wellington, New Zealand Planning Council.

⁴⁹ *Karetu*, T., 1979. '*Taku Taha Maori*', in *He Matapuna, A Source, Some Maori Perspectives*. Wellington, New Zealand Planning Council.

⁵⁰ *Kawharu*, I.H., 1975. *Orakei, A Ngati Whatua Community*. Wellington, New Zealand Council for Educational Research. Walker, R., 1986. '*The Meaning of Biculturalism*', paper for the National Council of Churches Programme on Racism. Walker, R., 1990. *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End*. Auckland, Penguin.

⁵¹ Schwimmer, 1973, p.18.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p.18-19.

Maori culture'.⁵³ Teachers were encouraged to 'cater' for the cultural needs of their students. In general, *Maori* students and Pacific Islands students were subsumed under the label of Polynesian. Courses for teachers promoted strategies for greater inclusion of *Maoritanga* in school curricula. Specific *Maori* cultural values were 'selected' and promoted as positive aspects of modern *Maori* society. These became the organising themes around which classroom topics were selected for teaching.

Such as it was, *Maoritanga* as a curriculum initiative was not taught across all schools or by all teachers, although it was aimed at all schools. It was resisted by many teachers and generally only seen as useful where *Maori* children were the pupils. It was structured in ways which continued to cast *Maori* culture as trivial and unimportant, for example, it became a club option or was confined to a *Maori* club activity for performance at school functions. Many of those who had the responsibility for teaching *Maoritanga* in schools and teaching the teachers were *Maori*. As Judith Simon's research has shown, teachers themselves held quite negative attitudes towards *Maori*, and so not only resisted teaching *Maoritanga* but actively undermined the values and benefits of *Maori* language and culture.⁵⁴ Its development as a curriculum initiative was uneven, with some schools and teachers creating exciting programmes and others doing as little as possible.

Rangatiratanga and the Limits of *Maoritanga*.

The demarcation or redefinition of cultural boundaries by *Maori* manifested itself across a number of different sites (in education, in literature, for example), and was politicised in the 1970s through new *Maori* activist groups such as *Nga Tamatoa*. In the policy arena the National Advisory Council for *Maori* Education (NACME) had proposed a more comprehensive and sympathetic policy for *Maori* education in its 1970 report and in the later 1980 report. This does not imply that educationists, policy makers and *Maori* activists were concurring with each other. There were major disjunctions between what was happening in

⁵³ Gadd, B., 1976. *Cultural Difference in the Classroom; Special Needs of Maoris in Pakeha Schools*. Auckland, Heinemann Educational Books. p.7.

⁵⁴ Simon, J., 1986. *Ideology in the Schooling of Maori Children*, in *Delta Research Monograph 9*, Palmerston North, Massey University.

the *Maori* world and what was happening officially. The development of more active politics by younger *Maori* was an outbreak of resistance and sheer frustration at what was viewed as the reluctance of the system to address the cultural needs of *Maori*. The 'system' was regarded as racist and structurally hostile towards *Maori* language, knowledge and culture. The *Maori* Organisation for Human Rights (MOOHR), for example, referred to the education system as a site of 'cultural murder'.⁵⁵ *Nga Tamatoa* targetted education as the site which was most responsible for the undermining of *Maori* language, and organised a national petition promoting the teaching of *Maori* language in schools and promoted a *Maori* Language Day as a focus for protest. In 1973 *Waitangi* Day was created as a public holiday and this single day proved a more potent focus for bringing together all aspects of *Maori* frustration, conservative and radical.⁵⁶

The multiple layers of *Maori* resistance came together under the umbrella of the Treaty of *Waitangi*. If one word can encapsulate what the Treaty of *Waitangi* has meant for *Maori* it is the struggle for '*rangatiratanga*'. When measured against this concept, *Maoritanga* came to represent, for *Maori*, a despised idea. Whilst *rangatiratanga* incorporated a sense of autonomy and self-determination, a sense of identity based on a 'traditional' system of organisation, a sense of inter-connectedness of identity, values, resources, leadership and political control, *Maoritanga* smacked entirely of tokenism. It reduced a culture to a set of classroom topics, and complex values could be reduced to short definitions. *Maoritanga* failed to address the deeper issues which were being discussed concurrently in *Maori* politics, and it failed to address the educational tendencies which continued to undermine *Maori* language, knowledge and culture.

By 1980 this confused context set the scene for a series of rapid policy and political shifts, The Review of the Core Curriculum, the start of *Te Kohanga Reo*, the *Maori* Education

⁵⁵ Cited in Walker, R., 1990, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou, Struggle Without End*. Auckland, Penguin, p.210.

⁵⁶ *Ranginui* Walker suggests that within *Nga Tamatoa* there were both radical and conservative tendencies. However, there was a wider split between people who belonged to groups such as *Nga Tamatoa* and other *Maori* who did not engage in politics. Recently, October 24, 1995, the Government announced that there would no 'celebrations' from now on at *Waitangi*. The formal occasions will be held in Wellington. Ostensibly the rationale is that this years celebrations had been marked by very heated protest by *Maori*. Other commentators have suggested that the Government intend to control all aspects of *Waitangi* Day in preparation for a Republic.

Development Conference, the coming to power of the Fourth Labour Government and the beginning of major educational reform. It was in this context *Taha Maori* came into being. The following chapter examines this scene in the context of 1994.