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ABSTRACT

Adopting the role of a bricoleur researcher I created ways to explore complex issues in postcolonial societies. Complex issues require creative and innovative methodologies. In New Zealand, as in other postcolonial nations, we are confronted with an increasingly multi-ethnic and multicultural society haunted by a colonial past. Of particular interest in this study was the development of Pākehā (European New Zealander) identities. Pākehā, as the dominant group, are purported to have no cultural/ethnic identity. Rather, Pākehā default to a national identity, perpetuating a ‘norm’ status against which all ‘other’ identities are compared. As a Pākehā educator I responded to the call that Pākehā need to know their past, to understand their present, and disrupt assumptions of a homogenous white identity.

As a critical autoethnographer I interrogated my touchstone stories and those of my colonial ancestors. I juxtaposed the stories alongside those of two other Pākehā educators in a duoethnography. I created ways to engage with the human and non-human to explore the concepts of entanglement, intra-action and becoming. Through employing arts-based methods I immersed myself in embodied engagement with the data generated. Through poetry, creative writing, painting, sculpture and the making of an arpillera, I engaged with my stories. Important also was creating ways to bring conversations on to the page in an endeavour to let the ghost speak. As a critical researcher, I deconstructed stories of becoming Pākehā to reveal diverse ethnic and cultural threads. I uncovered the silenced stories of those ancestors who had gone through a process of assimilation and I engaged in counter-stories as a process of decolonisation. This study reveals Pākehā as a dynamic identity always in the process of becoming along a continuum of engagement with Indigenous Māori. Examples of critical pedagogical practice are provided, enabling others to engage productively with the complex issues of identity development in postcolonial societies.

This thesis is a material witness to my serendipitous tale as a bricoleur researcher creating a way to speak with, and about, some ghosts.
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SECTION 1
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Beginning No. 1:
A Scripted Conversation with Key Players

I am determined to begin this thing. As always, for me, the hardest thing to write is a beginning. There are so many beginnings, which one do I start with? Why not the right now of this particular beginning, as I come to the end of the thesis and return again to the start. This thesis stories the creation of an innovative arts-based method to explore the complex issue of Pākehā identities in a postcolonial society. Pākehā is an Indigenous term to describe New Zealand people (originally of European descent) who are not Māori (Belich, 2001; Jones, 1999; King, 1999). It is a multivalent term and has a varied history. And so I will begin by introducing you to some of the key characters in the stories that follow; I will do so through a fictionalised scripted conversation. Much like in a dream, they arrive and disappear again throughout the following three scenes. However, as a thesis with publications, you will meet them again in the following pages, in the chapters, in the published articles, in the poems and in the stories. This is not a linear narrative; there is an overlapping, folding back, repetition and cyclic motion as I layer and stitch together a lot of different ideas. Mine is the serendipitous tale of a bicoleur researcher.

I am sitting here this morning in the comfort of my local café considering how to begin this story, as I come to an ending. Outside it is grey and wet, the rooster crows a good morning, and other customers are slowly making their way to work. It is a slow kind of day.

I am wondering now how to summon the ghosts onto the blank page that sits in front of me, and in what order they should be called up. Should I arrange them chronologically? Is time something ghosts adhere to? Or should I create some sort of ghost hierarchy? Would they follow such rules? I am reminded that ghosts, like me, are forever becoming. Their identities are elusive and subject to mis/interpretation and transformation. You can’t pin a ghost down. So what am I doing trying to talk with ghosts? I look at the empty chair in front of me and wonder who would sit there first. As Derrida said, “We can never make a strict distinct between perception and imagination, and reality and fiction” (Burchill, 2009). So I beckon them in.
Scene One: The Hardware Cafe

Enter the ghosts.

They each walk in and draw a chair up to my table, responding to my questions and each other. Avril Bell arrives first. She is smiling that beautiful smile with a laugh in the corner of her mouth. Her work is one of the reasons I am sitting here. Melinda Webber walks in. We all stand, hug and kiss. Melinda and I go way back, we share stories of laughter and tears. She is my friend, colleague and Māori (Indigenous) advisor for this project.

Bell thoughtfully: You know I think the problem with a lot of Pākehā, the descendants of European settlers in New Zealand, is they don’t know their histories. There is a lacuna at the heart of their identity stories.

Webber nodding: I agree Avril, my work with adolescents shows that often Pākehā resort to claiming a national identity and an assumption that Pākehā represent the ‘normal’ alongside which all other ethnic identities are measured. I wonder also who Pākehā are today and what defines them? Pākehā need to explore and know their own histories.

Bell: Addy (2008) argues this assumed norm perpetuates the dominant role Pākehā play in New Zealand society and that it works to further the standard story mythicised by the colonial project. We need to know the origins of our ancestors, the implications and entanglements, to face them and learn from them, and to connect these personal stories to the wider public context and issues. I believe there is an educative role in this type of work.

Webber: Mmm, perhaps. Hanly (2009) has shown that many Pākehā teachers struggle with teaching about the history of New Zealand and, rather, stick to the standard story of an enlightened people civilising a savage world. Or instead, they practise a type of multiculturalism which further essentialises some groups while maintaining the notion of Pākehā having no culture and defaulting to a norm status.

Bell: In this kind of work Pākehā will also have to tread carefully to ensure they don’t romanticise the ancestors they write about while, at the same time, remembering the ethics of writing others’ stories.

Esther: Well, all your comments encouraged me to explore my own histories. As a researcher I decided I needed to begin with my own stories. However, one of the
questions I had at the start of this project was how to research my Pākehā stories without reifying my ancestors. As Sara Ahmed (2004) warns, when interrogating issues of dominant white populations, further bringing a focus onto stories of Pākehā may create Pākehā-ness into “an essential something” … although Pākehā are “haunted by absence, lack and emptiness” … this focus further contributes to recentering their inhabitants in intellectual inquiry. However, I am also aware that remaining silent, or as Martin Tolich (2002) describes it, performing ‘Pākehā paralysis’, stifles potential engagement with important issues. I am encouraged by Alex Hotere-Barnes’ (2015) notion of “non-stupid optimist capabilities” where he describes the importance of Pākehā valuing their own cultural identity. “This capability speaks to Pākehā valuing the richness, paradoxes and challenges of their own cultural identity, while also acknowledging that diverse realities exist amongst Māori too” (p. 48). I’d like to think of myself as a non-stupid optimist.

Jim Traue, Michael O’Loughlin, Jacques Derrida, Soyini Madison and Christine Sleeter all rush to join us at the table. They have been listening in to our conversation.

Traue: I believe there is such a thing as a Pākehā whakapapa. An ancestry of the mind. Like the Māori, Pākehā too have ancestors, literary and otherwise, who are significant to how we understand ourselves as Pākehā.

O’Loughlin excitedly: Ha! This reminds me of my writing about being haunted by my childhood stories in Ireland. How the troubles never left.

Esther: Haunted? Now that was an interesting term Michael, haunted by our childhood stories, haunted by our whakapapa.

Webber: Remember whakapapa is more than just your direct family, it is our myths and legends, stories from our past, it is our relation to the land, to the sky, to our before time. You needed to know your whakapapa, Esther.

Derrida: You needed to speak with your ghosts. To live you must speak with your ghosts, Esther.

Sleeter thoughtfully: I suppose I have been talking with my ghosts. I’ve been doing genealogical work, developing it into a method called ‘critical family history’. This means when I find a particular story from the past I use a critical lens and interrogate the story by making connections to the wider social, political, and historical context of those stories.
Madison pointing at me: You must have also considered your own position in this research project. Using the theoretical framework of a postcritical ethnographer you need to always make transparent what your own story is. What power dynamics are at play in your stories? And ensure you maintain a critically reflective position.

Esther: Excellent. These were all great strategies for researching my settler stories, looking at who they were, where they came from, and what brought them to this place. I needed to find a way to, as Jacques just said, speak with the ghost. How do I enable a ghost to speak? How do I create a method to summon up the ghost and provide a space to engage in conversation?

Katie Fitzpatrick, who is one of my supervisors, just popped into the café.

Fitzpatrick: So what did it all mean Esther? And how does this bring justice?

Derrida looking at Katie: The future belongs to ghosts. “If [we] love... justice at least, the ‘scholar’ of the future, the ‘intellectual’ of tomorrow should learn it and from the ghost. [We] should learn to live by learning not how to make conversation with the ghost but how to talk with him, with her, how to let them speak or how to give them back speech” (Derrida, 1994, p. 221).

Exit the ghosts. Well, all except for Derrida, who sits in the corner puffing quietly on his pipe.

Scene Two: Hardware Cafe

I am still sitting in the café. I am now drinking my second double-shot flat white of the morning. The barista, Thomas, is singing behind the coffee machine – now and then I join in. I am thinking about the previous conversation and how I developed a method to speak with the ghost. There is a noise, a polite cough, and Derrida pulls up a chair.

Derrida after puffing a series of smoke rings into the air: It is the ‘art of letting the ghost come back’.

I play with his words, I like the idea of ‘art’ and ‘ghosts’. Peter O’Connor, Eliot Eisner, John Dewey, Monica Prendergast and Norman Denzin join us at the table. All the while Thomas sings to the music and now and then glances over with a knowing smile. I wonder what he is thinking and who he can see.

Esther turning to Peter my other supervisor in this study: Peter, I remember the first time I met Dorothy Heathcote, you introduced us to her at a Postgraduate course on Drama and Dance. On reflection it was a serendipitous encounter – for so many
reasons...

O’Connor mournfully: But sadly you never got to meet her, Dorothy, I wish you had.

Esther: Well you summoned her into the room that day. You ‘put on the shoes’ of Dorothy and showed us another way. You took us by the hand and taught us to think like Dorothy through process Drama. You played Dorothy as ‘teacher in role’.

O’Connor leans back and smiles. He always takes pride in the shoes he wears.

Eisner excitedly: Fabulous! Could this process be translated into a research method? I believe the Arts are an important way of making sense of our worlds. We need to stop trying to prove ourselves through a scientific lens.

Dewey: Humph. Yes the arts are important … although I do believe there is such a thing as ‘scientartic’ – a term I learnt from Elwyn Richardson.

Esther laughing: Interesting John, since you were dead before Elwyn wrote his educational philosophy “In the Early World” back in 1964! (Heyward & Fitzpatrick, 2015).

Dewey smiling: True, Esther. But Elwyn was extending my own philosophy on education. “… when science and art thus join hands the most commanding motive for human action will be reached; the most genuine springs of human conduct aroused and the best service that human nature is capable of guaranteed”. (Dewey, 1897, p. 10).

Eisner nodding to John: Very good John, BUT I was motivated by the possibility of creating a research methodology that emerged from the arts.

Denzin leaning in: I agree. We need innovative and creative ways to explore complex issues in our societies.

Prendergast softly: As Levy said, Ivory is cold, so I carved a poetic path.

Esther excitedly: Yes, yes! I was encouraged by all your thoughts but the question still remained – what does this type of research look like, feel like, sound like. How does it work? At the start I had no idea until serendipitously I experienced it for myself at the second Critical Unit in Applied Theatre Symposium in 2011.

Suddenly in front of us George Béliveau appears, standing on a stage. The room darkens with just the one spotlight on George. He performs a Shakespearean drama but it is not a Shakespearean drama, it is the words/worlds of a teacher and her
children he has been researching. We embody the moment, we are moved, we are engaged, he takes us into the classroom, and he changes us. The lights come back on. And we pause. And we clap. And then up rock some other ghosts: Horace Wadpole, Rita Irwin, Tami Spry, Douglas Harper, Michael Finneran, and Laurel Richardson.

Esther: OK, so George showed me that it could be done. Then I needed to find my way, to make/create a way to speak with the ghosts.

Derrida smiling: The art of letting the ghost come back.

Wadpole strokes his long moustache and chuckles: A serendipitous journey. (Quietly and almost to himself) A great word that, ‘serendipity’.

Esther: That’s so true. Just like the Three Princes of Serendip. It was a journey of so-called chance encounters.

Irwin: Yes a journey where you found a way to work with your different selves, the artist, the researcher and the teacher – the a/r/tographer.

Spry stretching: You needed to find a way to immerse yourself Esther; your whole body in the process.

Eisner leans forward: Yes. To embody the process. To acknowledge and listen to all of your senses.

Harper pointing his finger at me: I suggested you should become a bricoleur, a craftsperson who uses what is at hand. What could you do? What skills did you already have? What was possible?

Finneran flicking back his hair: And as a bricoleur researcher always remembering your research question; the context must guide what you do.

Laurel Richardson: You needed to play, Esther. Play with words, play with theory and with stories, to imagine and make a way.

Esther I look around at the ghosts – living and dead – who have so inspired me: I had your permission. And so I started to play. I played with wire and created a wire Pākehā, a Pākehā with an empty space that the stories I generated would fill – a space that I will continue to fill with the stories of other Pākehā. I began to play with words and write poetry, narratives, and scripts.

The ghosts exit.
Scene Three: Waihi Beach

It is summertime. I am sitting on a friend’s deck looking out over the Pacific Ocean. Digging my teeth into the dark red flesh of a plum the juices quickly trigger my taste buds and transport me back to my home town Ōpōtiki, back to a plum tree, and back to my mother Kathy. Chris Martin’s (Martin, Berryman, Buckland, & Champion, 2014) words start humming in my head, “Those who are dead, are not dead, they’re just living in my head, ohhhhh…”. My mother arrives beside me. I imagine her as she once was, posing for her older brother in her red velvet dress and holding a green umbrella.

Kathy twirling her umbrella: So are you finished yet?

Esther looking out to sea: No mum, I’ll never really be finished, but I have a story to share. You asked me a long time ago to tell this story. I hope others will now be encouraged to explore and share their own stories.

Kathy worried: Did you sort out that question about what you will measure? Remember when you first started this project and that doctoral student kept asking you what you would measure?

Esther smiling: Yes, I’m not measuring anything. This is an Esther-mation, it is my – Esther’s – story of becoming Pākehā; it is about arts-based methods and embodiment, and it is about entanglement with other. Using Said (1993) and Barad’s (2010) metaphors of entanglement I have interrogated how our relationship with the past and with Māori impacts on our becoming Pākehā. It is a story of postcolonial hauntings, both through engagement with others and through the wider historical, political and social practices over time. It’s our story, mum.

Kathy relaxes: Ah so you did it then. (Pauses and leans forward) What did that student mean when she asked you, “How come you can be so brave?” You know – after you performed the poem at the conference.

Esther thoughtfully: It is always a risk putting yourself out there, doing something new, something unknown. There are lots of messy moments, lost moments, when immersed in arts-based methods. And then there is the ethical issue of interrogating our own complicated histories, particularly as Pākehā, working to ensure a critical perspective is given and the dominant story is not further reinforced. But I’ve never been alone, you have always been there and … well along with everyone else.
How can I be so brave?
Because Laurel said I could
Because Norman said I should
Because Jacques said ‘Speak with the ghost’
Because Elliot painted a picture
Because Dorothy performed a play
‘You see’, I answer,
‘I am not brave,
I just wear a brave’s shoes’
(Fitzpatrick, 2014)

Beginning No. 2:
Addressing the Gaps

Our lives are made up of moments. This thesis draws on stories generated through a critical autoethnographic and duoethnographic study designed to explore issues of emergent identities in postcolonial societies. As the researcher, I take on the role of a bricoleur (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; D. Harper, 1987) and enter into a serendipitous journey, responding to data generated with the ‘tools at hand’. Through employing the methodologies of critical autoethnography (Holman Jones, Adams, & Ellis, 2013) and duoethnography (Norris, Sawyer, & Lund, 2012), I interrogate the past to understand the present, and inform the future. Through immersing myself in arts-based methods I speak with the ghosts, I evoke embodied memories and tell my story of becoming Pākehā.

Through a collaborative engagement with theory and story I stitch together moments of becoming Pākehā. As a child growing up in rural New Zealand I was described as Pākehā, a descendant of European colonial ancestors. But I live in a world where my identity is entangled with Māori, the indigenous people of New Zealand, an identity emerging in-between the future and the past.

Avril Bell describes how Pākehā identity, due to its historical and in-between status, is determined by the dynamic flux and flow of global immigration and
emigration movements, therefore will always be ‘becoming’. She describes how Pākehā need to, “know themselves as a people with a shared history that shapes their identity in the present, cements their relation to place and offers them direction for the future” (A. Bell, 2009a, p. 185).

This thesis centres on questions of ‘becoming’ Pākehā, an identity that is purported to be dominant yet cannot be clearly defined. An identity birthed out of a colonial past, and which still haunts the present. An identity that is unique to the individual but best described in relation to other, where self knowledge can only ever be tentative, contingent, and situated (Gannon, 2006).

The self both is and is not a fiction; is unified and transcendent and fragmented and always in the process of being constituted, can be spoken of in realist ways and cannot; its voice can be claimed as authentic and there is no guarantee of authenticity (Davies & Gannon, 2006, p. 95).

Michael O’Loughlin (2009) and Maddison-Macfayden (2013) describe how we are haunted by our pasts and, in particular, “our childhood touchstone stories, those stories that live deeply within us and inform our perspectives of the world” (Maddison-MacFayden, 2013, p. 4). This thesis critically interrogates how New Zealand’s colonial history continues to haunt the construction of a Pākehā identity. This thesis has three key aims: first, to create and employ a range of critical arts-based methods to explore how my experience of being and becoming Pākehā has been haunted by a colonial past. Second, the study critically reflects on how my practice as a Pākehā educator has been informed by my identity. And third, I consider critical pedagogical practices for teachers to employ with students to enhance the construction of a ‘positive identity for all’ (as envisioned in the 2007 New Zealand Curriculum).

My belief in the significance of this research is underpinned by my own experience as a Pākehā educator for over 30 years. Throughout my career as an educator, I have practised in several different sectors (early childhood, primary and tertiary) and in several different locations throughout New Zealand (rural and urban, North Island and South Island). Of significance to me has been my journey, so far, of becoming a Pākehā educator. I have become increasingly aware of how Pākehā educators in New Zealand often struggle with articulating a clear understanding of Pākehā as a cultural or ethnic identity and, consequently, how this may inhibit Pākehā children constructing a positive ethnic identity (E. Fitzpatrick, 2011a, 2011b; Hanly, 2009; Webber, 2011). Instead, Pākehā often resort to identifying themselves
using a national identity, which perpetuates the assumption of a homogenous, white, *normal* identity and stereotypical assumptions about others (A. Bell, 2009b; Webber, 2011).

**Addressing the gaps**

Current research into Pākehā identity suggests three dominant themes. First, although Pākehā call New Zealand home, they struggle with developing a positive ethnic identity due to issues of belonging (A. Bell, 2009b; Webber, 2011). Instead, many Pākehā resort to the standard story ‘we are New Zealanders’, claiming a position of normality (Addy, 2008; A. Bell, 2009b; McCreanor, 2005). The consequence of this positioning is that Pākehā often adopt a standard position against which other ethnic groups are compared. This positioning further perpetuates the dominant status of Pākehā, promotes Pākehā privilege, and reinforces strategies of invisibility and colour blindness.

Second, Pākehā identity is intimately related to New Zealand's colonial history. In response to inherited guilt from issues of colonisation, Pākehā have romanticised their past or ignored their histories (A. Bell, 2009b; Lawn, 1994). Consequently many Pākehā today do not know their histories and have little knowledge of their ‘whakapapa’ to draw on. Instead, in what Wells (2012) described as an environment of ‘political correctness’, Pākehā are often inhibited from exploring and openly discussing their ethnic identity in fear they might be considered racist (Webber, 2011). It is important that Pākehā find ways to critically explore and interrogate their diverse histories through a consideration of wider historical, political and social factors, in order to counter this fear and disrupt their position as the dominant ‘national identity’ (Grimshaw, 2012).

Third, further investigation into the unique racial–ethnic socialisation of Pākehā families is needed (Webber, 2011). These are the processes “in which an individual’s standards, skills, motives, attitudes, and behaviours change to conform to those regarded as desirable and appropriate for his or her present and future role in society” (Webber, 2011, p. 148). We need to richly detail what it means to be Pākehā and to construct and connect to narratives that explore our migration stories; our stories of emerging as one ethnic identity alongside other New Zealand ethnic identities (Grimshaw, 2012).

Likewise, it is evident in international research on ‘whiteness’ that more
research is required to better understand the construction of white identities in all postcolonial societies. Pākehā are traditionally understood as the dominant white ethnic group in New Zealand. Therefore, stories of Pākehā identity that emanate from this research will be valuable, both in contrast to, and by adding breadth to, the global body of work already discussing white identity construction. Research on white identity increasingly stipulates the importance of understanding how white identities are developed and maintained in order to better understand and counter the practice of racism (Grossman & Charmaraman, 2009a; McDermott & Samson, 2005; Phinney, 1996).

There remains, internationally, a dearth of published research that explores pedagogical practice to counter racial and ethnic stereotyping (Brown, 2008). Feminist and social activist, bell hooks (1994), tells the story of her early education being impacted by white teachers who reinforced racist stereotypes throughout their lessons. Recent research in the US has highlighted the significant role that schools play as sites for identity development, where teachers as identity agents, play a significant role in ascribing students with particular identities. Importantly for my study, these researchers call for more research to explore teachers’ beliefs and practice regarding education practices that promote the construction of positive ethnic identities (Schachter & Marshall, 2010; Schachter & Rich, 2011).

Similarly, research in New Zealand demonstrates the need to explore how educators’ beliefs inform their practice. Hanly’s (2009) research with Pākehā teachers, for example, highlighted the continued practice of retelling the ‘standard story’ and how most teachers felt ‘ill-equipped’ to develop bicultural practices. Several New Zealand scholars suggest that a critical exploration of what it means to be Pākehā, by Pākehā, is required to enable the construction of positive Pākehā ethnic identities (for example see A. Bell, 2009b; M. Brown, 2011; Hanly, 2009; Ritchie, 2003; Webber, 2011).

Much of the research on Pākehā identity and Pākehā teacher educators, referred to above, has employed traditional research methods. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) argued that complex issues demand the creation and implementation of innovative methods. This study therefore stories my response to their argument as I adopted the role of a bricoleur researcher to create and implement an arts-based method to investigate the complex issue of becoming a Pākehā educator.

The study involved the use of two ethnographic methodologies to generate
‘thick histories’ of being a Pākehā educator: autoethnography and duoethnography. Underpinned by qualitative inquiry, these two methodologies were appropriate to explore and challenge the dominant political and powerful discourses that occur in multiethnic societies. This exploration therefore contributes to issues of social justice through providing and critically analysing rich stories of Pākehā identity construction (Denzin & Giardina, 2011; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Along with Denzin, Lincoln, and Smith (2008), I believe we must ‘create our own stories’ and, further, we must “create spaces to encourage multicultural conversations” (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008, p. 6).

An important aspect of this research was to perform, and simultaneously investigate, these ethnographic methodologies (autoethnography and duoethnography) to inform future practice. Critics of traditional research have focused on how research can unconsciously reproduce systems of class and racial oppression (Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011). Critical ethnographic methods have the potential to ask, and engage with, important questions about our global lives (Spry, 2011b), expose dynamic interactions between power, politics and poetics (Madison, 2012) and produce new understandings. Further, these methodologies allow for the complexity of human behaviour while also potentially disrupting the façade of normalcy (Bhabha, 1994; Breault, Hackler, & Bradley, 2012).

Beginning No. 3: Identity Talk

I am a coffee drinker. I also enjoy reading and writing in cafés, and so I get to drink a lot of coffee. I also get to notice things – notice things about people. Like, when I order a pot of tea and a cup of coffee for my husband and me and the waiters ALWAYS give the coffee to my husband and the tea to me! I am NOT a tea drinker. Why do they identify me as the tea drinker? Where did this assumption, this stereotype, come from? My husband is so obviously the tea drinker – he was born in England! And we all know that English people drink tea. Isn’t that what the English are always doing in the movies? All English people drink tea all the time.

I look around the café. The customers, the staff behind the counter, the cooks in the kitchen, all with their varied accents catching the air. It’s just like Said’s (1993) metaphor of entanglement; a symphony of sound and a juxtaposition of different melodies. As I listen to this music I try to trace the sounds back to their origins. But I
am always only guessing. And I suppose a few of them might notice me, in the corner with my pen and paper, and wonder about me too. My son tells me of other students at Auckland University who frequently approach him and ask where he comes from. He is tall and blonde. His olive-skinned, brown-eyed, Jewish Great-great-great-grandmother was born in 1856 in Auckland, New Zealand. His strapping Danish and German ancestors arrived in the 1860s and his thick-set Yorkshire and Welsh steel-workers and miners in the 1870s. And then, approximately 100 years later, his Irish/English father arrived by DC10 in 1976. My son’s answer is, “I am from Titirangi.” This is the suburb of Auckland, New Zealand where he has lived for the past 20-plus years.

In increasingly multiethnic and multicultural societies, such as Auckland, questions about ‘identity’, how we make sense of our self, how we belong, nag at our becoming. These questions are woven into the fabric of our society and have political and epistemological power. They are the sorts of questions people go on protest marches about, and write policy, poetry and perform about. They really matter. Identity as a subject of scholarly inquiry became gradually more important in the 1960s and, although recognised as “notoriously elusive and difficult to define” (Wetherell, 2010, p. 3) continued to be a concept that demanded interrogation. I am mindful of how scholars have shaped, and continue to re-shape, identity in and through their inquiries. I am also mindful of the “great theoretical and methodological complexity” that pertains to identity studies and how these studies are “a site of continuous unsettled argument” (Wetherell, 2010, p. 4). However, these theories on the problematic of identity are critical in my study.

Identity was theorised by Erik Erikson (1968) as something that developed over time and could be achieved by struggling through a series of stages, to reach a nourishing sense of identity and healthy personality development (Duchesne, McMaugh, Bochner, & Krause, 2013). Erikson’s theory continues to be significant in psychological definitions of research on ethnic identity. Later, Henri Tajfel (1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) developed social identity theory where the relationship between the personal and social was explored and theorised. They suggest the individual’s psychology may change when they identify with a particular social group, and consequently behave in different ways (Wetherell, 2010). The dynamic relationship between a personal identity and a social identity remains important to understandings of the fluid and transformative nature of identity.
Another important area of identity exploration is how identities are theorised as being discursively structured. Foucault’s (1972) notion of discourse is “systems of thought composed of ideas, attitudes, courses of action, beliefs and practices that systematically construct the subjects and the worlds of which they speak” (Lessa, 2006, p. 285). Discourse is also understood in context to the relationship between knowledge and power and that meaning, likened to a ‘node’, is connected to larger networks of knowledge (Foucault, 1972). Discourse has the potential to make sense of, and order, people (Wetherell, 2010). Goffman (1981) describes “language as the jam of social interaction – language is sticky; like marmalade it gets everywhere, lingering on every surface” (cited in Wetherell, 2010, p. 13). Stuart Hall (1996b) critiques Foucault’s theory and argues that scholars should take notice of moments of identification where the individual encounters discourse and consequently invests in some discursive positions and rejects others (Wetherell, 2010). Our identities then, are determined by how we are “positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past” (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 4). As Hall stipulates:

Identities are thus points of temporary attachment to the subject positions which discursive practices construct for us […] They are the result of a successful articulation or “chaining” of the subject into the flow of discourse, what Stephen Heath[…] called an “intersection” (1981, p. 106). […] The notion that an effective suturing of the subject to a subject-position requires not only that the subject is “hailed”, but that the subject invests in the position, means that suturing has to be thought of as an articulation, rather than a one-sided process, and that in turn places identification, if not identities, firmly on the theoretical agenda. (Hall, 1996, p. 6, original emphasis)

Judith Butler (1988, 1993) further developed the concept of discursively structured identities to include ‘performativity’. Identity for Butler is understood as something that is constructed through repeated performances where “sustained performances built around initially privileged differences, ignore and render invisible other possible differences” (Wetherell, 2010, p. 17). Butler’s theory of performativity has been applied to better understand the construction of ethnic identity. Karen Barad further developed the concept of performativity and argues that “what is needed is a robust account of the materialization of all bodies – ‘human’ and ‘nonhuman’ – and the material-discursive practices by which their differential constitutions are marked” (Barad, 2003, p. 810). Importantly, she explores how identities are in the process of becoming through a dynamic intra-action between human and matter, such as an ‘identity artifact’.
Through the performance of a particular identity, the performer often summons into the space an identity artefact. Significant to this study is the use of identity artefacts, used both by the individual and others, to ‘stabilise’ an identity and to make it almost thing-like. The identity artefact is defined functionally by Leander (2002) as “any instrument (sign, material object, embodied practice, etc.) that interactants make use of to shape the identity of an individual or group” (p. 199). These artefacts as “material/symbolic configurations”, are used as “living tools of the self” (Holland, Lachicotte Jr, Skinner, & Cain, 1998, p. 28). Through a constant process of mediation and change, identities are constructed through relations between an artefact and the individual or group. It is through the embodied experiences an individual has with particular identity artefacts that an attachment between the artefact and a sense of self is made. Hence, at a later date the relationship can again be evoked through embodied memory. Artefacts can both constrain or enable the opening up of possible identities. Further, an identity is also a complex layering of several relations with different artefacts over time and hence becomes an intertextual layering of different texts, voices, and is continually hybridised (Leander, 2002, p. 203).

Identity is increasingly understood as a complex concept. Recognition of complexity takes account of various intersecting identities, such as gender, ethnicity, religion, class, race, sexual orientation, nationality, education and occupation that shape our multiple lived experiences (Grieshaber & Canella, 2001). Postcolonial research on identity explores the complexity of historical legacies of colonisation with the emergence of hybrid identities (elaborated on in Chapter 4), and other research explores the impact of globalisation where “strange new conjunctures emerge” (Wetherell, 2010, p. 20). These approaches open up ways to make sense of how “social, cultural and technological changes produced new kinds of people, new ways of life, new social groupings and new modes of identity production” (Wetherell, 2010, p. 19). These complex, dynamic and intersecting theories of identity are important lenses with which I grapple with the “slippery, blurred and confusing nature” (Wetherell, 2010, p. 3) of Pākehā-ness.

It is cold in the café today, but not as cold as it is outside; I wrap my hands around my coffee cup. I am bundled up in the corner waiting for the arrival of a Spanish academic visitor, Professor Aitor Gomez. He is a coffee drinker as well. I wonder what sort of coffee he drinks. Probably something very strong and black. After I spent a few days in Spain several years ago I am now an expert on Spaniards
and their coffee-drinking habits. I begin to think about Spain and my conversation, more recently, with family about Spanish citizenship. In 2014 the Spanish government apologised to all Sephardic Jews who were banished from Spain in the 1600s and offered them ‘right of return’. I had considered it. Me, some 500 years later after my Jewish ancestors had fled the inquisition, a Pākehā whose varied ancestors had first arrived here in New Zealand in the 1840s, could return to Spain! How would my identity be defined then: Jewish Spanish Pākehā?

Aitor arrives and orders a cappuccino; me and my black coffee assumptions – go figure! I ramble on about my Jewish ancestors and he tells me that my people, the de Castros, are a familiar name. He says they came from near Bilbao – where his own family comes from. Aitor and I might even be related! He then asks me what a Pākehā is. Now Aitor’s English is far superior to my Spanish, however, I try to give a simple answer and describe how the Indigenous people of New Zealand understood themselves through tribal identities, but that, with the arrival of the British colonials had called themselves, collectively, Māori which, basically, means normal. Pākehā was a term used to describe ‘others’. I then linked this to the Roma people of Spain, whom Aitor works with, saying how they too had lived in Spain for several generations and belonged there, yet were not ‘Indigenous Spanish’. He was satisfied with my answer. And yet we both knew it was a lot more complicated than that.

There is a shift beside me, I have been rambling again about some of my adventures.

Kathy: So are you going to get to the nitty-gritty now? You know who the Pākehā are and all that? Or is that it? I mean you set out to find Ada’s mother with the box I left you with, but you’ve managed to collect and generate more identity artefacts along the way! What does it all mean?

Esther: Yes I’m about to get to the nitty-gritty, mum. But it’s a complex story, so stick with me for the next few chapters, because I’ll come back to the story of ‘Aunty Kate’ soon enough. But first, I have written a poem to introduce the theoretical framework for this study. Each of the key theories introduced here are elaborated on in the following chapters.
Theoretical Framework:

A Poem

As a bricoleur researcher I set out to trace –
What haunts my becoming?
A serendipitous noticing to embrace
The complex process of becoming.
Critical autoethnography as the base
Of the exploration of my becoming.
Then duoethnographic storying provides a space,
A juxtaposition of our becomings.
This generates counter stories; I seek to displace
The ‘standard’ stories of becoming.
Through embodied arts-based methods I chase
An unfinished tapestry of becoming.

A diversity of theory all over the place
To explain my becoming.
Contentious hauntings of ethnicity and race,
Imagined boundaries of our becomings.
Postcolonial entanglement and in-between space
A dynamic Pākehā becoming.
To deconstruct and reconstruct the haunted face –
A method of becoming.
Engagement with ‘human’ and ‘non-human’ I trace
‘Matters’ of becoming.
For emerging identities I make the case
For a range of theories on becoming.
Overlapping, distinct, each with a différant gaze
They speak to our becomings.

As an educator I aim to replace
A practice that essentialises becoming.
To create and story method in this thesis space –
For a future in this increasingly globalised place –
Of encouraging dynamic becomings.
The Thesis as Bricolage: How to Navigate a ‘Patchwork’ of Stories and Publications

The thesis is divided up into four sections. Section one, ‘The beginning’, includes Chapters 1 through to 5. You are reading Chapter 1 right now. Chapter 2 is a Methodological bricolage and throughout the second chapter I tell the story of developing my role as a bricoleur researcher engaging in serendipitous encounters through a postcritical ethnographic study. I draw on critical autoethnography, duoethnography and discuss the development of critical arts-based methods to interrogate complex issues. Chapter 3 is a theoretical and historical bricolage where I discuss the significant theories and histories of ethnic identity construction in postcolonial countries. Chapter 4 explores the complex history of Pākehā identity. And Chapter 5 concludes Section one through a discussion on Pākehā educators and various classroom approaches employed in response to issues pertaining to increasing multiethnic and multicultural populations, and emerging identities.

Note that, in this thesis, I use the Hebrew term ‘Selah’ to indicate a place where I will provide a space for the reader to:

Stop.

An Interlude;

Pause and think of that

In preparation for what is to come.

Section two comprises several chapters and published works from the Critical Autoethnography project. First is a chapter on Derrida’s concept of ‘hauntology’ where I discuss the key ideas of hauntology through exploring some of my own stories with poetry. Next, using the arts-based method of script writing and factionalisation, I wrote and published “A conversation with Steinbeck: Finding my way to postcritical ethnography” (E. Fitzpatrick, 2014a). This is followed by two chapters using the framework of critical family history to interrogate one ancestor’s story. And then follow two publications, “Embodiment and education” (E. Fitzpatrick, 2014b), and “It’s a tricky business performing poetry with the Ghost” (E. Fitzpatrick, 2015a).
Section three includes chapters and published works from the Duoethnography Project. In these chapters I draw on Karen Barad’s concepts of intra-action, quantum entanglement, and engagement with ‘human’ and ‘non-human’, to interrogate the stories generated. First is the story of making an ‘arpillera’, a material artifact, in “‘Summoning up the ghost with needle and thread” with co-author Avril Bell (E. Fitzpatrick & Bell, submitted). The last chapter in this section focuses on our role as Pākehā educators and explores critical practice in the classroom to address issues of ethnic and cultural diversity. In this chapter, “We can’t lead where we won’t go”, I interrogate the stories of two white educators – myself with Stephen May.

As a thesis with publication these chapters are knitted together with examples of the art works, poetry and stories of the process. Allowing for the ‘basted’ format (to sew together with long loose stitches) of these publications, there will be aspects of the work repeated between the chapters, especially concerning the background, contextualisation literature and methodology.

In Section four I conclude this thesis with the poem titled “Learning to live” (E. Fitzpatrick, 2015b) and a summary of the key writings from the study. I address here some of the key questions that underpinned the study. First, the usefulness of immersion as a researcher in embodied practice to make sense of complex issues. Second, the conclusion highlights what it means to be a Pākehā educator and describes critical pedagogical practices identified through the study.

Figures 1 and 2 below are photos of the wire Pākehā I made at the beginning of this study. These photos highlight my attempt to understand the emptiness of Pākehā culture that was being described in some of the literature I was reading. My thinking at the time was that this study would, in some way, begin to address this empty space.
Figure 1: Spiral of Life. Photo of Wire Pākehā with Spiral of Life Inside and Plaited Spinal Cord to Demonstrate the Traces of Multiple Family Histories
Figure 2: An Empty Space. Wire Pākehā Woven so Stories of Becoming Pākehā Can Fill up the Gaps
CHAPTER 2
THE BICOLEUR, SERENDIPITY, AND THE ART OF CRITICAL AUTOETHNOGRAPHY

The Role of a Bricoleur Researcher

We have a wall at home covered in art works. There is nothing particularly symmetrical or tidy about this wall. It is also a changeable feast. On our wall we have art we have bought for ourselves, won in competitions, been gifted, had painted lovingly for us, and there’s even some random pieces we have painted ourselves. My husband Mike’s Scooby Doo, in bright pink, hangs next to his mother’s calm watercolour of Lake Rotoma. The many-coloured arpillera of a Chilean market, gifted to me by Peter O’Connor, next to my daughter’s painting of Ōpōtiki-Mai-Tahiti, in memory of a weekend mother–daughter trip to the town of my birth. The artist, Dick Frizzell’s mum’s pavlova recipe, my acrylic still life of ‘a black pot with veges’, Lyall Pennisula’s abstract acrylic of the crucifixion, an embroidered elephant from India, and many other art works are framed by a collection of old vinyl record covers. And interwoven between the art works are intricate spider webs. It is an eclectic lot. And in many ways it represents who Mike and I are as a couple; a patchwork of stories. Following in the footsteps of the traditional bricoleur (craftspeople) we have created an art wall with what we had at hand.

In developing a research identity I was conscious of my ‘self’ as a patchwork of stories. I am a bricolage, a compilation of many stories. I am a complex self. As with any role we play in life I assume a particular identity, and a research story requires someone to play the role of a ‘researcher’. That is me. I am conscious that this time-honoured role in academia has a history, a set of traditions and assumptions. Therefore I approached the role with trepidation, wanting to respect heritage but not be locked into a role dominated by any particular paradigm. Therefore as I ‘put on the shoes’ of a researcher I had no clear path or map that pointed to a designated ending. The role was only partially defined; it required improvisation, a responsiveness to embodied practices, and space to evolve through the process. Responding to the argument that Pākehā need to know their histories I also recognised this sort of research required an innovative and creative methodology. I
needed to create a way to explore the complex issue of becoming Pākehā; no one definition, theory or method would suffice. Hence, I adopted the bricolage approach and learnt to play the role of a bricoleur researcher.

‘Bricoleur’ originally comes from the French expression to describe craftspeople who work creatively with materials left over from various other projects and who use ‘the tools at hand’ to create something new (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; D. Harper, 1987; Levi-Strauss, 1974; Rogers, 2012). Claude Levi-Strauss (1966, 1974) appropriated the term ‘bricolage’ in the early 1960s to explain the complex and eclectic process of meaning-making in his work as an anthropologist. Bricolage as a metaphor was employed by Levi-Strauss to make sense of the underlying structures that determine human meaning-making and, simultaneously, used it to disrupt the structuralist binary which, he believed, polarised mythical with scientific rationality. Levi-Strauss therefore focused on how mythical knowers worked through a flexible, fluid and open-ended process, piecing together fragments of their life-history, in cultural contexts, to make meaning (Rogers, 2012, p. 3). Hence the work of a bricoleur is understood as both an intellectual activity and a mythopoetical activity (Derrida, 1978). Popularised by Tolkien in 1931 as a title of his poem ‘Mythopoeia’, mythopoetical is a Greek term for myth-making. Tolkien’s poem referred to the creative human author as ‘the little maker’:

Your world immutable wherein no part
The little maker has with maker’s art.
I bow not yet before the Iron Crown,
Nor cast my own small golden scepter down… (cited in Parish, 2010)

Rejecting what he perceived to be modern ‘man’s’ misplaced worship of rationalism (the Iron Crown), Tolkien believed that myth-making helped narrate and disclose truth (Manglaviti, 2004). Through his myth-making Tolkien believed he could speak to people who were grappling with concepts of a natural world that had become de-personalised and a God who seemed distant, even irrelevant, to an enlightened modern sensibility (Manglaviti, 2004, p. 161).

Important also in Levi-Strauss’s take on bricolage was the use of myth-making and the imagination where:

…mythical meaning-making bricoleurs combine their imagination with whatever knowledge tools they have-at-hand in their repertoire (e.g. ritual,
observation, social practices) and with whatever artefacts are available in their
given context (i.e., discourses, institutions, and dominant knowledges) to meet
diverse knowledge-production tasks. (Rogers, 2012, p. 3)

The bricoleur is required to move between the worlds of the intellectual
knower, the mythical knower and the imagination. As the bricoleur researcher I was
stitching together fragments of story generated from the historical archives, and this
required using my imagination where there were (usually) gaps in the story. As a
storyteller and researcher I used clues that were often found through making creative
connections to other data sources such as wider historical, social and political texts.
I would then hold the fragments of data I had discovered “up against the background
of the broader context” (Chang, 2013, p. 116). I needed to creatively play with those
cues that were available, those ‘treasures’ I had inherited from my culture and that
exist in our social environments, responding psychologically and existentially to the
experience (Weinstein & Weinstein, 1991, p. 162). As Chang (2013) said, we
“imagine a smell not buried in the data” (p. 116, emphasis added).

Later Denzin and Lincoln (1999), in the spirit of Levi-Strauss, reapplied the
term ‘bricolage’ to explain the significant ways qualitative researchers were adopting
eclectic approaches to their research endeavours. These approaches were
manifested through multiple methods of inquiry, multiple theoretical lenses, a
diversity of perspectives and through philosophical notions of the object of inquiry
(Denzin & Lincoln, 1999; Kincheloe, 2001; Rogers, 2012). Kincheloe believed there
was “no better concept [that] captures the possibility of the future of qualitative
research” (Kincheloe, 2001, p. 670). So as a novice bricoleur I immersed myself in
the research role with both body and mind, involved in an interplay of the theoretical
and empirical, constructing meaning through creatively applying what became
available throughout the process. In this process I first needed to attend to my
personal feelings, thoughts and emotions, always keeping in mind the question and
context of the research endeavour (Chang, 2013; Finneran, 2008). Second, I would
begin by drawing on what I knew, “or what [was] at my finger tips”, and then “blend,
borrow, add to, adapt and transform my approach” always gaining skills and further
insight (D. Harper, 1987, p. 95). Hence, through my role as a bricoleur, I was
constantly “defining and extending myself … by what [was] finally a mysterious
mixture of improvisation, opportunity, and accident” (D. Harper, 1987, p. 92). In other
words it was a serendipitous journey… Selah.
I believe there is a distinct synergy between the role of a bricoleur and a serendipitous approach to research. As the journey unfolded, the word ‘serendipity’ began to feature more and more in my conversations and writing as an important aspect of my journey. It required investigation. Horace Walpole coined the term ‘serendipity’ after his reading of the ancient tale of the *Three Princes of Serendip* in 1754. The Princes had made several ‘chance’ discoveries on their journey (Merton & Barber, 2004). Although the term has become common usage, the original story and Walpole’s understanding of serendipity are useful to better understand the role of the bricoleur researcher. Like the *Three Princes of Serendip* (see also K. Fitzpatrick & Fitzpatrick, forthcoming; Merton & Barber, 2004), the bricoleur also sets out on a journey of discovery. They are skilled and knowledgeable, and prepared to make sense of their discoveries along the way. Weinstein and Weinstein’s (1991) description of the bricoleur researcher resonates with the Three Princes. As an “astute wanderer” the bricoleur must “connect seemingly isolated fragments with other apparently unrelated fragments” (Weinstein & Weinstein, 1991, p. 160). The Three Princes are described as having sagacity, wits, skills and intellectual training to make sense of these fragments (Merton & Barber, 2004). Again Weinstein and Weinstein describe the bricoleur who, with “sensitive reflection upon each of life’s fragments, can arrive at an understanding of some aspect of society” (1991, p. 160). Similar again to the Three Princes, Kincheloe (2001, 2005) believed the bricoleur researcher needed a high level of skill and knowledge before embarking on the research journey. For example, skill in performing a range of research tasks, the ability to self-reflect, and a knowledge of diverse qualitative paradigms (Denzin, 1994, p. 17).

As chance would have it, some distant Facebook friend posted an article on “How to cultivate the Art of Serendipity” (Kennedy, 2016) just as I was about to write about critical family history. It was a serendipitous posting, and in the article I learnt about the role of a ‘Serendipiter’, which was coined by the New York photographer Gay Talese, as well as the term ‘Super Encounterers’, which Sanda Erdelez relates to those researchers who have special powers of perception that lead them to clues. Hence, the Serendipiter is a skilled researcher who always has a problem or question that occupies their mind, who immerses themselves ‘playfully’ and ‘passionately’ into their world, and who is open to notice and discover connections and patterns throughout their daily encounters. The article ended with an important question for
the Serendipiter, ‘One day we might be able to stumble upon new and better ways of getting lost’. So how do we as serendipitous researchers cultivate a practice of getting ‘lost’ in our research?

My aim as a bricoleur researcher was to create an embodied approach to my exploration, an interplay between the mind and the body; applying thinking to my embodied *senses* in the process of creating the bricolage. This meant allowing space for getting lost, learning to use my intuition by *feeling* my way through, taking my time, waiting and mulling over, playing with my material, and tossing back and forth between theory, words, and knowledge. I was enchanted by the idea of being a bricoleur, but more than a little wary. There is a certain vulnerability and riskiness involved in being a bricoleur as you never know exactly what is around the corner.

Pinar (2001) argued that qualitative researchers must involve themselves in important, but risky, hybrid interdisciplinary constructions, where fragments of philosophy, history, literacy theory, and the arts, among others, collide (pp. 698-699). The bricoleur, like the Three Princes of Serendip, needs to be responsive to the stories generated by allowing for the dynamics of the context, have an aptness for creativity, know how to artistically combine theories, techniques and methods, and also be able to create their own methodological tools when needed (Rogers, 2012, p. 6). How then, you might ask, does adopting the role of the bricoleur best fit with my task? What is ‘the thing’ I am trying to get a sense of? As asserted by Finneran (2008), the bricolage approach emerges and is directed by the research question and the context (Finneran, 2008, p. 41). I pause before I answer the questions. Selah.

Complex constructs, such as identity, require a research approach that can explore the multifaceted, fluid and emerging aspects of the lived world. Pākehā constitute a complex and elusive identity. Therefore by adopting the role of a bricoleur I could respect the complexity inherent in the processes and the contradictions of the lived world of becoming Pākehā. Bricolage afforded me the privilege of openness and responsiveness in the research process – it is an emergent design (Denzin, 1994; Rogers, 2012). It is not a linear, ‘by-the-book’ method, rather, it requires the researcher to *create method* through a “marriage of the hand and the mind” (D. Harper, 1987, p. 118). As a postcritical ethnographer I worked inside the research moments, generating stories, analysing, and making-meaning through a constant, cyclic to-ing and fro-ing. Immersing myself in critical arts-based methods I responded to the stories generated with the ‘tools at hand’
The role of a bricoleur fitted my purpose. There was permission given here for me to experiment, to struggle, critique and develop my own methodology.

**Critical Bricolage**

The role of a bricoleur researcher demands a new level of research consciousness. Throughout the research process it was important for me to personally interact with the subject/object of inquiry to generate data and negotiate methodological strategies, as they were required, in the unfolding context of the research situation (Kincheloe, 2005, p. 324). Therefore, a high level of cognitive thinking was required as I “tinkered” with the tools at hand to create appropriate research methods (Kincheloe, 2005, p. 324). The process was messy. I cycled between deciding where the research was going, choosing the appropriate methods, thinking about what was being studied, and making sense of the data generated (Becker, 1998, p. 9). Referring to these strategies as ‘tricks’, Becker (1998) describes how the bricoleur researcher acknowledges complexity, not wishing to reduce the process to a formulaic response. Rather, the strategies are likened to a “manic tinkerer adrift with his wits” (Geertz, 1995, as cited in Becker, 1998, p. 9). The tinkerer uses their imagination and mythical thought as a critical strategy where “mythical thought is [considered] a kind of intellectual bricolage which allows mythical reflection to reach brilliant unforeseen results on the intellectual plane” (Finneran, 2008, p. 112; Levi-Strauss, 1966). I also needed to critically reflect on my own position in the research endeavour, taking into consideration my histories, how they are located, and how this shaped my interpretation (Kincheloe, 2005; Rogers, 2012). Excited by the potential bricolage offered qualitative research, Kincheloe (2001, 2005) expanded Denzin and Lincoln’s idea of the bricoleur researcher with the aim to develop a rigorous critical approach. Kincheloe (2001, 2005), and later Rogers (2012), then explored the different dimensions of research bricolage as originally defined by Denzin and Lincoln (2000): methodological bricolage, theoretical bricolage, political bricolage, and narrative bricolage. I discuss these below in relation to my own work.

Again, as the researcher, I needed to be critically conscious of my own positioning in the research process. This resonated directly with my stance as a Postcritical ethnographer. I am a Pākehā educator and, therefore, I was exploring a context and identity in which I am personally entangled. As such there is no claim to
neutrality or objectivity in this research, rather there is a recognition that my position will shape the process and final bricolage; as well as my own becoming (Finneran, 2008).

**Methodological Bricoleur**

As a *methodological bricoleur* I became engaged in meaning-making tasks throughout the process that were fluid and creative. I worked with a range of critical research methods, ethnographic strategies, Pinarian *currere* (an autobiographical reflection on one’s own educational experiences, 1975) (Pinar, 2012) and embodied arts practices. Kincheloe and Berry (2004) describe a ‘gateway’ to approach the research context which they call ‘Point of Entry Text’ (PoET). The PoET is described as anything that can provide or generate meaning. Throughout my study these PoETs were diverse and ranged, for example, from photographs, census records, family stories, historical archival data, to the online ancestry.com database. Each of these PoETs was poststructural in nature as they were subject to a range of different lenses for analysis (Finneran, 2008). The PoET is further described as the “bottom text” in the process where, overlaid onto the original PoET, are several transparent layers (Finneran, 2008, pp. 114-115), such as the methods (described above) and theories (that I will describe below). I also employed a range of critical arts-based methods throughout the process to both generate and interpret data. These are all discussed further in the thesis but include script writing, fiction/faction, poetry, visual arts, sculpture, performance, ekphrasis and the creation of an arpillera. These choices were not made in advance, rather I responded to the dynamics and context of the data, then sought a creative method to attend to ‘the thing’. Throughout the generation and analysis of data I combined relevant theories, techniques and methods to make meaning (Rogers, 2012, p. 6). I created my own methodological tools when needed.

**Political Bricoleur**

As a *political bricoleur* I needed to be attendant to the different ways power was being played out in the research process and through the data generated. McLaren (2001) cautions the emerging bricoleur to interrogate and keep the “material world in view”, that they need to consider “the economic structures of society … and [keep] the materiality of human existence squarely in sight” (McLaren, 2001, p. 701). This was particularly significant in my work as I was exploring the ‘becoming’ of a Pākehā identity. The term, Pākehā, is fraught with political implications, especially so
when we are considering the role of a Pākehā educator. It is important then to understand in what ways political power has, and continues to have, to shape Pākehā. And further, how Pākehā as a particular dominant identity, shapes others.

**Narrative Bricoleur**

> Storying is also a significant part of this work. Therefore as a *narrative bricoleur* I needed to attend to the stories I generated; how knowledge was shaped by stories and how I told them. Importantly in this process, I attempted to counter the dominant stories of Pākehā and to offer alternative readings, and to also share those small stories and secret stories that have often been trivialised and/or silenced. It is in essence an attempt to disrupt the power of the dominant story.

**The Art of Critical Autoethnography**

> My fingers have holes in them. I’ve been threading a story of becoming Pākehā. It’s just a fragment of history, in a window of time and a slice of place that I have sewn into fabric. If you looked close enough you would see my blood where the needle pricked my finger. If you leaned in more you would hear whispers of laughter, taste tears, or smell my sweat. And if you were open and ready, you might feel something stirring inside yourself, like a memory of belonging. It has been a wonderful magical journey, this role of a bricoleur. I set out like the Three Princes of Serendip, taking on the task Denzin and others had required of me: to create and implement innovative methods to make sense of complex issues. In my case this is the complex issue of emerging ethnic identities in postcolonial societies. Bricolage provided a framework for me to draw upon diverse research knowledges, as they were required to respond to the unfolding context of the research situation (Kincheloe et al., 2011). As a bricoleur I drew on a range of textual and critical strategies to interpret and deconstruct the phenomenon explored (Kincheloe, 2001). I have learnt what it means to be a bricoleur researcher. I have learnt how to write poetry, how to make art, how to write and perform scripts, and in the process I have also learnt how to sew stories into an arpillera – a Chilean tapestry. Hence, even the tips of my fingers are marked with the story of becoming Pākehā.

> As a bricolage the *creation* of method was a central thread of the whole inquiry. For the purpose of this study I required a methodological approach that would enable me to construct an in-depth exploration of particular stories of becoming Pākehā and begin to connect it to the role of a Pākehā educator. I needed to choose the “right tool[s] for the right job” (Saldana, 2009, p. 2) to generate, slice,
stitch and create something new. I, therefore, adopted a postcritical ethnographic approach. This approach provided a framework for two complementary projects: an autoethnographic inquiry followed by a duoethnographic inquiry. Threaded through both these inquiries were also aspects of performance ethnography. These three ethnographic methods were suitable for my role as a bricoleur researcher, where I could respond to the stories generated through a variety of arts-based methods. I had permission to play, to immerse myself in making and creating.

**A Postcritical Ethnographic Bricolage**

Here I take each particular part of the term ‘postcritical ethnography’ and discuss how they contribute to each other and to my study: Beginning first with ethnography, then to the inclusion of critical, and last, the shift by Noblit and Maddison to postcritical ethnography.

*Ethnography* provided me with a way to explore culture and society, responding to how local understandings and perspectives influenced and mediated human experience and interaction (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Higgs, 2009; Murchison, 2010). As a qualitative form of research, ethnography includes a range of diverse approaches employed to study everyday life (Cohen et al., 2011). Ethnography demanded that I immerse myself deeply into the everyday life of becoming Pākehā to probe into the past and explore how Pākehā “negotiate and contest meaning in the course of their interactions with each other” and with others who are non-Pākehā (Higgs, 2009, p. 9). Applying Derrida’s notion of ‘hauntology’ and using a method of Critical family history, the everyday life was interrogated in relation to the past. As an ethnographer I was involved in a complex cyclic process of noticing, collecting and thinking (Seidel, 1998) through a reflexive exploration of social groups in real-life contexts (Cohen et al., 2011). As a Serendipiter my question was always with me, I would notice something on Facebook, or in a story shared in the café, or in reading the paper or watching a programme on television. I would cycle back to the historical records, cycle back to a theory I had read a few months before, cycle back to a poem I had scribbled in my journal. I was consistently moving back and forth between the retelling and a fragment of data, generating other questions, researching other data, examining epiphanies and connecting particular stories to how they are located in a historic moment (Denzin, 2013).
Over time, ethnographers have adapted in accordance with changes in society and criticism of the methods used (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). One criticism, arising from early ethnographic work (1920s-1950s), was concerned with how ethnographers presented descriptions of their observations as if they were objective 'fact'. Another concern was the way ethnographers detached themselves from their field of study, often writing up the work as a third person narrator. These concerns were related to issues of power. Importantly in this study, I needed to consistently consider my own subjectivity when trying to make sense of others’ lives through considering the wider historical, social and political factors of the time, as well as considering the stories of others who were entangled with my stories. From historical data I was retelling the stories of my ancestors, patching fragments of their story into a cohesive retelling. Therefore, I included within the research design my own standpoint and perspectives through adopting the postcritical approach (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

Critical ethnography is concerned with an ethical responsibility to pay attention to issues of unfairness or injustice with a focus on social change (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Denzin et al., 2008; Madison, 2005; Sullivan, 2010). As a critical ethnographer I explored beneath-surface appearances to disrupt standard or dominant stories of becoming Pākehā, which typically portray Pākehā as the ‘great white saviour of an uncivilised land’, and, further, to unsettle neutral and taken-for-granted assumptions (Madison, 2012, p. 5). To also disrupt the notion of a homogenous identity and highlight the diverse and fractured nature of Pākehā-ness, the stories exemplified in this work highlight there is not ‘one’ story of becoming Pākehā, but many different stories of becoming. Through questioning assumptions and dominant stories that exist in particular societies like New Zealand, I uncover and challenge the unfairness and injustice of some socio-political structures that remain dominant because of a past that remains (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Delving into the histories of my ancestors I reveal how Pākehā often became privileged at the expense of Māori. Critical research approaches “recognize that claims to truth are always discursively situated and implicated in relation to power” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 172). This work examines how Pākehā identities are haunted by their association with the notion of whiteness and how systems of governance resulted in diverse people groups being subsumed into a national identity. In the following passage Jim Thomas provides the aim and a description of critical ethnography as an approach, which serves as
“intellectual rebellion” where:

Critical thinking implies freedom by recognizing that social existence, including our knowledge of it, is not simply composed of givens imposed on us by powerful and mysterious forces. This recognition leads to the possibility of transcending existing forces. The act of critique implies that by thinking about and acting upon the world, we are able to change both our subjective interpretations and objective conditions. (Thomas, 1993, p. 18)

Postcritical ethnography acknowledges the importance of identifying and contextualising my position as researcher, hence I was involved in ongoing critical reflection to ensure my own beliefs, bias, and assumptions were transparent throughout the study (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Madison, 2012; Noblit, Flores, & Murillos, 2004; Sprecher, 2011). Critique of critical ethnography highlights concerns that, as a method, it “was in itself a form of hegemony – patriarchal, Eurocentric, individualistic, and white” (Noblit et al., 2004, p. 191). Postcritical ethnography extends the goals of critical ethnography to include “positionality, reflexivity, objectivity, and representation” (Noblit, 2004, p. 198). Madison argues that postcritical ethnography is a move to contextualise the position of the researcher and that “positionality is vital because it forces us to acknowledge our own power, privilege, and biases just as we are denouncing the power structures that surround our subjects” (2012, p. 8). Hence, in this study I implemented particular methods to ensure my own subjective and political perspectives were accessible and transparent to others. I begin with a personal history, with the “sting of child memory, with an event that lingers and remains” in my life story (Ulmer, cited in Denzin, 2013, p. 126). I link my stories to the stories of my ancestors, a form of critical family history, using arts-based methods to evoke the senses. My story is then juxtaposed through a duoethnographic project with two other Pākehā educators. By applying the prefix ‘post’ to critical ethnography I signified the importance of reflexivity through the research process (Grant & Giddings, 2002).

As a bricoleur researcher I drew specifically on two ethnographic methodologies that I perceived to be the right tools: autoethnography and duoethnography. The intent was to begin the study with an autoethnographic project to position me as the site and key narrator of the research story. The second project was a duoethnography that involved juxtaposition between my stories and other educators. Performance ethnography was drawn on as a form of analysis of stories generated throughout the two projects.
Project One: Autoethnography

Stacy Holman Jones asked, “How do we do critical autoethnography?” It was the closing session of a two-day conference in Melbourne in 2015: ‘The Art of Critical Autoethnography’. We had feasted on a range of beautiful, rich and evocative stories. I was full to overflowing, but there was a distinct shuffling in the room. Stacy had disturbed a complacent, satisfied moment. Her word ‘critical’ demanded attention. It was not enough to tell a provocative story. As researchers we are interrogating our personal stories to disrupt ‘standard’ or dominant stories, to bring justice, to disclose, to reveal and recover silenced stories. As a critical autoethnographer I had ‘taken up my pen’, I had taken up the paintbrush, the needle and thread, and I had immersed myself in fragments of personal story as primary data (see Chang, 2008; Denzin, 1999). I had interrogated my stories with theories to merge with my creative and scholarly voice (Boylorn & Orbe, 2014). I understood my role as a critical ethnographer. There were a few hesitant replies to Stacy’s question. Some of the participants sounded perturbed. It was an intellectual question and was not meant to reprimand. It was an important question. And one I continue to explore in my work.

Ellis, Adams, and Bochner (2010) define autoethnography as “an approach to research and writing that seeks to describe and systematically analyse (graphy) personal experience (auto) in order to understand cultural experience (ethno)” (p. 1). Many research theorists describe autoethnography as an emerging, critically framed qualitative research method that is based on personal experience and is derived from postmodern philosophy (see Boyd, 2008; Ellis et al., 2010; Holman Jones et al., 2013; Starr, 2010; S. Wall, 2006). Postmodern thought postulates that there are many ways of knowing (S. Wall, 2006). As a type of self-narrative, autobiographical in genre, it placed me within a social context to explore the complex multiple layers of Pākehā identity (Starr, 2010). As a research process, autoethnography combines features of both autobiography and ethnography, requiring me to critically select and analyse past experiences that have been significant in my life (Ellis et al., 2010).

As a qualitative methodology, the main purpose of autoethnographic research is to extend sociological understandings of particular cultures (Sparkes, 2000; S. Wall, 2006). Significantly, autoethnography provides opportunity for the voice of the researcher, through the lens of the ‘incorporated and integral self’ in the research process, so we may gain new knowledge relating to culture and society (Chang, 2008). Denzin and Lincoln (1994) suggest that small scale knowledge, such as that
derived from autoethnographic research, can inform particular problems in particular situations. Rather than separate the research from the researcher it “recognises and uses personal-cultural entanglements” (Adams, Holman Jones, & Ellis, 2014, p. 35). It encourages us to think differently about knowledge where, aligned with the postmodern perspective, knowledge is understood as socially constructed and predicated on the social, historical, moral and political (Starr, 2010, p. 4). Through a focus of connecting the personal to the cultural (Boyd, 2008) autoethnography enabled me to explore personal knowledge which, in turn, has the potential to inform educational theory and practice (Starr, 2010).

Ellis et al. (2010) argue that autoethnographic research is a political, socially just and socially conscious act. As a form of critical social research it has the potential for moral effect through disrupting socio-political structures that are unjust and unfair (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Through its “relentless nudging against the world of traditional science [it] holds wonderful, symbolic, emancipatory promise”, where it says that the knowledge I have (and those less privileged than me) matters (S. Wall, 2006, p. 3). Transformative potential was obtained through a process of critical engagement where I was involved in a cyclic, in-depth analysis of the lived experience of being Pākehā (Starr, 2010). Through a process of conscientisation (Friere, 1971, cited in Starr, 2010), I became increasingly aware of my social positioning and the possibility of transformation was created (Starr, 2010). Conscientisation involved me actively participating in a cyclic, critical process of self-analysis and understanding, creating a space between myself and culture to engage in transformation (Starr, 2010). Starr stipulates that the purpose of the autoethnography is to “reflexively critique the situatedness of self in relation to others” and be “committed to dialogue that leads to catalytic change” (Starr, 2010, p. 3).

**Project Two: Duoethnography**

Duoethnography is a relatively recent ethnographic form of qualitative research. Its point of difference from traditional forms of ethnographic research is that it involves two or more researchers investigating, through a multi-dialogic process, how their own lives have been situated socially and culturally (Sawyer & Liggett, 2012). The researchers are primarily interested in the process of how human beings make sense of what is being investigated. Sawyer and Norris (2012) originally created the duoethnographic approach to deconstruct meta-narratives and
interrogate those same stories. They define duoethnography as a “collaborative research methodology in which two or more researchers of difference juxtapose their life histories to provide multiple understandings of the world” (Norris et al., 2012, p. 9). It is through each telling their *different* stories about a particular issue that juxtaposition can occur.

For the purpose of this study, duoethnography provided me with a counterpoint for my autoethnographic study. Like autoethnographers, duoethnographers typically take a postmodern view of the construction of identity. They also, however, work to further disrupt standard stories and bring about transformation (Norris et al., 2012; Sawyer & Liggett, 2012). Premised on postmodern explanations of identity, duoethnography acknowledges the culturally layered, contradictory, socioculturally based and constantly changing nature of identity (Sawyer, as cited in Krammer & Mangiardi, 2012).

When exploring the role of an educator Sawyer and Ligget (2012) argue that duoethnography demands “understanding and critiquing our own educational histories in an honest and complex way” (Sawyer & Liggett, 2012, p. 72). bell hooks (1994) critiqued classroom practice that created barriers and thrived upon people ‘keeping their mouths shut’. She argued it is essential for critical thinkers to engage in conversations that cross boundaries and create space for interventions in order to transform our teaching practice (hooks, 1994, p. 129).

My duoethnographic conversations involved two colleagues who had an invested academic interest in the research topic and who also described themselves as ‘Pākehā educators’. The duoethnographic conversations provoked me to examine and excavate particular stories, promoting deeper understanding of how I had interpreted Pākehā identity and where I identify, expose and describe the interplay of identity narratives. These conversations were significant because “having the courage to open up conversations that have been silenced gives us the opportunity to voice important issues and continue necessary conversations” (Le Fevre & Sawyer, 2012, p. 285).

**Methods**

As a form of inquiry, autoethnography and duoethnography moved me from self-observations to self-introspection (S. Wall, 2006). Clandinin and Connelly (1994) suggest the “freedom of a researcher to speak as a player in a research project, and
to mingle his or her experience with the experience of those studied, is precisely what is needed to move inquiry and knowledge further along” (cited in S. Wall, 2006, p. 3). Much of my work fits within the realm of what Christine Sleeter defines as Critical Family History (Sleeter, 2015). Initially using the same methods as genealogical researchers, I dug around into historical archives to better understand the stories of my colonial ancestors.

**Can critical family history research enhance a critical autoethnography?**

There is increasing interest in family history research by people in postcolonial nations (Sleeter, 2015). Does this research respond to the claim that white people in postcolonial societies need to know their histories? (Bell, 2009b; Howard, 2006; Webber, 2011) Typically, family history research has been done by people interested in their family origins and stories, but what is being asked for above by Bell, Webber and Howard, is critical family history research. Christine Sleeter (2015) provides a productive framework to reconceptualise family history research as a form of **critical family history**. This framework is a useful way to interrogate fragments of one family history. As an autoethnographer, I argue here that critical family history is a useful way to summon up the past to make sense of our present and inform our future. As Art Bochner (2013) argues: “The past is always open to revision and so, too, are our stories of the past and what they mean now” (p. 54). In retelling these stories we make sense of the past and trace its effects to the present.

Through applying a historical lens to autoethnography I am exploring what Giorgio describes as “absent memory” and interrogating my past through the relationship of “I and the Other” (Giorgio, 2013, pp. 418-419). Hence, in writing an autoethnography I also bear witness to memories that I have not experienced. They are memories from family stories, artefacts, historical records and those scars etched onto the bodies of family that still remain. These memories are “felt like a ghost’s presence” (Giorgio, 2013, p. 418). My work intends to thread these particular stories together and link them to the social, political and historical context of the time to show how they shape the story (Pathak, 2013, p. 599).

Family history research has become increasingly popular with the advent of advancements in technology and easy access to online historical records. Family history sites (such as ancestry.com) offer many incentives and support to aid the beginning researcher in their quest. Popular also is the search for family connections through DNA testing, and these tests can enable people to trace their ancestors back
to an almost mythological past — in my case to one of the four original Jewish mothers around 2000 BC. DNA findings connect you to people who share common biological ancestors back hundreds or even thousands of years, often-times turning up unexpected relatives. Hence, family history research serves several diverse purposes: religious groups (such as Mormons) looking to ‘baptise’ dead relatives; to answers and insights into health and medical questions; to people researching their personal histories to develop their family narratives. These family narratives, however, usually involve a researcher attempting to identify an ‘idealized progenitor’ and create a narrative of 'long-term heroism' (Gardner, 2003). Often, these narratives exclude ancestral stories that do not support the ‘right’ pedigree. Rather they work to maintain ‘officially sanctioned’ stories of colonisation (Norquay, 1998). As argued by Bell (2015), critical family history researchers must be careful not to continue the practice of romanticising our ancestral figures.

Family history research, as a method to explore sociological issues, is a recent phenomenon and is beginning to attract attention from various scholars for different reasons. It is now recognised that there is an enormous range of genealogical data that is available, not only to the community of genealogical family historians but also to researchers in sociology and other disciplines, which can be used to answer questions about the inter-generational transmission of material and non-material culture and about the social factors that prompted our ancestors either to stay in their home country or to come to New Zealand and with what consequences in, and for, both societies. It can be used to assess the impact of those decisions on their descendants, and particularly their ethnic and national identity (Barnes & Swain, 2012).

How, then, are researchers using family history research tools in a ‘critical’ way rather than perpetuating dominant narratives and silencing the voices of others?

Initially family history research was used by black scholars to provide counter-stories to dominant white historical narratives; researchers are now creating ways in which this research can enable us to interrogate the past to understand the present (Gardner, 2003). Importantly also, for this study with a focus on Pākehā ‘educators’, is how educators are developing pedagogical practices that enable students to explore and tell their stories of immigration to better understand identity formation. “As a pedagogical strategy, it has the potential of bridging two important projects within progressive teacher education, the well established multicultural and anti-racist
approaches to teaching and learning” (Norquay, 1998, p. 188). Sleeter’s (2015) critical family history framework involves an approach where the researcher includes particular family details, describes the historical context and considers the social context, such as what other social groups were impacted in the same space (geographical and time). Layering these stories alongside each other the researcher, and later the reader, gets a sense of the power dynamics at play.

A range of analytical tools can be applied to stories generated through the process of family history research. In retelling stories of postcolonial identity formation, critical theory and critical race theory are useful. Critical theory enables us to interrogate how economic, political and educational structures have been organised historically to privilege some and disadvantage others. Critical race theory provides a lens to consider how historical belief systems, such as racial hierarchies, resulted in particular power relationships with consequential political and social decisions. In these situations racial identities began to function like ‘property’. Interrogating family stories critically often highlights how race became intertwined with class, and how ‘racism’ became ‘washed out’ of family stories (Sleeter, 2015).

John Lee (2013) provides a strategy to begin asking questions about why our ancestors immigrated and what happened when they got to the ‘colonies’ He calls these the ‘Hidden Four Ps’ of immigration: push, pull, punishment and privilege. These four Ps are useful to situate family stories within a historical context. Briefly, push are the factors that encourage someone to leave their home, pull are the incentives offered through the move, punishment includes negative experiences on arrival, and privilege are those things that help and support the immigrant to settle. These four Ps are used in a later chapter to explore questions concerning the reasons for, and experience of, one ancestor’s (Charles Bawden Rogers) immigration to New Zealand in 1875.

Sleeter encourages a critical examination of our family histories, to help us understand “vexing issues of the present by unearthing how they were enacted in our own pasts, and how the present is linked to that past” (Sleeter, 2015, p. 2). Her reasoning is that, by peeling back the layers of who we are, how we have learnt to identify ourselves and how we relate to those whose backgrounds are unlike ours, we will ultimately engage in a conversation about cultural diversity social justice that includes everyone (Sleeter, 2015, p. 10). Through telling our family histories we complexify the liberal narratives of progress (Bell, 2015). It is in these tellings that we
can highlight how each of us is implicated and connected to a historical past, providing a counter-story to the sanctioned, dominant stories of our histories.

Throughout this project I also attended to Anderson’s (2006 cited in Boyd, 2008) five criteria. First, I was a full member of the research group, Pākehā. Second, I engaged in analytic reflexivity. Third, I was visible in consequential published texts and conference presentations. Fourth, engagement with informants beyond me was an essential part of the design, and last, I was committed to an analytic research agenda focused on improving theoretical understandings of broader social phenomena, such as white identity.

As a form of self-narrative the methods I used were underpinned by stories of my own experience, non-linear, and utilising a range of narrative-writing techniques. The data generated represent a wide range of narrative activities which included: personal documents, notes, journals, reflections, interview notes and transcripts, poems, artwork, snap-shots, artefacts, metaphor, and relevant literature (Adams et al., 2014; Boyd, 2008; Ellis et al., 2010; Starr, 2010; S. Wall, 2006).

Performance

Interwoven throughout the autoethnographic and duoethnographic inquiries I drew on performance ethnography to analyse and represent findings. Performance ethnography is often referred to by scholars in the field as a marriage between two complementary partners. The purpose of both performance and ethnography is to celebrate the richness and complexity of life, to recognise the dynamic and transformative nature of knowledge, and “acknowledge the subjectivity of human research” (Ackroyd & O’Toole, 2010, p. xvii). As a recognised form of qualitative research, performance ethnography is a fairly recent and emerging methodology (Saldana, 2003).

For the purpose of this study, performance ethnography provided a critically, aesthetically, appropriate and generative method for analysing and representing the stories. The nature of the methodology allowed for the complexity of human beings and recognised the sensory elements of the phenomena as significant in the investigative process. Ackroyd and O’Toole use the metaphor of ‘cooking mince’ to explain how performance ethnography enables the researcher to mince the data and then cook them in such a way as to provide a richness that evokes the senses and awakes the researcher and audience to new insights and possibilities (Ackroyd &
O'Toole, 2010, pp. 2-5).

For this study, performance methods provided another mechanism to critique and disrupt the standard stories that emerged through the autoethnography and duoethnography. Performance ethnography also provided a critically reflexive way of narrating and engaging with theory, the co-researchers and others in particular social contexts (Spry, 2011b, p. 498). This fits with Denzin’s directive that “as researchers we need to find new ways of connecting persons and their personal troubles with social justice methodologies” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. ix). Spry (2011b) contends that, through the power of performance, participants are empowered to critically and collaboratively make meaning, and to challenge and change particular power structures (pp. 500-503).

**Performance as method**

As an emerging methodology, performance expands the meaning of texts by privileging embodied ethnographic research (Tedlock, 2011). The method provides a way to explore the expressive elements of culture and recognises embodiment as an essential component of cultural analysis (Hamera, 2011). As Spry (2011b) argues, “embodied knowledge is the somatic (the body’s interaction with culture) represented through the semantic (language), a linguistic articulation, a telling, of what does and does not go into the body, and why” (p. 502). Hence, through performance ethnography the researcher is required to draw on, and integrate, different knowledges: specialised and expert knowledge, sensory embodied knowledge, politically engaged conceptual knowledge and pragmatic (know-how) knowledge (Hamera, 2011, p. 318).

For this study, I utilised performance ethnography as a method for teasing apart the stories generated, interrogating the stories with theory, and creating a representation of the findings. This involved writing scripts and poetry that represented stories generated throughout the process. Many of the scripts and poems in the following articles and chapters in this thesis have been performed both with colleagues and as solo pieces at different local and international conferences (see E. Fitzpatrick, Mullen, & O’Connor, 2015). These performances have provided a rich and deepening embodied experience of the stories generated, hence provoking critical reflection and further exploration.
**Analysis of Information**

The bricoleur researcher ‘slices’ and ‘stitches’ the new understandings; blending, overlapping and creating something new (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Kincheloe describes how the ethnographer-as-bricoleur moves to a deeper level of data analysis as he or she sees “what’s not there” in physical presence, i.e., what is not discernible by the ethnographic eye (Kincheloe, 2001, p. 686).

Analysis was an ongoing, cyclic process throughout the duration of my study. Likened to an infinite spiral (Seidel, 1998), analysis occurred as an iterative and progressive act as I noticed, collected and thought about data. A dynamic relationship existed in the process between the reading and evaluating of relevant literature, collecting data, analysing data and sharing findings (Ryan, 2006, p. 97). Early stages of analysis occurred through the writing of reflections and memos in research journals, providing a subtle analysis through narrative description. More in-depth analysis, involved abstract thinking and theorisation, occurring at later stages as I identified and reflected on concepts that underpinned particular themes and began to theorise about the data. Theorising involved critical thinking through scrutinisation of stories for evidence of discourses, paradigms, meaning repertoires, values and attitudes.

Critical analysis of the experience and an examination of ways others may have experienced similar phenomena are urged by Ellis et al. (2010). Hence, as a bricoleur I utilised analysis that best suited the stories generated. Analysis involved the initial coding of data in a coding journal and ongoing reflective narrative writing in research journals. As a critical bricoleur I employed various creative writing technologies to the stories generated and interrogated these with theory (Richardson & St Pierre, 2005). Gannon argues that theory is a “tool for thinking” about our stories and when we ‘dance’ theory with personal autoethnographic writing we produce stories that are “powerful, evocative, and theoretically sophisticated” (Gannon, 2006, p. 476).

**Narrative analysis**

Narrative analysis was used to analyse the stories, where I applied the conventions of typical narrative genres to reflect upon the psychological and sociological context of the stories (Riessman, 2008; Saldana, 2009). The story-generation process was intricately intertwined with analysis and interpretation.
Throughout the project various forms of narrative analysis were employed to interrogate the data (e.g., thematic analysis, visual analysis and dialogic/performance analysis). Each analysis involved me noticing patterns and sequences, and particular actors, places and times that demanded my attention, whilst endeavouring to keep the ‘story’ intact. Thematic analysis was employed to interrogate archival documents (for example letters, historical documents, census records) and my own journal writing and personal narratives (Riessman, 2008). Visual analysis was employed in my own art and with visual artefacts, such as photos and drawings, to attend to details, contextualise the image, compare, and theorise (Riessman, 2008, pp. 141-143). I employed creative writing as a mode of inquiry and analysis throughout the project as a way to make sense of the fragments of historical stories/data I unearthed. Laurel Richardson describes how she was…

…not certain how others will document their becoming, but [like Richardson] I have chosen structures that suit my disposition, theoretical orientation, and writing life. I am “growing myself up” by refracting my life through a sociological lens, fully engaging C. Wright Mills’s “sociology” – the intersection of the biographical and historical. (Richardson & St Pierre, 2005, p. 967)

**Arts-based research**

Arts-based research was also an important method of generating, analysing and presenting stories. Critical arts-based research emerged as a response to a crisis identified in qualitative research by Denzin and Lincoln (2000), and others, who urged researchers to find new ways to inquire and represent complexity and critique hegemonic texts of privileged stories (Finley, 2011). Arts-based research, as developed and theorised by Elliot Eisner (2002), utilises the embodied self, making use of affective experiences, senses, and emotions (Finley, 2011). Arts-based research methods, sometimes defined as A/R/Tography, employed as a creative process, provided a way of analysing the felt, embodied, contradictory and temporal aspects of the data generated (Irwin & de Cosson, 2004; Sullivan, 2010). The objective of arts-based research was to understand more deeply who I am and what I believe … (Lymburner, 2004, p. 76). Lymburner further asserts that “art-based journaling methods provide the opportunity to reflect in action and on action aesthetically, intellectually, and introspectively” (2004, p. 87).

A/R/Tography acknowledges the interaction between the roles of **Artist**, **Researcher**, and **Teacher** in the research process. Through employing arts-based
practice the researcher is acknowledging the body as a “site for the production of knowledge, feelings, emotions and history” … hence, “[b]odies themselves engage in theory making” (Gannon, 2006, pp. 476-477). Figures 3 and 4 demonstrate an arts-based exploration early on in my study of the key methods and theories I was using. Participating in an arts-based workshop facilitated by Jane Luton, I was asked to create an installation, using whatever materials were at hand, for an imaginary museum. The installation’s objective was to represent the story ‘so far’ of my doctoral journey. The blue pieces of paper, in the two figures below, were attached to rope and inserted in the spiral and named the theoretical and ancestral ghosts I had spoken with up to this point.

**Figure 3**: Becoming Pākehā. An Early Art installation of my Research Proposal to Grapple with the Integration of Theory and Method

In this study I was a researcher first, the arts-based methods were used as a tool; I was involved in the ‘doing’ of research. There has been much debate on the role of the non-expert artist utilising arts-based methods. I am in agreement with Finley (2011) who, with clear links to D. Harper’s (1987) work, described how the created product is secondary to the “mental and cultural experiences of the work” (p.
Further, as a bricoleur researcher involved in the process of responding to stories and making, I was required to learn the skill best suited for the ‘tools at hand’.

Figure 4: Spiral of the Research Journey

Dialogic/Performance analysis acknowledged me as an active collaborator ‘performing’ in the narrative. Through the process I needed to attend to my own struggles over meanings and how “identities are situated and accomplished with the audience in mind” (Riessman, 2008, p. 106). Importantly, I moved back and forth between the data and the ‘scholarship of others’ to theorise and contextualise the narratives that emerged.

A coding journal

The purpose of the coding journal in qualitative research is to begin capturing the essence of the data being generated (Saldana, 2009). This initial coding involves noting ideas and questions to consider throughout the study. Reflective memos on these coding choices provided a personal and subjective analytical response (Saldana, 2009). These memos reflected: my code choices and definitions; emergent...
patterns; categories and themes; possible connections and overlaps; emergent or related theory; problems or ethical dilemmas; and, ideas about future direction (Saldana, 2009, pp. 35-36). As this initial coding was solo it was essential I had a mentor/s to discuss the coding and analysis as I progressed through the project. This role involved my advisors and supervisors during different stages of the study.

**Performance**

Following Saldana’s (1998, 2003, 2009) analytical process, the first phase of utilising the method of performance was to reduce the data corpus to that which was essential and salient for the purpose of the study (Sallis, 2008; Seidman, 1991). Reducing the data initially involved me engaging in a process of conceptualisation to make sense of, and begin to order the data, with reference to my own narrative (Sallis, 2008). This involved me dancing or playing with the data corpus, reading and rereading in order to become familiar with the meaning and feeling of the ‘words’ to evoke strong metaphoric images (Bagley & Cancienne, 2002; Sallis, 2008).

Throughout this phase I engaged in the process of crystallisation to cater for the multiple forms of analysis, range of perspectives, and inclusion of many writing genres or representations generated throughout the study (Ellingson, 2009, 2011). Crystallisation, as a postmodern approach to triangulation, was well suited to this study. This is particularly evident when considering the five principles given by Ellingson (2011). First, this study was concerned with generating a deep, complex interpretation of Pākehā identity through ‘thick descriptions’ and juxtaposition of different stories. Second, the study sits along a qualitative continuum of ethnographic forms of inquiry. Third, the generation of data included many writing genres and artistic representations (including performance). Fourth, my reflexive and critical position in the study was central. And lastly, as a bricoleur, knowledge was celebrated as “situated, partial, constructed, multiple, and embodied” (Ellingson, 2011, p. 605).

The analytical process as outlined by Saldana meets two objectives. First it is consistent with Denzin’s call that, as researchers, we need to create new versions of the past, a new history, through bringing together a chorus of discordant voices (and images) (Spry, 2011b, p. 499). This chorus recognises and gives voice to the multiplicity of histories that exist to challenge dominant narratives (Spry, 2011b). Secondly, it created a space for interaction with the audience and readers to generate future data and further participatory civic social action.
Theoretical Bricoleur

In the next chapter I respond to the concept of a ‘theoretical bricoleur’. As a theoretical bricoleur I was chasing the complexity of being and becoming Pākehā by employing a range of lenses on particular artefacts or stories. These included, in the main: Derrida’s (2006) notion of hauntology and différance; New Materialism and ideas around quantum entanglement and the agency of the ‘thing’; postcolonial theories; embodied ethnicity; and, critical race theories. I also needed to consider the different perspectives on race, ethnicity and culture that were being played out in the literature I was reading. It was, therefore, necessary to work “between and within competing and overlapping perspectives and paradigms” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 8). Proponents of bricolage assert that applying a range of lenses adds depth, rigour, and multiplicity to the inquiry (Kincheloe, 2001, 2005; Rogers, 2012). For this thesis the theoretical lenses were a critical component of my own journey as a bricoleur. They were employed in response to my serendipitous encounters with different ideas from my reading, from my experiences with data, and from those encounters with the life stories I was privileged to hear.
CHAPTER 3
A THEORETICAL AND HISTORICAL BRICOLAGE

It was a tricky business journeying through the vast range of literature that pertains to this study. Which path to take? What theory is relevant to this journey? Whose truth should I share? One dimension of difference cannot take into account the multiple experiences that occur in the process of becoming Pākehā. Rather it requires a ‘mash up’ of different theories, integrated at different layers, to allow for the complexity of a dynamic identity. I am interested in the embodied experience of becoming Pākehā. I am interested in how these experiences are translated in our role as Pākehā educators. I am interested in how, as Pākehā educators, we can provide culturally responsive spaces – where all students can develop positive identities.

The exploration process, therefore, required an openness and a responsiveness where I was prepared for serendipitous discoveries throughout the journey. Hence, the historical narratives and theories represented here not only offer a wide breadth of subject matter, but tap into the minds, hearts and dreams of philosophers, poets and prophets – writers who have provoked my thinking, evoked my emotions, and shattered my truths. And they continue to speak to me. As a bricoleur I draw on the work from a range of theoretical perspectives: postcritical, socio-cultural, socio-psychological, postcolonial and postmodern. For this study I chose those theories that resonated with my experience of becoming Pākehā throughout the journey. These theories all provide a different perspective on Pākehā and yet, importantly, there are connections and overlaps between them as well.

Throughout this study the importance of my childhood stories increasingly became realised (Maddison-MacFayden, 2013; O’Loughlin, 2009). These stories were both written and oral, local and foreign, fact, fiction and fantasy. If my story were chronological it would start, as it were, ‘In the Beginning’ with the Bible, the book of my childhood. There would also be the stories that originated in the place of my birth – the Māori myths and legends. The mythical tales of the Tūhoe people and the Patupaiarehe pale fairy folk – the stories of ‘the children of the mist’; and there would be the prophecies of the Ringatū. Juxtaposed alongside these were stories from afar, thanks to Enid Blyton, you would find the Famous Five who taught me how to prepare for and execute a journey of exploration – and how to pack a picnic, Aesop’s fables and Brothers Grimm opened my imagination to the possibility of other
worlds, and Arthur C. Clarke in the possibility of the impossible. Next, from New Zealand, would come Michael King and his story of Whina Cooper and the Māori land march, creative writers Katherine Mansfield and Frank Sargeson also loom large; they offered counter-stories to my own childhood in New Zealand, stories of a New Zealand I did not recognise. Maurice Shadbolt returned me to the places I knew with his historical novel *Season of the Jew*; a story of the Māori prophets in the Urewera rainforest with names and landmarks so very familiar to me. All these stories haunt my story of becoming Pākehā. However, my story is not merely a chronology – it cycles to and fro, back and forth through time, as I engage with the literature.

My research on Pākehā identity was initially influenced by the writings of Avril Bell (1999, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2009a, b, and 2014), Alison Jones (1999, 2008, 2011, and 2012) and Melinda Webber (2008, 2011, and 2013). Avril Bell insisted that Pākehā need to know their past. Alison Jones reminded me of my entangled relationship with Māori, and of both the limits and the possibilities of this relationship. And Melinda Webber told me her story of ‘walking the space between’ (Webber, 2008) and the experience of a hybrid identity. These researchers continue to speak to my work.

I begin this theoretical bricolage by defining race and ethnicity and the complicated relationship between such identities. Race is defined as a problematic concept that is often used to categorise people into different groups for political and social reasons (Michael Apple, cited in Leonardo, 2009b). Ethnicity is defined as a socially constructed concept which has very real consequences for individuals and society (Fenton, 2010; Leonardo, 2009b). Next I discuss the emergence, through the period of the Enlightenment, of ‘whiteness’ as a political and dominant identity.

Note from my journal (August 2015):

*I was at an academic seminar in 2015 on identities and a colleague responded to another speaker, ‘we don't use the word race in New Zealand’. I didn’t respond, I had heard it before. I wondered if it was fear that provoked the response, that in speaking the word race aloud we might give it power. But I also wondered if by not speaking about race we are perpetuating the power it has. I thought back to a moment in my early childhood, walking down the main street of Ōpōtiki with my mother. An old Māori man walked past and I said loudly, pointing, 'chocolate'. As a small child I was curious about the world and, as children do, I was busy noticing difference. My mother, however, was extremely embarrassed. To her the concept of race was very real, her life experiences had been haunted by the notion of racial difference.*
You Can’t Leapfrog the Term Race

My mother’s embarrassed response in the above narrative is typical of people who have been conditioned, through modernist and colonialist understandings, to believe there is a correlation between phenotypical characteristics of groups of people, such as skin colour, and racial categories (Kubota, 2010; McKinley, 2005). Leonardo (2009b) describes the uncomfortable position for scholars researching understandings of race, he draws our attention to race scholars Gilroy and Nayak who succinctly capture the complexity of exploring these understandings in the following two quotes:

[We] always agree that ‘race’ is invented but are then required to defer to its embeddedness in the world. (Gilroy, 2000, p. 52)

The problem that race writers encounter, then, is how do we discuss race in a way that does not reify the very categories we are seeking to abolish?.(Nayak, 2006, p. 415)

While there is a consensus amongst the scientific community that race does not exist as a biological category, it persists, and is a “very real socially constructed marker used for classifying people” (May & Sleeter, 2010, p. 106). The concept of using race as a strategy to classify different groups of people gained traction during the emergence of western imperialism as a way to dominate and control (A. Bell, 2005; Song, 2003). Said described how the western world justified political dominance (colonialism and imperialism) through the creation of the ‘Oriental Other’ and associated racial difference with weakness (Said, 1978). Said further highlighted how the categorisation of groups has had a global impact on how people construct their social identities:

Imperialism consolidated the mixture of cultures and identities on a global scale … its worst and most paradoxical gift was to allow people to believe they were only, mainly, exclusively white, or black or Western or Oriental. Yet as human beings make their own history, they also make their cultural and ethnic identities. (Said, 1993, p. 408)

Racial identity is extremely complicated (Apple, 2009). It is always in flux between how an individual self ascribes their identity and how their identity is ascribed by others. It is therefore not a static, essentialised ‘being’. Rather it is always in the process of becoming. As a socio-psychological construct racial identity involves the individual’s sense of belonging to a particular collective group (Ashmore,
This sense of belonging is often influenced by racial identification, where a categorisation is imposed on an individual by others utilising phenotypic characteristics (i.e., observable physical characteristics or traits), and where individuals are said to belong to a racial group who share a common heritage (Helms, 1990; Meyers, 2005; Phinney & Ong, 2007). Racial identification often occurs in public spaces where individuals are ascribed, or asked to self-ascribe, themselves according to a ‘crude classification’ system (Flynn, 2010). These systems are employed to gather data for various purposes, and are often used for planning by government bodies in such areas as schools, police, health and housing. The use of these crude categories is often then reported, for example by the media, which works to further strengthen the imagined boundaries.

Scholarly definitions of racial identity evolved during the Enlightenment from the idea of a dividing line based on biological and genetic dimensions (discussed later in this chapter) to the recognition of socially constructed meanings of race (Quintana, 2007; Song, 2003). Research on racial identity, however, shows how traditional definitions of racial groups continue to persist where socially constructed lay theories and essentialist thinking fixes people into groups defined by their assumed biological and genetic differences (A. Bell, 2005; Guibernau & Rex, 2010; Quintana & McKown, 2008). This assumed boundary between different racial groups continues to have powerful consequences, since systems of inequality have been (and continue to be), built around racial categories (Pollock, 2004). These consequences are especially apparent where race is a determining factor in how a child is perceived by others, including its peers and people in authority, and the subsequent types of behaviour that result from that perception – types of behaviour such as racism. Subsequently, the use of racial terminology is often avoided due to the concern that it reifies an incorrect notion of biological boundaries (Quintana & McKown, 2008). These imagined boundaries are the product of the employment of traditional race categories, where people associate particular phenotypical characteristics with certain patterns of behaviour and potential. It is through the repeated performance of racial identification experiences that these imagined boundaries appear ‘real’ (Flynn, 2010).

During the 1950s and 1960s the term ‘race’ was increasingly questioned (Guibernau & Rex, 2010). This was due to: (a) sociological changes in how were ‘race relations’ were analysed; (b) challenges from particular social movements; (c)
global political shifts (as countries demanded independence from colonial rule); (d) international critique of racial policies through the era of colonialism; and also, (e) the feminist and civil rights movements, through which the term ‘race’ fell out of favour (Guibernau & Rex, 2010; Meyers, 2005; Spoonley, 1988). Racial discourse became further problematised by the recognition, in much of society since the post-civil rights movement, that public expression of racist ideas are often unacceptable (Meyers, 2005). Pollock (2004) described how individuals are consciously concerned about being labelled racist if they fumble race words, such as white and black, and instead they become ‘colormute’. She further emphasised the dilemma where maintaining a silence on race can result in either a dismantling of racial constructs, or a reinforcement of them (Pollock, 2004). Hence, other terms began to become more popular in identity discourse – terms such as ethnicity. This was especially apparent in New Zealand where, as explained by Spoonley:

The old notions were challenged and ‘race’ was discarded in favour of a concept that was much more positive in its approach and which did not employ the biological determinism of the past. Ethnicity was the new term, which was used by sociologists and others to acknowledge the positive feelings belonging to a cultural group. (Spoonley, 1988, p. 40)

However, racial discourse continues to pervade how we make sense of ourselves and those we come into contact with. Through the continued actions of, for example, the media, enforcement agencies and educational policies, race may be used to explain certain actions and behaviours; and hence assumptions continue to be made about others based on historic notions of race (Spoonley, 1988).

The Overlap Between Race and Ethnicity and Culture

When discussing terms such as ‘race’, ‘ethnicity’ and ‘culture’ there needs to be recognition of the considerable intertwining, overlapping and debate these concepts cause in identity-related discourse (Grossman & Charmaraman, 2009b; Phinney, 1996; Phinney & Ong, 2007; Song, 2003). The overlap between racial identity and ethnic identity is apparent where stereotypical phenotype characteristics are used to categorise one group in comparison to another (Cross & Cross, 2008; Song, 2003; Tyler, 2008), and where both are concerned with developing a sense of belonging (Grossman & Charmaraman, 2009; Phinney & Ong, 2007). As definitions for race and ethnicity have evolved there has been a tendency for them to be used interchangeably. Furthermore, there is increasing opposition to distinguishing them
as separate entities, but rather to acknowledge their entangled or hybridised state (Quintana & McKown, 2008; Song, 2003). The artificial differentiation of race and ethnicity does not correlate with the lived experience of individuals (Cross & Cross, 2008; Quintana, 2007), as stated by the American Anthropological Association:

…by treating race and ethnicity as fundamentally different..., the historical evolution of these category types is largely ignored. For example, today’s ethnicities are yesterday’s races. (as cited in Quintana, 2007, p. 260)

Rather, it is important to explore and acknowledge the synergy and overlap between these three terms, how they are used by individuals or groups for different purposes, and how they continue to be redefined and haunted by history.

**Cultural identity**

Cultural identity is concerned with the shared values, beliefs, traditions and practices that people acquire as a collective group (A. Bell, 2005; Bhabha, 2005; Matthewman, 2005; Yon, 2000). A standard definition of a culture describes the *behaviour* of the members of a group in response to shared meanings, symbols and values; this results in the development of customs, traditions, norms and expectations (J. Martin, 2002; Rata, 2003). Cultural affinity is defined as a shared understanding of one’s cultural heritage, beliefs, values and traditions, and is often associated with ethnic identity (Phinney & Ong, 2007; Song, 2003). I am in agreement with Yon (2000) who described culture in postmodern terms as elusive, moving away from a definition with a fixed set of attributes toward an ‘open-ended text’, which consists of multiple voices in a complex relationship, continually being refined through the process of everyday life.

When discussing the construction of an ethnic identity I am cognisant of the significant interplay between understandings of ‘ethnicity’, ‘race’ and also ‘culture’. I recognise the considerable intertwining of these three terms in identity-related discourse (as exemplified in the works of Grossman & Charmaraman, 2009; Phinney, 1996; Phinney & Ong, 2007; Song, 2003; Yon, 2000). Fenton argues that, “no amount of peeling back the layers of meaning” of these terms will reveal a decisive set of markers; rather, at the core there is a shared meaning (2010, p. 7). Fenton (2010) argues the shared meaning oscillates around beliefs of ‘descent’ and ‘cultural difference’. Important for my study is recognition of the history and complexity of these terms and how they continue to inform each other. Hence, although there is a
focus on the term ‘ethnic identity’, it is done so with an interest in how ethnicity is haunted by historic beliefs about race and the overlap with culture.

In real-world terms, ethnicity is clearly distinct but the definitional edges are so blurry that it is hard to know where ethnicity stops, where the old-fashioned idea of “race” starts, and where exactly within this morass the concept of community sits. (Didham & Bedford, 2004, p. 11)

The Construction of Ethnic Identities: Routes and Roots

Distinguishing ethnicity from race, and focusing on the importance of subjective positioning, ethnicity was famously defined by Weber as:

Those human groups that entertain subjective belief in their common descent because of similarities of physical type or of customs or of both, or because of memories of colonisation or migration. (Weber, 1922, 1968, cited in Guibernau & Rex, 2010, p. 2)

In this study I highlight ethnicity as a construct that is both real and imagined. It is real when people’s lives are impacted by policy, systems, or experiences, and when ethnicity is used to inform or make decisions. It is imagined when people invent and position conceptual boundaries around particular groups of people to categorise, organise and explain how one might belong to a particular group and whether that belonging is self-identified or ascribed. These real and imagined ethnicities are constructed, and reconstructed, in response to social and political context and the meanings and implications concerned with belonging (Carter & Fenton, 2010):

…the widely held view of ethnic membership as a fundamental and relatively stable ascriptive attribute of human populations is flawed, as is the idea of “ethnicity” as a stable “force” in society. Sociological definitions of ethnicity, like sociological definitions of race, tend to rely on popular perceptions of ethnicity – ethnic identities are whatever people think they are or whatever they think others are. (Carter & Fenton, 2010, p. 8)

Whether belonging to a particular ethnic group is perceived as real or imagined, Jenkins (2008) reminds us that, “we must take seriously the fact that ethnicity means something to individuals and that when it matters, it can really matter” (p. 172, emphasis in original).

Pākehā can be defined as an ethnic group that is both real and imagined, where ‘ethnicity’ is a term employed to make sense of an identity constructed in
response to a shared history, to histories of migration and colonisation, and is haunted by its predecessor, ‘race’. Yet the term ‘Pākehā’ also extends to include factors such as language, and/or religion, nationality and heritage. And Pākehā is a term that is both ascribed and self-ascribed; it is dynamic and always in the process of becoming, and it is not exclusive of other ethnic identities.

I also argue ethnicity is a complex concept, and in doing so I acknowledge that no one discipline ‘owns’ identity. Rather a multi-interdisciplinary approach will add value to how we might think about such issues (Liu, McCreanor, McIntosh, & Teaiwa, 2005). Tahu Kukutai (2012) argues:

To acknowledge that ethnicity does not exist in any ontologically objective way is not to deny its real consequences and effects in society, nor to minimize its significance for those who perceive themselves to be part of a community bound by common ties of descent, customs, histories and so forth. (Kukutai, 2012, p. 29)

The purpose of my work is to explore the concept of Pākehā ethnic identity through a postmodern and postcolonial lens. The postmodern perspective insists on critiquing and challenging stable and fixed notions of ethnic identity (Yon, 2000) through recognising the situational, contingent, and changeable aspects of identity construction (Song, 2003). Postcolonial theory, however, focuses on the interplay between the Enlightenment, histories of colonisation, and the construction and institutionalisation of emerging identities (Phoenix, 2010). Postcolonial writer, Stuart Hall, argues that “[c]ultural identity … is a matter of ‘becoming’ as well as ‘being’ … Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialised past [it is] subject to the continuous play of history, culture and power” (Hall, 1990, p. 225).

Ethnic identity as a construct is not something to be captured and secured, rather, it is significant as a phenomenon to be explored (Fenton, 2010). Exploration of ethnic identity helps makes sense of why people construct imagined boundaries and how they are used in the lived world. Brubaker, Loveman, and Stamatov contend that ethnicity is not a ‘thing’ in the world but a shared way of seeing, “thinking, parsing social experience, and interpreting the social world … not ontological but epistemological” (Brubaker et al., 2004, p. 45). Therefore, Pākehā identity is understood in this study not as a fixed, stable entity but rather, as a fluid, slippery process that is always in the state of ‘becoming’ (Yon, 2000). I am also cognisant of the use of ethnic identity labels to enable particular groups to make sense of their
histories in order to make sense of their present and, therefore, to be strategic about their futures. This is particularly useful for ethnic minority groups (such as Māori in New Zealand) who have suffered economically and socially through the abuse of such categories in policy and governmental structures.

In postcolonial countries, such as New Zealand, there has been a rapid increase in globalisation through migration and advances in technology. These changes in our society result in increased multi-ethnic groups with accompanying diverse understandings of themselves as ethnic, racial or cultural groups. It is important, therefore, to develop more complex and nuanced ways of making sense of these changes.

The salience of [ethnic] identity and identity politics is a product of two of the constitutive elements of modernity: globalisation, which brings people together from different parts of the world in both harmony and conflict, and democratisation, wherein these people and the groups they belong to, whether they stand in the centre or on the margins of society, are expected to have a say in determining the future of society. (Liu et al., 2005, p. 11)

Hence, in postcolonial countries ethnic identity is increasingly defined as a complex, multifaceted, dynamic construct, that develops over time, and is in a constant state of becoming (Ashmore et al., 2004). However, one important aspect of this becoming is in relation to how society continues to inform us (for example, through education structures, census forms, and the media) that these categories are ‘real’. Socio-psychological research provides a useful lens to explore how these continued practices impact on people’s developing identities.

**Socio-psychological research**

Socio-psychological research often defines ethnic identity as a shared sense of identity relative to the ethnic group that an individual is ascribed to through birth, or assigned to by others based on phenotypic characteristics or background (Phinney & Ong, 2007). Hence, ethnic identity incorporates race, but extends further to include other factors such as religion, nationality, heritage and cultural practices (Meyers, 2005; Song, 2003). Social psychology understands identity as a linear process toward an ideal where the individual is positive in their own identity and able to cooperate as an ally with others from different ethnic groups (Phoenix, 2010). Research through this lens is useful due to access to large data sets, and where it addresses the dynamic, multifaceted nature of an ethnic identity. However, it is
limited through its use of language which reproduces a view of identity as static, which reduces the complexity of identity construction (Phoenix, 2010).

Further, ethnic identities are defined as social identities that develop when individuals compare themselves with ‘others’ and construct ideas of ‘belonging’ to a particular social group or groups (Ashmore et al., 2004; Moinian, 2009; Song, 2003; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Belonging is described as possibly the most important marker of ethnic identity and is associated with ideas of commitment and attachment to place (Ashmore et al., 2004; Phinney & Ong, 2007). Importantly, Phinney and Ong (2007) stipulate that, to achieve a secure sense of belonging, people need to be involved in a process of exploration, where individuals experience, seek information, and reflect on aspects of their own ethnic identity (Phinney & Ong, 2007; Webber, 2011). Further, an achieved and secure sense of belonging results in the rejection of negative perspectives founded on stereotypes (Phinney & Ong, 2007). Pertinent to my study is research in social psychology that demonstrates that Pākehā encounter problems with ‘belonging’, which Bell suggested is related to a ‘lack of cultural substance’ and ‘shallow roots’ when compared to Māori (A. Bell, 2009b). The issue of Pākehā struggling to develop a sense of belonging has also been identified through recent research with adolescent students (Webber, 2011) and consequently, may have ramifications for how they relate with others. Pākehā, most often, default to a national identity when they encounter questions regarding ethnic or cultural identity (explained in more depth later in this chapter in the section titled Pākehā). Pearson (1990) argues that we need to interrogate deeper than the physical appearance of Pākehā, that:

> Physical appearance immediately generates a set of symbols about human difference in which the threads of history, territory, and belonging are woven. Yet to base our definition of Pākehā solely on the foundations of physical appearance is to look at the outer shell with no thought to the person within. (Pearson, 1990, p. 214)

**Bodies Matter**

Considering the interplay of any identity development between self-ascribed and ascription by others, I argue the body remains a significant player in any identity discourse. Mindful here of Judith Butler’s work in relation to gender constructions, I interrogate the role of the body in ethnic identity constructions. The work of the 17th century French philosopher, Descartes, further developed the theory of a clear
distinction between the body and mind. The mind, thus separated from the body, was attributed with rational thought, imagining, feeling and willing. Instead, Butler (1988) argues that the body is produced by discourse, it is open to interpretation, and is continually ‘becoming’ through a performance of culturally influenced acts. Disrupting the Cartesian dualism between body and mind, in my study I recognise how the body and mind are entangled in the process of identity construction. Leonardo contends people are born with a particular body that is inscribed with meaning (Leonardo, 2009b, p. 170). It is important to recognise how these bodily inscriptions have been imagined, how people interpret these inscriptions, and to challenge those assumptions.

As argued by Butler (1988, 2011) – the ‘body matters’. Therefore, important in this study is not neglecting the role of the ‘body’. Hence, when exploring Pākehā ethnic identity I also considered research on ethnic embodiment. Wetherell (2012) describes how research on identity has turned to the different ways individuals make meaning through their senses: “touching, feeling, noticing and seeing’ through ‘sensual, corporeal, kinaesthetic, and haptic (sense of touch)”. Wetherell (2012) distinguishes between ‘affect’ and ‘emotional response’, describing affect as a broader, more generic initial response ‘that rush of feeling’, that is then consequently expressed through an ‘emotion’, which is informed by historical emotional ways of being and is, therefore, culturally recognised.

The body social is many things: the prime symbol of the self, but also of the society; it is something we have, yet also what we are; it is both subject and object at the same time; it is individual and personal, as unique as a fingerprint or odour plume, yet it is also common to all humanity … The body is both an individual creation, physically and phenomenologically, and a cultural product; it is personal, and also state property. (waskul & vannini, 2006, p. 1)

When interrogating the body and its role in ethnic identity construction, the researcher needs to be conscious of the layered, nuanced, complex and multifaceted world in which the body exists. First, our identities are formed in relation to an ‘other’. Mutual glances reveal the other and, hence, disclose oneself (waskul & vannini, 2006): “An I assumes there must be a you” (p. 4). Similarly Joshua Newman (2011) described the role of the body in his autoethnographic work where “[his body] was most often “read” as a [re]productive agent of these residual, regressive cultural politics” (p. 551). And drawing on DuBois (1903/1996), Newman further described how he found himself often “wrestling” as he reflected on his new “self” (as an
intellectual, progressive, pedagogical, transgressive) and consequently developed a “sharpened awareness of how others perceive an alternative [white] ‘self’ within empirical space” (p. 551, emphasis added). This study, therefore, also interrogates how others ‘read’ our bodies, relying mostly on the “imaginations which people have of one another”, which often become “the solid facts of society” (Cooley, 1902, cited in waskul & vannini, 2006, p. 5). The embodied experiences of becoming Pākehā are explored through the use of arts-based methods to tap into sensual knowledge.

Another important consideration is how bodies ‘perform’ identity. Identities are continually (re)constructed through performance where our bodies express, and unavoidably impress, themselves upon others (waskul & vannini, 2006, p. 7). “Through the body we perform, express, and present subjectivity to others – yet others simultaneously judge our bodies by means of appearance and performance” (waskul & vannini, 2006, p. 10). Our bodies exist in interaction with other bodies, making meaning through embodied experience “within the discourses rhetoric, and praxis of cultural physicality” (Newman, 2011, p. 551). Through performance our bodies represent traces of culture and power. Hence the body is a narrative of our experiences in-the-world and also contains traces of the narratives of our whakapapa; remembering being-in-the-world (waskul & vannini, 2006). These embodied memories are described by waskul and vannini (2006) as an embodied ethnicity.

Our identities are performed through a dynamic conception of culture (Bhabha, 1994) where there is a “recognition that all speak from a particular place, out of a particular history, out of a particular culture, without being contained by that position” (Hall, 1992, p. 258). The body as narrative is ‘read’ and through discourse is an ‘actor’ in identity construction. Consequently, the body is significant in how it is imagined and constructed through discourse and, also, through how it intentionally performs a particular identity role. Derrida (1974) described how the body is “that most transcendental of signifiers” (cited in Newman, 2011, p. 553). Hence, the body is discursively structured, where language constructs our reality and, further, that language enables and constrains our identity constructions (Butler, 1988; Vasterling, 2003).

Through providing a thick description of the lived embodied experience of one individual, a story can open up the life-worlds of other individuals and groups to disclose meaning (waskul & vannini, 2006). Research on embodied ethnicity probes
deeper into questions that explore not just who we are, but how we feel in and about a particular situation (Dion, Sitz, & Remy, 2011). Dion et al. (2011) describe three different notions of embodied ethnicity: (a) embodied ethnicity (being-in-the-world); (b) embodied ethnic imaginary (remembering being-in-the-world); and, (c) embodied ethnic interactions (being-in-the-world with others) (p. 312). As Dion et al. suggest, “[t]hose physical states experienced in ethnic settings reinforce ethnic feelings because they can live in their flesh their ethnic singularities” (p 317). As argued by Spry (2011a) a story ...

... starts with a body, in a place, and in a time. The investigators analyze the body for evidence, the body as evidence, the body of evidence. But evidence, like experience, is not itself knowledge; like evidence, experience means nothing until it is interpreted, until we interpret the body as evidence ... [hence the] body [can be understood] as raw data of a critical cultural story. (Spry, 2011a, p. 19)

Interrogating the construction of an ethnic identity is a complicated process, a peeling away of several layers of meaning. Therefore, although arguing on the one hand that ‘ethnicity’ is an imagined construct, particular governing forces have invented powerful ways of “making people” (Haking, 2002, as cited in Carter & Fenton, 2010, pp. 8-9) that have significant impact on how people understand themselves. As educators, to begin to disrupt dominant political ways of ‘making people’, we need to ask how, “historically, systems of naming take on social and political significance, how they are constructed, how they are deployed and for whom do they become salient” (Carter & Fenton, 2010, p. 9).

Likewise, when exploring ethnic identity it has increasingly become important to acknowledge how an ethnic identity intersects with, and is differentiated by, social class, gender and sexuality. There is increasing recognition then that, “people are always simultaneously positioned in many categories so that there is no essence to any category ... [also] all categories are associated with power relations” (Phoenix, 2010, p. 303). Hence, a focus on the dynamic, complex, contradictory, transformative and situatedness of an ethnic identity is required, with an acknowledgement of the intersectionality and juggling of other identities (Phoenix, 2010). This is significant to highlight that there is more than one way of becoming Pākehā. To interrogate and highlight the intersectional nature of an ethnic identity, Phoenix suggests an autobiographical approach. Autobiography provides a method for interrogating ‘whiteness’ and highlighting the intersectional nature of such an identity (Phoenix,
2010, p. 314). Therefore, this story of becoming Pākehā is particular to the experiences and intersections of myself and my participants. Others will juxtapose their own stories of becoming alongside these.

The autobiographical approach is especially pertinent for this study where the purpose was to interrogate the historical stories of becoming Pākehā. This approach enables the researcher to open up critical questions and consider the “coupling of history writing with the modern nation and of the haunting presence of a reified ‘west’ in widespread beliefs in historical progress” (Phoenix, 2010, p. 133). Through the process of interrogation it was recognised a closer examination of the Enlightenment and the construction of whiteness as a dominant strategy was required.

Selah

My conversations, my thoughts, kept returning to my white body. My Pākehāness and how this matters – how others judge me, assume they know me because of what they see. I picked up the thread and followed it back through the ages, back to when my ancestors first came to New Zealand, and back to the Enlightenment.

Whiteness

In these layered, always-ruining places, our ghosts haunt, and we are blind to it. They are ghosts birthed from empire’s original violence, the ghosts hidden in creation’s myth, and the new ghosts on the way as our ruins refresh and mutate. They are spectres that collapse time, rendering empire’s foundational past impossible to erase from the national present. (Tuck & Ree, 2013, p. 654)

The Enlightenment is usually understood as a period in western history, starting midway through the 17th century through to the beginning of the 19th century. The Enlightenment was revolutionary in nature, when many intellectuals of the time debated radical ideas that impacted science, philosophy, society and politics (Pitchford, 2000; Roediger, 2002). Beginning with the scientific revolution, political and social orders became increasingly informed by the ideals of freedom and equality for all; this was based primarily on the principle of human reason. The following discussion on the Enlightenment’s fundamentally new ways of thinking is not to dispute the importance of such ideals, but rather to interrogate how the Enlightenment also became a justification to entrench politically dominant ‘norms’ of a racial hierarchy, conjuring up ‘whiteness’ during the colonialisation of other countries. Kyungman Moon (2011) captures this evocatively when describing the
Enlightenment, “…as [an] attempt to build a foundation for normative values by drawing on ‘empirical’ facts … [where] thinkers tried to validate their normative values by instituting an epistemological framework founded on scientific reason’ (2011, p. 87, emphasis added).

**Enlightenment and Race**

The Enlightenment continues to haunt understandings of race and ethnicity. Through the 18th century intellectuals, predominantly from Europe, began to construct theories of difference based on groupings of people according to biogenetic categories and notions of phenotype (Ladson-Billings, 1998). These categories worked to create a sense of polar opposites and resulted in a cultural ranking (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p. 8). In each of the various theories of fixed racial difference, a hierarchical scale was constructed, which concluded that whites were superior and others were increasingly inferior, “from the epitome of humanity to the hardly human at all” (A. Bell, 2014, p. 29). Leonardo (2009b) described how “white bodies” existed well before race but were interpellated into its discursive structure approximately five centuries ago (p. 102). He links this (f)pigment of the imagination to Enlightenment philosophers such as Kant (p. 124).

Very (2012) also invites us to consider Immanuel Kant as the inventor of Enlightenment. He provides a thoughtful analysis of Kant’s writings with regard to scientific racism, and identifies Kant as producing the first recorded empirical study of racial hierarchy and human nature (Very, 2012, p. 1). Very’s concern is of the ‘paradox’ where Kant’s status is as a respected, widely read, and influential philosopher, yet his work “continues to socially construct race and racial minorities”. However, Very posits a:

…way out of the paradox … [that] does not involve ignoring Kant’s racism, explaining it away, justifying it, or even condemning him for it, but simply acknowledging it. It does not involve distinguishing among his writings, but distinguishing among his claims. (Very, 2012, p. 8)

Very’s argument, I suggest, offers us a potential way of working with our pasts, so that we acknowledge our colonial stories, not to condemn, judge or explain, but rather, to begin to interrogate and make sense of who we are today. Our colonial histories are often-times contradictory where particular ancestors were on the one hand courageous, inspiring and hardworking people, yet who also participated in the
destruction of an Indigenous people’s culture, socio-economic status, and life chances.

**Survival of the fittest**

Later in the Enlightenment period, with the advent of Darwin’s publication of *The Origin of Species* in 1859 coupled with political threats to the Empire being felt globally, there was a change in how race was defined (Simon & Smith, 2001). Many colonial settlers adopted a polygenesis perspective (Simon & Smith, 2001) likened to a type of *social* Darwinism (Pitchford, 2000), where humans were sorted into types using ‘scientific measurements’ and the idea of ‘survival of the fittest’ gained traction. Social Darwinism was never accepted by Darwin himself, instead the originators used his theories to create a system of thought that suited their own agendas. Hence, the theory of social Darwinism served to explain a decline in indigenous populations and provided a justification for European imperialism through the establishment of laws that secured settler interests – such as more land (Simon & Smith, 2001; Pitchford, 2000). Missionaries were now understood as a barrier to the advancement of Empire, and ‘real’ Christianity was equated in New Zealand with ‘British culture’ and ‘amalgamation’ of the Māori into British norms (Ballantyne, 2012, p. 152). Christianity was increasingly used as a vehicle to reinforce the construction of whiteness. Although Christianity has Jewish/Middle-Eastern/North African origins, over time (since the Renaissance) depictions of Christ and the Virgin Mary became paler and whiter than everyone else in the art works of the time (Roediger, 2002, p. 32).

**The creation of the “normal” white race**

Extensive European colonisation began with Christopher Columbus in 1492 serendipitously ‘discovering’ the New World. Since that moment the imaginary construct of whiteness has worked to homogenise a range of diverse ‘white’ ethnic groups into a single entity for the purposes of racial domination (Leonardo, 2009b, p. 171). Roediger describes the process in the United States where immigrants from various European cultural and ethnic backgrounds “encountered and appropriated” whiteness (Roediger, 2002, p. 34). However, Frankenburg reminds us that the label ‘white’ has evolved over time and is neither fixed nor homogenous (Frankenberg, 1993b, p. 53). Hence, the invention of the white race should be understood as a construct – a political act employed by groups of ‘multiracial’ human beings from Europe to often justify their colonisation of other people groups in other nations.
(Allen, 1998). Therefore the “white race” should be understood, “not simply as a social construct but as a ruling class social control formation” (Allen, 1998, p. 8). Further, as a privileged marker, whiteness assumed that lives of people of colour depended on white progress and enlightenment (Leonardo, 2009b, p. 94). It is important, however, to remember these ‘multiracial’ groups often represented immigrants from Europe who, in response to the politics of the time, were pressured to hide their own ethnicity under a white identity (Sleeter, 2011). Important then, in any study of white identity formation such as Pākehā, is to uncover and peel back the layers of whiteness that have been coated over the cultures of a diverse range of people groups. And, further, it is important to disrupt the power of a dominant ‘national’ identity.

Although an invented and socially inscribed identity, the ‘white race’ quickly assumed the position of ‘norm’ in colonial societies (Kincheloe, 1999). Ladson-Billings (1998) argues that, where “whiteness is positioned as normative, everyone is ranked and categorised in relation to these points of opposition” (p. 9). Likewise Dyer (2003) contends that it is important to recognise whiteness as constructed in our political imagination. Where this recognition has the potential to dislodge whiteness from a hegemonic (dominant) position (Dyer, 2003, pp. 22-23). He further contends that the consequence of a norm status is an invisible racial identity, where whites are understood as ‘the human race’, or instead identified as the national identity. This normal status is described as an “invisible power” whites obtained through rational epistemology, which determined non-whites as the “unreasonable other” (Kincredible, 1999, p. 2). Roediger (2001) urges us to disrupt the fiction that whiteness is normal. Rather, he argues that whiteness is always a phenomenon whose existence must be explained, not a natural category but a “peculiar identity”, a “strange fruit” (Lillian Smith), a “peculiar institution” (Theodore Allen), not a presumed norm (Roediger, 2001, pp. 77-79).

The stories of a diverse range of settler ancestors are interrogated in section two (Autoethnography) and three (Duoethnography) to highlight the diverse ethnic and cultural groups who immigrated to New Zealand and now call themselves Pākehā.

The issue of whiteness as a historical, political, and complex construct

Kincheloe (1999) argues that, “whiteness cannot escape the materiality of its history” (p. 3). Furthermore, he cautions against assuming that whiteness, like any
ethnic identity, has a fixed essence. Rather, he recognises the importance of historical connotations and the impact of whiteness on ethnic identity, stating that a middle ground must be found where the “socially constructed, artificial, ephemeral nature of racial identities [are embraced]” (Kincheloe, 1999, p. 6). However, as Leonardo argues, it is important to distinguish between whiteness, white people and white culture; that these things are connected only through historical association (Leonardo, 2009b, pp. 170, 186). Where whiteness is a political strategy, and white culture is the product of a group of ‘white’ people claiming a national culture as their own, but white people encompass a vast range of people groups, cultures, political views and experiences.

The debate on whether to abolish or rearticulate whiteness studies continues. The historical association between white bodies and the ideology of whiteness complicates any desire toward anti-racist pursuits. Although “race is a fiction biologically” it is “a pernicious social fact” (Roediger, 2001 p. 91). As Frankenberg (1993a) reminds us, “it seems foolish to imagine that as individuals we can escape complicity with racism as a social system” (p. 78). Rather, she urges us to examine how race has, “shaped our own lives, theories, and actions through examining our personal histories” (p. 78) and applying a critical lens to understanding the history of racist ideas (p. 79). Through her own increasing engagement with non-whites, Frankenberg began to realise how race impacts the lives of all participants, white and non-white. Initially understanding race as something external to her own life, even though involved in anti-racist activities, Frankenberg began to examine her personal history and see how she too had been shaped by race. The following poem was written by Frankenberg to highlight her understanding of white privilege.

White Privilege

Today I got permission to do it in graduate school,
That which you have been lynched for,
That which you have been shot for,
That which you have been jailed for,
Sterilized for,
Raped for,
Told you were mad for –
But which I mean

Challenging racism –

Can you believe

The enormity

Of that?

(Frankenberg, 1985, cited in Frankenberg, 1993b, p. 52)

In the New Zealand context Pākehā are correlated with the white dominant population in New Zealand. How the discourse of whiteness has influenced the construction of Pākehā identities, and continues to impact on New Zealand society as a whole, is of major significance to this study. However, are all white New Zealanders Pākehā? And also, or perhaps more importantly, should ‘white’ be a conditioning factor in the experience of becoming Pākehā? Take my friend Kelly for example.

Note from my journal (January 2016)

It is about 1pm on a Friday and I have gone down to the local café where they make the best chicken salad. I have a plan to eat and edit. This is also the same café where I usually grab my first morning coffee.

Kelly delivering me my salad: Hey Esther did you see that guy this morning yelling at me?

Esther thinking back: Yea. I thought maybe he was some sort of friend.

Kelly with force: No way!

Esther concerned: Oh, that’s a bit of a worry then.

Kelly with a story to tell: Yeah. I walked past him and he shouted, ‘Are you Māori?’ I said, ‘No’. The next time I walked past he shouted, ‘Oh you must be Pacific Island?’ ‘No’, I replied again. Then when I had to walk past again. He shouted, ‘Thai then, you must be Thai?’ I said, ‘No I am none of those’, then quickly walked away.

I paused before replying. Kelly was on her summer break from university working in her parents’ café. Her mother is a Chinese/ Pākehā and her father is Pākehā with Irish and English ancestors. Kelly is a 5th generation Chinese/ Pākehā New Zealander. Like so many people in Auckland, New Zealand, Kelly is multi-ethnic. But people still feel the need to ascribe them with one particular identity.
Esther carefully: There are a lot of people like that out there.

Kelly quietly: I know.

So of course I ditched the idea of editing and wrote this story instead, which Kelly said might make her famous. But I knew was just an important story to tell.

The next chapter explores those conditioning factors that influence our understanding of what a Pākehā might be and could be; those things that haunt our becoming.
CHAPTER 4
BECOMING PĀKEHA

My mother once wrote a story of being Pākehā, about a moment in her childhood where she had to strip down to her underwear. She was the only child at the ‘native school’ who had ‘white undies and a totally anaemic body’, where the only name she was given was Pākehā. This childhood story was something she carried with her, a story she shared with others that informed who she became; her stories of becoming were uniquely hers. Many years later she wrote a book about her childhood experiences of becoming Pākehā. Her ‘white undies’ story and the illustration (Figure 5) were included.

Figure 5: Kathy at School in her White Undies
In this chapter I story the history of Pākehā, explore the construction of ‘whiteness’, and describe its continued involvement in the positioning of Pākehā as the dominant group in New Zealand. This is significant in the development of a Pākehā identity where Pākehā exist entangled in a dynamic relationship with Māori, who are the Indigenous people of New Zealand. Next, I discuss how Pākehā identities can be understood via postcolonial theory. Recognising that almost all cultures have somehow been impacted by colonisation and continue to be positioned in society as a consequence of this history, I discuss how New Zealand is subject to an ongoing process of colonisation. Hence, the Enlightenment’s construct of race also has an enduring history and ongoing influence on education systems in New Zealand.

**Defining Pākehā**

Since the settlers first came to New Zealand the term ‘Pākehā’ has been reinvented, at times by Māori with derogatory meanings, such as ‘white louse’, or the most popular insult being ‘white pig’ (Ranford, 2006). Mythical origins such as the patupaiarehe fairy creatures were also used. Many white New Zealanders believed the word had derogatory meanings, or were unsure of its origins, or simply did not want to be given a Māori name, hence not all New Zealanders of European descent use the term to describe themselves (Ranford, 2006).

The first groups of people to be labelled Pākehā were from different parts of the British Isles, from different walks of life and with different sets of expectations – each with distinct accent, language and customs and with different socio-economic histories. It is from this diverse group that Pākehā culture emerged (Phillip & Hearn, 2008). The term Pākehā, representing a collective group, initially gained momentum through the era of progressive colonisation between 1840 and 1886 (Belich, 2001). Understanding who the Pākehā are is problematic since the historical lumping together of all ‘white’ settlers into an imagined homogenous group in much of the writing and policies pertaining to Pākehā. Rebecca Lenihan (2012) argues that, “[t]o achieve a greater understanding of factors contributing to the development and shaping of New Zealand society and culture it is essential to know more about the various immigrant strands” (Lenihan, 2012, p. 91).

Ideas pertaining to ‘race’ were a hotbed of intellectual curiosity and debate throughout the period of colonialism in New Zealand (Ballantyne, 2012; Simon &
Ballantyne argues that the idea of race had a pivotal effect on the development of Māori and Pākehā relations over time (2012, pp. 28-33). The history of colonisation in New Zealand begins with two stories: Māori and Pākehā. The Pākehā story (for the most part the British version) has dominated retellings of colonisation, particularly in the classroom (Hanly, 2009). However, in the past few decades there has been a resurgence of interest in the Māori story. Jones and Jenkins (2011) in their book *He Kòrero: Words Between Us*, tell us the important story of Māori seeking to be educated in reading and writing. Hence Māori had invited missionaries to New Zealand, who they had met through their trading enterprises in the early 1800s, in the belief that the knowledge of European culture was valuable. This invitation coincided with the humanitarian movement in Britain, where ideas of race were coupled with a belief in the unity of Mankind (monogenesis), and that, over time, all people through Christianity could become civilised (Simon & Smith, 2001). There are two significant consequences of these early relationships between Māori and Pākehā that linger today. First, the signing of a treaty between the Indigenous people and the British Crown, which recognised an official partnership between Māori and Pākehā. Second, the early missionaries had a significant involvement, although with a paternalistic attitude, with the education of Māori through translations of the *Bible* into Te Reo (Māori language) (Ballantyne, 2012; Simon & Smith, 2001). Through their research in historical archives, Jones and Jenkins (2011) show how Māori quickly became educated in Pākehā ways (such as reading and writing), and utilised these new skills to develop further trade networks in New Zealand and abroad.

In the 1830’s and early 1840’s missionary teachers reported that among northern Māori (indeed throughout the entire country) it had become fashionable to learn to read and write … Their enthusiastic letter-writing … was largely in Māori, mainly for Māori recipients … writing was valuable among Māori for organising and consolidating new political alliances, recording decisions, drawing up land titles and recording poems and stories. (Jones & Jenkins, 2011, pp. 200-201)

This early period of New Zealand’s colonial history involved the development of close alliances between Pākehā and Māori, where many settlers spoke fluent Te Reo and participated in Māori cultural practices. This was, in part, because the Māori population was initially dominant and New Zealand was isolated; thus Pākehā relied on Māori for survival. However, it was also a reflection of the thinking of the time.
the early 1800s Māori, and the early settlers of New Zealand, requested British protection of newly formed trade relations from increasing unrest between tribes and settlers, and the threat of French occupation. Hence, the request for British intervention was for a range of reasons: commercial, humanitarian, legal, political and strategic (Orange, 2015). The request also coincided with an influential benevolent humanitarian movement in Britain during the early 1800s and was subsequently actioned by men who were “deeply influenced by evangelical religious beliefs” (King, 2003, pp. 156-157). Their aim was to “negotiate a voluntary transfer of sovereignty from Māori to the British crown” and resulted in the signing of a treaty on the 6th of February 1840 at Waitangi (King, 2003, p. 156). The Treaty and the consequential bicultural relationship between the Crown and Māori are discussed further under the subheading ‘bicultural relationship’.

**New Zealand polygenesis perspective and social Darwinism**

However, in New Zealand the benevolent humanitarian attitude very quickly changed as demands for more land, an influx of new settlers into urban areas, and demands for infrastructure followed. Between 1831 and 1881 the Pākehā population increased by 50,000 per cent (King, 2003, p. 178). Michael King describes how…

The character of New Zealand was changed forever. Those who had to relinquish ground, literally and metaphorically, for this influx of ‘foreign’ people were the first New Zealanders, the indigenous Māori. And in relinquishing ground, they would lose it. (King, 2003, p. 178)

The change in attitude toward Indigenous peoples was further heightened by the shift in Enlightenment thinking toward a polygenesis perspective after 1859 and the survival of the fittest. This shift in thinking had repercussions in New Zealand society that still vibrate today. As Pitchford (2000) argues, racial distinctions are meaningful because we attach meaning to them, and the consequences vary from prejudice and discrimination to slavery and genocide (p. 2332). At this time there was a belief that the Māori population would ‘decay’ and, as stated in 1860 by physician and politician Dr Isaac Featherston, Europeans ought to prepare “to smooth the pillow of the dying [Māori] race” (Featherston, cited in Kukutai, 2012, p. 32). Subsequently a strategy of assimilation was employed to educate the Māori with ‘civilised’ habits. In 1877 the Education Act was introduced which provided free compulsory education up to Year 8 (approximately 12 years of age). The system of education in New Zealand, originally focused on missionary schooling for Māori
(bilingual teachers and students), and private education for those settlers who could afford it (Stephenson, 2009), became structured along prejudicial and discriminatory lines. The early missionary schools and later the Native Schools (initiated in 1867) encouraged the use of Māori language to facilitate English instruction. The Native Schools were initiated by the Government to replace the missionary schools in the education of Māori and to increase the assimilation process. Many of these schools were in rural areas, and were managed by the local Iwi, consequently they became a significant part of the Māori community and were shaped by Māori views on what counted as schooling (Stephenson, 2009). Ironically, my Rogers ancestors (Pākehā) were educated at the Waioeka Native School (1885-1915) and all learnt to speak fluent Te Reo. Changes in the curriculum after 1877 resulted in Māori education being directed towards manual labour pathways; Te Reo was disallowed; Native Schools hardened their attitude towards Te Reo, and Māori were politically shafted towards a lower position in the hierarchical stratification of society (Simon & Smith, 2001). Assimilation was a clear priority in the Native Schools Act of 1877 (Donn & Schick, 1995). The new curriculum worked to reinforce hierarchical representations of race. As one Geography textbook in 1879 declared:

…Whites form by far the most important race, for they have the best laws, the greatest amount of learning, and the most excellent knowledge of farming and trade. There are five great races of men and of these the white race is the highest. (As cited in Simon & Smith, 2001, p. 251)

Leonardo (2015) describes such actions as a policy of colonising the mind, where education can be understood as a colonial project. In this sense Māori children were subjected to an education that was filled with white intentions and ‘civilised’ ways (Leonardo, 2015, p. 90), and where the dominant ideology of white superiority was written on children’s minds. These experiences are highlighted later in my autoethnographic chapters of the Rogers family. Conversely Pākehā children were told their race was the highest. O’Connor (1996) described the impact in New Zealand where:

…[t]he colonisation of the mind carried out through our education system has been as successful with Pākehā as it has with Māori, although of course the effect on Māori has been more pernicious. It was successful in presenting a world view that was entirely Eurocentric, that maintained the notion that somehow we are all British and that we are all the same with equal opportunities. (O’Connor, 1996, p. 14)
Hence, the childhoods of our Pākehā and Māori ancestors were greatly influenced by a racially constructed curriculum. In relation to whiteness studies in the USA, Frankenberg (1993b) describes the impact of race thinking on our social geographies, how our physical landscapes, our material environments and our conceptual frameworks, all have traces of this political history (p. 54). What traces remain today? As educators how do our curricula, the policies we implement, the conceptual frameworks we utilise, and our own personal philosophies continue to re-establish, reconstitute ‘white’ ideology? As Frankenberg asserts:

The landscapes of childhood are important because, from the standpoint of children they are received rather than chosen ... the landscapes of childhood are crucially important in creating the backdrop against which later transformations must take place. ... once in a landscape structured by racism, a conceptual mapping of race, of self and others, takes shape, which follows from and feeds the physical context. (Frankenberg, 1993b, pp. 55, 77)

It is also important to note that Māori were continually active politically and socially throughout the 19th century and entangled with Pākehā in innovative and sometimes ‘fearful’ ways (as highlighted in the poem below). As British colonialisation increasingly dominated the social and physical environment, Māori responded in several ways: through cooperation; by passive resistance; and, by armed struggle; the latter conflicts being termed the ‘Māori wars’ (Spoonley, 1988). Pākehā responses were also not universal and were influenced by context, belief and relationship to Māori. Maurice Keesing (1910) published a set of poems and plays in 1910 that encapsulated some of the feelings and fears of Pākehā in Auckland city. In the poem titled ‘Then and now’ he wrote:

Ingenious pahs crowned all thy fireless cones
And Māori Warriors threatened oft thy fall
But there what remains of them but bones,
Since thou has triumphed o’er those evils all? (Keesing, 1910, p. 13)

There were also several different social and religious movements that arose throughout this time (Spoonley, 1988, p. 9); significant to my story was the Ringatū movement. As a child I spent a lot of time staying at and visiting Ringatū Marae (a Marae is a meeting place for formal gatherings) in the Bay of Plenty. The Ringatū
people were close friends of my family and many of my touchstone stories come from these entangled relationships. Founded by the prophet Te Kooti, Ringatū is an Indigenous Māori religion that incorporates aspects of traditional Māori practice with the Old Testament, and is closely aligned with Judaism (Binney, 1997; Elsmore, 2000).

**The language of classification.** During the twentieth century Pākehā identity continued to be haunted by the ‘family of Empire model’ (Pearson, 2004). Since the earliest colonial settlers arrived, New Zealand has experienced a “continuous flow of British kin all bound together by ties of ‘race’”, where systems of governance and education adopted racial categories (Pearson, 2004, p. 295). These systems of governance and education employed standard classification categories that continue to be problematic, often resulting in a reification of such categories, and further these “quasi-nationality terms” are used by individuals (and ascribed to individuals) “to identify their sense of belonging in New Zealand” (Didham & Bedford, 2004, p. 8). Census reports used a language that categorised and shaped how people understood themselves. Usually Pākehā were lumped under the category ‘European’ which has connotations of an unmarked and, therefore, ‘acultural’ group. In the 1921 Census there was an explicit linking between the term ‘Europeanness and whiteness’ where the phrase “Race aliens” was applied to anyone who was not of European descent, arguing that “maintenance of the pure European or ‘white’ standard of population has been invariably a consideration of immigration legislation” (see Goldsmith, 2012, p. 68). From the 1840s until the 1950s census reports were preceded by detailed commentaries describing Māori originating from the Aryan race, revealing that the “spectre of scientific racism still existed” (Kukutai, 2012, p. 39).

**Colonies in common.** The perpetuation of racial thought in New Zealand was sustained through continued relations with the ‘mother’ country and also, importantly, through relations between the different colonies of the Empire, such as Australia. These relations existed through trade, ministerial appointments, missionaries and the British army. The metaphor of an intricate web is provided by Tony Ballantyne (2012) to describe the complex structure of these relationships and processes of Empire. He urges the reader to consider the ‘horizontal’ and ‘vertical’ connections that existed in the development of colonial New Zealand. The vertical relationship between settlers of New Zealand and the Mother country is discussed later under postcolonial hybridity, however, Ballantyne argues the horizontal relationships with other colonial
nations also need to be recognised. He highlights the:

…significance of a network of exchanges that wove colonies together into a shared space of intellectual exchange – the ‘bundles of relationships’ that moulded the colony’s development and, more generally, creating broader vision of the workings of the British imperial system. (2012, p. 43)

Often it is specific historical events that continue to tie us together with a shared sense of identity. For example Pākehā, as a culture, ‘blossomed’ again between and after the two World Wars as a result of years of schooling, the social control of the state, and a pervading sense that New Zealanders were loyal to Britain (Phillip & Hearn, 2008); many Pākehā held the belief that they represented a better British than the actual British (Belich, 2001). In a Metro article in 1986, Wall reported on the many ‘old’ groups in New Zealand that still referred to New Zealand as the ‘colonies’ (C. Wall, 1986). The power of these relations between the different colonies still exists today and is typified by the recent centennial commemoration of the role of ANZACs at Gallipoli and arguments (or rejection) over the suggested changes to the New Zealand flag. Throughout the early twentieth century, the invisibility of Māori in political, educational and economic structures of society resulted in a dominant settler culture that was British in origin, where it was not necessary to categorise or label oneself Pākehā – not when you were considered the ‘norm’.

Māori urban migration and renaissance

A significant challenge to the ‘norm’ status, of a New Zealand settler identity, was the migration of rural Māori into the city spaces from the late 1940s to the 1980s. Prior to this, New Zealand’s geographic landscape had predominantly reflected rural Māori and urban Pākehā settlements. This separation highlighted the notion of traditional Māori culture as a counterpoint to modern New Zealand (Wood, 2002). Although some rural to urban drift was beginning to occur, after the Second World War New Zealand experienced rapid Māori urban migration. The reasons were complex involving both push and pull factors. Rural areas were experiencing economic marginality and unemployment while the cities offered work, money, pleasure, medical services and education (see Metge – A New Māori Migration p. 128, as cited in Wood, 2002). There was also a shift in government thinking, from a focus on assimilation to one on integration.
The Hunn report of 1960 was commissioned by the government to review the department of Māori affairs and found that the government objective was now “[t]o combine (not fuse) the Māori and Pākehā elements to form one nation wherein Māori culture remains distinct” (Hunn, 1960, p. 15). Māori were now seen as economic and productive citizens and were therefore assisted into urban areas to work in industry (Kukutai, 2012; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). To achieve this goal, Māori were supported through training, employment, housing and relocation costs (Kukutai, 2012; Wood, 2002). For many Pākehā this was the first time they had experienced any real contact with Māori. The result altered the dominant Pākehā culture forever (Wood, 2002) since increased interaction with Māori, coupled with immigration of Pacific Islanders, forced Pākehā to consider themselves in relation to other ethnic groups and, also, to understand themselves anew (Donn & Schick, 1995).

A dream deferred. Hence, by the 1970s, Pākehā identity had begun a process of metamorphosis. This was due to several factors. Until then many Pākehā simply assumed they belonged to a country where ‘we were all one New Zealand’ (O’Connor, 1996). However, with the ‘motherland’ joining the European Economic Community in 1973, the financial ties with Britain were severed (Belich, 2009). “In short, [Pākehā were] kicked out of the comfortable nest and told to grow and find [their] own identity” (C. Wall, 1986, p. 41). Michael King linked this moment generally to a theory of sociological development of migrant identities; that as third generation descendants Pākehā were beginning to ask questions such as “where [do] I come from?” (King, cited in C. Wall, 1986, p. 41). However, perhaps the most significant factor in the Pākehā evolution was the Māori Renaissance of the 1970s and 1980s. With ‘great gusto’ Māori developed language nests, set up programmes on taha Māori (Māori perspectives) in schools, created a Waitangi Tribunal to address grievances with the Treaty, reclaimed their rights through land marches and various political protests (such as the protest action in 1977 at Bastion Point and the 1981 Springbok tour), and set up a Marae system of justice in urban areas (O’Connor, 1996; C. Wall; 1986). The Pākehā discourse of ‘we are one’ was disrupted and suddenly Pākehā felt ‘naked’ (Wells, 2012). In 1986 Wall reported on the feelings at the time, where ‘mystified’ Pākehā responded in different ways. Some liberals cringed a little harder, right wingers lashed out, and generally sympathy for Māori lessened. Hamish Keith is quoted as saying:

Racism is based on racial fear and racism flourishes in a climate of uncertainty
where people don’t know what they are. If Pākehā culture doesn’t evolve and Pākehā’s don’t acquire a sense of identity they will continue to make life hard for those who have. (Hamish Keith cited in C. Wells, 1986, p. 46)

The political upheavals of the 1970s and 1980s in New Zealand jolted many Pākehā awake, disrupting their dream of ‘one people’ resulting from Māori/Pākehā assimilation” (Pearson, 1990, p. 1). Paul Spoonley’s (1988) book *Racism and Ethnicity* captures the turbulent changes taking place in New Zealand society at that time. He describes how race relations were centre stage in the New Zealand of the 1980s:

But for all these changes, it is easy enough to be reminded of the existence of racism. In some cases, the changes have encouraged Pākehā to be a lot more direct about their racist beliefs. Extreme right-wing groups were certainly around in the early 1970s, but the number of groups and the people involved in their activities had grown substantially by the late 1970s. Here was an anger and a resentment at a more assertive Māori presence. At another level, the racism has become more sophisticated and therefore hidden. (Spoonley, 1988, p. xii)

Spoonley (1988) also asserts that it was in relation to Pākehā that both Māori and Pākehā were forced to define themselves (p. vii). Hence, the conditions that provoked the ethnic revival, resurgence and renaissance of Māori also related to, and combined with, an ethnic awakening within the Pākehā majority (Pearson, 1990, p. 212).

This ‘Pākehā awakening’ resulted in several scholars and writers publishing their understandings of what defined a Pākehā. One such scholar was Richard Mulgan (1989) who described himself as a Pākehā who accepted the need for protecting Māori identity and culture, but at the same time saw Pākehā as having their own distinctive identity and their roots firmly and legitimately planted in this country (p. vii). Further he asserted that Pākehā were not visitors, rather that they, too, were Indigenous (Mulgan, 1989). Mulgan further contended that reserving the concept of indigeneity for pre-colonial peoples freezes time at the point of original settlement, thus denying the descendants of colonial settlers a chance to be at home in the country their ancestors colonised (p. 20). Likewise in his book *Being Pākehā Now*, King (1999) expressed his belief that Pākehā belonged in New Zealand due to an alignment of their colonial history with Māori: “Pākehā born in and committed to New Zealand have no other home, no other Tūrangawaewae, any more than Māori
do” (p. 11). And Spoonley (1988, pp. 63-64) insisted that the uniqueness of Pākehā was their evolving culture, their ancestry, and their sense of place.

That Pākehā are indigenous to New Zealand has been critiqued by several writers. For example Bell (2005) has analysed King’s (1999) claim to be a ‘White Native’ and that Pākehā are a second Indigenous people. King’s belief was that indigeneity occurred at the ‘moment of commitment’ to place. Bell was wary of King’s assertions for two reasons: firstly, that refusing a colonial past inhibits the ability of Pākehā to deal with the impact of colonisation on a productive Pākehā/Māori relationship; and, secondly, appropriating an indigenous status restricts any political authority the term grants Māori through international law (A. Bell, 2005). Likewise, Lawn (1994) described this initial quest for identity by Pākehā as a response to instances of ‘white-bashing’ and attributes it with the label “Pākehā renaissance” (p. 295). Critical of much literature about Pākehā, by Pākehā, such as King’s (1991) edited book,: Pākehā: The Quest for Identity in New Zealand, Lawn expresses unease over a “hegemonic group who ostensibly abject themselves to an idealised other, while diverting the terms of debate from material conditions of oppression to their own psychic malaise” (Lawn, 1994, p. 295). Hence, I argue it is important for those New Zealanders who identify themselves as Pākehā, who belong here entangled with Māori, to continue working critically with our histories in a process of becoming.

Human Rights and Race Relations. New Zealand’s experience of racial unrest and political change is not unique. There was now a global recognition of human rights, highlighted through the establishment of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in 1947 and their subsequent focus on decolonisation in 1967. Consequently, in 1971 New Zealand’s first piece of human rights legislation, the Race Relations Act came into being and consequently created the Race Relations Office (Human Rights Commission, March, 2012). The objective was to foster and advocate human rights in New Zealand and in international forums.

Incidental findings from a learning and teaching research project in 1987 highlighted patterns of hostility occurring between children in New Zealand classrooms that included a racist dimension (Alton-Lee, Nuthall, & Patrick, 1987). The authors emphasised that, in New Zealand, statistics demonstrated long-standing evidence for the discriminatory nature of the education system, with both overt and covert practices. These practices were described as ‘the hidden curriculum’ that
operated in classrooms. The curriculum in this instance was not the official curriculum, but rather the curriculum the children ‘experience’ in action. The authors refer to Michael Apple’s (1982) description of the hidden curriculum as the “tacit teaching of norms and values that goes on in the routines and institutional context of schooling, and in the nature of educational knowledge” (p. 206). They also describe Apple and Lois Weiss’s (1983) later notion of the ‘lived culture’ of a school, where conflicts and tensions in wider society are played out in the classroom. To understand the complexity of the processes that promote racism, the authors suggest that both the dominant and minority cultures should be studied. Often, they observed, Pākehā children were unaware of, or denied, the impact of their racist comments. Likewise, a few years later, Wetherell and Potter (1992) developed social psychological methods and theories to cut a slice through a group that represented the majority, Pākehā, to critically analyse the codes and practices used to sustain racism. From their findings they described how race talk had become embarrassing and strange (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 120). However, they also described how, through their research using discourse analysis, race was still ‘everywhere’ in the talk of Pākehā New Zealanders (p. 123). Through analysing the discourse of Pākehā New Zealanders they noted how certain tropes, metaphors and images of racist talk had been retained.

A consequence of the focus on human rights, and findings from research, such as the two studies above, was the research project initiated in 1993 by the Race Relations Office and the Ministry of Education, to explore what was happening in education with respect to Māori and Pākehā. The Race Relations Conciliation group met with school principals to address some of the challenges experienced by the educational system of the time. These included: relations between Māori and Pākehā; different interpretations of the Treaty of Waitangi; the high profile political activism of Māori; and New Zealand’s bicultural heritage (Donn & Schick, 1995, p. 7). As a result of these meetings a study was undertaken jointly with the Race Relations Office and the Ministry of Education to research ‘success stories’ to ultimately provide a resource for schools to enhance positive race relations (Donn & Schick, 1995). There was a recognition, within the research group, of individual and institutional racism that existed within schools, especially compounded by an educational system shaped by a British “single system of rational thought”. The concern of the researchers was that, “while educators work in an established
institutional environment, [educators’] own actions and programmes have considerable impact on the social, emotional, and academic well-being of students from different groups” (Donn & Schick, 1995, p. 23). The report argued for schools to provide emotionally supportive and academically effective environments while also focussing on preparing children to function successfully in a multiracial and multi-ethnic society. Also, and important for my research, was the insistence from participant teachers in the study that it is important for all educators to, "know 'who they are' (in a cultural sense) and what their own attitudes are, as these will affect the way they teach their students" (Donn & Schick, 1995, p. 276).

Increased interaction with other ethnic groups, and changes in policy in systems of governances all worked as catalysts for Pākehā to explore their own place and identity (Belich, 2001; King, 1999; Lawn, 1994). However, 26 years after Carroll Wall’s (Nov, 1986) article in Metro on Pākehā identity, Peter Wells wrote, again in Metro, of the increasingly invisible position Pākehā hold as a cultural group. He asked the questions: “Where exactly do Pākehā belong? Do they belong at all? Or are we simply a kind of lost tribe, dwelling in someone else’s country on sufferance?” (Wells, 2012, p. 102). Wells argued that Pākehā are a unique kind of human being and “in a profound sense, the meaning of being Pākehā sits alongside the experience of being Māori” (p.102). This echoes Spoonley’s (1988) earlier description of how, through the period of the Māori Renaissance, new ethnic groups emerged and his speculation that perhaps Pākehā also were subject to this term ‘ethnogenesis’ – the evolution into a new ethnic group.

Such theories warrant further investigation, but this is often complicated (and even thwarted) by continued immigration and conflicting views of what it means to be a Pākehā. One thing is for certain, however. There are several ‘white’ Pākehā (for example Michael King and Avril Bell) who have written about belonging in New Zealand as descendants of the early colonials, who have no other place they call home. I include myself here. But Pākehā may also represent a range of ancestral ethnic and cultural backgrounds that are not ‘white’. Hamish Keith is quoted in 1986 stating “I’m a Pākehā … the signs and symbols I live by are devised in these lands. My genetic background is Sri Lankan, Irish and Scots, but that was three and four generations ago. I am a Pākehā” (cited in C. Wall, 1986, p. 46). And in her essay “Race you there”, Asian New Zealander Tze Ming Mok suggests that, in the future, pluralities will “rise from the ashes of majorities and minorities” (Mok, 2004, p. 18).
She calls to other New Zealand minority groups (excluding Māori) to take up their role as Pākehā in the bicultural relationship and make the Treaty their business. In this sense she is attributing to the category Pākehā a political, not an ethnic, role.

**Aftermath of Colonialism = Post-colonial**

The term ‘postcolonial’ is useful for several reasons in this study, however I am also mindful that it is problematic term with layers of meaning and an assumption inherent in its structure that there has been an end to colonialis influence (Barker, Hulme, & Iversen, 1994). I explore here the term ‘post-colonial’ (with hyphen), postcolonial theory, hybridity and bicultural; with particular reference to New Zealand. For the rest of the study I refer to postcolonial with these conversations in mind.

**Post-colonial**

The term ‘post-colonial’ (with hyphen) is usually understood as that period after independence from colonial rule (Sharp, 2009). It is a geographical and chronological term, where the hyphen emphasises the break. The term, however, does not take into account the lingering, even festering, consequences of the colonial project and how it has impacted on the culture, language, the psyche, systems of governance, and education of many people – both those colonised and those who are descendants of the colonisers. These consequences are the aftermath.

The hyphen in post-colonial reminds me of Michelle Fine (1994), Alison Jones and Kuni Jenkins (Jenkins, 2008; Jones, 2012) writing on ‘working the hyphen’. Fine (1994) suggested that, to work the hyphen, we need to engage in the social struggles of our time, to erode the fixedness of categories and to enter and play with blurred boundaries (p. 72). The word ‘post’ in post-colonial implies the colonisation of other people and their countries is over with, a thing of the past; yet the term ‘colonial’ persists – even in the name. The aftermath of colonialism requires a working of the hyphen. For Jones and Jenkins the hyphen demonstrates a space that is always conditional on the relationship between Māori and Pākehā. Jones describes this relationship where:

The indigenous-settler hyphen reaches back into a shared, and troubled, past. In Aotearoa New Zealand, even our names – Māori and Pākehā – discursively produce the other. Each term brought the other into being … The shared indigene-coloniser or Māori-Pākehā hyphen not only holds historical/whakapapa difference, but also marks a relationship of power that continues to shape differential patterns of cultural and social privilege. (Jones, 2012, p. 104)
As a fifth-generation Pākehā, I am not a colonial, yet I need to work the hyphen of this entangled relationship with Indigenous Māori and the ancestors of my past. I am a post-colonial. Pākehā today, I argue, are one aftermath of colonialism. As a Pākehā educator I am aware of the wider macro-factors, where our present education system is post-colonial, and the traces of our colonial past are very evident. I speculate that our present (post) is always conditional upon our relationship with our past (colonial). The myth that post-colonial describes a linear process of development, where countries experience pre-colonial, then colonial and at long last reach post-colonial is just that, a myth (Barker et al., 1994). This particular myth serves to ignore the continued experience of colonial power by those who were colonised, and those who are the descendants of the colonisers. There is also increasing recognition that the aftermath of colonialism is still experienced through the “constitutive elements of the modern world and its conflicts” (Barker et al., 1994, p. 1). In Sharp’s (2009) autobiographical storying of her participants’ experiences she describes how:

Each experience is post-colonial, of a world after the colonial period in which … people – like each of us – are created by the powers, connections and imaginations that were written into the world during Europeans’ first explorations of the world and the making and remaking of these geographies ever since. (Sharp, 2009, p. 2)

Therefore, post-colonial as a time and place is always in constant negotiation with its colonial past; it is always working the hyphen. Fine (1994) also critiques the role of the researcher and asserts that we need to probe our position in relation to the context we are researching, to begin to write ourselves into the text, making transparent our “privileges, interests, biographies, fetishes and investments” as researchers in the process (pp. 74-75). As a researcher engaged in exploring what it means to be a Pākehā educator I, therefore, needed to work the hyphen in the process of the investigation, and also interrogate my own practice of working the hyphen as a Pākehā.

Postcolonial theory

Postcolonial theory is a response to the continued experiences of individuals and groups entangled in the aftermath of the colonial project. It consists of a large body of work which is primarily concerned with ‘speaking back’ to colonist discourse
which continues to reproduce and impact on, primarily Indigenous, cultures today. In this study I acknowledge this critical body of work and draw on key themes developed therein, but do not overview its entirety. Through adopting the language of post-structural theory, postcolonial theory provides a critical analysis of these experiences, opening spaces for alternative voices, ways of knowing and understanding (Barker et al., 1994; Sharp, 2009). The term ‘postcolonial’ signals a critical engagement with colonialism, realising its limitations while also acknowledging its significance to emerging ethnic identities in nations that have been colonised (Grant & Giddings, 2002). Important, for this work, is Sharp’s contention that “the internalisation of a set of values and ways of knowing the world is much more difficult to overturn than the physical rule of colonial regimes…” (Sharp, 2009, p. 5). What is required, then, are strategies that enable a decolonisation of the mind.

The term ‘postcolonial’ is used in diverse ways by different scholars (Ashcroft, 2001; Maver, 2006). For the purpose of this study I use the term to embrace all culture impacted by colonisation and the consequent Eurocentric, hegemonic structures and systems that seek to displace and/or replace those of Indigenous people. The site of a postcolonial discourse is recognised as transitional where cultural identity is in a constant process of ‘becoming’ (Girkandi, 1996, cited in Maver, 2006, p. 20). For Pākehā, ‘becoming’ can often involve subtle changes that occur over time as they constantly engage with Indigenous culture. Hall (1990) explores the idea of cultural identity as transformative, having history yet subject to a constant engagement with ‘culture and power’. These identities are determined by how we are “positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past” (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 4).

Hybridity

The concept of ‘hybridity’ is central to postcolonial theory. In postcolonial writing, hybridity refers to the production of new transcultural forms through the interweaving of cultural signs and practices (Ashcroft, 2001; Bhabha, 1994; Czarnecki, 2002). The subject positioning of hybrid identities straddles both cultures and occupies a space ‘in-between’ the coloniser and colonised; a ‘third space’ (Bhabha, 1994). This third space provides a position to negotiate difference; a space for ‘disruption’ and ‘displacement’ of Eurocentric, hegemonic, cultural signs and practices (Bhabha, 2005; Czarnecki, 2002; Meredith, 1999).

However, an inbetween position is considered by some writers as problematic
for Pākehā. Bell describes the positioning of Pākehā in relation to their diasporic history and to the indigenous people of the place. The settler is perceived here as the unauthentic Other (A. Bell, 1999, p. 122). She links this to Morris’ metaphor of a ‘Human Hinge’ (1992) caught between a metropolitan/European past in a country that belongs to an indigenous Other. Caught inbetween, the settler struggles to form a distinct identity, through two strategies: (1) attempts to objectify and control indigenous people; and (2) the appropriation of indigenous authenticity (A. Bell, 1999). Bell (1999) cites Wolfe (1994) who warns of a repressive authenticity which works to restrict and create inauthentic indigenes where people are not deemed ‘pure’ through blood or cultural markers. The New Zealand settler populations’ ‘unevenness and fragility’ is attributed to their inbetween position (Stasiulis, Yval-davis, & Helm, 1995) or, as described by Lawson (1995), doubled subjects suspended between ‘mother’ and Other.

Postcolonial theories, however, consider notions of entanglement, hybridity, and the emergence of new ethnicities. Royal (2007) asserted the Māori–Pākehā paradigm is one of the oldest identity paradigms in New Zealand. He also described how the words ‘Pākehā’ and ‘Māori’ historically, and still today, are “powerful ways by which … New Zealanders relate to one another” (Royal, 2007, p. 1). Royal was cognisant that, for political purposes, the terms were still beneficial, particularly for Māori with a political claim to indigeneity and minority rights. However, Royal went further to suggest the terms may have passed their ‘use by date’ and were problematic rather than constructive. He argued, in line with Said (2003), that terms such as Māori and Pākehā, can act as a ‘reductive formulae’ and construct boundaries that fail to represent or encourage diversity. Royal’s argument echoed that of Meredith (1999), who called for an optimistic negotiation of ‘affinity and difference’ and for a letting go of the ‘them and us’ categories. Meredith made reference to Bhabha’s (1994) theory of a third space where new possibilities are rendered due to the interweaving or entanglement of the coloniser and colonised, resulting in an hybrid identity. These scholars argue for a blurring of boundaries to create a politics of inclusion and initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration and contestation (Bhabha, 1994; Meredith, 1999).

**Bicultural relationship**

Postcolonial discourse in New Zealand is distinctive due to the ongoing interweaving and entanglement of Pākehā and Māori. As discussed earlier, it is
distinct where the initial educational relationship established between Māori and Pākehā in the early 19th century was initiated by Māori (Jones & Jenkins, 2008). Another point of distinction in New Zealand is the bicultural relationship between Māori and Pākehā. Biculturalism is founded on the ideals of the Treaty, which recognises Māori and Pākehā as equal partners. The Treaty illustrates an unparalleled collective agreement between an Indigenous people and a colonial government where, through the Treaty, Māori were incorporated *en masse* as British subjects (Pearson, 2005). The Treaty was designed to enable Britain to gain ownership of New Zealand while concurrently providing protection for the traditional possessions of Māori (Spoonley, 1988). This political relationship rendered New Zealand unique amongst other settler nations and created important psychological differences in how New Zealanders think about and represent themselves within various social groups (Sibley & Liu, 2007, p. 1225). However, as discussed earlier, the Treaty was largely ignored as the colonial quest for capital required more land, thus several governmental acts were introduced, beginning with the constitution Act of 1852, as a process of ‘legal imperialism’ (Kelsey, 1984).

Bicultural politics, which originated in the 1970s from a belief in the need to recognise Māori culture and identity and protect it from colonial practices of assimilation (Sibley & Liu, 2007; Spoonley, 1995; Spoonley, Macpherson, & Pearson, 2004), resulted in a political separation of Māori and Pākehā (A. Bell, 2005). As a result of the Māori Renaissance of the 1970s, the Treaty was revived and became a focus for addressing grievances. It was argued that the “Treaty was, first and foremost, an agreement made with Māori at the founding of the nation that should be honoured in the name of fairness” (Barclay, 2005, p.120). Through a consequential discourse of equality, Treaty principles were developed as a pragmatic lived response to injustice (Barclay, 2005). Although these principles have been embedded in policy for several decades, there still exist Pākehā and non-Pākehā concerns that they encourage institutional Māori privilege, are divisive, and are a form of racism (Barclay, 2005). Interpretations of the Treaty and interpretations of the bicultural relationship between Māori and Pākehā continue to be persistent points of contestation from the inception of the Treaty to the present (Pearson, 2005). Hence the Treaty, as a significant historical contract in New Zealand history, continues to haunt Māori–Pākehā relationships, and impact both at personal and wider political levels.
Pākehā are described often as the *white* European partner in New Zealand’s bicultural relationship (A. Bell, 2009b). Addy (2008) likens whiteness in New Zealand, to a “tangled and sticky web of racial dominance and cultural racism” (p. 10). She argues that, through an assumption of normality, Pākehā have historically constructed and organised social systems the ‘white way’. Therefore she calls for Pākehā to recognise and confront the issue of white privilege as racist thinking and to recognise that racist practices are significant in identity development from birth onwards. For many Pākehā, the legacy of whiteness hangs over them as an unwelcomed inheritance in which they are unsure how to act; they become paralysed (Tolich, 2002). Leonardo’s work on the complexity of whiteness considers the same experience for whites in America. He argues that:

Whites traverse the social landscape, threatened of being exposed as bogus racial agents as they round every corner. They know few alternative forms of whiteness outside of the colonial framework, where they are interpellated as the colonizer. As a result, the unbearable whiteness of their being overcomes their search for alternative subjectivities and they become paralyzed to act. (Leonardo, 2009b, p. 97)

Paralysis lends itself to essentialised identity formation, where people become locked up and unable to encounter change productively or challenge stereotypical assumptions. As educators we need to find ways for whites to engage critically with their histories in productive ways.

The social consequences of the invention of race are fundamental issues of our history that continue to haunt us today. If, as Leonardo (2015) insists, education is a form of racial contract where we write children and students into a subjecthood that positions them (p. 86), what is the role of a Pākehā educator? The following chapter interrogates the role of Pākehā educators and, more globally, the role of white educators in multi-ethnic communities.
CHAPTER 5
BECOMING A PĀKEHA EDUCATOR

Note from my journal (June 2015):

*It splashes across the headlines, finds its way onto Facebook, is the talk of the town and doesn't go away – well not quickly. A white women pretending to be black. And this was in no small way. She had gone so far in her adopting of ‘blackness’ that she had won scholarships for her work and education (see Warren, 12 June 2015). Indignation, bewilderment, a dozen academic theories, outrage, and lots of questions. Learning how to walk as a white women fighting for the rights of the minority – can it be done? Or do you have to sacrifice who you are – or are becoming – is this what Zeus Leonardo (2015) means by ‘race traitor’?*

In this chapter I discuss how whiteness impacts on and complicates the role of Pākehā educators. I consider how Pākehā students and educators may resort to strategies of avoidance, guilt and ignorance and may, therefore, be unable to articulate a positive ethnic or cultural Pākehā identity. Rather, they may resort to assuming a national identity and themselves as the ‘norm’. Or, in contrast, they may appropriate ethnic and/or cultural practices from other (often minority) groups.

I am particularly interested in how all educators, Pākehā or not, can work to create positive learning opportunities for all students, enhancing their potential for the development of positive identity exploration. Through the advances of globalisation our communities are becoming increasingly multi-ethnic and, with that, more hybrid, more entangled and more inbetween. So to conclude my discussion I highlight advice from scholars on how we might proceed through this complexity. These scholars insist that white educators need to know their histories. My study is, in large part, a response to their clarion calls.

*Pākehā Educators*

bell hooks (1994), feminist and social activist, tells the story of her early education being impacted on by white teachers who reinforced racist stereotypes throughout their lessons. There is still a dearth of published research that critically explores pedagogical practice to counter such racial and ethnic stereotyping (Brown, 2008). Recent research in the United States has highlighted the significant role that schools play as a site for identity development (Schachter & Marshall, 2010;
Schachter & Rich, 2011) and, further, that teachers, as identity agents, play a particularly significant role in the development of children’s identities. Importantly for my study these researchers call for more studies to explore teachers’ beliefs and practice regarding education that promotes the construction of positive ethnic identities.

**New Zealand educators**

Research in New Zealand has also identified several concerns regarding white teachers’ ‘neutral’ or ‘biased’ approach toward ethnic identity. Most Pākehā educators are described as continuing to teach a version of New Zealand history which perpetuates dominant Pākehā discourse (Hanly, 2009; Ritchie, 2003). Hanly argues that New Zealand teachers continue to practise and deliver traditional stereotyped and racist versions of New Zealand history. Educational practice in New Zealand also continues to teach children that Pākehā have no ethnicity, no collective identity, and no culture (Hanly, 2009). Educators were also found to be ‘ill-equipped’ to effectively practise bicultural pedagogy. Recent research on teacher expectations has highlighted that many teachers ‘operate within a deficit model’ and often hold “seemingly prejudiced, stereotypical and deficit beliefs … towards indigenous and minority group students’ in New Zealand” (H. Turner, Rubie-Davies, & Webber, 2015). Turner suggests that what is required is a “pedagogy … that is holistic, flexible and complex, that will allow children to present their multiplicities and complexities and their individual and collective diversities, rather than a pedagogy that perpetuates teachers’ images” (H. Turner, 2013, p. 35).

Research by M. Brown (2011, p. 251) demonstrated how teachers who critically explore and engage with how Pākehā and Māori history has been intertwined were able to release themselves from the “imposition of dominant thinking” and become, what she described as, “fully Pākehā”. Similarly Hanly (2009) and Ritchie (2003) argue that Pākehā educators should adopt a critically reflexive approach to explore what it means to be Pākehā. It is proposed that, through critical exploration of Pākehā identity, there is potential to decentralise Pākehā culture from its position of power as the ‘norm’ such that it will exist as one ethnicity alongside other ethnicities in New Zealand (Hanly, 2009). Webber (2011) argues that Pākehā need to be educated about their own racial, ethnic and cultural backgrounds in order to be able to challenge their position as the ‘normal’ New Zealander. Much New Zealand research suggests that a critical exploration of what it means to be Pākehā,
by Pākehā, is required to enable the construction of positive Pākehā ethnic identities (for example see A. Bell, 2009b; M. Brown, 2011; Hanly, 2009; Ritchie, 2003; Webber, 2011). Turner argues that:

It ought to be the teacher who makes the cognitive adjustment...culture is central to effective pedagogy [and] teachers need to be afforded the opportunity to critically reflect upon their own discursive positioning and the implications of this positioning for their own agency and for ... students’ learning. (H. Turner, 2013, p. 61)

**International research**

Internationally the role of the educator is mostly absent in academic discussion on the construction of an ethnic identity (Harrell-Levy & Kerpelman, 2010). The relationship between the construction of identity and educational practices has also seldom been explicitly and comprehensively discussed (Schachter & Rich, 2011). Recent research has highlighted the important role educators, and other significant adults, have on the construction of positive identities in multicultural and multi-ethnic communities. Schachter and Marshall (2010) argue that teachers shape the environment and experiences of students and, therefore, act as *identity agents* in the construction of individual identity. Regardless of which teaching practices and philosophies govern a school, schools are identified as a significant site for identity exploration. Further, teachers within a school are identified as having the greatest potential to influence the construction of a student’s identity (see Schachter & Marshall, 2010, p. 71).

The strategic position of the educator as an identity agent is problematic where the shaping of the environment and experiences for students are influenced by the educator’s own perception and worldview. Of concern are educators who abuse their position by imposing their own perceptions and beliefs about an individual’s or group’s identity rather than creating an environment that encourages positive identity exploration (Schachter & Rich, 2011). Haviland (2008) describes how white teachers in the United States often employ strategies, consciously and unconsciously, that inhibit the development of progressive and anti-racist practice. These strategies have been identified as a culture of niceness, avoiding critique, failing to interrogate, colour blindness and the myths of meritocracy (Haviland, 2008, p. 42). Further, Haviland highlights the significant role white educational discourse has played in perpetuating whiteness, and as being a barrier to change. These white discourses, she believes,
require interrogation. Similarly Schachter and Rich (2011) suggest that further research needs to be employed to investigate what guides the thinking and practice of educators regarding the development of a positive identity. This research is described as particularly significant for white educators when concerning the construction of racial–ethnic identities.

**White students’ ethnic and cultural identity development**

Research has shown that an awareness of cultural diversity and the ability to consider other perspectives provides a defence against discrimination and an awareness of race-based assumptions (C. S. Brown, 2008; Quintana, Segura Herrera, & Nelson, 2010). However, Grossman and Charmaraman (2009) describe how white adolescents in the United States are often unable to articulate what a white identity entails. They suggest this is due to discomfort with white privilege and a humanistic urge for ‘colour blindness’.

**Default to a national identity.** Dominant white populations often demonstrate a disconnect with their culture and an inability to understand and express who they are culturally and ethnically. Webber et al. (2013) found that young adults in New Zealand resort to a national identity by default, defining themselves as New Zealanders. Similarly, whites in the United States have been described as unable to articulate themselves culturally and ethnically but instead default to a national identity, therefore perpetuating the myth of the ‘norm’ (Grossman & Charmaraman, 2009). Educational systems and practices have often resulted in perpetual stereotyping and prejudice rather than providing white students with space to explore and make sense of their own identities (Dickar, 2008; McDermott & Samson, 2005; Schachter & Marshall, 2010; Schachter & Rich, 2011). Consequently white students may adopt a range of evasive strategies to avoid talking about racial or ethnic identity, fearful sometimes of sounding racist or saying the wrong thing (Dickar, 2008; Miele, 2013; Russell, Liebenberg, & Ungar, 2015). In one study, children over 10 years of age strategically avoided talking about race during social interactions, as it was considered normatively inappropriate (Apfelbaum, Pauker, Ambady, Sommers, & Norton, 2008). This finding also correlates with research that shows how children (especially those in the majority ethnic group) over the age of 10 control explicit racial and ethnic prejudice to fit with a perceived norm, yet may still demonstrate prejudice implicitly (Fitzroy & Rutland, 2010; Rutland, Cameron, Milne, & McGeorge, 2005). Further, when students become aware of white privilege, there is a lack of knowledge
regarding what to do next (Crowley & Smith, 2015).

Ladson-Billings (2003) argues that research is required to explore innovative practice that enables children to construct positive racial–ethnic identities, to respect and tolerate difference, and to challenge traditional ideas that result in stereotyping and racism. Similarly recent New Zealand research (Webber, 2011) highlights how low levels of connectedness amongst Pākehā adolescents indicate Pākehā are less salient about ethnic identity, and that they also had less positive feelings about group membership than the other three groups in her study (Māori, Samoan and Chinese). Webber’s study involved 695 adolescent students and used a questionnaire to examine the self-identifications, feelings of connectedness, meanings and perceived consequences of their racial–ethnic identities (Webber, 2011). She applied Tajfel and Turner’s (1986) theory of ‘in-group’ behaviour, a social psychological term that refers to those social groups that individuals have a sense of belonging to. Webber’s findings are consistent with previous research that demonstrates Pākehā struggle with a sense of belonging and group connectedness (A. Bell, 2009b; McCreanor, 2005). As a result of this research, Webber asserts that “a positive sense of belonging to one’s racial-ethnic identity group is needed before members are able to enact racial-ethnic identity and/or engage in relevant in-group behaviour” (Webber, 2011, p. 104).

**White educators**

Why explore what it means to be a Pākehā educator? Through my earlier research (E. Fitzpatrick, 2011b) with adolescents I began to understand the significant influence my own beliefs and subsequent actions had on the classroom environment. I also understood that, for many Pākehā, and other white teachers, their existed a struggle to articulate an ethnic identity, and that, for many, much of this was ‘difficult knowledge’. Research on white teachers highlights the importance of exploring the complexities involved to better understand how we might respond in the future (see for example, L. A. Bell, 2002; Crowley & Smith, 2015; Matias & Zembylas, 2014; Miele, 2013).

White teachers have been found to grapple with the same issues as their students with respect to the disconnect from their culture and ethnicity (Miele, 2013). Matias and Zembylas’ (2014) research with white pre-service teachers showed how, for many, racially diminutive emotions masked a ‘deep-rooted disgust’. Although these teachers displayed care and empathy, it was often considered empty and
unauthentic when they failed to accompany such emotions with action (Matias & Zembylas, 2014). For many pre-service white teachers their first real and sustained interaction with non-whites is on practicum (field placement), where the tension experienced through this interaction with non-whites often results in deficit views and discourse (Crowley & Smith, 2015), as well as risks confirming implicit racist beliefs (L. A. Bell, 2002). How then, as educators, can we provide spaces and opportunities for students, especially pre-service teachers, to engage critically and effectively with their own ethnic and cultural identities?

Lee Anne Bell’s (2002) research in the United States identifies the need to prepare white pre-service teachers with useful pedagogical strategies for creating classroom environments that encourage the positive exploration of racial-ethnic identity. Significantly, she highlights the need for white educators to “examine their own socialisation, the unearned advantages of white, racial dominance, and their conscious and tacit assumptions about race and racism” (L. A. Bell, 2002, p. 236). Further, Bell asserts that white educators often use a colour-blind discourse (i.e., avoid racial talk), are naive and ignorant about racial matters, and apply normative assumptions towards people who are white. Similarly Dickar (2008) explains that white teachers are reluctant to become involved in racial–ethnic discourse because of fear:

... [a] fear of being on the wrong side, of saying the wrong thing, and the failure to find ways to work through the philosophical differences around pedagogy and classroom practice contribute greatly to white teacher’s reluctance to openly discuss race with their colleagues and each other. (Dickar, 2008, p. 128)

Schools continue to be places where racial and ethnic identities are formed (Miele, 2013). Garrett and Segall (2013) describe their concern that teacher education, in all its various guises, may have unwittingly perpetuated a reinforcement of prejudices and misconceptions that white pre-service teachers have about diverse students. They “worry about the methods by which teacher educators have gone about interpreting and acting on the ignorance and resistance” (p. 298) of pre-service teachers to issues of race and ethnicity. These methods include, for example: critical pedagogy (Giroux & McLaren, 1994); antiracist pedagogy (McDonough, 2009); multicultural education (Asher, 2007); culturally relevant teaching (Ladson-Billings, 1996); and, culturally responsive teaching (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Although
epistemologically, ontologically and pedagogically different, they have all tried to intervene in predominant white ways of thinking, and involve students in meaningful explorations of issues of power (Garrett & Segall, 2013). Common strategies employed by white students when confronted with issues of race and ethnicity are silence, anger, resistance, guilt, and the use of colour-blind discourses (Garrett & Segall, 2013, p. 294). Recognising that ignorance and resistance are the primary responses white pre-service teachers have to critical notions of race, Garrett and Segall (2013) explored how educators might think differently about these two responses, to what is often described as ‘difficult knowledge’.

**Difficult knowledge**

Hence, we need to consider the term ‘difficult knowledge’ and how it relates to white educators. The term was originally used by Britzman (1998, 2013) to describe situations where both teacher and students experienced curriculum as ‘painful and traumatic’ through re-encountering a history of suffering, distress, and cruelty. Britzman (2013) later expanded on her original definition of difficult knowledge through an exploration of uncertainty in teaching and learning. Applying a psychoanalytic framework she described uncertainty in education, where education is always an emotional situation and, as such, is difficult to know. Through recent recognition of pedagogy as always an emotional event, and therefore as a fragile construction, Britzman directs our attention to the continued influence of history, uncertainty and controversy.

The fragility is that larger historical and cultural forces that have not been metabolized and have not been worked through affect the imaginary of the teacher and student (100). …I think the main point comes in the form of a phantasy: for everyone the boundaries of self are porous and the transference of emotional states is what makes the difficult knowledge difficult to know. The safe bet is that teachers … are always transmitting what is difficult to know, namely unconscious emotional situations that already direct the actors. (Britzman, 2013, p. 115)

Britzman (2013) further argues that uncertainty may be a space for something new, where we begin to understand the in-between of love and loss, and presence and absence. It may also be a space where we can ask the unknowable question pertaining to the place of the pedagogue in the pedagogy. A situation where difficult knowledge is welcomed.

To effectively respond to difficult knowledge, educators need more nuanced
and generative ways of working with white pre-service teachers (Garrett & Segall, 2013). So, returning to Garrett and Segall’s (2013) critique of ignorance and resistance, ignorance is usually simply understood as a “lack of knowledge” (p. 295) and resistance as an active not doing what is asked of. However, Garrett and Segall (2013) redefine ignorance as a strategy of avoidance, which they link to psychoanalytic theories of ‘unconscious knowing’ (Britzman, 1998) and difficult knowledge, and how these influence learning. They argue that white tertiary students already have “raced” ways of knowing through living in a “raced” society (p. 295). Further, alluding to Leonardo (2009b), this knowledge is uninterrogated white racial knowledge. Likewise, den Heyer and Conrad (2011) describe white students occupying a “privilege-ignorance nexus” where they are in a position of luxury and able to employ ignorance as a resistance strategy to a conscious acknowledgement (p. 297). Ignorance, redefined as a dynamic of knowledge, is a matter of choice. It is an active ‘forgetting’, a ‘dismembering’, a refusal of information and a desire not to know (Garrett & Segall, 2013; den Heyer & Conrad, 2011).

Another challenge to teaching students about issues of whiteness is when student teachers display a desire not to know (Alcorn, 2010). Alcorn contended that teachers need to be aware of the diverse range of prior experiences, ideas, values and beliefs that students bring with them into the learning situation and, further, that these are often at conflict with what we are teaching. Alcorn (2010) cites Wilfred Bion’s work (Bion, 1962a, 1962b) on the concept of minus K (-K) which represents an individual’s desire not to know. When what is taught is in conflict with the student’s experiences, knowledge and beliefs, the student “experiences an unconscious attack on linking” the new material, “a motivated but unconscious undoing of the linking of thoughts that are in some process of formation” (p. 346, emphasis added). Britzman (2013) also refers to Bion’s notion of “thought without a thinker” and suggests that thoughts are prior to thinking, and that thoughts may well attack the knowledge we thought we had already made. She describes how our emotional experiences with new ideas may fragment and disrupt what knowledge is being constructed (2013, p. 98). This is consistent with Alcorn who states that:

…[u]sually, when people do not want to talk about things it is because thinking about these things makes them anxious … anytime thought is rejected, intelligent action is also rejected, and uncomfortable situations develop that need analytic intervention. (Alcorn, 2010, p. 347)
Britzman (2013) also contends that we should, therefore, apply *thinking* to our thoughts. However, he warns that interrogating our thoughts may result in frustration and pain. Likewise Alcorn (2010) argues that, as educators, we need to be aware that educators cannot “drive a thought into the mind of a thinker” (p. 351). Rather, that educators should be encouraging students to explore, over time and through a variety of contexts, where they will ‘seesaw’ between a fascination to know and a particular dread of knowing (p. 349). It is through this process that a shift can occur within the emotional contexts of facilitating thought (p. 347). Further, Alcorn also reminds the educator that they, too, should be prepared to be uncomfortable, to experience and challenge the ‘desire not to know’.

When working with pre-service teachers, in such vulnerable and emotionally charged situations, Garrett and Segall (2013) suggest an educator’s role is to be open to facilitating – making sense of the various responses to issues of race and ethnicity and developing more complex approaches. Further, educators need to provide space and time for the learner to own their emotions and question the origin of their initial response, be attentive to the student’s struggles, be open to their confusion and defensive actions, and understanding of their response as an opportunity to learn and engage the student in exploration (pp. 300-301). They further assert that educators “…ought to help teacher candidates understand that just because they are implicated in the raced … conditions of society, classroom, and pedagogy, it does not mean they are solely responsible” (Garrett & Segall, 2012, p. 300).

**Classroom Approaches to Issues of Ethnicity and Race**

**Multicultural education**

Over the past few decades the prevalent strategy used to address issues of ethnic and cultural diversity in schooling has been Multicultural Education (MCE). One outcome of the civil rights movement in the mid-1960s was a demand by many educators that education should address the histories and cultures of specific minority ethnic groups (Banks, 2006). In response, a number of schools and universities began to provide ‘ethnic studies’. As noted by Banks, however, these courses were at times ‘harmful’ for students if taught by teachers who had negative racial and ethnic attitudes. An outcome of the ‘ethnic studies’ course was that other marginalised groups consequently demanded universities respond to their cultural
needs and consider the notion of diversity within a broader definition. Multicultural education was a response to these demands and included the following five dimensions:

Teachers should use content from diverse groups when teaching concepts and skills, help students to understand how knowledge in the various disciplines is constructed, help students to develop positive intergroup attitudes and behaviors, and modify their teaching strategies so that students from different racial, cultural, language, and social-class groups will experience equal educational opportunities. (Banks, 2006, p. 10)

MCE is traditionally characterised by a practice of assuming there are distinctive boundaries between different racial–ethnic groups and that each group is defined by unique cultural behaviours (Ackroyd & Pilkington, 1997). This practice may result in essentialising ethnic and racial minority groups, and the consequential exoticising of these groups (Lowe, 2009, p. 208; May & Sleeter, 2010). McLennan (2001) describes the evolution of multiculturalism and the problematic nature of the different forms, highlighting that multiculturalism’s focus on difference has been at the expense of what people have in common (McLennan, 2001, p. 405). Likewise, Murphy (2007) defines multiculturalism in New Zealand as an approach to managing diverse cultural and ethnic groups with an emphasis on respect and tolerance, especially for minority groups. Criticism of MCE has raised concerns over practice that focuses on stable, fixed notions of identity that often portray stereotypical characteristics of the chosen minority group – locking them into perceived notions of authenticity. Stephen May’s (1994) critical ethnography (1990-1992) of a New Zealand school (Richmond Rd Primary) provided an example of successful MCE pedagogical practices. In summary he concluded that MCE requires organic change within the structure of the school, critical analysis of the larger social context and active participation of teachers and other interested persons, and that there needs to be an emphasis on cultural pluralism, cultural maintenance and access to power.

In response to some of these concerns ‘critical multiculturalism’ emerged (see May & Sleeter, 2010; McLaren, 1994). It is believed critical multiculturalism encourages children to “engage critically with all ethnic and cultural backgrounds, including their own ... allowing both minority and majority students to explore the complex interconnections, gaps and dissonances that occur between their own and other ethnic and cultural identities ...” (May, 1999, p. 33). Further, critical multiculturalism problematises the historical structures that haunt our comings,
disrupts the notion of a normative identity, and “strikes at the heart of hegemonic positions”, such as a white identity (Vavrus, 2010, p. 22). There is a whole field of work that contributes to these conversations on MCE. For example, the work with a focus on learning to teach for social justice (Linda Darling-Hammond), bell hooks (1994), teaching to transgress, and work on culturally relevant pedagogy (Gloria Ladson-Billings), continue to impact on educational theory and practice. One example of culturally responsive pedagogy, researched and implemented in New Zealand, is Te Kotahitanga (Berryman & Bishop, 2016). The focus of this programme originated from increasing concerns with Māori underachievement in education and findings from the Kaupapa Māori research project, which commenced in 2001. Significant to my study was the attitude of teachers in the classroom, which included deficit theorising of Māori students and ignorance of their agency as teachers to make a difference. The research recommended that teachers “understand the power they have to respond to who students are and what they bring” (p. 188). The programme implemented into schools’ ‘pedagogy of relations’ on Māori cultural aspirations where teachers develop teacher–learner, culturally located, caring relationships, demonstrate high expectations of their learning, create safe, well-managed learning environments, and establish relationships with whānau and respect for the mana (cultural pride) of their students.

Researchers from a range of disciplines continue to explore how to best respond to cultural, ethnic and racial diversity. Dyer (2003) highlights issues that must be considered when talking about whiteness, such as: using it as an excuse to just talk about ourselves (whites) and forget about issues pertaining to non-whites; developing a new assertiveness of celebrating whiteness; or, becoming overwhelmed by guilt which acts to inhibit the ability to examine critically what constructs whiteness, the complexities and contradictions (pp. 24-25).

One theme highlighted in research on white identities is a lack of knowledge of their own histories. Several scholars suggest that identification with the culture of one’s own ancestors is an important starting point (A. Bell, 2014; Crowley & Smith, 2015; Howard, 2006; A. Jones, 1999; Russell et al., 2015; Sleeter, 2011, 2013). However, exploration of our family histories should be understood within the context of race and class. And historic events should be situated within a context of power relationships (Sleeter, 2011). Exploration of one’s own history is understood as beneficial for both whites and non-whites to understand the experiences and
processes that influence how they view themselves and others (L. A. Bell, 2002, p. 242).

**Social interaction with the Other**

A second and subsequent theme in the literature critiquing whiteness is the importance of social interaction with the Other (Howard, 2006). Hoskins (2010) describes the significance of face-to-face ethical interactions where, through interaction, the individual becomes aware of different worldviews and, specifically pertinent for whites, “reminds you all the time that you are not central” (p. 157). Important in these interactions is an openness to knowledge and an acceptance of difference, where the dominant group develops ‘ears to hear’ the other as well as humility (A. Bell, 2014; Jones, 1999; Yukich & Hoskins, 2011). Also in this interaction is accepting the tension between ‘knowing’ and ‘not knowing’, where whites will need to be positioned at times as ignorant and uncertain (A. Bell, 2014; Jones, 1999; Yukich & Hoskins, 2011). Gary Howard describes that, as we enter into relationship with Other we cannot fully know, but we can be with for a moment (Howard, 2006, p. 77). Through interaction, individuals will also experience discomfort, where they are involved in experiences that push them out of their ‘comfort zones’ (Matias & Zembylas, 2014; Miele, 2013). Significant here, as Miele (2013) argues, is to also understand white students as ‘capable learners’, rather than seeing them through a deficit lens. Similarly, Sleeter (2013) suggests it is important to assert to whites that their beliefs are legitimate, but do not apply to everyone. She insists that “Multicultural education is about multiple realities, not about one ‘correct’ reality” (Sleeter, 2013, p. 172). Also, uncomfortable spaces provide a fertile ground (Miele, 2013) for the individual to experience tension and “engage beyond [their] own understandings and to pursue relationships enlivened by care and responsibility before politics” (A. Bell, 2014, p. 22). Bell cites the work of Rose (2007) where one participant in that study described how...

You take risks and make yourself vulnerable. But this is also a fertile stance; your own ground, indeed your own self, can become unstabilized. In open dialogue, one holds oneself available to be surprised, to be challenged, and to be changed. (As cited in A. Bell, 2014, p. 190)
Criticality

Another significant theme in the literature is the importance of criticality throughout the process. I liken this to Britzman’s (2013) earlier suggestion that we apply *thinking* to our thoughts. There is an emphasis in the literature on the fluid and ongoing development of cultural and ethnic identities: Miele (2013) describes it as a process that requires a metacognitive undertaking; Maclaren (see Crowley & Smith, 2015) as a continual process of critical reflection; Matias and Zembylas (2014) discuss having strategic empathy with criticality; whilst Leonardo (2015) describes it as a pedagogical task involving self-reconceptualisation. Howard (2006) developed a model of white identity orientations to highlight the different stages whites experience in the process of identity development.

Howard’s model was created to support educators in their understanding of the complex process of such a development, and to enable them to facilitate and encourage multicultural competence amongst whites (Howard, 2006, p. 103). The desired stage is a ‘transformationist white identity’ where the individual seeks to understand diverse points of views, has strong positive connections with their historical past, yet rejects the notion of white superiority, and, finally, is committed to social action and pursuing relationships with cross-cultural connections (pp. 110-111). I am particularly interested in how Howard’s stages might aid us in developing a more nuanced and respectful attitude towards what white students might be experiencing at any given moment.

This thesis attends to Miele’s call for “more research that explores the courageous journeys that teachers – who view their work as social justice – undergo in the face of institutional constraints” (Miele, 2013, p. 187). Perhaps we can then become, as Zeus Leonardo describes, “race traitors” and follow pedagogy of “racial disruption” (Leonardo, 2015, p. 96). Our educational histories are all haunted. We are all implicated in some way to the larger historic ideas and controversies. As Britzman states: “… this subjective history – the lived one, the imagined one, the projected one, and the forgotten one – leaves a trace and proposes a problem for memory” (Britzman, 2012, p. 103). As a white/Pākehā educator I follow the traces left behind, I summon up the ghosts of my past, and I explore my own becoming, to uncover and disrupt this imaginary ‘normal’ identity. Using a range of arts-based methods, I employ critical autoethnography, duoethnography, and critical family history as methodological and pedagogical practices to explore some of these issues.
Through critically interrogating my own history as Pākehā, I consider how these methods impact on my own becoming, on my own educational practice, and how they might be employed in the classroom.
SECTION 2
SELAH: THE WEDDING PHOTO

I return to the tattered brown box. I research, gather and generate data. I examine the identity artefacts. I find those ‘things’ that are a witness to my becoming. I find the photo of a wedding from long ago. I notice it differently now. I see us all on a bright sunny day, such an entanglement of culture, of ethnicity, of religion, standing together in front of the camera lens. And I remember them differently.

This photo (Figure 6) haunts me. It is a photo of me at a Ringatū wedding when I was a child. This is my childhood and below is my poem in response to the photo.

Figure 6: The Wedding Photo

I often take the photo into my classroom and I ask my students to find me. It is a tool to provoke thought. It is an identity artefact that speaks to the complexity of a becoming Pākehā identity. In writing the poem I summon the ghosts from my childhood onto the page and invite them to speak of their own complicated past.

In the next chapter I explore Derrida’s method of hauntology. Again using poetry I draw on my experiences, touchstone stories and identity artifacts to speak with the ghost. I begin to create a way.
The Wedding Photo

A boy Pierre with ginger hair
What the fuck is he doing there?
From Waikino – the Mackinnon Clan
Dressed in their finest scots tartan
Germanic blood runs very thick
In my tall and kind Grandpa Vic
While Grandma’s hair unruly wild
Welsh or Jewish ancestors pride
My father smiles – his English kin
Cornish and Viking lurk within
Tūhoe have gathered to this place
Kiri is dressed in fine white lace
Ringatū wedding quite an event
A Jewish Māori covenant
Captured here at Marae Te Kooti
Positioned by the Whare Nui
Waiata’s sung and prayers are said
Hangi lifted and the guests well fed
Peeking out of the wedding crowd
My white blonde hair screams out loud.
CHAPTER 6
A HAUNTING TALE OF ONE PĀKEHA EDUCATOR’S EMBODIED EXPERIENCE WITH HER GHOSTS

ONTŌS
‘To be’
I am I was I will be
The truth
Travelling becoming
An identity
In flux in-between entangled
Belonging
Becoming
Me

(Fitzpatrick, 2011)

I begin with this poem to direct attention to how I live with my ghosts. This chapter tells my story of speaking to ghosts as a method of inquiry about my own identity. I draw on Derrida’s concept of ‘hauntology’ in order to examine what it means to become Pākehā through employing poetry as an arts-based approach.

When exploring what it means to be a Pākehā there are many questions I struggle with. How do I live as Pākehā? What does it mean to become Pākehā? In response to such questions of belonging Derrida advised, “talk with the ghosts” (Derrida, 1994). Bell would say, “remember your colonial heritage” (Bell, 2009b). Traue would suggest I recognise the “ancestors of my mind” (Traue, 1990). My ghosts are many, my heritage complex, and the ancestors of my mind and body are culturally and ethnically diverse. Which ghosts do I choose to summon to better understand being and becoming Pākehā? My heritage is occupied by a diverse host of ghosts. Through family stories, photos and fragments of memory, these ghostly ancestors abide in the recesses of my mind and I embody them. I argue here that the possibilities of my being and becoming Pākehā will always be haunted by my ghosts — historically, politically, and socially.
A posse of poets
My ghosts and me
Chasing a memory
Of who I might be

I draw here on poststructuralist notions of identity to understand the dynamic and emerging construct of my Pākehā identity. I recognise that postcolonial discourse is transitional and cultural identities are in a constant process of becoming (Girkandi, 1996 as cited in Maver, 2006, p. 20). For descendants of a settler population, becoming involves subtle changes that occur over time as they constantly engage with indigenous culture. Hall (1990) argues that cultural identity is transformative, and that, while it has a history, it is also subject to a constant engagement with culture and power. Identities are thus determined both by how we are “positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past” (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 4). This resonates with Derrida’s description of an ontological bricolage that results as we borrow ideas from the texts of our heritage (Tilbury, 2001). Likened to a bricoleur, my identity is constructed as I draw on the diverse and varied discourses of my ghosts. Likewise, Gye (2003) described the practice of the bricoleur as decoupage (like a collage), where the autoethnographer, as family historian, grafts together fragments of his/her families’ story that they “happen to unearth” (p. 8).

**Hauntology and Pākehā**

‘In learning to live – between life and death – one must talk with or about some ghost’ (Derrida, 1994, p. xviii, emphasis added).

Hauntology is a methodology of deconstruction that works to problematise particular narratives (A. Harper, 2009). Originally coined by Derrida, hauntology restored speaking to ghosts as a respectable subject of enquiry (Davis, 2005; Derrida, 1994). Hauntology involves interrogating our relationships with our dead to “examine the elusive identities of the living, and to explore the boundaries between the thought and the unthought” (Davis, 2005, p. 379).

Derrida (1994) insists that it is at the “edge of life”, not through living, but through interaction with Other, and with death, that we might learn to live (p. xvii). To learn to live, he suggests, first you require knowledge of the ghost and to know the
place it occupies, second, what marks the name of the ghost or place it occupies and, last, how the ghost works, or transforms (Derrida, 2006, p. 9). For that purpose we follow a ghost, where the “future, comes back in advance: from the past, from the back” (p. 10). To then deconstruct our past we need to take into “account historical entanglement” (p. 16) where, our past, our inheritance is not “at one” with itself (p. 18). Rather, in summoning the ghost “one must filter, sift, criticize, one must sort out several different possibles that inhabit the same injunction … [we must] choose and decide from among what [we] inherit” (p. 18). Furthermore, likening the researcher to Shakespeare’s Hamlet, Derrida contends we are obligated to summon the ghost to find justice “for a fault, a fault of time and of the times” (p. 23). Derrida reminds us that:

If [we] love… justice at least, the “scholar” of the future, the “intellectual” of tomorrow should learn it and from the ghost. [We] should learn to live by learning not how to make conversation with the ghost but how to talk with him, with her, how to let them speak or how to give them back speech … (Derrida, 1994, p. 221)

As the researcher I then summon up the ghost to find justice for... “the crime of [my colonial ancestors], a misdeed whose event and reality, whose truth can never present themselves in flesh and blood, but can only allow themselves to be presumed, reconstructed, fantasized” (Derrida, 1994, p. 24). Hence, in summoning up the ghost I reconstruct from fragments of history, fantasise and imagine the story of my becoming Pākehā. I am a bricoleur.

Hauntology is an ideal methodology to explore what it means to be Pākehā. According to Coddington (2011), hauntology provides three purposes: it demands attention to the history and practices of the state, draws attention to issues of justice, and allows us to better contemplate the “continued colonial contradiction embedded in the present day” (p. 744). Cameron (2008) asserts that hauntology works to unsettle the often assumed stability and integrity of the dominant group. Further, actively working with hauntology draws attention to our involvement in the colonial experience, and interrogates the past (Cameron, 2008). Coddington (2011) also describes how, through interrogating our past, our attention becomes focused on elements of the colonial past that exist as active elements of the present. She argues that “employing haunting to explain the continued presence of the colonial state … disrupts the fantasy that justice and reconciliation has already occurred”
My reading of Derrida leaves me unsure about how I might speak with the ghost. Cameron (2008) argues that it is only by “living with, talking with, and accommodating our ghosts that we might ‘learn to live’ in these ‘post’colonial times” (p. 383). As the researcher, how then do I live with, talk with and accommodate a ghost? One suggestion Cameron (2008) makes is that I need to pay attention to singular, specific historical experiences and events. Holloway and Kneale (2008, p.298) describe this methodologically as being alert and looking for sites where we may be “enchanted, surprised, charmed and disturbed”. They also suggest that we need to actively “encourage a response” from the ghost (p. 298). Coddington (2011) differs, suggesting that it is rather through examining the everyday practices of the state that we might encounter the “seething presence” of the ghosts (p. 749). It is through these everyday practices that we can come to an understanding of how the “state is constructed by the repeated and embodied practices” of individuals (p. 744). “The everyday represents not only the activities that make up our lived experiences, but it also encompasses the embodied nature of these practices … where power is experienced close to the skin” (Coddington, 2011, p. 749). Coddington (2011) then explains that these everyday practices are situated in a particular context, that they take place in “specific moments, which produce outcomes contingent on the geography and time in which they occurred” (p. 751).

An analysis of haunting is further contingent on the context of the ghostly summoning, the history of the particular ghost that is summoned, and the purpose of the researcher. Rather than hauntings being repetitive they, therefore, may have a spiral effect, each time offering something new (Holloway & Kneale, 2008). Importantly, Cameron (2008) reminds us that ghostliness is a politicised state of being and that we need to “reconsider the political potential of haunting tropes in [our] accounts of the colonial and postcolonial” (p. 390). Since one objective in employing hauntology is to draw attention to issues of justice, I endeavour to provide space for those who are unable to speak to be heard. I need then to be wary of obstructing opportunity for change where, as Cameron suggests, there exists a “fear that postcolonial ghost stories risk perpetuating a kind of endless ‘dancing around the wound’ … while neglecting to mobilize effectively for change in the present” (Cameron, 2008, p. 389).

I argue here that for Pākehā to learn to live as Pākehā, to stop ‘dancing
around the wound’ of a settler identity; we must talk with or about some ghosts. This resonates with Bell (2009b) and others (for example King, 1999; S. Turner, 2000) who insist that Pākehā need to not be ignorant about their ancestors, but rather acknowledge their colonial heritage. Bell further argues that our sense of identity is not constructed out of thin air but rather “out of the ways of thinking and relating that we inherit from the past” (A. Bell, 2005, p. 122). Similarly Wells (2012) argues in a media piece, that Pākehā need to acknowledge their colonial heritage, and also celebrate its positive aspects, not drown through wallowing in colonial guilt.

Hauntology then provides a method for remembering our past and interrogating how it speaks to our present. As Ruitenberg (2009) states:

> Our world or culture bears the marks of Christian and colonialist inheritances … Denying the traces of these inheritances in the world today, or trying to bury these traces as deeply as possible, does not stop their influence … we should aim to come to (speaking) terms with them. (Ruitenberg, 2009, p. 299)

Hauntology is, in many ways, like Traue’s (1990) metaphor, ‘whakapapa of the mind’. The term ‘whakapapa’ refers to the layered Māori genealogy which includes spiritual, mythological and human stories (Taonui, 2013), including actual ancestors. In his essay “Ancestors of the mind – a Pākehā whakapapa”, Traue illustrated his Pākehā identity through using the Māori claim to identity of whakapapa and recited his own genealogy. Traue’s whakapapa included his ontological ancestors and he made reference to the many different ideas of ancient and modern-day writers and thinkers. Traue’s whakapapa resonates with hauntology in that all stories are haunted by ghosts and owe a debt to the literary ghost as well. Davis notes that “ghosts [are the] ungrounded grounding of representation and a key to all forms of storytelling” (Davis, 2005, p. 378).

Traue’s use of whakapapa also highlights the significance of childhood narratives. Maddison-MacFayden (2013) and O’Loughlin (2009) describe how we are all haunted by our pasts and, in particular, “our childhood touchstone stories, those stories that live deeply within us and inform our perspectives of the world” (Maddison-MacFayden, 2013, p. 4). Maddison-MacFadyen argued that, by analysing our touchstone stories, which often provide a colonial meta-narrative, we engage with counter-stories as an act of decolonisation. Traue argued that Pākehā need to recognise their ancestors of the mind and be proud of their inheritance; I argue here that Pākehā also need to analyse these touchstone stories to disrupt the standard
story that implies Pākehā are a homogenous group.

To better understand how Pākehā embody their ghosts I need to follow the traces left behind by my whakapapa. Gramsci defines identities as, “the consciousness of what one really is”. He argues they are the “product of the historical processes to date which [have] deposited in [us] an infinity of traces, without leaving an inventory” (Gramsci, 1971, p. 324). Drawing on Gramsci, Hall argues that it is important to develop an understanding of how historical forces in society structure and determine the terrain “in the sense that they … define the horizon of possibilities” (S. Hall, 1996a, p. 422). He repeatedly refers to the deep historical traces which continue to have significant “ideological and practical repercussions on life … today” (Coutinho, 2012). These historical traces are significant in the work of hauntology.

In the Specters of Marx, Derrida (1994) critiques the notion of ontology through his discussion of hauntology. Ruitenberg (2009) argues that, for Derrida, “Ontology becomes hauntology” (p. 296). She goes on to describe hauntology as a method of interpretation where the individual struggles with their intellectual heritage, in contrast to re-collecting a universal truth. Derrida seeks to replace ontology with hauntology, stating “[t]o haunt does not mean to be present, and it is necessary to introduce haunting into the very construction of a concept. Of every concept, beginning with the concepts of being and time” (Derrida, 1994, p. 161). Szeman (2000) begins by suggesting that Derrida’s spectre is outside of ontology then adjusts the thought to the spectre haunting the ontological. One thing is for certain, Derrida consistently suggests there is a strong connection between hauntology and ontology. For Derrida, hauntology is irreducible and makes possible: “ontology, theology, positive or negative onto-theology” (Derrida, 1994, p. 51). I argue here that all ontology is haunted.

I summon up the voices of the ghosts to facilitate discussion and debate (Schutt & Berry, 2012) to deconstruct dominant narratives of being Pākehā. I “carve out spaces” to listen to the ghosts endeavouring to gather a richer interpretation and more complex understanding of the subject being discussed (Stern, 2012, p. 181). Further, engagement with ghosts provides traces of possible meanings that allow me to “leap from the unknown to the known by inference on the basis of clues” (Gye, 2003, p. 6).
Poetry: Speaking with the Ghosts

So how does one speak to a ghost? In response to Derrida’s notion of hauntology I designed an autoethnographic study to speak to my ghosts. Autoethnography gave me the ‘right tools for the job’ (Saldana, 2009) to explore my whakapapa, my layered genealogy of Pākehā identity and how I am haunted by my past. It valued my touchstone stories. Through moving back and forth, shifting between times and different places, I interrogated the historical, cultural and biographical circumstances that are significant to my experience of becoming Pākehā (Denzin, 2014). Through writing about my past, I brought the world of others into my text. I summoned up my ancestors, and I created them as if ‘real’ as I storied their lives (Denzin, 2014). Through recognising the significance of the knowledge that I have as an individual, autoethnography persistently pushes against the world of traditional science and offers the potential for transformation (S. Wall, 2006). Transformation in this project was achieved through a process of critical engagement with the data, and a cyclic, in-depth analysis of my lived experience (Starr, 2010). Through critical engagement with the data I become increasingly aware of my social positioning and “committed to dialogue that leads to catalytic change” (Starr, 2010, p. 3).

Involved in a cyclic process, further data were generated as I responded to the historical data I was exploring. I took photos, drew sketches, told stories, wrote poems, painted my ancestors and sculptured a Pākehā using wire to represent the unstoried, uncultured, invisible Pākehā, and I wrote more poems. I then started performing my poems and stories. Playing with data, such as writing poetry and narrative, enabled me to “interrogate the self, within the social and political” (K. Fitzpatrick, 2012). Poetry as an art form provided a different way to develop understanding, to explore and analyse the story (Richardson, 2008). Rinehart (2012) also explores the use of poetry in research urging me to “creatively apply [my] own imagination and memory to profound problems that both touch on and are implicit within … [my study]” (p. 197).

I define my writing of poetry as research poetry, or as Lahman and Richard (2014) describe it, ‘good enough’ poetry. It serves multiple purposes in the study and has become embedded in nearly all phases of my research process (Furman, Lietz, & Langer, 2006). In keeping with Richardson, poetry has provided a space for me to play with the data “to recreate lived experience and evoke emotional response”
My poems are derived from those fragments of historical data I have generated and my experiences within the process. I have been ‘poking around’ at my data through and with poetry (Lahman & Richard, 2014). It has given me the ‘right tool’ to gather up my many fragments of data and “create a more collective and comprehensive” telling of my findings (Lahman & Richard, 2014, p. 348). As a method of analysis the poems are loyal to the original data and work to achieve data reduction where they are presented in an accessible, evocative and trustworthy style (Furman et al., 2006). As research poems, their connections to existing research are made apparent (Lahman & Richard, 2014) and my position as researcher is made transparent (Furman et al., 2006).

It is through these art forms I was able to speak to the ghost. When I was deep down into my subject I embodied my ghosts. As Avery Gordon (1997) states…

Haunting is a constituent element of social life … [Being] haunted draws us affectively, sometimes against our will and always a bit magically, into the structure of feeling of a reality we come to experience, not as cold knowledge, but as transformative recognition. (Gordon, 1997, p. 8)

Derrida never specifically states what the ghost is. Nor does he suggest how we might speak to the ghost. In exploring becoming Pākehā I drew on his concept of hauntology and summoned up the ghosts of my whakapapa, to follow the traces left behind, to analyse my touchstone stories, and disrupt the grand narrative that Pākehā are the ‘norm’ in terms of cultural and ethnic groups in New Zealand. The following selected poems and narratives highlight some of those touchstone stories. Through analysing these fragments I begin to identify the traces left behind; those traces of the ancestors of my body and mind.

**Poetry, Pākehā and the Ghost**

**A Pākehā Haunting 1**

What if you were blind?
How would you see me then?
How would you read my actions?
How would you hear my words?
If you touched my skin
Would it be soft and warm?
Sweaty from the summer sun,
Salty from the sea,
Smokey from the hangi?
If you shared my meal
Would you taste my love,
My invitation for friendship?
If we had time to share our stories
Would we talk of our arrivals,
The waka and the ships,
Our whakapapa stretching back in time.
I believe we would love and cry,
Argue and agree.
And you would see my Pākehā bricolage:
My Jewish bones,
My Viking skin,
My Sami cheek bones,
My Danish eyes,
My German hair,
My Cornish courage,
My Yorkshire creativity,
And my Welsh love of singing.
(Fitzpatrick, January 2013)

In “A Pākehā Haunting 1” I explore how I am haunted by a diverse group of people, “fractured by a myriad of ethnic practices” I have inherited from my ancestors (Nayak, 2006, p. 426). My becoming is subject to an entanglement of cognition and body (Dion, Sitz, & Remy, 2011). Further, my becoming is forever subject to change as I struggle with my in-between place and global transformations. It is a poem to disrupt the fallacy of a homogenous settler identity.

The first line of this poem, “what if you were blind?”, is the crux – the most telling. Through reading literature on ethnicity and labelling, interwoven with my own experience of being defined by the colour of my skin, I began to imagine how I might be defined if people could get below the surface of what they see. It is not a rejection of the colour of my skin, but rather a desire for people to recognise the complexity of an identity. My embodied experience of being labelled white, and Pākehā, silences
my story of being multi-ethnic. I have a desire for people to know me through my actions, my voice, my touch and my love; a desire for people to see my Pākehā bricolage.

The second part of the poem begins to touch on the idea of haunting and the "ancestors of my mind" where I raise the possibility of people beginning to "share our stories ... our whakapapa stretching back in time". There is recognition here of difference and similarity, of an emotional response to our histories – where we would "laugh and cry"; we would “argue and agree.”. Our becoming disrupts the possibility of being. Our present carries the past. Those who have been before exist as ‘virtual’ beings in the actuality of our becoming (May, 2003).

This is a hopeful poem. Interestingly, when I read back through this poem I never mention the word ‘white’. The absence of the word highlights the invisible power it has over the way many descendants of colonial populations construct their identities. The ghost of Enlightenment shadows us and casts its influence on how people make sense of who we are. As Pākehā I cannot escape my history and my involvement in the colonial experience, but I can learn to see that I am more than just "the colour of [my] skin."

How I see and understand my world, the beliefs that I build my understanding/s upon, the stories that inform my being and sense making, they are all haunted. I deliberately avoid using the word ‘white’ as a strategy to illuminate how ontologies connected with settler identities are haunted by the concept of the Enlightenment. Whiteness as a normative status has its roots in the Enlightenment period (Kinchesloe, 1999). Kinchesloe described the invisible power Europeans obtained through rational epistemology, which defined and located non-white people as the “unreasonable other” (Kinchesloe, 1999, p. 2). Although there is no fixed essence of whiteness, “whiteness cannot escape the materiality of its history” (Kinchesloe, 1999, p. 3). Rather, those of us who are described as white must recognise the important historical connotations and the impact of whiteness on cultural identity. Consequently as Pākehā I am subjected not to being white but to being thought of as white (Ware, 1993). In the poem above I disrupt the invisibility of whiteness and the notion of whiteness as a normative identity through describing my multi-ethnic heritage.

The list at the end of the poem is my naming of, what I am calling my Pākehā bricolage. This presents a challenge to the assumption that all settler identities in
New Zealand were British (Belich, 2001; Phillip & Hearn, 2008). The English have a history of political dominance in Britain, and significantly here the former British Empire. Significantly, the articulation of a British cultural identity or an English cultural identity is thwarted by this history (Kumar, 2006).

**A Pākehā Haunting 2**

My body;
The body corporeal.
The physical self that clothes me every day.
I am imprisoned inside this mapping,
An historical ‘mish mash’ of DNA,
A bricolage of possibilities and potentialities,
Unique as a finger print or odour plume (waskul & vannini, 2006),
And so I arrived into this world a very tiny purple plum,
The last of the baby boomers.
Edging toward a new day.
A small town between two rivers,
A small town between mountain and sea.
Surviving the great flood,
Waving to my ancestors as they floated by in their coffined vessels.
I am a memory of survival,
Mapped onto my skin, in my bones, pulsing through my veins.
The memory of my ancestors remain:
Blonde, blue eyed, white skin, Pākehā
(Fitzpatrick, December 2012)
I started life as purple; neither black, brown nor white. Emerging as a blonde, blue-eyed, white-skinned child I was consequently defined by my “body corporeal.” As a child, and as an adult, people have placed me in a group, or on a list, with reference to my physical self. I recently underwent a DNA testing programme to discover my maternal line. Growing up with rumours of my Jewish heritage and an ongoing search by my mother and grandmothers for the truth of this, I believed this test might provide more insight into the story. And it did. I now have scientific evidence to support the stories that I am descended from a maternal Jewish line; further, the programme has linked me with a large Jewish family. Through my historical genealogical research I have data that show a ‘mish mash’ of DNA. This DNA mapping in many ways has defined my becoming, “I am imprisoned inside this mapping.” The “possibilities and potentials” for the DNA mapping are numerous and the outcomes as described by waskull and vannini (2006) are as “unique as a fingerprint or odour plume.” I am a throwback to some Viking ancestor – blonde, blue eyed. According to family lore other members of my family physically resemble my Jewish great-grandmother.

In the poem “A Pākehā Haunting 2”, I explore my in-between position, a turning point, a shift, the “last” of a particular group and “edging toward a new day.” My identity emerges therein “between two rivers” and the “mountain and sea”. In the poem, I represent my past and my future; I represent the ancestors of my birth and the ancestors of the land. Postcolonial writers such as Homi Bhabha describe the emergence of in-between or hybrid identities. Bhabha (1994) contended that hybrid identities can be performed and defined in an in-between space of culture, in which traditional fixed identities are questioned and criticised. He described how these evolving hybrid identities transform traditional symbols, including language, which results in them meaning something new. “Hybrid identities can be performed and confirmed in an in-between space of culture, in which traditional fixed identities are questioned and critised” (Moinian, 2009, p. 34). I contend that, for descendants of colonial ancestors who exist in-between, our ghosts are both those of our ancestors’ ‘mother’ countries and those ‘touchstone’ stories of the place we call home.

Many of my touchstone stories are of survival. The tiny purple plum, a baby not yet breathing, I was not meant to survive. Not even a year after my birth I survived the Great Flood of 1964 in Ōpōtiki, where I was told, again by my mother, how another baby rolled off a table and drowned. In my genealogical research I kept
coming across stories of survival. My ancestors in Wales escaped the struggling economic conditions of rural Cardiganshire where, I was told by relatives who stayed in Wales, many were starving in the 1860s. My ancestors from Rehme and Hanover escaped religious oppression and economic hardship (Berry, 1964) in the 1850s because of their Lutheran religion. My ancestors in Yorkshire and Cornwall were escaping the death traps of the mining industry. My Jewish family however, were again seeking a place where they would be safe after a history of escaping: Spain, Portugal, and lastly Amsterdam. Through reading and telling their stories I summon up my ghosts. I “wave… to my ancestors” and exist today as “a memory of survival”.

**A Company of Ghosts.**

Who is sitting up there now  
Peeking over the rim,  
A cloudy horizon  
Down to earthly things?  
Peeking through my window,  
Snooping through my mind.  
Go back to your piano,  
Sing your joyous songs,  
Play the accordion;  
One day I’ll sing along.  
(Fitzpatrick, 2013)

This poem was written in response to my reading of Derrida’s “company of ghosts” (Derrida, 1994, p. 3). I just scribbled something quickly on my note pad then kept going back to it, teasing it into a shape. My reading of Derrida is strongly influenced here by my own history with ghosts. From an early age I was made aware of a company of ghosts that watched over me. My Christian heritage provides a visual image for me of my own company of ghosts peering down on me from the clouds, whispering in my ears, reminding me of who I am. For me, Hebrews 12:1,
"the great cloud of witnesses", always conjured up in my mind an image of those who had gone before peeking down from a lofty height.

My interpretation of these ghosts is based mostly on fragments of scripture, paintings/visual illustrations of heavenly beings beyond a “cloudy horizon”, and also the Māori concept of whakapapa. The first line, “who is up there now” conjures up the image of someone watching over me. My company of ghosts comprised mainly of a group of individuals who have each watched over and loved me in my past. They also had particular expectations for what I would do with my life. The “peeking” and “snooping” indicates my reluctance for them to have knowledge and interfere with my life choices. However, my love for them is real, as I state “one day I’ll sing along”. It was my mother who urged me, before she died, to tell their stories.

Derrida’s (1994) company of ghosts however, is more aligned with key ideas or beliefs that inform a group. Early on he questions his use of the plural “specters of Marx” and explores the possibility of a crowd, masses, the horde, society or a population of ghosts (p. 3). The reference to a ghost being one of many continues throughout his discussion (Szeman, 2000); as Derrida states “there is always more than one of them” (Derrida, 1994, p. 8). Derrida then describes a “gathering place toward which all repatriated specters run: the forum or agora for all those who come back, for there is a lot of talking” (Derrida, 1994, p. 129). Where Derrida believed society would be being haunted by the key ideas of Marx, essential to my poem is my Christian heritage and the belief in a “heaven”, a place removed from “earthly things” where we will sing “joyous songs”. But, as indicated again by “peeking” and “snooping”, it is also a place of judgement. So I also urge my ghosts to leave me alone to “go back to your piano” and let me get along with living.

Suspended in the spectral zone

Them Bones

Great Grandma Ada was perched on my shoulder with her clawed hands curled up in a ball. Pain etched and stretched. I wriggled to rid myself of her – to sleep again. But then she pounced on my ankle. Grandma Molly began to prod me as the birds welcomed the dawn “Get up you old bag of Jewish bones. Get moving; don’t let those old bones lock you down”. My mother stood in the corner of the room, massaging her hands, soothing them with her lemon-scented ointment. My Jewish mothers gifted me their aching bones.

This fragment of narrative represents one way I make sense of, and manage,
my rheumatoid arthritis. Stories and memories of my mother and grandmothers are used to explain the onset of the condition I inherited. But it is also these stories and experiences that remind me I belong to a group of special courageous women – I am not alone. These poems are here to remind us that my Pākehā identity is entangled with my identity as a women, as Jewish, as a wife, a mother and daughter and as an academic (to name a few). These identities are not separate, and neither are they fixed. Rather they are in constant interaction with each other and in the process of becoming. The intersection of our many identities inform and shape our multiple lived experiences (Grieshaber & Canella, 2001). How were my experiences of becoming Pākehā particular to my gender, socio-economic background, and religion?

The intersection of my religious, female and Pākehā identity is an important part of my process of becoming. During my doctoral studies I involved myself in another project to explore the ethical tensions that exist in duoethnographic work, in preparation for the second project in the thesis (Farquhar & Fitzpatrick, 2016). Sandy Farquhar and I juxtaposed our childhood stories to understand our differing responses to our ‘service’ role as academics. The following is a poem I wrote about an incident in my childhood. It was a significant moment that caused me to see my family differently, and to question my own role in life.

Duty calls

Like a trumpet blowing in my head
What is my duty?
To obey
He has her by the hair
Her long golden mane
He drags her down the driveway back home
A mare that refuses to be broken
My Grandfather calls, ‘She’s not mine now – she belongs to you!’
My mother cuts her hair short
This poem is not particular to being Pākehā. However, it does impact on the type of Pākehā I am and am becoming. Our responses to these touchstone stories haunt our futures and how we make sense of the world. As autoethnographers we tease out those critical biographical experiences, those epiphanies that are experienced as social dramas, or dramatic events, the crisis or schism that ruptures the structure of our daily life (Denzin, 2013, pp. 131-132). I remember being devastated that my mother cut her hair; as a child I saw her hair as ‘her glory’, her feminine mystique. These life dramas are turning points, on the micro and macro level. Her role as mother and wife changed dramatically. She was no longer a stay-at-home mum, no longer a dutiful wife or daughter, she was someone caught in-between the past and the future; it was never a peaceful place.

Bell describes Pākehā as lacking substance, plagued by an ontological unease, and with no identity (A. Bell, 2009b), like ghosts. I wonder if I, too, have been chasing a core identity, an identity with substance. Butler (2000) argues that a core identity is imaginary and that, through discourse, people become attached to an imaginary core identity. Through interaction with others we are ascribed with, or consequently may ascribe ourselves with, a core identity. This identity draws on discourse that marks out the imagined boundaries of who we are or might become (Butler, 2000, pp. 5-7). She further argues that, in the process of core construction, we close off the potential for plural identities contending that those who accept the notion of a core identity formulate assumptions about others’ identities based on how those others act or appear (p. 7). Similarly, Scott (2001) describes the construction of identity as a “fantasy echo” which she contends offers a “way of thinking not only about the significance of arbitrary temporal designations ... but also how we appeal to and write history” (Scott, 2001, p. 285). The echo is incomplete, a fragment of something, spanning gaps of space and creating gaps in meaning, an imperfect return of sound. Through the repetition of the echo we imagine and create relations of identity between our past and present. Importantly, Scott reminds us to analyse these fantasy scenarios as echoes, looking for distortions and diffraction, taking into account the profound differences in the very being of Pākehā (Scott, 2001, p. 303).

My work as an autoethnographer, grafting together the fragments from the text of my heritage, tells one story of becoming Pākehā. This story, too, is incomplete. As I followed the ghost, I worked like a bricoleur, patching together the diverse stories of my whakapapa; fantasising to fill in the gaps. I filtered and sifted, and
worked with the bricolage of ‘possibles’, an entanglement of becoming. I followed the
ghost back into the murky complication of being. And there I spoke with more
ghosts: the ghost of the Enlightenment with ideas of racial identity, the religious ghost
with puritan and rule-bound scriptures, the ghost of the Māori and Jewish prophet,
and other touchstone stories.

Rather than existing in an ontologically suspended zone (Butler, 2011), I
believe I am haunted by several ghosts, a multiplicity of voices; in talking with my
ghosts I am able to construct a Pākehā bricolage, a hybrid ontology. Considering my
own bricolage of becoming Pākehā I speculate that Pākehā represent eclectic
echoes of ancestral traces of ethnicity.

There is no ‘standard story’ of being Pākehā, but rather a constant becoming
in response to our different stories of arrival, our engagement with Māori, and our
constant discourse with globalisation. As exemplified in the poem below ‘A Pākehā
Haunting 3’, I am a Pākehā emerging along a continuum of entanglement. My
becoming, my engagement with Indigenous culture, my engagement with a diverse
history of touchstone stories, is uniquely mine. Other in-between, emerging identities
will have their own unique becoming stories. To ‘learn to live’ as an emerging
entangled identity you must summon up the ghosts, those ancestors of the body and
mind, juxtapose your stories against others’, and bring justice.
A Pākehā Haunting 3

Dancing through the cracks in time
Learning to live at the edge of life

Travelling back to foreign lands
Memories of distant worlds

Speaking with my many ghosts
Exorcising the myth of Enlightenment

Following a tattered tale
Deconstructing the dominant story

Languages of ancient peoples
Te Reo and Hebrew

Stories of Saints and Sinners
Te Kooti and Moses

Fragments of another’s dreams
Indigenous and coloniser

Rules of Race and Religion
Conditioned and constrained

Possibilities and potentials
Nature and nurture

Am I here?
Here I am

[In-between]

Here I am
Am I here?

Nature and nurture
Possibilities and potentials

Conditioned and constrained
Rules of Race and Religion

Indigenous and coloniser
Fragments of another’s dreams

Te Kooti and Moses
Stories of Saints and Sinners

Te Reo and Hebrew
Languages of ancient peoples

Learning to live at the edge of life
Dancing through the cracks in time

Memories of distant worlds
Travelling back to foreign lands

Exorcising the myth of Enlightenment
Speaking with my many ghosts

Deconstructing the dominant story
Following a tattered tale
SELAH
IDENTITY: MEMORIES OF MOMENTS AND THE AGENCY OF IDENTITY ARTEFACTS IN ONE ANCESTRAL STORY

Anne Harris asked: How do you perform an identity you have never known? (Harris, 2014).

When you enter into a serendipitous journey as a bricoleur, you are opening yourself up to the unexpected. Here is one story I have uncovered that begins to show how these identities are performed.

A box of memories

I was given a box. It was just an ordinary brown tattered file box, left to me when my mother died. She was only 48 years old. Inside the box lives the story of a ‘ghost-child’ (Harris, 2014), a child with no birth certificate that lacked both mother and father, a child whose family rejected her. Inside the box was everything my mother, and her mother, knew about this child. Her name was Ada, born in 1873 in Thames, New Zealand; she was my great-grandmother. I grew up with the story of Ada. I grew up wondering who her mother was. And when my mother died I was given the task of finding Ada’s mother. All the clues were in the ordinary brown tattered box.

A memory from my childhood

My mother Kathy has found a source for importing Israeli wine. She is ingenious. We live in a small rural town way down the East Coast of New Zealand. It is the 1970s and my parents have befriended a hippy couple that is camped out by the beach. He is Jewish. His father is a practising Jew in Auckland and imports Israeli wine. And so we now drink Israeli wine from a crystal glass (I have no idea where she found that) during our Christian meetings, in our rambling house. Around my neck I wear a star of David crafted by a boy I met. The Israeli wine and the star of David are the outward manifestations of a ghost story. As Harris (2014) suggests, “when we cannot perform our roles within known communities … we imagine new ones” (p. 70).

A fragment of story I was told

It is possible that on an Auckland suburban street, in April 1915, four generations of my Jewish family stood just a few metres apart. I imagine the autumn colours beginning to appear, the wooden villas starting to wrap up in their heavy
drapes ready for the oncoming winter. I can imagine my Grandmother Molly at 11 years of age coaxing her mother Ada to take a trip to Auckland. I can imagine her taking Ada to finally meet her own mother; to confront her ghost. After all, my Grandmother Molly was described as the ‘fearless one’ of the family. Ever since Ada’s wedding (Figure 7), the ‘day she had been told’ she was adopted, Ada had wondered about who her mother was. The most obvious person seemed to be the elusive Aunt Kate, a Jewish Auckland socialite, who would arrive once a year to visit. And then there was the way she was always treated as different and nicknamed the little Jewish girl. Was it more than just her looks?

Figure 7: Ada on her Wedding Day

For some reason, on this day Ada had plucked up the courage to travel to Auckland, accompanied by her bright and persistent daughter. I can see them in my mind’s eye standing, gazing up at the bright white villa in Mt Eden. Molly took Ada’s hand and together they climbed up the steps to the closed door. Who knocked on the door? Was it Ada or Molly? All we know of this story is that a maid answered the door and questioned their visit. They were never invited in. I wonder what they told the maid. Probably, like Harris (2014), when she first went to meet her birth mother, they too made ‘stalker mistake #1’ and told her the truth. The maid returned and closed the door on their faces. As they walked back down the steps, down the path, and down the street, I imagine there were two faces peeking from the curtains, Ada’s
mother Kate Keesing and Kate’s mother Esther; both catching a glimpse of their ghostly future – their daughter and granddaughter. Births, deaths and historical records, my family stories, and my identity imprinted in my DNA prove this story to be plausible, at the least.

So mine is a family story “known and unknown, hidden and present, all at once” (Adams & Holman-Jones, 2008, p. 373). There continue to be gaps in this story. Important gaps I fill with my imagination and other stories I have gleaned from geography, history, politics and artefacts of that time.

**Another memory from my childhood**

My mother has planted another fig tree. Wherever we go she determines there is, or will be, a fig tree. When I read Ross Gray’s (2014) poem I am taken back to my mother’s fig trees and climbing into the branches, “reaching into the giddy throngs of wasps sugar”. I see her fig trees as a symbolic answer to Anne Harris’ question; she is performing an identity she has never known. And every time I see a fig tree, or even a fig, I too blow…

a kiss
to the tree which everyone knows
cannot grow this far [south]
being Mediterranean
and favoring the rocky, sun-baked soils
of Jordan and Sicily
but no one told the fig tree
or the immigrants
there is a way
the fig tree grows
in groves it wants,
it seems, to hold us…(Gay, 2014)

**A memory from yesterday**

Here I am at last. It is 2013. I have grabbed a moment of time during a whizz-
bang conference trip to Europe to visit Amsterdam. I am sitting in the old Sephardic synagogue (Figure 8), gazing down at the sandy floor below imagining my ancestors before me, some 300 years ago. It is quiet and I am alone, but I am not alone. Suddenly the modern world clangours into action; I have a text message. My DNA results have come through. I am a direct match with ‘Aunt Kate’. A descendant of Rose Keesing, Kate’s sister has had her DNA tested. As the Keesing family historian she has included me on her family tree. I whisper into the silence of the sanctuary, ‘I belong’. I whisper at the closed door back in Mt Eden, ‘I am yours’.

Figure 8: Sephardic Synagogue in Amsterdam; a Photo I took in 2013

I take the ordinary, brown, tattered box of historical archives collected by my family and add my story. As Harris reminds us “kinship often remains an imagined community (part fact, part fiction), yet deeply important to constructing a sense of belonging in the world, even when the world falls short” (Harris, 2014, p. 71).

Who we are, how we fit into this world, what our role is in particular situations, in particular social groups. These are all questions we struggle with. My story of Kate and Ada has informed my identity. I grew up as a Christian yet being told I was Jewish. I grew up a female in a society that held particular expectations for me. I grew up poor yet had a childhood full of rich stories. I grew up curious. I grew up
When I first started this journey and mapped out a plan of how it might progress, I decided this would be a thesis with publications. The reason was purely in response to the increasing demands of the University where I work, that I should be accountable for my research endeavours, which is evidenced through publications. It was an attempt to feed the neo-liberal beast that was biting at my heels. This next chapter is evidence of my early mulling over arts-based methodologies, the purpose of my thesis and the ethical tensions of working with others’ stories. I framed it around a fictional conversation with John Steinbeck whose poem, "Like Captured Fireflies", had so inspired me when I first went to work at the University (Figure 9). This was also my first experience of using a scripted conversation to explore important considerations in autoethnographic and duoethnographic work. After presenting the work at the IDIERI (The International Drama in Education Research Institute) conference in Ireland in 2012, I decided to craft it into my first publication for my thesis. The work has also been published in a different format in the online Waikato Education Journal with audio and slides, where I also received permission to show rare photos of Steinbeck and his son Thomas, as below.

**Figure 9:** Captured like Fireflies. A Painting with Acrylic to Capture the Magic of the Firefly that John Steinbeck Calls up in his Poem, ‘Captured like Fireflies’ (Steinbeck, 1955a)
CHAPTER 7
A CONVERSATION WITH STEINBECK: FINDING MY WAY TO POSTCRITICAL ETHNOGRAPHY


Fumbling muddling
Conscious of my lack
I come back to Steinbeck
A ghost to whom I speak
A ghost whom I admire
A ghost who writes on my mind.
(Fitzpatrick, 2013)

This chapter tells the story of how I conversed with others as I considered and designed a study to critically explore my research question: What does it mean to be a Pākehā educator? Defining myself as Pākehā, I represent what is usually understood as the white European partner in New Zealand’s bicultural relationship with Māori – the Indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand. As an emerging researcher I looked to mentors/guides/critical friends to enlarge my understanding of the role I was about to undertake, represented here through a fictional conversation with John Steinbeck, the Nobel Prize winning American author.

To represent my experience I chose to script a fictional conversation as it provided me with the performative capability to connect the reader with my struggle in a critically reflexive way (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Spry, 2011b). Scripting a conversation engaged me critically with questions regarding the methodological and ethical choices I needed to consider throughout the initial stages. Fictionalising the script was a way of illuminating the message, whilst allowing the complexity of the process to be apparent. It was also a strategy for connecting the reader to my experiences in order to evoke an emotional and intellectual response (Eisner, 1997; Schuck, Aubusson, Buchanan, & Russell, 2012; Spry, 2011a). Writing the script involved a cyclic integration of theory, relevant literature, personal experience,
analysis and key ideas (Saldana, 2003). The process meant reducing the data corpus from the volumes of methodological readings I was engaged with, down to those ideas that resonated. I was engaged in the process of reading and rereading text, creatively writing and playing with ideas, to become familiar with the meaning and feeling of the words (Saldana, 2003; Sallis, 2008).

**Like Captured Fireflies**

I returned repeatedly to a poem by John Steinbeck that has influenced my own practice as a teacher educator. I believed that same poem had a message for researchers in education. It is this belief that has motivated me to script a fictional conversation with Steinbeck to explore performative writing and connect the reader with my concerns on developing an ethical research practice. Steinbeck’s replies throughout the script are constructed from several fictional and nonfictional sources. Interwoven through the conversation are my own poems, stories and voices of other researchers as significant others who have spoken to me throughout this process. These layers of conversation keep the text in motion and invite the reader to engage reflexively with the process (Rath, 2012). I imagine if Steinbeck and I had shared a conversation it would have begun with me sharing my favourite Steinbeck poem, and I would call him John …

**Like Captured Fireflies**

In her classroom our speculations ranged the world.

She aroused us to book waving discussions.

Every morning we came to her carrying new truths, new facts, new ideas

Cupped and sheltered in our hands like captured fireflies.

When she went away a sadness came over us,

But the light did not go out.

She left her signature upon us

The literature of the teacher who writes on children’s minds.

I’ve had many teachers who taught us soon forgotten things,

But only a few like her who created in me a new thing a new attitude, a new hunger.

I suppose that to a large extent I am the unsigned manuscript of that teacher.
What deathless power lies in the hands of such a person?

John Steinbeck (1955b)

**Scripted conversation**

**Characters**

*Esther*: Doctoral candidate

*John*: John Steinbeck

**SHADOWS ON THE BEACH**: Other significant researchers, theorists, John’s son.

**Scene One**

*It is a summer evening at a beach holiday house. Rays of early evening sunlight illuminate Esther, who is sitting on the deck mulling over what she has read and written that day for her research proposal. Enter John Steinbeck who walks across the deck and sits beside her. He relaxes back into the chair, crosses his legs, and lights a cigarette. They stare out at the ocean together and begin talking, slowly and dreamily. Somewhere on the beach, hidden from view, are other significant characters listening in on the conversation; researchers, theorists – fellow dreamers.*

*Esther*: *Dramatically.* I love your poem about the fireflies. I always wanted to be that teacher. To listen to the stories those children and others brought to me “cupped and sheltered in their hands like captured fireflies”. Now I am involved in a research project that involves listening to and gathering stories – about what it means to be Pākehā educator.

*John*: *Kindly and thoughtfully.* It was written for you. It was written for all teachers, educators, and researchers, who are involved in the business of listening and interpreting the stories of others. “I have come to believe that a great teacher is a great artist and that there are as few as there are any other great artists. Teaching might even be the greatest of the arts since the medium is the human mind and spirit” (Steinbeck, 1955b).

*Pause.*

*John turns and focuses his gaze on Esther.*

*John*: *In a sceptical tone.* But I do wonder. What is a Pākehā? And why is listening to their stories worthy of your attention?
Esther: Sits up straight. Her face adopts a serious expression. Where do I begin? A multivalent term, fraught with a myriad of contentious meanings and sentiments, Pākehā are usually understood as the white European partner in New Zealand’s bicultural relationship with Māori – the indigenous people of New Zealand (A. Bell, 2009b). Understanding the development of such an identity in New Zealand is a significant undertaking since it is complicated by recent globalisation, polyethnic communities and a bi-cultural relationship between two Founding Peoples; indigenous Māori and Pākehā Settler (A. Bell, 1999). The development of an identity for Pākehā is even more complicated by their history as colonists, their hegemonic position in society, and for some their ignorance of white privilege (Addy, 2008).

The sound of seagull cries rise and fade. Esther glances over at the shadows on the beach. These shadows from the beach shout out to her:

Awatere: You have no culture (1984)

Hoey: What culture you have is borrowed or appropriated from Māori (2004)

Turner: Pākehā are in a place of internal exile (2000)

Esther: She turns back to John with urgency. To answer the second question: Pākehā are an emerging ethnic group who have no other home. A form of multicultural education has persisted in New Zealand that emphasises the authenticity of minority groups – further essentialising ethnic groups – and mostly ignores the existence of Pākehā. The concern here is that this practice further isolates and stereotypes particular groups which can result in racism. Pākehā consistently demonstrate that they struggle with articulating a positive ethnic identity and a sense of belonging (A. Bell, 2009b).

Esther stands steps forward and talks directly to the reader.

Here is a poem I wrote nearing the end of my last research project of my own journey of becoming Pākehā:
ONTÖS
‘To be’
I am I was I will be
The truth
Travelling becoming
An identity
In flux in-between entangled
Belonging
Becoming
Me
(E. Fitzpatrick, 2011a)


Esther sits back down smiling.

John: Quizzical look on his face. How do you propose to go about listening to the stories of Pākehā educators and interpreting them as truthfully as you might? How will you tell of those traits we also detest, tell of our failures, our self-interest and yet be ethical to your participants? As to your poem (John points to Esther):

Remember as you travel through life and continue this journey of becoming, the journey is a person in itself; no two are alike. And all plans, safeguards, policing, and coercion are fruitless. We find that after years of struggle that we do not take a trip; a trip takes us. (Steinbeck, 1962, 1997)

Enjoy.

Esther: Picks up her pad and pen. She looks at the words on the page. I am exploring the stories of Pākehā educators and how being a Pākehā influences our practice. This will involve three ethnographic projects: autoethnography, duoethnography and performance ethnography. Using a postcritical ethnographic framework I will be paying particular attention to how as educators we “write on children’s minds” (Steinbeck, 1955b).

Turns to John.

Reading through some survey questions last week – exploring the relationship
between adolescent understandings of ethnic-racial identity and school experience –
I was struck with how we unconsciously write on children’s minds. This survey was
given to hundreds of adolescent children in New Zealand, including Pākehā. I
wondered how they interpreted the following questions.

*Esther reads off the page. Dramatically:*

I have a strong feeling of hatred and disdain for the majority culture.

I dislike many of the things that the dominant culture represents

People from the dominant ethnic group are vicious and nasty…

(Worrell, Vandiver, Cross, & Fhagen-Smith, 2010).

*The sound of seagull cries rise and fade. Esther glances over at the shadows on the
beach.*

*A lone voice from the beach instructs:*

**Moin Syed:** My recent research on the impact of the survey on participants would
suggest these Pākehā students would be made to feel uncomfortable and internalise
the negative images portrayed about their ethnic group – or become resistant
altogether (Syed, Juan, & Juang, 2011).

**John:** *Leans back in chair. He shakes his head and frowns.* You are speaking in
some other language? I can’t understand much of what you have said other than it
involves a lot of stories about you! Why are you in the centre of this research? Is it
just going to be a whole lot of navel gazing – “poor wee Pākehā me”? ‘Where did
this discontent start? You are warm enough, but you shiver. You are fed, yet hunger
gnaws you. You have been loved, but your yearning wanders in new fields. And to
prod all these there’s time, the Bastard Time!’ (Steinbeck, 1954, 2008).


As to the survey questions – these remind me of what provoked me to write the ‘Like
Captured Fireflies’ poem. *(John stands. Takes a step forward. A smaller shadow
stands alongside him.)* My eleven year old son came to me one day …

**Son:** *tone of patient suffering.* How much longer do I have to go to school?

**John:** About fifteen years

**Son:** *despondently.* Oh! Lord, – Do I have to?
John: I'm afraid so. It's terrible and I'm not going to try to tell you it isn't. But I can tell you this – if you are very lucky, you may find a teacher and that is a wonderful thing.

Son: Did you find one?

John: I found three. They all loved what they were doing. They did not tell – they catalysed a burning desire to know. Under their influence, the horizons sprung wide and fear went away and the unknown became knowable. But most important of all, the truth, that dangerous stuff, became beautiful and very precious. (Steinbeck, 1955b)


Esther: Loud whisper. Perhaps I misrepresented what I am doing. I am very aware of the concerns – that this type of research is sometimes misunderstood as indulgent. (She sits back into chair.) For example starting out on this research I became fascinated by the stories of my ancestors. I am now a complete ancestry on line convert. I mentioned my concern to a critical friend and her answer was “it is important to know my whakapapa” (Laughs. Pause.) As part of my research I am creating a wire Pākehā sculpture and while playing around with wire one afternoon I started to think about these ancestors:

Esther stands and addresses the reader with emotion.

Wire
I am drawing out the wire
It is neatly bound like my Grandmas yarn of wool
I am imagining how I will weave my wire Pākehā
I draw out the wire carefully
Knitting, weaving, tukutuku koru
I draw more wire and remember
An ancestor who drew wire
In Thurgoland
An ancestor who used wire
In Sheffield
An ancestor who manipulated wire
In Auckland
To make my Poppas crib
And then I think of number eight fencing wire
And remember
An ancestor who won a bet
Building fences
In Christchurch New Zealand
My mother’s chicken wire
Chinese bantams, Rhode island red
And then I remember running a race
Across the paddocks
Dodging the cow pats
Smeared with paspalum
ZAP
My first electric fence.


I begin by telling my stories of becoming Pākehā and then weave these stories in a critically reflexive way through the whole process. I begin with my story – to make transparent in the larger story how I am situated – so others can comment, juxtapose their stories against, and add to this script. This provides an opportunity for the voice of the researcher to be identified (Chang, 2008) and enables me to explore personal knowledge to inform educational philosophy and pedagogical practice (Starr, 2010). Ellis et al. define autoethnography (2010) as “an approach to research and writing that seeks to describe and systematically analyse (graphy) personal experience (auto) in order to understand cultural experience (ethno)” (p. 1).

Pause. Esther leans forward conspiratorially. Looking about furtively to check who is listening. She continues in a low whisper.

One ethical dilemma is the tension between telling those stories (or versions of) I am proud of and those I would rather hide away, such as the story of Goldie and Me...

I am sitting in a special room in Auckland library. Before me is a box that contains the history of one side of my family. I am prowling excitedly through the contents. I have always liked to play the part of detective uncovering secrets. I read a story
about a great great uncle who was best friends with Frederick Goldie (a famous New Zealand artist in the 19 century). The story paints a marvellous picture of my relative, his exploits as a conservationist, gardener, photographer and painter. But what I especially enjoyed reading about was his relationship with Māori who gifted him many treasures. Goldie also gifted my relative with several of his paintings. It was a stunning story … until I turned the page. After he died his wife burnt everything, everything, yes I know what you are asking … everything.

John: Smiling. How and why do we select particular stories to tell? This is a marvellous story. I can imagine which part of this story is the firefly cupped and sheltered in your hand and which is locked up in a box in a cupboard in a museum. “When speaking for others just remember no man really knows about other human beings. The best he can do is to suppose that they are like himself” (Steinbeck, 1961, 2000).

The sound of seagull cries rise and fade. Esther glances at the shadows on the beach.

Shadows from the beach instruct:

Rath: Sometimes we need to learn to live with mystery, with unfinished stories, with hushed and silenced stories (Rath, 2012).

Anderson: Esther, as the researcher, I suggest you consider …

- Being explicitly a full member of the research group
- Engage yourself in analytic reflexivity
- Ensure you are visible in published texts
- Also engage with other informants
- You must be committed to the agenda of improving understandings of broader social phenomena (Anderson, 2006).

John: Laughs. Ah yes I like Anderson’s idea of being engaged in analytic reflexivity throughout – such as a personal journal – such an important and useful strategy. I often use a personal journal when writing, such as when I wrote the first draft of East of Eden. That particular journal was actually published in 1969. It primarily consisted of a series of letters I pretended to write to my editor (but which were never mailed). These letters helped me to prepare myself for the day’s writing. I also recorded
personal thoughts, ideas for plot, characters etc., questions to follow up on and so forth … (Railback & Meyer, 2006, p. 190).

**Esther: Smiles.** *Looks at John and nods.* Thanks for that – I have actually planned to use a personal journal – this will be an essential part of my documenting reflections, poetry, and visual art throughout the process. *(They both pause and stare thoughtfully out at the darkening waters)* The second project I alluded to is a duoethnography. My aim with this project is to involve myself with three other educators, who are Pākehā, to explore in a collaborative inquiry how being Pākehā has influenced what we do as educators. *(Referring to her writing pad.)*

Duoethnography is defined as a collaborative research methodology in which two or more researchers of difference juxtapose their life histories to provide multiple understandings of the world (Norris et al., 2012). Before embarking on the above project I worked with a colleague and friend for a few months writing a duoethnography. Our research relationship is described as with another rather than on another – both my colleague and I as the researchers are the site of the research. We have encountered a few ethical dilemmas while exploring how our position and experience in our families has influenced how we respond to our roles in the University. *(Esther stands and a shadowy figure from the beach comes to join her.)* For example, our right to tell the stories of those we are close to, as highlighted in the following transcript:

**Esther:** The dining table.

**Sandy:** It’s not a very safe place for a lot of people.

**Esther:** You were talking about that dinner time and that brought back in a negative memory. You have warm memories of your family but the dinner table was not a positive memory. So when you refer to family you sometimes refer to them as the household. Were there warm memories?

**Sandy:** Actually I feel a bit uncomfortable about what I said. … and I wouldn’t want her to think that I would write about it. *[Sandy puts her finger to her lip not wanting to disclose ‘her’ name]*

**Esther:** I know what you mean. I was reading through the transcript and I thought “Oh that was not always true”. This storying seems to highlight the flaws and make them stand out rather than the wholeness of her – all her goodness is not seen because her flaws are more vivid in this story.
Esther sits down. The sound of seagull cries rise and fade. A shadow from the beach calls out reprimanding.

**Norris:** I hope you are aware that your relationship is of paramount importance in this endeavour. Have you taken time to establish a respectful, trusting, and caring relationship? Your commitment to each other is to assist each other in the process of sharing stories; that you are receptive to each other’s stories and are open to transformation (Norris et al., 2012).

**John:** Leans back in chair. Laughing. I’ve never heard of duoethnography before – sounds to me like a good excuse to get paid for sitting in a bar with a mate for a gossip! (Pauses. Leans forward. Serious.) But what really worries me is who is protecting the stories of those who you and your colleagues are in relationship with? What right do you have to disclose their stories? (Leans back again. Looks off into the distance remembering.) Ha! But in saying that I did enjoy writing about the character Kate in *East of Eden*, modelled after my second wife. She was evil incarnate! It actually helped me to pull myself together after one of the lowest points in my life (Steinbeck, 1990).

**Esther:** Yes, the concerns you have highlighted cause unease for my colleague and me as well. (Pause.) Norris and Sawyer, who coined the term duoethnography, recognise the potential harm of disclosing the stories of others who are in relationship with the storyteller as the most problematic aspect one must consider. Cognisant of this issue, they suggest I tell the story without placing any judgments on the Other and that I ensure I make it explicit that the story is told from my point of view (Norris et al., 2012).

The sound of seagull cries rise and fade. The shadowy voices from the beach call out in warning.

**Mienczakowski:** … be faithful and do no harm (Mienczakowski, 1996).

**Madison:** What matters is that the researcher is always aware of the consequence of the message (Madison, 2012).

**Esther:** Contemplatively. Perhaps, here my Christian upbringing still speaks to me “do unto others as you would have them do unto you”, Matthew 7:12. (She leans over to John and whispers.) I too have stories I am not prepared to publish on the world stage.
(Pause. Sits up and reads off page.) The last project is performance ethnography. Saldana (2003, p. 218) describes performance ethnography as a methodology that involves presenting to an audience, the dramatisation of “research participant’s experiences and /or researchers' interpretations of data”. This gives me an opportunity to work creatively with the data and present them in a palatable form for people in the academy, and outside the academy, to engage with and respond to (Ackroyd & O’Toole, 2010).

**John:** Sits up in chair excitedly. I can’t wait for this. What a wonderful way to take the richness and complexity of life’s stories and re-imagine them for others to respond to. Here is a way to take the fireflies that have been gifted to you and share them with the world. Just remember creativity in your writing and your research requires a high level of attention to questions of responsibilities.

**Esther:** Nodding in agreement. Looking over to John. Yes, I completely agree and am aware of the centrality of questions of power (Ackroyd & O’Toole, 2010, p. 27). (Smiling) Thank you again for watching over me. (Pause) I’m quite excited now my proposal has been accepted and the formal ethics procedure completed. One of the ideas is to create composite characters to increase anonymity of individuals for the final script. (Speaking to a ghostly figure on the beach.)… Yes I know what you’re thinking Richard Sallis … I won’t take words or incidents out of context and although the scenes will be fictionalised they will represent themes that emerge from the data.

Exit John Steinbeck and others. The sun slips below the horizon.

**Scene Two – In Closing**

*Esther is seated at desk writing. Light spilling from the reading lamp reveals the reflective look upon her face.*

Dear Reader,

Constructing a fictional conversation between Steinbeck, other researchers and myself engaged me personally with the ethical tensions inherent in ethnographic research at the start of my journey. As a postcritical ethnographer I positioned myself as the central character in the unfolding story to reveal the struggle of the novice. Conversing with experts in the field and linking their ideas to my own stories, in a critically reflexive way, provided me with an opportunity to begin to hear my own voice and construct a methodology that I believed could effectively explore the research question and was fundamentally an ethical process. Scripting a fictional
conversation gave me a space to play, to imagine and consider in creative ways how these writers and researchers would respond to my ideas. The words of these writers were no longer text-bound, but became part of an unfolding conversation as I imagined them in dialogue with me. When performing the script with and for others we have together embodied the experience of the research process. My hope is that as the reader, you too have begun to play, and imagine if …

*The sound of seagull cries rise and fade.*

*The lights dim.*

Acknowledgement and appreciation for permission granted to use material from Steinbeck 1955 from Craig Hamilton, Editorial Assistant, CTA Communications, 27th March 2013.
SELAH
CRITICAL FAMILY HISTORY

Fictional/factional conversations through scripts, poetry, and narratives increasingly became part of my analysis and presentation. The following two chapters were written near the end of this journey, where I worked with data generated over the years through the framework of critical family history. It was an important story, but difficult to tell. Sitting with my supervisors a few months back, as I was beginning to thread the published work and other chapters together, a conversation arose.

Katie: pointing to the rough draft on the table. There is nothing in here about your father’s family – is that on purpose?

Peter: I agree. It seems to be all about your mother.

Katie: You need more stories; the publications don’t provide space for enough stories.

I looked at the pile of words, pictures, stories that lay on the table between us. And I saw and felt the gap in my story.

Katie: Kindly. That’s OK – but you just need to justify why you focus on your mother’s stories.

I didn’t really give either of them an answer. Instead I went back and addressed this gap. I went back to speak with my ghosts. Those stories I had silenced by their absence on my pages.
CHAPTER 8
A CRITICAL FAMILY HISTORY THROUGH A LAYERED CHRONOLOGICAL STORYING

Critical Family History Chronology

Gathering and generating data in critical autoethnography is a process. As with most research endeavours it is also never-ending; there is always another story out there. This chapter demonstrates the process of layering the personal story alongside the wider historical and social story, alongside stories of other peoples who are entangled in our becomings.

It was one of those serendipitous moments. I was scrolling through Facebook and noticed a story from my place, the place of my childhood touchstone stories. I read about the Whakatōhea celebrations, a gathering of people in the Waioeka to remember the Te Tarata war, a war between the local tribes and the colonial army 150 years ago (Walker, 2007). This war eventuated in the confiscation of much Māori land in the Waioeka Valley. The land my great-grandfather Charles Bawden Rogers bought at auction several years later, the land with the sacred place Poppa told me never to run on, the place where I first learnt the word “tapu” (sacred).

I speculate here that there is no conclusion for an identity that is forged between two worlds, an identity that exists in relation to its complicated past and uncertain future. Rather there is a constant negotiation with the process of becoming. I begin this story by introducing you to my home town of Ōpōtiki, and then I provide a three-layered chronological story of some of the significant events that occurred up until November 2015.

The following is a critical family history chronology of one of my ancestors who settled in Ōpōtiki, in the Waioeka Valley in 1875. I tell this story through briefly summarising the historical records of the Ngāti Ira hapū of the Whakatōhea iwi (hapū is made up of several family groups and belong to a larger iwi group, bound together through a shared ancestor) alongside the story of my ancestor, Charles Bawden Rogers. Parallel to these two stories I share fragments from newspaper accounts and other historical records to provide a link between the personal and wider political, social and historical context of the time with the intent to make visible the “historic construction of unequal relationships and their ongoing legacy” (Sleeter, 2015, p. 2).
The key historical texts drawn on are the works of Ranginui Walker (2007) and Judith Binney (1997, 2010). Walker described Ōpōtiki as the capital of the Whakatōhea peoples (Walker, 2007). Telling my story alongside the Whakatōhea furthers Walker’s argument (2007) that “the history of Whakatōhea is a microcosm of the history of New Zealand” (p. 9). However, these local stories are also important to explore and tell, since they work to dislocate the historical national narrative and focus on how radically different narratives of settler and indigenous histories are particular to certain communities (Ballantyne, 2012, p. 63).

In the following three-layered chronology (see the chart in the pocket in the back cover of the thesis, or the supplementary PDF file in the electronic version), I employ the genre of letter writing to story the history of Whakatōhea, particularly Ngāti Ira, and my Rogers family. Letter writing is a useful strategy to gather the historical facts generated together and story them in such a way that the facts become more easily accessible to the reader. One set of letters are written to my friend Karen Barber’s son, Tahukiterangi, whose father is from Ngāti Ira. Karen and her family attended the Te Tarata battle commemorations and it was her who posted the photos on Facebook. And the other set of letters are written to my niece Molly; Charles Bawden Rogers is her great-great-grandfather. The historical and political story is layered above the letters, with the use of bullet points to highlight the significant events of each time period in relation to the two families. The images included are mine, except for the one showing the Te Tarata battle 150-year commemoration, for which I obtained the permission from the photographer (Erica Sinclair). The stories themselves can be read horizontally or vertically, randomly or as a whole. And as with all stories, this is my story of the facts, and now I give it to you to read.
CHAPTER 9
HIRA TE POPO AND CHARLES TE PUIA: A SCRIPTED
TALE BESIDE THE FIRE AT WAIOEKA

The story of Hira Te Popo and Charles Te Puia, and the Art of Critical Family History

In this chapter I draw on the data generated through the critical family history chronology and create a factionalised (Bruce, 2014) script. The purpose of the script is to give the different characters in the story an opportunity to speak to the complex and entangled nature of their relationships. And it is to summon up the ghosts.

Ōpōtiki-Mai-Tawhiti

If you are ever lucky enough to travel to the small town of Ōpōtiki on the East Coast of New Zealand, you must also pay a visit to the local museum. Upstairs there is a thoughtfully designed picture window, so as you gaze out you look over the wharf, up the Waioeka River to the place where Tārawa, a renowned ancestor from Hawaiki, is said to have landed with his ‘pets’ – two supernatural fish, legend says, that travelled with him across the seas. On his arrival Tārawa released the pets into a spring, which has since been known as Ōpōtiki-Mai-Tawhiti (literally, ‘pets from afar’). For a Christmas gift one year, my daughter painted a watercolour of Ōpōtiki-Mai-Tawhiti. This gift now hangs on my wall.

When I go back to Ōpōtiki, my home town, there are no more of my Rogers family living there. Going back is much like my trip, several years ago, to St Breward in Cornwall to visit the place my Rogers lived before they came to New Zealand; there are none left in St Breward either. It seems my family dwelt in Ōpōtiki for a while (120 years), lived a rich entangled life with the Indigenous people of the land, and left when work, education and circumstances pushed, pulled and pointed them elsewhere. However, my childhood stories are an important part of who I am today. So I decided the stories of Charles Bawden Rogers and Hira Te Popo should be shared.

In writing the story that follows, several serendipitous encounters occurred. One of them was bumping into a friend at a local coffee shop; he proceeded to tell me about his grandfather, Sir Norman Perry. Sir Norman, a Pākehā, had worked as a clerk for Sir Āpirana Ngata, then served in the Māori Battalion in WWII, and had also, for a term, worked as a manager of the Whakatōhea Trust Board in Ōpōtiki (Walker,
2007). My friend told me how his grandfather had hanging in his study a large portrait painting of Sir Āpirana (prominent New Zealand politician), and whenever he had a difficult problem he would disappear for a ‘chat’ with his old friend and mentor.

The second serendipitous encounter was my turning on the TV randomly late one afternoon and seeing an old Tūhoe man sitting by a large outdoor fire telling the story of Ōhāua Marae, Te Urewera (Huia, 2015). I decided to record the programme and watch at a later date, just in case there was something more in this story. It turned out there was. The old Tūhoe man was Ron Tahi and he spoke of the importance of the fire as a gathering place to share stories of whakapapa, especially those provocative stories to teach the younger generations and make them think. Hence, the following four scenes draw on data I have gathered from trips to the museum, historical records, family stories, photos, history books (particularly the works of Ranginui Walker, and Judith Binney) and my imagination. It is a factionalisation. The character Kahurangi is fictive. I know she existed, but I don’t know her given name or her birth date. The other characters are real. Charles is my great-grandfather and Hira Te Popo is an honoured kaumatua (chief) of Ngāti Ira (White, 2016). I use the fire as a gathering point for those characters significant to my story, where both those living and dead can come together and korero (talk).

**Charlie and the Chief**

**Scene One**

It was early December 1875 the Pohutakawa tree was signalling Christmas was coming with its full blooms of deep red, and the warm evenings stretched languidly into the night. There was really no need to light the fire, but the tradition was maintained as the people gathered around to share stories. This is how it was done. This is how the ancestors stories were told, how other stories were shared to provoke the old and young alike to remember and think. Hira Te Popo, chief of the Ngāti Ira, sat upright in a seat of authority, thoughtfully smoking on his pipe. He looked across the fire at the young Pākehā man and smiled. The young man had proven to have great courage pitching his tent on the land he had just acquired; land that bordered that of the Ngāti Ira which had, according to Te Popo, been illegally confiscated by the Crown. After the land wars some sort of negotiated peace had been made, yet not all Māori had peace in their hearts. The scarred Waioeka Valley still smouldered and the ‘prophet’ or ‘rebel’ (depending on who you were talking to) Te Kooti and his followers would still turn up now and then to stir them up to retaliate
against land sales. The young Pākehā had sought Hira Te Popo out as a friend and in each other they had recognised a thirst for knowledge and a passionate belief in their religion. Earlier in the year Hira Te Popo had organised the building of a schoolhouse and the Pākehā had helped him locate a suitable teacher.

Te Popo now looked at the pale-skinned man with his flaming beard and fiery bright blue eyes; this particular Pākehā was never settled and always eager. Te Popo called out, “Te Puia tell us a story”. The Pākehā looked up and laughed, “My name is Charles!” Te Popo declared, “You need a proper name, and I will now call you Te Puia – the fiery one”. Great rumbles of laughter flowed out around the camp fire and each fought to share a tale about Te Puia and his new name. Te Popo and Charles Te Puia smiled at each other across the flames. It was done.

Later it is just Hira Te Popo and Charles who remain by the fire. A few others were scattered around engaged in their own kōrero.

**Te Popo:** Why don’t you let us help you build a proper house?

**Charles smiling:** A proper house Te Popo? Where I come from all the houses are made of grey stone squashed up against each other in a stony lane. My father was a stonecutter, and my brothers work in a deep hole in the ground digging out more stone. Some people even worship great stones that they place in a round circle. The church is made of stone and inside the church is a tombstone of my ancestor. I think much of my life I lived on what we call ‘stone soup!’ So what do you mean by a proper house?

*Te Popo chuckles quietly to himself. He can just about imagine some of these things but stone soup, he thinks, will be a story he must save for another fire.*

**Te Popo:** A stone house, Te Puia, I cannot do. The stones in the Waioeka belong there to stay, and they are too small and slimy. I can build you a wooden slate house, like old man Parkinson beyond you, with a thatched roof like the schoolhouse. It will be warmer and drier when the winter season comes. And you can find some work for my boys on your farm and building the new roads. We need to store up for the winter also.

*Charles scratches his beard and swats at a waeroa (mosquito) thinking carefully.*

**Charles:** I’ve only just got newly elected onto the Board Te Popo, but I will see what I can organise. Would they be prepared to travel to the Motu? There are plans to build
a road to connect up through the valley to where the Motu River begins. I’d also like to get some land cleared to plant some crops. What do you suggest?

**Te Popo leans in:** I will show you where to plant your crops. Your land is where some of our best lands were before the wars. And I will also show you where you must never go, where the land is tapu at the top of the hill. That is a sacred place. Can you keep that place safe for me, Te Puia?

*The old man stares keenly at the younger with bright fierce eyes. The aching memory of the battle still raw inside his heart.*

**Charles quietly and firmly:** Of course Te Popo. The sacred places will be respected.

**Te Popo leans back and puffs quietly on his pipe:** It is sorted then, Te Puia. And next time you will tell me more about your stone soup. Haere ra, Te Puia.

*Charles stands and stretches, smiles across at the old man and makes way to collect his horse. It is only a 10-minute trot over to his small tent tucked into the side of the hill. But it’s a lonely one. He begins to dream about a long ago place, and stone soup.*

**Scene Two**

The distant hills of the Urewera are covered in a blanket of cold grey mist and the sun is quickly disappearing. Charles saddles his horse, bundled inside an old oilskin and wearing the lamb’s wool jersey knitted with love by his daughter, Isabella. She is the strength of his heart. He directs the horse toward the Te Ira Pa. Following secretly is his only remaining and youngest son William John. It is June 1928. Hira Te Popo left the bodily realm in October 1889, but is still Charles’ closest confidant. As he gets closer to the pa Charles sees the fire and fastens the trot; it has been far too long. The old people greet him with hongi and slaps on the back, and then they reprimand him for being away too long. But then, in an instant, he is seated comfortably by the fire. He stares into the flames as William John melts into the crowd. This is William John’s home away from home, he speaks fluent Te Reo and all the people in this place are his friends and his kin. Charles would not recognise him. The voices around the fire become muffled as Charles relaxes into the moment and he begins to sense someone next to him.

**Charles:** Ah so you came?

**Te Popo:** Ha … you are one to talk … I never left! I have been helping my people
petition back for their land. We are up to the fourth petition to the government. I have great hopes in our cousin Āpirana Ngata.

**Charles:** I know. I know. You see Te Popo the large wharenui they have built to hold their meetings, where your portrait hangs in pride of place? The house Te Kooti built no longer stands.

*The both glance over toward the large meeting house with its fine carvings. It has been built to stand for a long time.*

**Te Popo** turning back to **Te Puia:** So what have you been up to old friend?

**Charles** pauses: It is a sad story.

**Te Popo:** They all are. That is life. Love, loss, love, loss and then there is us. We are dead, but we still live.

**Charles:** I loved. I had a daughter and then I lost my wife. I loved. And I had another daughter and I lost my love. Then one daughter died and the other, well you know, she came back here to her people. Then I loved once more, or at least married sensibly to ensure I had a son to look after the land. A woman from Yorkshire, living in Auckland, her father was a Freemason like myself – he was well connected. My first two sons died in that miserable ‘war to end all wars’. Many of your people fought bravely in that war as well Te Popo. Can you believe it? Sailing to the other side of the world to fight in a war for the people that took their land? And so I am left with three unwed daughters, who follow after their mother in their strident religion. And then there is my dear young son, born in my old age.

**Te Popo:** I have heard much about this son from my own mokopuna.

**Charles** sits up and looks surprised: What do you mean? He is a runt of a boy. Quiet as a mouse around the house and bullied by his three older sisters! His mother died when he was eight. And I was in no fit state. I just fell into a selfish depression.

**Te Popo:** He has been here. He is here now. He has continued your work in looking after the tapu places. He is a thoughtful and caring boy. And boy, does he like to sing!

*They both stop then and listen, on the other side of the fire a group of young people are singing waiata and one is strumming the guitar. Charles sits quietly watching and feels warmth in his heart. He can see his daughter Kahurangi (blue eyes) in the distance, every now and then she glances over and smiles. His son has a smile on*
his face he has never seen at home. All will be well he thinks. Beside him something shifts.

Charles whispers: I will visit you in your place soon, my old friend.

Scene Three

The smell of smoke still permeated the village. There was stillness, a shocked silence, as the people shuffled through their mundane chores. But it was hard to ignore the barren hill, stripped bare of its entire luscious green bush, revealing to the stark hot sun the story of loss. Those with keen eyes could follow the line of trenches dug into the rim and recall the stories shared around the fire of long-ago battles and the loss of their land. Someone sees a small yellow car making its way up the Waioeka Straight. It is 1980, on most nights now families disappear into their whare to watch TV, those who have not gone to the city looking for work. However, tonight they will light the fire and share once again the stories of the past, stories of today and stories of tomorrow. The small yellow car turns off the main road and winds its way carefully up to the pa. An old Kuia comes out of her whare and watches intently as the man, aged with more than just time, slowly parks his car and emerges. "Haere mai Te Puia boy" she calls and beckons him over. “Haere mai Kahurangi”, he tiredly replies. They hongi and then hold each other close. Sorrow etched into their bodies.

Later they sit together by the fire. Some of the young people are curious about the old Pākehā, there are not many Pākehā they know who speak fluent Te Reo and who know stories of Hira Te Popo. After a while Kahurangi and Te Puia boy are left quietly staring into the flames.

Kahurangi softly: What’s this nonsense I hear about you throwing yourself into the river e hoa? Your mauri – our breath of life – is a taonga. It is a precious gift.

William John raggedly: I have failed, Kahurangi. My child has corrupted the tapu. The hill is opened up like a fresh wound and the sacred place is unprotected.

The sound of a deep wailing rose from inside the blankets he was cloaked in. Kahurangi sat with him as he mourned. The breeze rushed into the fire, sparks flew and shadows played on the edges of their vision. Both Kahurangi and Te Puia boy shivered and sat upright as they sensed they were no longer alone.

Te Popo: Kia Kaha Te Puia boy. Be strong. There are great changes happening and some of these must pass before we reclaim what is ours. We have our Te Reo back.
Now we must invest more in our young, continue to educate them in the ways of the Pākehā, but also in the stories of their whakapapa.

**William John:** I have failed there as well Te Popo.

**Charles gruffly:** When you and your siblings went to school it was here at Ngāti Ira Pa, at Te Popo’s Native school, so of course you all learnt Te Reo. They were our neighbours, our friends and our whānau. The world changed, William; your children had to go into town for schooling, where Te Reo was banned. They know little about your friends at Ngāti Ira Pa, your wife made sure the door was closed whenever they came to visit and kōrero with you. And your sisters made you promise to keep Kahurangi a secret.

**Te Popo:** You are not alone in how the world has changed us. It has now shrunk and sometimes fits inside a screen! What our young people listen to are stories from other places, stories about what they can own, about the individual not about the whānau and the wider family.

**William John:** So who will tell the stories? Who will protect the sacred places? Who will sit around the fire and remember Hira Te Popo and Charles Te Puia? Who will tell of the battle of long ago?

**Te Popo softly:** Go home and rest, Te Puia boy. There will be another fire. We are still here. There will continue to be stories and you and I will sit here again one day soon. Haere ra.

*The Ruru owl hooted into the night as William John hugged his sister Kahurangi one last time and walked back to his car. He knew what waited for him at home, another scolding for disappearing without telling anyone where he was going. But he felt rested inside now – peaceful even. He must trust that one of his mokopuna would remember Te Puia and Te Popo.*

**Scene Four**

It was October 4th 2015. Much planning and preparation had been put into this day of commemoration, many Whakatōhea and a range of dignitaries had come to celebrate. There had been speeches, haka, waiata, feasting and remembering. It was on the TV news, it was on Facebook and other social media, and stories were being shared.

*The fire had burned late into the night and all that remained was the pile of bright hot*
embers, smoke swirling into the warm spring air. Four shadowy figures sat staring into the past, remembering other fires. A young man, who earlier in the day had famously stood on the back of the horse and waved the Waioeka flag, was now wrapped up in an old blanket and almost asleep. What he saw and heard, perhaps he was just dreaming.

**Te Popo** puffing rings into the air with his old pipe, his eyes gleaming with delight: It was a fine day. A fine day.

**Charles Te Puia** softly and smiling: The best of days. Te Popo – the best of days my old friend.

**Kahurangi** with her blue eyes shining and tears on her cheeks: It is a proud day for Ngāti Ira, a proud day for Whakatōhea, and a proud day for you Hira Te Popo.

**Te Popo:** Aye … it is a proud day. A proud day for my mokopuna.

**Te Puia boy:** They sang well, Kahurangi. Such song, such harmony, such unity. We will keep winning the Kapa Haka competitions and put Apanui back in their place. *(They all chuckle; their distant cousins the Apanui are their strongest rivals in the national Kapa Haka competitions).* And they remembered!

**Te Popo:** Aye. They remembered us. The battle of Te Rata has not been forgotten, even after 150 years. We are remembered.

**Charles Te Puia:** And the loss Te Popo … that is still remembered.

**Te Puia boy** sadly: And the sacred places.

**Te Popo:** They are healing, Te Puia boy, and the land is returning.

**Kahurangi:** Aye. The whānau have been working together. The pre-settlement claim will be submitted in November.

**Charles Te Puia:** The Whakatōhea Trust Board is working well Te Popo.

**Te Popo:** Aye. I few hiccups early on, but they are strong now. We have farms and a sound education fund for our future generations.

**Te Puia boy:** And the young people have returned – returned to the fire.

_The tui sings into the dusky sky and signals the beginning of a new day. There is the sound of a small child crying and the singing of an early-morning lullaby; after a long night mum isn’t quite ready to face the day. Kahurangi smiles. It is her newest mokopuna, her great-great-granddaughter, Kahurangi girl. And she has eyes bright_
A Closing Thought

In summoning up these stories of my ancestors through the scenes above, I have remembered them. Not has heroes or villains, but as human. These are the complicated and entangled relationships of my early settler family with Te Ngāti Ira. These are the people who are my family and friends, and they are the actors in my childhood touchstone stories. Through interrogating these stories through the process of layering them alongside the historical, social and political factors of each time period, a deeper understanding of what privilege and loss are is realised. Hira Te Popo and Charles Te Puia are representative of many early relationships between settler and Indigenous people in Aotearoa New Zealand, and yet they are also unique. Theirs is a story best told by the fire at Te Ngāti Ira pa, as the mist descends over the Urewera and the Ruru owl calls – the mythical messenger between the living and the dead.

The Critical in Critical Autoethnography

In my head I now hear again Holman-Jones (2015) asking: what is the critical in critical autoethnography? And so I ask myself, what is the critical in these family histories, these fragments of history I have collected and placed and layered here? I notice that the Whakatōhea whakapapa and my Rogers ancestors share similarities. They both trace back to a history of migration stories. Whakatōhea whakapapa trace their lineage back to migrations from a legendary Hawaiki through Polynesia to Aotearoa (New Zealand). Likewise I trace my Rogers ancestors’ penultimate migration in Europe (most European ‘tribes’ were involved in several migrations in the past 12,000 years) back to around 900 AD, when their Proto-Germanic tribe moved south from Scandinavia into Normandy. Then they migrated through France and Italy, before eventually settling in Cornwall, England around 1300-1400 AD. Around the same time the Whakatōhea people migrated to New Zealand and settled around Ōpōtiki.

Historical records show that the Rogers family of Cornwall settled in the Parish of St Breward and became farmers, miners and labourers, and married into local Cornish families. As is common in many Pākehā family narratives, I grew up with the story of a great white male ‘idealised progenitor’. Roger de Montgomerie was the ‘shield bearer’ for William the Conqueror. The stories of the Cornish women the
Rogers men subsequently married are more difficult to trace. Hence, when I visited St Breward a few years ago the name ‘Rogers’ had no connection to the locals, only to the tombstones in the churchyard.

In the early 1800s the Whakatōhea people began to set up trade networks, further developing their education (taking advantage of the newly arrived writing skills of missionaries), and they prospered economically (Binney, 2010; Walker, 2007). At the same time, the Rogers family were experiencing hardship. The industrial revolution demanded more from their labour, and resources were becoming scarce. Hence, the hunger for new lands and resources to feed Mother Britain opened up new opportunities for people to immigrate to the colonies. Serendipitously, Charles was of the right age. And he was both educated and a skilled farm labourer – exactly what the government of New Zealand was looking for. Considering Lee’s (2013) Four Ps – Charles was pushed due to the economic hardship experienced in Cornwall, his position in a poor family and no great prospects for the future. He was also pulled by an opportunity for assisted passage and the potential to buy available land in the new colony. How he managed to purchase land is still a mystery. I suspect he was assisted through some scheme desperate to situate such settlers in problematic spaces, such as the Waioeka, at that time. Between 1865 and 1875 much of the Whakatōhea lands, including the fertile Waioeka, had been confiscated after continued resistance to land sales and subsequent battles between the colonial soldiers and local iwi. Many of the original settlers had left the area due to the continued unrest. Hence Charles became part of a privileged class of people in a small settler town. He was British, spoke English, and became part of the dominant class – joining the local Council Board, becoming a leader in the Masonic Lodge, and participating in the governance of the local school.

Applying critical theory asks us to consider who Charles “identified with and under what circumstances, how those identifications shaped beliefs and actions, and what class-based ideological principles undergirded those beliefs and identification” (Sleeter, 2015, p. 3). Although I believe Charles had a positive relationship with his neighbours Te Ngāti Ira, he also imagined himself as superior. His education and religion taught him that he represented the ruling Empire; as a white male he was superior racially and sexually. As a Methodist, and later a Salvation Army parishioner, he had firm beliefs about what ‘civilised’ and ‘proper’ ways of being were. It is possible that living on the fringes of the Waioeka and closely associated with Te
Ngāti Ira, he lived a double life, one as Te Puia (the name the Te Ngāti Ira gave him) and the other as Charles Bawden Rogers. His marriage to Jane McKenzie was just a few months before the birth of Jane’s daughter Dorothy; Jane died a few months later. Twelve years later Charles travelled to Auckland and married Hannah Frith, who had recently arrived from Yorkshire, England, with her family. She represented good English roots with a strong Christian faith.

When Charles married Hannah, the town of Ōpōtiki was beginning to prosper again due to peace negotiations between the Whakatōhea and the colonial government, which led to an increase in settler occupation. The Waioeka farm was flourishing and Charles was a respected part of the colonial population. Newspaper records tell how he worked to build roads, develop a ‘proper’ education system, support the building of the Salvation Army Church, and become the Master of the Masonic Lodge. However, the cards turned again early in the next century. First his daughter Dorothy died in 1902 at just 22 years of age. Then, in 1916, his eldest two boys (Arthur and Samuel) enlisted to fight in WWI, but Arthur died of tuberculosis before even leaving New Zealand. Then Charles' wife Hannah died, according to the death certificate from a seizure due to the climateric. And finally just weeks before the end of the war, Charles received notice of Samuel’s death in France. The last three deaths occurred in the space of less than three years. My Poppa (the baby of the family) told the story of how, on the day Charles received the telegram informing them of Samuel's death, his father did the unthinkable – he walked off home abandoning the plough and horses in a far field. At the age of eight, my Poppa, William John, went out to fetch the horses and plough. Later he inherited the farm and supported his three sisters for their life-time – none of the sisters married.

Applying critical postcolonial perspectives to these stories means interrogating how the same political, social and historical context impacted on others, in this case the Whakatōhea. First and foremost is the fact that the farm Charles developed for his family to inherit, originally belonged to the Whakatōhea people. During the late 1800s and early 1900s Whakatōhea consistently worked to fund and submit claims to the government to have some land returned. Claiming first that the lands had been unjustly confiscated, historical records also show Te Ngāti Ira did not have enough good land to survive on (Walker, 2007). After their lands were confiscated they initially returned to traditional hunting and gathering practices to survive as they slowly built up their resources. Many of the Whakatōhea found seasonal work on
local farms and building roads. Charles employed Te Ngāti Ira skilled workers to help clear and build his farm. Ironically also it was the school Hira Te Popo of the Te Ngāti Ira funded and built, that my Rogers family first attended. Hence, my family benefited from the land, from the education, and the skilled workforce of Te Ngāti Ira of the Whakatōhea.

I imagine the initial relationship between Charles, his family and Te Ngāti Ira would have been mutually beneficial, and they worked to support each other. Te Ngāti Ira needed work to build up their resource base again, and Charles needed support to survive on the fringes of ‘civilisation’, isolated from the town. During periods of unrest, such as when Te Kooti came to visit, it was Charles’ home where other colonial farmers would seek refuge. I have several questions about this time. Who cared for the baby Dorothy after her mother died? Why did Charles wait 12 years to marry again? How are my family related to Whakatōhea? How do I explain those times my father describes when his Māori friends would say, “hey we are cousins!” My great-aunties knew something, but they would not tell. Perhaps there was another wife for Charles, and other children. But birth records of that time did not include Māori. And if Charles’ Māori wife had died too, Te Ngāti Ira would have claimed the children and brought them up as their own.

The new century brought more immigrants, and new technologies. The Rogers family now travelled into town for education and social occasions. They had close connections to their British relatives in Auckland and hence became increasingly distant from the initially close relationship with Te Ngāti Ira. By the time my father was born, Te Reo was banned from the home.

When I travel back to Ōpōtiki now, it is to visit the ghosts. The only Rogers I know are all in the cemetery. The farm was eventually sold and the three boys who inherited after my uncle died moved on. My father, with four daughters, inherited nothing. However, as a child I benefited from belonging to this particular ‘class’ of white farming families. When times were difficult in my own nuclear family, I could always go to the safety of my grandparents’ farm. There were networks and certain expectations that influenced the decisions that were made. But I wonder one day, say another Rogers goes back to Ōpōtiki looking for these stories, what will they be told? Perhaps they will be told the story of Hira Te Popo and Charles Te Puia.
How does the Story of Hira Te Popo and Charles Te Puia Enhance my Becoming a Pākehā Educator?

It was at our friend Paul’s birthday party, a summer BBQ before the next term began. My friend Melinda was sharing an idea for a research project she was considering with Ngapuhi, her Northland Iwi, with our friend, a recent immigrant from Britain. I had joined the conversation late, but the friend was asking something along the lines of “who could do research with Māori in the Northland?” Melinda replied “well take Esther for example. If she rocked up to the Ngapuhi Iwi and said ‘I’d like to do some research with you’, they’d be like, ‘who are you? ’ ‘Where are you from?’ But if she went back down to Whakatōhea, which is where she is from, they’d welcome her, she is part of that place.” I sat there and smiled. I knew what she said was right, but to hear her say it confirmed something inside me.

Investigating the critical family history of Hira Te Popo and Charles Te Puia has been both exciting and challenging. The ghosts I have summoned up have revealed how my Pākehā family were privileged at the expense of Ngāti Ira, but the stories also reminded me of the entangled and mutually beneficial relationships of many early Māori and Pākehā settlers. It was usually Pākehā who, later, moved away from these relationships, who shut the door on Te Reo, who forgot the tapu places, or no longer cared. Hence, it is Pākehā who now need to rebuild trust in these relationships, to again turn to Māori to be our mentors, to open our doors to Te Reo and learn again about the tapu places. Critical family history provides an opportunity for Pākehā, and others, to explore and understand our histories in a richer and more human way. Furthermore, it provides us with the potential to understand the complexity of an identity forged out of a relationship with Other. Perhaps once again we will be invited to sit down at the fire with Hira Te Popo and Kahurangi, and hear the Ruru call.
SELAH

Telling the story of Hira Te Popo and Charles Te Puia Rogers was an emotional experience. Through using the strategy of scripting their fictional conversations around the fire they became more human – ‘as if real’. For me the ethics of telling this story were always in tension with the importance of the work. Talking about this concern with Melinda Webber (my Māori advisor) she suggested I share it with someone from Whakatōhea. So I sent the two chapters to Bruce Taplin (a colleague at the University) and Dr Virginia Tamanui (a friend) and met with them both individually. Bruce spoke to me of the importance of the work making accessible to others and future generations the stories of our whakapapa through creative writing. Virginia nicknamed me Te Puia girl, further strengthening our friendship where we learnt to negotiate the space between through sharing our stories. As a Pākehā educator I believe it is important I work to build these relationships with Māori – to sit again at the fire and share our stories.

As I am sitting here writing a waft of smoke drifts over my page.

Charles Te Puia: OK but what about Kahurangi? How does she fit in to your story?

Esther: I see her every day. She is the student in my class, the young girl who serves me coffee and the author of a paper I have just read. Our ancestors, our whakapapa, are threaded and entangled through our landscapes, here and there remain knots, places where intra-action has transformed our becoming.

As exemplified here and throughout this thesis, serendipity became an important aspect of my practice as a bricoleur. The next chapter describes my finding, working with and expanding on the strategy of ekphrasis to further analyse some of the stories and art-works to create a way to speak with the ghosts.
CHAPTER 10
IT’S A TRICKY BUSINESS PERFORMING POETRY WITH THE GHOST


For George Belliveau who showed me how to be an a/r/trographer

(In a Piratey voice)
‘Tis a half blood that I be,
The Muggles world rejecteth me.
I can’t think strait I never shall,
Kant can’t Kant me with his spell.
I swerves and leaps then turns around
And sometimes soars to higher ground,
Where misteries and angels thrive
And songs and colours come alive.
I feast on dreams and then I sup
On imaginations’ freedom cup.
I stare into my looking glass
And see an echo of the past.
Refracted fragments of a ghost
Speak to me and gives me hope.

(Fitzpatrick, August 2013)

It is a tricky business talking to ghosts. They can snare you with their tantalising world of secrets. You can find yourself on a journey to worlds, imagining their families and histories, and chasing mere fragments of information into the early
hours of the next day. But how does one – as Derrida (1994) implores researchers’ to do – speak to the ghost? Derrida’s theory of hauntology as a method of deconstruction provides no articulate way of pursuing such an objective. This chapter posits that critical arts-based methods, such as a/r/tography and ekphrasis, and performance can provide a medium to speak to the ghost.

George Belliveau’s keynote presentation in 2011 on a/r/tography changed the way I now see, understand, and practise research. It was fortuitous, as I was busy deciding what methodology I would use to explore my tentative research question: What is a Pākehā educator? I was already an Eisner (2002) convert and believed that arts research should be able to exist without constantly having to justify itself to more dominant research methodologies. Belliveau’s performance exemplified an arts-based methodology that wove in narrative, drama and visual methods. The poem I begin this chapter with is a celebration of my position as an a/r/tographer; straddling the restrictions imposed in my current world of being a university researcher, and the desire to imagine new ways of exploring and making sense of important questions in society. This fits with Denzin’s directive that “as researchers we need to find new ways of connecting persons and their personal troubles with social justice methodologies” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. ix). The broader project this study sits inside is to further develop a methodology that enables empathetic capabilities, for adults and children, breaking the persistence of stereotypes in our postcolonial societies (E. Fitzpatrick, 2011b, 2014a; E. Fitzpatrick & Rubie-Davies, 2013).

This chapter is also in response to, and a continuation of the conversation given by Gauntlett and Hozwarth (2006). In this conversation they responded to the puzzlement of other academics about issues with the use of creative artefacts within the research process: For instance, “how researchers can use and interpret such visual artefacts” (Gauntlett & Holzwarth, 2006, p. 82). Gauntlett and Hozwarth posit that researchers should be developing visual creative methods. They are convinced that creative methods are a “good way of building sociological knowledge, and offer a positive challenge to the taken-for-granted idea that you can explore the social world just by asking people questions, in language” (p. 83). Rather, they insist that creative methods are an enabling methodology that provide a way for participants to express what they feel about the issue or question, and to express their embodied experience within the study.
A/r/tography, Ekphrasis and Performance

A/r/tography values the three intersecting roles of artist, researcher and teacher. Throughout this study I applied the arts-based method of a/r/tography as a form of critical self-reflection and analysis.

As a researcher I was interested in using my art making as a medium to talk to the ghost. Gina Wall (2013) describes the medium of photography as ‘Ghost Writing’ making explicit links to Derrida’s notion of hauntology and différance. The visual image of the photograph conjures up questions of ‘what is?’ that are haunted by questions of ‘what is not’. “Between the [visual] image and the subject is a gap, and in this in-between is the play of the spatial and the temporal…” (p. 240). The visual work creates a gap between the real and the image, a distance which disrupts temporality and provides a space for the ghost to speak. Are not all art works haunted by the trace of otherness? As Derrida suggested, the essence of photography is the spectral (Derrida, 1998). Does not all art work like a ‘medium’, providing space for the spectre to return? I propose that the art in this study is like ghost writing, “a medium which writes the present into an archive enabling it to repeat and repeat again” (p. 240) and that the “past is never completely finished with … the ghost returns again … demanding we anticipate our possible futures” (G. Wall, 2013, p. 242).

Through my journaling, using a selection of arts-based methods, I began to use ekphrasis (a form of poetic inquiry, see Maddison-MacFayden, 2013) where I would use one art form to respond to another art form to reveal, communicate and illuminate the message. I used the ekphrasis process to disrupt traditional readings of visual and textual art, and to analyse these art works providing additional layers of meaning. My use of ekphrasis as a form of inquiry is consistent with Prendergast’s (2004) definition – a method to “draw out or make clear” (p. 3) the practice of creating art in response to art. Different to Prendergast, however, the creation of my art work was in response to my own original art works. Ekphrasis was then used as interplay between visual, textual and performative works. Hence, a cyclic interplay was used to disrupt any privileging of one art form over another. Rather, ekphrasis was used to problematise the work and provide an interpretative framework (Watson, 2009), drawing out and transforming the essence of the arts work to evoke further interpretation (Prendergast, 2004). Prendergast highlights five important categories from Bruhn (2000) on the use of ekphrasis in inquiry. First, the potential for
ekphrasis to recreate through other art forms in response to an original art work (transposition). Second, the potential for ekphrasis to add non-spatial, for example, sensory, dimensions (supplementation). Third, it provides a stimulus to trigger memories (association). Fourth, it provides the researcher with a critical eye (interpretation). Last, ekphrasis has the potential for playfulness in the crafting of the new art work.

Tim Ingold’s (2010) “Ways of mind-walking” enabled me to consider ekphrasis further as the interplay between the forms of art work. He suggests that the reader consider the visual … “as a node in a matrix of trails to be followed by observant eyes” (p. 16). Ingold describes two instances of one art responding to another art form, which I liken here to the process of ekphrasis as defined above by Pendergast. First is the essay by Kandinsky on the “Spiritual in Art”, inspired by an art exhibition where the essay questions the ability of the observer to experience a painting (Ingold, 2010, pp. 20-21). Second is the description of a musical composition (“Pictures at an Exhibition”) written by Mussorsky in response to the paintings of his late friend Russian artist, Victor Hartmann. Each piece of music responded to an art piece he imagined hanging in a gallery. Ingold suggested that “[t]ogether [the painting and the music] open the mind to inner truths that are ontologically prior to the outward forms of things … directly touch the soul and set it in motion” (Ingold, 2010, p. 21).

Performance of an ekphratic poem enhances the potential to generate an embodied experience of the subject of inquiry for both the researcher and reader/audience. Spry describes the process of performance as a continuation of the writing process where the body is moved from the “page to the stage” (Spry, 2011a, p. 159). The performance of autoethnographic text is understood as a method of inquiry and analysis that engages the body with the text, and further works to create more text. Embodying the text through performance provokes the researcher to become vulnerable to critical reflection, where they can then continue to work through and understand the self. The performance also invites the audience to engage in the story (Spry, 2011a).

Dialogic performance … is the interpretation of the complex interaction between performer (self), text [poem], and sociocultural context; it is what allows/invites/motivates an audience to engage the performance, to communicate with the persona, to exist in the world of the story. (Spry, 2011a, p. 188)
My use of ekphrasis is most apparent when I perform poetry and fictional scripts in response to stories, photos and other visual art forms. I have also created visual work in response to a textual work. Performing the work has further transformed the work into an ‘utterance’ (Maddison-MacFayden, 2013). Utterance is, defined by Bakhtin, as an expression embedded in a history of expressions by others in a chain of ongoing cultural and political moments… thus fundamentally dialogic and historically contingent (Irvine, 2013). The process of ekphrasis moving to performance has involved me expressing not just my findings but also my feelings – an embodied experience of being Pākehā. Taking me, as Maddison-MacFayden describes it, “deeply down into [my] subject” (Maddison-MacFayden, 2013, p. 12). It is through these art forms I am able to speak to the ghost. When I am deep down into my subject of inquiry I embody my ghosts. As Avery Gordon states:

Haunting is a constituent element of social life … [Being] haunted draws us affectively, sometimes against our will and always a bit magically, into the structure of feeling of a reality we come to experience, not as cold knowledge, but as transformative recognition. (Gordon, as cited in Maddison-MacFayden, 2013, p. 1)

Pivotal to the autoethnography was the adoption of an ongoing reflexive and recursive approach that was applicable throughout all phases of the study (Braun & Clarke, 2008; Sullivan, 2010). An ongoing reflective dialogue was established through the use of a research journal to document my embodied experience as researcher. This involved reflective conversations with self about the data; the choices being made, the patterns being identified, and the process of questioning and unravelling the deeper and more complex meanings the data evoked (Saldana, 2009). The research journal provided a place to be creative and play with the data through writing poems, recording anecdotal stories, memos to self, visual texts and metaphor (Irwin & de Cosson, 2004; Saldana, 2009).

Haunting tales

Each example of ekphrasis presented tells me something different about my becoming Pākehā. The first example is my making the “Wire Pākehā” (see figure 10) and my response during the process of making. A poem was birthed as I manipulated the wire. I remember being on the deck at home with all my wire and wire tools, playing with the wire and having to rush back inside to get a pen and paper.
Wire

I am drawing out the wire
It is neatly bound like my Grandmas yarn of wool
I am imagining how I will weave my wire Pākehā
I draw out the wire carefully
Knitting, weaving, tukutuku koru
I draw more wire and remember
An ancestor who drew wire
In Thurgoland
An ancestor who used wire
In Sheffield
An ancestor who manipulated wire
In Auckland
To make my Poppas crib
And then I think of number eight fencing wire
And remember
An ancestor who won a bet
Building fences
In Christchurch New Zealand
My mother's chicken wire
Chinese bantams, Rhode island red
And then I remember running a race
Across the paddocks
Dodging the cow pats
Smeared with paspalum
ZAP
My first electric fence.

(Fitzpatrick, December 2012)
It was through the act of playing, of drawing out the wire, that I felt my ancestors speak to me of their various relationships with wire. In New Zealand we take pride and sometimes have a bit of a laugh at ourselves about how important wire has been in our emergence as a culture – specifically number eight wire. This is both a Māori and Pākehā experience. It is part of our culture that, cognisant of Wells (2012), we celebrate our ingenuity, our ‘make do-ness’. We live on the edge of the world where we ‘give it a go!’ The wire poem spoke to me of my connectedness with one world I never knew much of – an industrial Yorkshire, England. I now have a photo taken on a recent visit to my ancestor’s wire mill built in 1624 in Thurgoland, Yorkshire. It is pinned to the wall in my office, a spectral image of something
speaking to me (G. Wall, 2013), disrupting the fabric of time. It conjures up an image of people … workers … working with wire to create something new. Coming to New Zealand as early settlers they brought their skills, their strengths, and their desire to forge something new.

The second example of ekphrasis is of the painting (Figure 11): “Before arrival: A haunting past” and the poem entitled “A Pākehā Haunting Part 1.” The painting is something I played at for many months. It represents my responses to my own genealogical huntings as I scrolled through census records, read ancient family stories and began to make sense of this very distant and not so distant past.

![Figure 11: Painting 1. Before arrival: A Haunting Past.](image)

I started the painting with a yellow base, to signify the struggle for a better future. The face at the top of the painting looms large, pale and ghostly over the rest. This was to represent my embodied experience of being so white, a throwback to some Nordic Viking or Sami (Sápmi) ancestry, that influenced me all of my life as a child growing up in the rural town of Ōpōtiki, as someone different. The mother with the baby wrapped in her shawl represents all of my Jewish mothers who have fled, suffered and survived to bring me, eventually, safe to this land. I have borrowed
“The Scream” and have sewn a Star of David onto his garments to represent the horrors my ancestors experienced. The rubbing up against each other of the Jewish and Christian religion is demonstrated in the Ten Commandments and the burial ground. The poppies in the middle of the painting drip the blood of those who died back in the Nile, from whence they first fled with Moses. But there is more there to contemplate. In painting this work I realised it would always be an unfinished piece; just like me. These ghosts that arrived on the canvas spoke to me of survival, of struggle and love, of war and hate, but most of all, of courage.

The poem “A Pākehā Haunting 1” (refer Chapter 6) began to take shape after I first started painting. My embodied experience of being labelled white, and Pākehā, had silenced my story of being many. I began to see while painting, my many stories of becoming. It was a complex bricolage of bits, fragments of becoming, entangled and juxtaposed against each other. My being Pākehā would have different meanings dependent on the context I was in, and was forever emergent, “subject to the continuous play of history, culture and power” (Hall, 1990, p. 394). It is a poem also for others to juxtapose their own unique stories against of becoming Pākehā, to begin to draw on their own diverse histories of becoming. It is a poem to enable others to begin to tell their stories of arrival and of their whakapapa stretching back in time. It is a poem to disrupt the standard story of being Pākehā that Pākehā are not a homogenous group but a complex and diverse group of people who call Aotearoa New Zealand home.

The last example of ekphrasis is different again. This time it began with a poem. I suppose this poem has been in process of becoming since my childhood. It eventually made its way to paper when Whakaari, Ruapehu and Tongariro (three volcanic mountains) started rumbling in 2012. The poem “In memory of a Ringatū Prophecy from my childhood” was written in response to a ‘touchstone’ story from my childhood that represented a significant part of my upbringing.
In Memory of a Ringatū Prophecy from my Childhood

White Island – Whakaari – is troubled.
Ruapehu shudders in anticipation.
Tongariro shouts out a warning.
Queen Victoria’s great great great granddaughter still sits on the throne.
Aging, her eyes dimming, reaching for the night.
A premonition, a prophecy in waiting:
‘Evacuate the shore, stay away from the rivers
At her death the great wave will come’.
(Fitzpatrick, December 2012)

The green hill painting (Figure 12) grew from the poem as I imagined all these stories, the names of places and people that informed my childhood and the many hills I would run up to imagine their lives and mine. I carved their names into the vivid green hill to reveal the blood of those ancestors of my mind who speak to me. Both the poem and the painting demonstrate the two worlds I straddled as a child. In the poem we have the Māori prophecy I grew up with about the British Queen who we were told ruled our world. The painting gives the names of significant places, people and stories revealing the Māori Hauhau movement: A political and religious uprising during the New Zealand wars between the settlers and the Indigenous Māori; and how it touched our lives in the Waioeka Valley. The language is both Māori and English.
The poem and painting resonate with Said’s (1993) musical metaphor of entanglement. Said likened the relationship between coloniser and colonised to two (or more melodies) that coexist in a complex relationship (Said, 1993). This
entangled relationship could contribute to a “richer musical form” as it progressed through both “discordant and harmonious moments” (A. Bell, 2006, p. 266). My becoming Pākehā is forever in response to my relationship with Māori. My touchstone stories come from the myths and legends of Waioeka, from the Bible, and from my experiences as a child both on the marae and in the church. As I show in the painting, this relationship for Pākehā summons up memories that are enriching and painful. It was on top of the green hill at Matawai, confiscated land, that I would look down over the Waioeka Valley and the hills of the Urewera and visualise Māori warriors being pursued by the British soldiers and the burning of the bush to reveal their hiding places. The dead trees stood like crosses in the graveyard. If I looked harder, toward the ocean, I could see the peach tree that once belonged to my great-grandfather, where Carl Volkner was hanged by the Hauhau who accused him of being a spy for the British army. These were the stories of my childhood.

It is always with trepidation that I step out onto the stage to present my work. I position myself in a place of vulnerability, by opening up my stories, and my art for critique. The performing of my stories, my works of art for others, has been another level of interpreting and opening up of self. I have drawn out the wire, I have embodied the experience of the labour as I have recited the poem “Wire”, with the “Wire Pākehā” hanging in the background – taking me deep down into my subject. I scripted the poem, “A Pākehā Haunting 1” and performed it with my sister. During the performance, with the painting as a backdrop we evoked a deeper level of emotions, perhaps as Ingold (2010) describes, directly touching the soul and setting it in motion. In performing “In memory of a Ringatū Prophecy from my childhood” I found myself chanting the words, reminiscent of my experiences with prophecy on the marae. It is here, in being haunted, that we begin to feel, to experience and to recognise ourselves (Maddison-MacFayden, 2013).

‘Kia Kaha’ they whisper

‘Be strong’ they say as they push me on the stage

‘Take courage’.

In this study I have been able to spend time playing and art making, immersing my whole self in the process. And it took time. The wire Pākehā uncoiled itself slowly from my imagination; it’s beginning a three-strand woven spine. Through each art making I summoned up my ghosts. Their complex, complicated stories
transformed by paint on canvas; creating a collage of colour. Through the use of ekphrasis I wrote poems to give a richer and deeper understanding of the issue being explored. Drawing the reader closer to the work to evoke an embodied response through the engagement with the visual and poetic (Butler-Kisber & Stewart, 2009). Two of the key points made by Gauntlett and Holzwarth (2006) are the time involved in the making of an artefact and the embodied experience of the making. Through adopting ekphrasis as an approach I speculate that the researcher employs a critical gaze at their first work of art, providing a deeper engagement with the complexities of the issue through another interpretation of the work.

With a world increasingly shrinking through globalisation many postcolonial/multiethnic societies are grappling with making sense of new and in-between identities. The important ability to articulate a positive identity and develop respect for others is essential to combat stereotype behaviour and racism. This is particularly relevant for most white identity groups in postcolonial societies. Descendants of European settlers often lack any coherent sense of ethnicity and rather blindly persist in an imagined national identity; perceiving themselves as the ‘norm’. Many researchers insist that it is important to know our histories to understand our present. With this in mind I postulated that arts-based methods would provide me with a strategy to speak to my ghosts. I found a way to draw on historical archives and stories to make a sense of my own becoming Pākehā. Through speaking to my ghosts I was able to develop a sense of an ethnic identity that is constantly in the process of becoming. The complex and multilayered history of my becoming is especially evident where my touchstone stories drew from more than one cultural experience.

Through the making and performing of art, I embodied the experience of examining global issues of inbetween and emerging identities at a personal level. By adopting the process of ekphrasis I was able to critically analyse my own stories through a thoughtful reflective reinterpretation. This work supports the use of arts-based processes to tap into embodied knowledge and provide a richer, more full description of the issue/question being explored. I anticipate that, in sharing these stories, it is possible for the reader/audience to engage with the issue and make sense of the work for themselves. Further, that in the sharing of these visual and textual stories, the reader/audience is provoked to analyse their own histories, to make sense of their own becoming, and in doing so develop empathetic capabilities.
CHAPTER 11
EMBODIMENT AND EDUCATION


The Reunion

It all started with an unexpected phone call.

“Esther here.”

“Oh hi! It’s Grant Tailor from Ōpōtiki – do you remember me? Karen gave me your number and helped me track you down”. I begin to remember.

Karen, Fiona and I are sitting obediently behind the science bench. Perched on our stools, careful with our Bunsen burner, listening to the teacher. Grant turns around and makes us all laugh. Again. Karen turns pink. Fiona goes quiet. I am pious – I put on the face of a Nun hoping it will work – or not. For a moment I am tempted to break out of my familiar bonds but I’m not sure how yet. I’m not ready.

And so it was that one moment I was happily locked in my office with piles of paperwork balancing on the edges of my desk. Spring beckoning to me outside the window. The frantic life of Auckland edging me onwards, coffee infusing my veins. Then a few weeks later I am rocketing down a one-lane road precariously chiselled into the side of Maungahaumi, guardian of the Motu, inside my little red mini with the roof down. Tossed in the back is my weekend bag and clutching the black leather passenger seat is my old friend Karen, who is giving me instructions on every coming bend .... “25 Kilometres an hour for this bend Esther”. Karen and I had done this road once before. Except that time it was Karen’s mother at the driving wheel taking a bunch of scrawny teenagers on a camping trip. She drove too slow for me.

I glance at Karen. She hasn’t changed a bit in 35 years. I used to like visiting her house down the street from our place. It was such a contrast to mine. Her parents were educated and very English. Her father even had a mountain named after him in Antarctica. I remember the novelty of eating my first meal of homemade ‘Fish and chips’ at her place.

“So what are you doing your PhD on?” asked Karen. I thought about how I might
explain it to Karen. She finished her PhD almost 30 years ago in environmental science. I’m a late bloomer.

“Exploring what it means to be a Pākehā educator”, I reply, “you know – educators who define themselves as Pākehā and – well, how that influences what they do in the classroom.”


There was a contemplative silence. “Doesn’t Pākehā mean something nasty in Māori, like white pig or something?” Karen queries. “Anyhow, why is this important to you?”

“Lots of reasons” I answer. Thinking all the time how can I explain this to Karen. So I choose a story. “Like, for example, this one day I was teaching a class at the University on the Treaty of Waitangi. The class had just watched this video called ‘What if? 2050’. So I asked them this question, ‘What if Māori had sovereignty in 2050?’ This bunch of girls at the back of the room called out ‘We’d all go home!’ I was stunned.”

“Where was home?” asked Karen. She’s now smothering her pale freckly skin in sunscreen but still seems interested. But that was typical Karen, interested, interesting and why I always enjoyed hanging with her.

“Exactly my question. Where was home? They looked surprised when I asked them. ‘Well Britain’, they replied.” Karen pulls a funny face. “I remember standing there wondering what this meant for me. Any of these girls could have passed as my daughter when you looked at them; blonde hair blue eyes. ‘Well where would I go?’ I said to them. ‘I could pluck out my eyes and send them to Denmark, scrape off my skin and send it Germany, chop off my right leg and ship it to Lithuania, carve off my left hand and send it to Cornwall. And that’s just for starters. My ancestors came here ages ago – this is my home, this is where I belong’”. Karen smiles.

“Hey Karen!” I shout pointing ahead, “This is the place where the sun rises. Where Māui hid to catch the sun.”

“Tight turn up ahead” answers Karen, “10 kilometres an hour”.

The Pohutakawa has blossomed bright red on the right side. A blood red carpet is laid out. Karen and I spin around corners. The Motu is still a dangerous road. Down
below us we see the River, fanning towards the ocean.

*You can smell the sea. At the mouth of the Motu my father fished for Kahawai, I picked blackberries with my sisters for our pudding, while my mother baked potatoes in the fire on the hot stones. The Kawhai would be cooked on the hot stones wrapped in damp newspaper. I remember the blackberries one year being fat with purple juice that stained my hands and ran down my arms.*

The roof of the mini is down and the sun kisses us all over. In the morning Karen finds a love bite on top of her right breast.

We come down into the valley. I recognise the land. “We are close!” I tell Karen. I point out and shout “Waioare Marae. This is Kiri and Bogan’s land. Bogan the pig hunter.” Karen sits smiling, covering her fine red hair with a scarf tied under her chin.

We approach Te Kaha Hotel perched in-between the village and the sea. Karen and I are quiet. We haven’t seen these people since I was a child. I hear their laughter first. Karen and I leap up the stairs. I have eagerness inside me driving me forward – something seems to have taken over.

I see Viktor first. He has exactly the same smile and gives me a wonderful hug. He looks grizzly now. Viktor was in my art class and went on to be a painter in Auckland, then he worked in Wellington organising music festivals, and now he’s come back home to Te Kaha to dive in the waters and run the hotel.

*I am running along the river bank of the Waioeka. The willows reach down to the stony beach. My good friend Viktor Hart and I are playing a game of catch – I am unsure of the rules but have a notion I’m not ready to be caught.*

All of a sudden there is a sea of other faces, hugging and kissing me. I see glimpses of a past. “Don’t you remember me?” they ask. “How do I know you?” I reply. There is something about her smile, his eyes, her laugh, his shape, her sound, their feel. I am frustrated but satisfied to be here.

Grant and Karen are standing, laughing, framed by the sea. I love it when Karen laughs. She laughs all over.

Later Grant tells me his mother shot his dog. I stand there stunned. I love dogs. I consider all the academic reasons this may have happened. “Was your dog sick?” I ask. Grant was 12 years old. His dog had fallen asleep in his mum’s vegetable garden. His mother, had grabbed the gun in fury. Grant stood in front of the dog. “Get
out of the way or I’ll shoot you” his mother had screamed. Grant shifted a moment to the right. The gun blasted – thundered through the air. Grant felt the world explode and shift beside him. Forever.

Someone had wisely brought along the old school magazines. I found myself in there: scrawny and white with unkempt hair. And then I began to feel the others – to see them across time.

The Day twins are still small and dark, with lovely smiles, embracing the world. They float around looking after everyone.

*I sit on the school bus travelling up Waioeka Straight. I live in the old green farmhouse on the corner of Apanui road for four dollars a week rent. My father helps out with the milking. I peer out the window waiting; the last stop is always for the Day twins. They stand there beautiful in their exactness, smiles, hair, uniforms. I so want to know them but they don’t get off at my school, they carry on to the convent.*

I see Cynthia. Cynthia’s family owned their house and farm. She had lovely long red hair and always dressed beautifully. She is here today, with her kind smile and pleased to see me. I looked then for Polly … and I am told she won’t come.

*I am sitting back in the classroom at school and it is creative writing time. We are given 20 minutes to write our story and then share it with the class. The students will then get to vote on their favourite story. My stories were fabulous fantasy adventures, I would sit there and write write write, spilling onto the pages marvellous things. But Polly always got the vote. Polly lived on my bus route; her father was a farmer with his own house. The farm belonged to the Whakatōhea Māori Trust. Polly was always very neat and tidy with her long glossy black hair tied up in a ponytail. We were good friends, not best friends; her best friend was Cynthia. Polly was a quiet and careful girl, but she was kind and thoughtful to me. She was in the top maths group that got to go and study with the headmaster. I remember in the final year of primary school we all had to sit an IQ test to sort out our placements in the local high school for the following year. The high school was streamed. Up until this point I would have been happy just to get the vote for best creative writing. But the teacher left the results for the IQ test on the desk in the classroom – and my curious nature got the better of me. This is when I understood that I had an IQ; surprisingly it was above the class average, but not as high as Polly’s.*

Someone reads the list of names of those in our year who have died. There are six.
Three of those were murdered; 50% of those who have died were murdered. That’s half.

Tracey Collier is doing a PhD as well. Hers is on Waka. She now lives in Rotorua and looks the same to me; serious and beautiful. It is she who decides to go swimming first. I look out at the water again. Around the corner I know is Waiorore Marae and the beach and secret lagoon which fill up a space in my heart.

*I smell the hangi. My Dad is working with Bogan removing the hot stones from the oven dug into the earth. They are sweaty and tired in the summer sun but laughing. I am in the kitchen helping the women. There is a lot of chatter. I smell the big pot of cooking cabbage. It is hot in here so I am pleased when given the task of setting the tables in the large cool hall. Someone outside is playing a guitar. They sit in the shade of the wharenui porch; inside we have piled up our mattresses and swept the wooden floor. Later I will go down to the rocks and gather booboo, a small black sea snail, to cook over a fire, plucking out their flesh with a twig. I will climb over the rocks around to the cave where the water has pushed its way inside the rock to make a small lagoon. And if the tide is right I will go swimming.*

I have no togs – nothing! They are swimming now. I look at Karen. “Come on” I say “let’s find something”. Karen and I go swimming. I have these flimsy pants on and a singlet. I lie on top of the water, my face to the sun, floating. The top four inches are warm and lull me. How do I describe a perfect moment? My whole self has given itself to the ocean. I have relaxed into its warm arms, soft and caressing, it is a memory and it is now – I am in this place of memories – warm happy memories of sun, blackberries, whales, laughter, and family. But there is a reminder. If my hand slips deeper the cold bites me. Always running hidden from us is danger – just a hand slip away. But today I just smile and lift my hand again into the warmth. I know about danger and biting cold water. Today I am enjoying the sun.

Back on the beach we lay there, our sameness and difference on the warm stones, skinny, slim, luscious, white, freckly, brown, short, tall, and drip dry under the Te Kaha sun.

I am finding this easier than I imagined. It’s like a part of me has been reawakened. They take me into their arms and love me. We sit gazing out at the ocean, Beryl starts talking about which Marae she belongs to and others join in. I point out toward Waiorore. “I used to stay there”, I say. “Where Bogan and Kiri’s Marae is”. Beryl turns
to me, “You were brought up a Māori” she says. I’m not sure how to answer – ‘yes’ – ‘no’ – ‘sometimes’ – but the conversation has moved on. It was never a question.

In some way we were all yes, no, sometimes. Five of them have come over from Australia, another five of us have come down from Auckland, one from Gore, and a few from Tauranga. Perhaps, in the end, only five have remained. But even then, listening to their stories, they too have travelled and have come back home. We are an eclectic lot – drawn together by blood, by birth, by belonging – or sometimes just by being the same age as a group of people at the same place at the same time in a certain time of history: Ōpōtiki, 1974-1978. Now all turning 50.

We laugh and chat an afternoon away. Later we will meet again in Ōpōtiki at the RSA for a party. But as I sit there looking over the blue water I remember someone else: Miss Pahewa. I promised her when I was next in Te Kaha I would visit. I sit on the balcony looking out over the perfect sea on a perfect day and know somewhere amongst the Pohutakawa on this shoreline I would find you. Viktor finds you in the phone book and gives me directions.

**Miss Pahewa sits on her chair with her guitar. It is my favourite part of the day. At her feet are sprawled all of us children. “Sit up” she says to Tania who has decided to lie down on the floor. Today she made me a Pirate King. I am the skinniest, smallest, whitest girl in the class and she made me a King. Yesterday she read my story and told me when I published my first book she would like one. Miss Pahewa believed in me. When my husband and I published our first book I sent her a copy.**

I tell Karen, “Come on we’re going to find my old teacher Miss Pahewa”. Karen smiles. We jump back into the mini and put the roof down. It seems we have been going around a few bends so we stop an old man walking along the road. “Do you know where Miss Pahewa lives?” we ask. He points down the road, “four kilometres, over the hill, over the bridge, first house on right”. “Yes, she’s home,” he says. We find the first house on the right. A dog looks suspiciously at me and a man comes out of the house. “Is this where Miss Pahewa lives?” I ask, wary of the dog. He smiles and points further down the road. “Next house,” he says. We zoom off again and drive up a long drive way that opens to a field with several houses surrounding it.

Which house? Someone back at the hotel had called it ‘The Homestead’. I’m not sure which house is ‘The Homestead’. Someone comes out of the first house. “Hi” I say, “I’m looking for Miss Pahewa?” She tells me to drive across the field, and points to a house. She’s Miss Pahewa’s niece. The Whānau seem to have stretched their
homes down from The Homestead toward the sea. We drive across the field and find the homestead. I knock on the door and Miss Pahewa comes to the door with her rosy pink dimpled cheeks, friendly eyes and welcoming smile. “Esther,” she says and grabs me for a big warm hug. “I promised I’d come,” I said.

I sit down at the worn wooden table and suddenly I am back in my Grandma’s farmhouse kitchen on the Waioeka. Everything here tells a story.

“We have plans to do up this kitchen.”

I look around at the much-loved walls, covered in memories, the impractical kitchen that has cooked countless feasts for generations and the eclectic chairs.

“Did you know Kiri and Bogan from Waiorore Marae?” I ask.

“Sure ... you want sugar? I shake my head. “Why you ask?”

“We used to stay there as kids. My Grandpa would speak in the Ringatū meetings.”

“They’re gone now.” Silence. “I belong to the Delamere Whānau”.

“Oh ... I went to school with Delameres.”

“When you gonna write your next book?”

“Maybe the next one will be about you”.

“What you want to write one about me for?” she laughs.

But I could tell she was pleased.

Karen and I sit down for a cup of tea with Miss Pahewa and her sister. I am comfortable in this house. I feel my whole body relax into the chair. We laughed and talked, sharing a packet of chocolate biscuits from Spain. “If you’re ever back this way” she says, “come and stay with me”. We drove off with laughter and love in our bellies. The Homestead stood at the top of the field looking down through the Pohutakawa to the perfect sea, on a perfect day.

The next afternoon Karen and I are zooming again in the mini, back to Rotorua airport so she can catch a flight back to her home in Christchurch. Our pukus are full again after a huge brunch at one of the Day twins’ farm. Her husband was a pig hunter and we feasted on wild pig sausages – plus heaps of other kai. But I still had to stop at the Ohiwa fish and chip shop. “Come on Karen,” I argued, “they make the best pāua fritters – we’ve got to have one.” Karen and I sat down outside at the picnic table by Ohiwa harbour with our pāua fritters, scallops and oyster fritters too. Back
home in Auckland there is a vege shop just down from the University where, when they are in season, I buy Māori potatoes and boil them up, just like my mum did, and eat them with too much butter. In summer I sometimes get Black Boy peaches and taste summer at Waimana Marae all over again. And each year in spring I buy a pottle of whitebait from the local fish shop and tell the story of me catching whitebait in the Waioeka and cooking breakfast on the river bank. Karen looks at her watch.

“I gotta catch my plane.”

“Yep. OK. Time to go.”

We look out over the Ohiwa Harbour. We can see Karen’s house right at the water’s edge and two young girls full of dreams and adventure rowing a boat to a promised land. We can see my family camping under Morepork Hill; my mother gathering cockles while my father teaches a young girl how to spear flounder. We can hear the elders at Te Kooti Marae advising Kiri and Bogan about marriage, about love and about God while a wee white girl with scraggly hair slips outside unnoticed to run through the summer grass.

“Hey we should do this again next year.”

“For sure.” I can feel the afternoon breeze cooling on my skin, so take off my jandals and put on my shoes. Seagulls are squabbling and squawking by our picnic table. I put the car into first gear and drive off slowly this time. In my rear vision mirror I see a small girl standing at the top of a hill. She has been running and is now looking out over her Pirate kingdom. The Urewera forest is covered in mist. Whakaari is puffing out ash off Waiotahi Beach. The Waioeka River is carving his way to the sea, as Ōpōtiki begins to stir. “Haererā,” she calls. “Mā te wā” I whisper to the girl in the mirror. See you later.

**The Reunion Postscript**

As part of an autoethnographic study the story of *The Reunion* represents my embodied experience of becoming Pākehā. It is believed that through providing a thick description of the lived experience of one individual, a story can open up the life-worlds of other individuals and groups to disclose meaning (waskul & vannini, 2006). I value the belief that ethnicity is not just who I am, but how I feel in, and about, a particular situation (Dion et al., 2011). First I analyse this story using three different notions of embodied ethnicity as described by Dion et al. (2011): embodied ethnicity (being-in-the-world); embodied ethnic imaginary (remembering being-in-the-
world); and, embodied ethnic interactions (being-in-the-world with others) (p. 312). I then discuss embodied ethnicity’s relevance to education and assert it is the educator’s role to create environments that provide safe places for students to explore their emerging identities. Cognisant of Spry (2011a), this story:

… starts with a body, in a place, and in a time. The investigators analyze the body for evidence, the body as evidence, the body of evidence. But evidence, like experience, is not itself knowledge; like evidence, experience means nothing until it is interpreted, until we interpret the body as evidence … [I] offer [my storied] body as raw data of a critical cultural story. (Spry, 2011, p. 19)

The trip back home reinforced that, in a particular cultural and geographical setting, I experience, through the body, a sense of belongingness (being-in-the-world); the sensual giving over to the caresses of the sea and the comfort of sitting with Ms Paheawa for tea. As Dion et al. suggest “[t]hose physical states experienced in ethnic settings reinforce ethnic feelings because they can live in their flesh their ethnic singularities” (2011, p. 317). My physical acts of swimming, laughing, eating are resonant with Hennion’s (2001) elements of the ‘sociology of passion’ where “individuals do not think ethnic products have taste ontologically, but they make themselves detect this ‘ethnic’ taste through a continuous elaboration of procedures that put ethnic taste to the test” (Dion et al., 2011, p. 318). In “The Reunion,” the eating of the pāua fitter is an example of where I detect ‘ethnic’ taste. Throughout the trip I was conscious of consuming Te Kaha and Ōpōtiki through my bodily experiences; breathing in deep the smell of the sea.

Throughout the story I reflect on my childhood memories, remembering being-in-the-world as I encounter sensory reminders of smell, taste, sight, sound and touch. Through these sensory reminders I am able to project myself into a particular ethnic experience. The embodied imaginary of Bogan and my father preparing the food at the hangi is called up through the “underlying sensory, motor, and introspective states” that are stored in my memory (Csordas, 1999, p. 321) as I sit in the sun looking across at Waiorore Marae waiting for my lunch. I also describe how, when I am in Auckland, my embodied imaginary is activated through my cooking and eating of the Māori potato, eating of black boy peaches and whitebait fritters. These activities have the potential to transport me back home.

My embodied interactions on this trip went through a process of transformation as my body remembered how to be with others. Back in the academy I wear
different shoes, on this trip I had my jandals on. I remember the nervous tension I had when arriving at Te Kaha Hotel which, as soon as I heard the laughter, was lessened. Being a white child on the Marae I was always working the margins of an emerging identity, an identity always in the process of becoming. Sitting, swimming, eating with my old school friends I found myself relaxing into a comfortable place that I remembered. When Beryl said “you were brought up Māori” I knew I was Pākehā. I am someone in-between, entangled with Māori. My body was relaxed and comfortable in this environment, I know how to be on the Marae, I know how to laugh and listen with respect. Our shared bodily experience of ritual gave us an emotional connection (Dion et al., 2011, p. 323). My friends and I shared this in-between space of emerging and straddling our different cultural experiences.

In post-colonial societies, as both Indigenous and settler populations often strive to construct an ‘authentic’ identity, the grappling with entanglement and concept of perpetually being in a state of ‘becoming’ is essential. As described by Ashcroft (2001), post-colonial identities are “constructed, political, and being formed within the inescapable historical reality of colonisation and its consequences” (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 3). For the coloniser, ‘becoming’ can often involve subtle changes that occur over time as they constantly engage with Indigenous culture. Hall (1990) argues that cultural identity is transformative, and that, while it has a history, it is also subject to a constant engagement with ‘culture and power’. Identities are thus determined by how we are “positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past” (Ashcroft, 2001, p. 4).

As a nation, New Zealand became increasingly independent from the Mother Country, England, early after colonial rule was established, reconstructing systems of education and governance (Maver, 2006). This move rendered an in-between position for Pākehā; belonging somewhere between a European mother and the indigenous world of Māori (A. Bell, 2009b). Occupying an in-between position the idea of a Pākehā identity resonates with Homi Bhaba’s theory of the third-space (Bhabha, 1994, 2005). In post-colonial societies emerging identities often straddle two or more cultures of origin, occupying a space inbetween the Indigenous and European culture/s of origin. The third-space provides a position for negotiating difference: a space for the disruption and displacement of Eurocentric cultural signs and practices. It is a space where new possibilities are rendered due to the interweaving or entanglement of the coloniser and colonised (Bhabha, 1994).
The differences between Māori and Pākehā, Bell (2004) asserts, and what they share, are important determiners of who Pākehā are and will be. She illustrates this by using Said’s (1993) musical counterpoint metaphor and argues that the process of entanglement is an essential part of identity development in post-colonial societies. Said likened the relationship between coloniser and colonised to two (or more melodies) that coexist in a complex relationship (Said, 1993). This entangled relationship would contribute to a “richer musical form” as it progressed through both “discordant and harmonious moments” (A. Bell, 2006, p. 266). Bell further argues, in relation to Said’s metaphor of entangled and contrapuntal melodies, that it offers a “vision for the … assertion, and maintenance of cultural distinction, whilst also acknowledging interconnectedness and the greater whole that arises from it” (A. Bell, 2006, p. 266).

Ethnicity, as a construct, is both real and imagined (Fenton, 2010). It is real when people’s lives are impacted by policy, systems, or experience and when ethnicity is used to inform or make decisions. It is imagined when people invent and position conceptual boundaries around particular groups of people to categorise, organise and explain how one might belong to a particular group; whether belonging is self-identified or ascribed. These real and imagined ethnicities are constructed, and reconstructed, in response to social contexts and the meanings and implications concerned with belonging (Fenton, 2010).

This chapter begins with a story of “The Reunion”. The story gives a detailed account of one weekend where I travelled back to my childhood home with an old friend. Mason-Schrock (1996, p. 176) states: “stories are like containers that hold us together; they give us a sense of coherence and continuity. By telling what happened to us once upon a time, we make sense of who we are today”. Our bodies are situated in stories that we tell about ourselves and the stories others tell about their bodies, and ours. My becoming Pākehā is situated in these ongoing stories as I continue to imagine and reconstruct my ethnicity through my embodied experiences in different environments, my interactions with different people, and consequently construct particular ways of being (Dion et al., 2011, p. 324). A person’s ethnic identity is not something to be captured and secured but, rather, is significant in and of itself as a phenomenon to be explored (Fenton, 2010). As educators we need to create positive environments for children to tell their stories of becoming, in-between, in flux and straddling the different worlds we walk in. “The Reunion” provides one
narrative that others can begin to juxtapose their own stories of becoming Pākehā with, and against. Selah

**The Body Matters**

Questions about identity, how we make sense of our selves, how we belong, persist and nag at our becoming. We respond to these questions in a myriad of ways. We respond to them through our bodies.

Through telling the story of The Reunion I drew on the strategies of creative writing and factionalisation to tap into my embodied memories. These strategies provided a ‘thick’ story of the experience where I identify how my identity is constructed through my emotional connections with ‘human’ and ‘non-human’ intra-actions (Barad, 2003, 2010, 2012). I summoned onto the page those memories of my relationship with the non-human and human through storying my sensory experiences. Investing in some memories and rejecting others is a method I utilise to position myself within the narratives of my past (Wetherell, 2010).

Our bodies matter. Our bodies remember. We are continually making sense of ourselves through those relational experiences with others and objects. My becoming Pākehā is an ongoing process of a performance of ‘culturally influenced acts’ (Butler, 1988, 1993). My becoming is a dynamic, fluid process of encountering, engaging, and entanglement with human and non-human. These experiences are not subject to an essentialised definition of ethnic or cultural groups. Rather, my identity as Pākehā is dynamic and constructed through embodied experiences in a range of cultural environments. In the reunion story I choose particular identity artefacts, those “living tools of self” (Holland et al., 1998, p. 28), that were remembered in my body, those ‘things’ I have an emotional attachment to. This reminds me of Hall (1996b) who describes how identities are points of ‘temporary attachment’ through discourse. Butler (1988, 1993) and Barad (2003) elaborate how we develop our attachment to ‘things’ through repetitive performance. For example when I buy my pottle of whitebait, boil up my Māori potatoes, buy the pāua fritter – I am deliberately choosing and remembering who I am through a performance of self. At other times we serendipitously experience the affective – that rush of feeling (Wetherell, 2012) – through an interaction with the non-human that summons up an attachment with the past; such as my emotional response to Waiorore Marae. Whether my embodied ethnicity is real or imagined – it is constructed and reconstructed in response to the social contexts and meanings and implications concerned with belonging (Fenton,
A few thoughts for my role as an educator

How do we provide spaces for our students to perform and continually reflect on their performance of self? Or do we provide them with a script of stereotypical characters?

How might we use and simultaneously critique identity artefacts?

How is embodied ethnicity acknowledged and respected? Our feelings about who we are in a particular place.

The next chapter interrogates further the concept of quantum entanglement and intra-action with the material world through a duoethnography where I immerse myself in the material world.
SECTION 3
I have been speaking with the ghosts for a while now – living inside the past and encountering again those embodied memories, uncovering silenced stories and learning to live. I have explored the role of identity artefacts, the critical links between the personal stories of becoming with wider historical, political and social factors. I have ‘played’ with material and words, to get deep down into the sense of becoming Pākehā. I have remembered growing up entangled in a Māori world.

The next section involves conversations with two other Pākehā educators to juxtapose my stories of becoming alongside theirs. These stories are also unique, with serendipitous encounters and unexpected findings. The concepts of entanglement, engagement and embodiment are further developed.

Figures 13 and 14 are my material exploration and representation of some of these entanglements.

**Figure 13**: Entanglement with the Wire 1
Figure 14: Entanglement with the Wire 2
CHAPTER 12
SUMMONING UP THE GHOST WITH NEEDLE AND THREAD


If [we] love... justice at least, the “scholar” of the future, the “intellectual” of tomorrow should learn it and from the ghost. [We] should learn to live by learning not how to make conversation with the ghost but how to talk with him, with her, how to let them speak or how to give them back speech. (Derrida, 1994, p. xvii)

Neither space nor time exist as determinate givens outside of phenomena. As a result of the iterative nature of intra-active practices that constitute phenomena, the ‘past’ and the ‘future’ are iteratively reconfigured and enfolded through one another; […] Neither the past nor the future is ever closed. (Barad, 2007, p. 383)

My fingers have holes in them. I, Esther, have been working with needle and thread to sew a story of early Auckland, New Zealand. I have turned to the ‘material’ to immerse myself in an embodied practice with questions of becoming Pākehā; a problematic identity, fraught with a settler colonial heritage. I want to disrupt the notion of a homogenous Pākehā identity and to provide counter-stories to those standard stories that dominate our becoming (Hanly, 2009; McCreanor, 2005).

Sewing an arpillera, a traditional Chilean tapestry, provided me with a method to bring together different stories of becoming Pākehā and to illustrate Pākehā entanglement with a Māori world, the indigenous people of New Zealand. Further, the act of sewing provided me with a method to engage creatively with new materialist ideas, and specifically with Karen Barad’s (2007) theory of the entanglement of matter and meaning, past and future. In addition, I follow Gauntlett and Hozwarth’s (2006) argument that researchers should be developing visual creative methods. They are convinced that creative methods are a “good way of building sociological knowledge, and offer a positive challenge to the taken-for-granted idea that you can explore the social world just by asking people questions, in language” (p. 83). Creative methods, they insist, provide a way for participants to express what they feel about the issue or question, and to express their embodied experience within the study. Crucially, the act of creation takes time and allows for reflection and a different form of learning through experience. This paper uses and reports on the range of arts-based methods I used – found poetry (Glesne, 1997; Prendergast, 2009),
factionalisation, script writing and the making of an arpillera – to talk with the ghosts and give them back speech.

In this paper the two authors’ different stories of becoming Pākehā are brought together and juxtaposed. We are both Pākehā educators who have an academic and personal interest in interrogating what it means to be Pākehā. In Avril’s earlier work (Bell, 2004, 2009b) she has often spoken of the importance of Pākehā knowing their histories, rather than avoiding confronting their entanglement in colonialism by romanticising their past or ignoring their histories. This duoethnographic study, primarily Esther’s project and part of a larger exploration of diverse stories of Pākehā identity she is undertaking, provided us with an opportunity to explore our personal histories of becoming Pākehā. Much like Christine Sleeter’s (2015) critical family history work, we were delving beneath those standard stories that dominate our history to think more critically and specifically about those people who are defined as Pākehā. Exploring our becoming Pākehā we discovered that we both had ancestors who had lived in Auckland – the city we now also both live and work in – in the early decades of colonial settlement. This historical fact became the basis from which to explore the diverse stories of these ancestors. Our looking back involved delving into a range of historical artefacts: old photos, census records, maps, letters, documentation, dairies and landmarks that remain. These historical fragments were stitched together through a range of arts-based strategies to connect/‘converse’ in experiential ways with these ancestral figures. By presenting these methods/data in this paper, we aim to illustrate the place of arts-based methods to creatively engage in a conversation with our ghosts and to ‘re-materialise’ and ‘reconfigure’ the past to disrupt the narrative of an homogenous Pākehā identity.

Significantly, the methods used here are both textual (found poetry, factionalisation, script writing) and material (sewing an arpillera), literally bringing together matter and meaning. In saying this, we realise that the textual is material (paper, ink, screen, pixels, electrical current) as well as meaning, and the material is meaning as well as matter. Following Barad (2007), we understand ‘spacetime matter’ and meaning as forever engaged in processes of intra-action. So too, our actions are intra-actions, not the result of our individual sovereign agency, but the outcome of our actions and the actions of others – human and non-human beings and materials. These intra-actions bring some things into being and exclude others (p. 82). Our becoming then is always already entwined and entangled, partial fragmented
evidence of past/present/future intra-action is cut into the fabric of the world, written in our flesh (Barad, 2010; Haraway, 1997). In this paper we describe the evolution of Esther’s arts-based methods for speaking with the archives of our Pākehā past, and relate the power of these methods to the insights of new materialism. And so we begin with one story of Auckland, and using the method of found poetry (Glesne, 1997; Lahman & Richard, 2014; Prendergast, 2009), link it to our reading of new materialism and quantum entanglement.

I always said I would live in Auckland. A place heaving with life, in constant flux with the dynamic intra-action between matter and the human, a place of emerging inbetween identities becoming, not becoming, past, present, and future. I just never knew how my becoming was so entangled with this place. It’s like I came back. That this is the place where my becoming Pākehā began. (Esther)

What’s the matter with Auckland?
The thing of the matter is ... Auckland.
Spacetimemattering,
Past/present/future.
A mish mash meshwork.
The matterthing and me.
What matters is intra-action,
Material and meaning,
Multiple threads,
Entangled becomings.
Wayfarers meet along the path,
Weaving their stories into the fabric,
Story matter/s.
(Esther Fitzpatrick 2015)
Finding the Threads

At the outset of this study, through our conversations we soon recognised that both our ancestors had been at Kororareka, Bay of Islands in 1840, and possibly at the signing of the Treaty. They were also among the very first Pākehā to settle in Auckland. Our families had travelled out from England. However, Avril’s family were part of the British colonial regiment, while Esther’s were Jewish traders. This difference was significant in our already known understandings of these ancestors and their place in our family histories. For Esther, her Jewish ancestors had long been ghostly and silenced figures in her family story. In her absence Kate represented the greatest gap in her family story, a silent dark hole, yet through the silence was the loudest voice. This entanglement of our ancestors gave Esther an opportunity to explore Kate’s story in more depth and to retrace the Jewish story in early Auckland that, in many ways, has been assimilated into the idea of one, homogenous Pākehā origin. For Avril, George Graham and his family were, in contrast, the ancestors her family most frequently told (sketchy) stories of and looked back to. As a minor public figure in the military and political establishment of early colonial Auckland, George was an ancestor to be ‘proud’ of (as long as the dispossession and violence of colonial history remained ‘forgotten’). Even so, this project gave her the opportunity to delve more deeply into George’s story. As two researchers we employed the method of duoethnography in our conversations to explore these diverse personal historical narratives.

The combination of intimate personal story-telling and theorising takes the reader beyond the personal to considerations of the social and political. Our shared conversations provided space to summon up our ghosts and explore what, for us, it means to be Pākehā. We begin with two narratives, derived from archival fragments, to introduce our ancestors, Kate and George.
A Letter to a ghost

Dear Kate

It is July and summertime in Amsterdam. I am sitting upstairs in the Sephardic synagogue looking down through the dust filtered light to the ghostly patterns on the sandy floor below. Giant stone pillars rise to the ceiling where our ancestors’ prayers have echoed and become embedded in the soul of the building. I have just received a text message that confirms you were Ada’s mother; you are my Great Great Grandmother. It has taken us 140 years to find you.

I only know fragments of your story, found after searching through the historical archives; it was the DNA test that confirmed your name: Kate Keesing, born 1856, Auckland, New Zealand.

Shalom,

Esther

Stitching together fragments of Mr Graham

I grew up aware that my great-great-grandfather, George Graham, was my earliest New Zealand ancestor, arriving in 1840. There is a family story that he was at the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi but I can find no evidence to support this. I wonder what this story meant to my mother’s and grandmother’s generations, being repeated through the 20th century during the time when the Treaty was supposedly ‘forgotten’ and a ‘nullity’ (Williams, 2011). He was in the Royal Engineers and arrived at the founding of Auckland to play his role in the building of a new city, bringing with him his wife, Jane, and three young children, all under five. In 1841 a fourth was born, William Australia, one of the early Pākehā children born in the new city. When Esther’s ancestor Kate was born, George may have been absent. At some point he was sent to China during the ‘second China war’. I wonder if Jane was still in Auckland with their now eight children. It seems more likely than them all going to China. I wonder about Jane and her life, what it took to follow her husband and raise a family in often challenging and risky conditions – the life of the colonial woman.

Avril
Engaging with the Material

At the outset of this study I (Esther) was working with Derrida’s notion of hauntology where he states “[i]n learning to live – between life and death – one must talk with or about some ghost” (Derrida, 1994, p. xviii). In settler colonial contexts it is often indigenous ghosts that are deemed to haunt the settler, and these ghosts can both disrupt and support the settler colonial project (Bell, 2014, pp. 112-115). However, here the focus is on our own Pākehā/settler ancestors, how to ‘speak’ to them and what we might learn from doing so. Reading through the transcripts of my conversations with Avril, I wondered how best to make sense of our stories. Derrida gives no clear direction to how I might speak with the ghost, but argues that, to do so serves ‘justice-to-come’. As the researcher, how then do I live with, talk with and accommodate a ghost? Emilie Cameron (2008, p. 389) suggests paying attention to singular, specific historical experiences and events as a means to engage with our ghosts, to focus in on specific moments in time, be alert, and ready to respond emotionally – enchanted, surprised, charmed and disturbed. This meshes with Kate Coddington’s (2011) suggestion that we should focus on those mundane activities that make up the lived experiences of our ancestors, exploring these through an embodied lens, “where power is experienced close to the skin” (p. 749).

As already noted, my arts-based practice in this project included textual and material forms. Using text I was able to creatively speak directly with my/our ghosts, but the material practice of making an arpillera provided a completely different form of engagement and learning. There are three aspects to this that I want to explore briefly – the pictorial, representational nature of the arpillera (I was producing a picture in cloth), the materiality of the arpillera itself, and finally the practice of making.

Firstly, in sewing the arpillera I was creating a picture – an image of a factionalised scene from early Auckland (more on the content below). My creating this visual image fits well with Weber’s (2008) description of a post-postmodern perspective where images are understood as existing in a dialectic relationship with the creator or seer, “as a dynamic product of our interaction with the world” (p. 41). Weber moves on to describe why visual images should be used in research. Many of these resonate with why and how I am using the arts. First, the image can be “used to capture the ineffable, the hard-to-put-into words … giving breadth and depth” to the idea. Second, images work by engaging us and provoking us to “pay attention”
and notice what we had not seen before, “discover what we didn’t know we knew”. Images encourage embodied knowledge. Also, images are likely to be memorable (Weber, 2008, pp. 4-8). In this study I captured images I have noticed with the camera, through a rough sketch, and ultimately in the making of an arpillera.

Secondly, in sewing the arpillera I was also engaged in the production of a material artefact, a three-dimensional cloth and thread ‘thing’. To say ‘thing’ rather than ‘object’ is to refer to the new materialist understanding of the ‘liveliness’ and vitality of things against the subject/object binary thinking of the Cartesian (and dominant post-Enlightenment view). Things or matter have their own power that call for a response from us. Further, in making an arpillera I create something that exceeds my own agency and intent. From the new materialist perspective, agency is shared between humans and non-humans, all of which come into being via processes of intra-action rather than being pre-existing entities. New materialist theorist, Karen Barad (2003) draws on the work of quantum physicist Niels Bohr, who argues that things do not have inherently determinate boundaries or properties, and that the assumed distinction between subject and object, knower and known should then also be called into question. In stitching the arpillera, then, I am engaged in a mutual becoming, transforming myself as I transform the cloth and thread into an imagined colonial scene.

This embodied experience of arts-based research has resonance with new materialism and provides a way of speaking with the ghost. Karen Barad (2010) argues for “diffraction” as a method of “reading texts intra-actively through one another, enacting new patterns of engagement, attending to how exclusions matter” (p. 243) and as “a material practice for making a difference, for topologically reconfiguring connections” (Barad, 2007, p. 381), including those between past, present and future. Diffraction allows the opening up, crossing over, cutting across, and entangling of diverse paradigms and forms – disrupting those traditional academic boundaries, disrupting bifurcation.

Finally, in sewing the arpillera I was engaged in a practice, a ‘doing’. As stipulated by Gauntlett and Holzwarth (2006), there is potential to engage thoughtfully and reflectively on our identities and experiences when you are methodologically involved in creatively making things (p. 83). Beyond this, as Tim Ingold (2013) argues, there is a difference between such ‘knowing from the inside’ and learning about something from text. For Ingold, in making something we are
engaged in “transformational” rather than “documenting” learning (pp. 2-8). Arts-based research then provides a critically reflective way for me as researcher to engage in a material and creative activity, to explore and imagine future possibilities, through reimagining our histories. Dwelling in in-between spaces I used the arts to explore multiple identities, complexity, difference and similarity (Springgay, Irwin, Leggo, & Gouzouasis, 2008).

Throughout this study stories were generated as I responded to the historical archives I was exploring. I took photos, drew sketches, told stories, and wrote poems, painted ancestors (or illusions of them) created a wire Pākehā, wrote more poems and began to sew an arpillera. Through threading fragments of story into the cloth I was engaged with the material, whilst also materialising the coexistence of Avril’s and my ancestors in early Auckland. I was engaged in a performance with our stories. Playing with the historical stories, through immersing myself in art making, such as writing poetry and creating the arpillera, enabled me to “interrogate the self, within the social and political” (K. Fitzpatrick, 2012, p. 13) and engage in intra-action with the material world. Through the art making I had to consider the positioning of our particular stories within the wider political, social story that was occurring. While retelling a ‘mundane’ story it also highlights the roles our ancestors played in the making of early Auckland. The playful and imaginative approach of art making also provided a more sophisticated way of responding to complex issues and questions of identity (Gauntlett & Holzwarth, 2006).

Practices of Re-membering

Through exploring and retelling stories it is useful to consider why some stories are deliberately remembered and others are forgotten. Paul Connerton (1989, 2008, 2009) writes about how societies remember and forget. When interrogating what it means to be Pākehā, several forgetting strategies described by Connerton become relevant to understanding our different becomings: prescriptive forgetting, repressive erasure, forgetting integral to forming a new identity, and humiliated silence. These are highlighted in the poem below. To remember Kate’s story I needed to both explore the “practices of inscription” (archival memory) and “incorporating practice” (embodied memory) to restore cultural memory (Connerton, 1989, p. 72-73). I also needed to consider the different strategies employed over time to forget, to better understand the complicated assimilation processes that have occurred. For example, where the early Jewish settlers, initially ridiculed for their
funny accents and different cultural practices, eventually became part of the collective group known as Pākehā. In response to my reading on forgetting and remembering, I created a ‘found poem’, from Connerton (1989, 2008, 2009), Stoller (1994) and Roodenburg’s (2004) work, to highlight how these concepts are relevant to my Jewish ancestors and the story of becoming Pākehā.

On forgetting...

First came the forgetting

A deliberate act

An erasure of a culture, a language, a history

The ‘air brushing’ of particular stories

The dilution of colour into a homogenous hue

The fabrication of normality

The arrival of ‘whiteness’

Dominant stories became curricula

Small stories edited out of sight

Consigned to a shadow world

Struggling to survive – blank out the past

To forge a new identity – discard and replace

Remembering only that which will serve you today

Falling silent when shamed, humiliated

No appropriate words to say

Until

You are asked to remember
... and on remembering

How to remember an identity that you cannot name?

Speak to the ghost

Explore practices of inscription

The archival memory

Texts, photographs, songs, books, video, dance, place names

Pay attention to repertoire

The incorporating practices

Embodied memory

Bodily movements, gestures, postures, facial expressions, table manners

Juxtapose text and body

Through the arts create ‘counter-memory’

Evoke the senses

Restory cultural memory

Anne Harris (2014, p. 70) asks, “How do you perform an identity you have never known?” In creating the arpillera I was engaged in a method that involved exploring historical artefacts and recreating the story of early Auckland. I was restoring the ‘small stories’ that had been consigned to the shadow world, evoking the senses through the arts and recreating cultural memory. I was performing identity through the retelling.

Threading Stories of Entanglement: Arpillera

It is no surprise that, when mulling over how I was going to represent the early story of Auckland, my mind went back to the arpilleras. The arpillera is a method of tapestry that originates in Chile, where breaking from the tradition of creating a tapestry of idyllic life, the peasant women of Chile gathered together to create works of art to story the horrors of their life during the revolution (1974-1990). The story I wanted to tell was rather more mundane, the daily struggles, the complexity and tension of different cultures thrust together at the birth of a city. I wanted to explore through my art making two stories in particular, the story of the British colonial army
and the Jewish traders. The arpillera provided a way to juxtapose the stories Avril Bell and I had shared of our early ancestors: British soldier and Jewish trader. Creating the arpillera was a way to show our shared beginning in Auckland, our being haunted by the same landscape, yet from different perspectives. Over time I had gathered fragments of Avril’s and my ancestors’ stories, of people’s daily lives and their interactions through a moment of this history.

The simplicity of the arpillera provided me with a method that was easy to follow. As stated by Bacic (2010) it “...allow[s] anyone willing to take the time and pick up a needle and thread to relate their own stories through cloth and stitches...” (p. 7). I was drawn to this method because, as a novice with the needle and thread, making an arpillera did not demand great skill, just a willingness to engage with the material and learn in the process. Further arpillera, as method to juxtapose and uncover silenced stories, had been used by several women’s groups throughout the world, often facilitated by Roberta Bacic. To utilise the method to explore, reveal and juxtapose the stories of early Auckland, to highlight our entangled beginning, seemed highly relevant.

Creating an arpillera also fits with hauntology as a way to summon up the past “as an art form wanting to make contact” (Moya-Raggio, 1984, p. 281) which enables the artist to recreate history and allow the story to live again that we might discover the truth of their lives (Hektner, 2003). As Agosin (2008) stipulated, “...they [the arpillera] will continue to sew arpilleras to dispel oblivion, to make the dead speak, and to regenerate collective memory” (p. 27). The arpillera also provide space for alternative stories to be shared; alternative often to the ‘official’ or standard story reproduced by dominant populations. The stories told in the arpillera are particular to certain individuals yet have the capacity to resonate with descendants of other families and cultural groups who are part of Auckland today, where they act as a trace to carry the story across the generations (Bacic, 2010).

The arpillera method fitted well with my role as a bricoleur, using the tools at hand, where I needed to source material that was available, and learn as I went. The making of arpillera historically was out of a need to tell a story; hence the artist would use whatever material they could lay their hands on (Bacic, 2010). Arpillera were, therefore, made out of fragments and scraps of material (both fabric and knowledge) which have been “combined and juxtaposed to depict scenes ranging from the most simple and basic to the most elaborate and complex” (Moya-Raggio, 1984, p. 278).
These fragments and scraps were often highly personal and therefore emotionally resonant. For example, the women would sew into the tapestry the cloth from the shirt of a husband who had been 'disappeared'. The act of making the arpillera also involves the artist in a “deeply human activity” (Moya-Raggio, 1984, p. 278) where the making brings the creator into bodily connection with the experience being expressed. For James E. Young, “every movement of the hand that pushed the needle in and pulled it out” is reflected in each stitch, and each shows “memory as a physical activity, a material process whereby artists make sense of events inwardly and outwardly in the same act” (as cited in Agosin, 2008, p. 23).

For my arpillera I hunted around to find scraps of cloth that would best represent the people in the story I was telling. The clothes of Avril’s and my ghosts had long ago disappeared. Hence I researched historical archives to establish the types of cloth, the colours, and styles that best fit what I was trying to depict. Different also to the Chilean arpillera makers I began with the dolls, not the background. In the recent history of arpillera (1974-1990) its role evolved as a mechanism for the peasant women to give voice to their untold stories. The artists decided therefore to create three-dimensional dolls that would make the work “active, lively, [and] versatile” (Agosin, 2008, p. 23). These cloth dolls were created to represent significant characters/people in the stories they wanted to tell, and were sewn onto the landscape of the tapestry. In my arpillera the use of cloth dolls enabled me to highlight specific characters that were important to Avril’s and my story. I researched family photos and other historical artefacts, and sketched up the characters I thought were needed to tell the story. Next began the slow process of making the dolls. As Agosin (2008) suggests, the process of creating the arpillera should not be rushed, it requires time learning how to look, to notice and translate what you see and felt into a visual representation. When it came to creating a doll for Kate I returned to a delightful photo of Kate with her younger sister, Rose, as children. This photo represented for me the importance of Rose to Kate’s story. Without Rose and her descendants I would never have found Kate. So I sewed them close together, as one unit, as they were in the photo (Figure 15).
Figure 15: Remembering Kate and Rose
Creating the Kate doll was like remembering someone I never knew. I closely examined the photos of Kate and read again her letters. How was I to make her hair? How did I understand her hair? These were the sorts of questions I struggled with. In the photo Kate’s hair was ordered with a tidy parting, so I manipulated the needle and thread to make it so. Her sister Rose, on the other hand, had curly unruly hair, so I tangled the thread and knotted it in place. I imagined them standing together watching their mother chase the goat, as described in Kate’s letter to her niece.

Artistic licence was also used in the making of the ‘pink’ pigs (Figure 16). In all probability the pigs were black, but I wanted them to stand out in this work; the story of a Jewish boy cuddling a pig had tickled my imagination. Through my reading of a family story, one of the small boys was gifted a small piglet on arrival, with whom he immediately fell in love. However, the relationship was cut short when his mother demanded he give it back. The story of the pigs and the boy work as a metaphor of the struggle the Jewish colonist had in retaining their culture as eventually some of the families resorted to eating pork; they were often referred to as the non-Kosher Jews.
To represent Avril’s family and the story of the barracks I examined several historical sketches and paintings in the archives of the library and museum. I then sketched and coloured in two soldiers that best represented what I had understood from the illustrations; the colours and the types of uniform worn. Then I made the two ‘British Soldiers’ (Figure 17) and positioned them by the stone wall. The Auckland University campus is high on a hill in the heart of the city’s CBD. I have always loved the remains of the old barrack walls, haunting the campus, a landmark that remains.

**Summoning up the ghost**

Holloway and Kneale (2008) describe the method of speaking to the ghost as a process of being alert and looking for sites where we may be “enchanted, surprised, charmed and disturbed” (p. 298). Thus, using stories from the historical archives I then employed the arts-based strategy of factionalisation. Bruce (2014) argues that:

[f]actionalisation is a blend of fact and fiction, of observation and imagination. It is a form of representation that must be methodologically rigorous, theoretically informed, ethically reflexive and interesting to read, see or hear. Its aim is to dissolve the arguably artificial line between fact and fiction, and create the conditions for deep emotional understanding. (p. 6)

The act of creative writing “transformed and stretched” my memory, enabling a “balance between the need to respond to the reality” of fragmentary data and the need to create a coherent story (Smorti, 2011, p. 306). Thus the imagination is applied to the gaps, drawing on plausible scenarios through considering the wider political, social and environmental factors known of the time. Factionalising the scene enabled me to draw on partial happenings, fragmented memories, and echoes of conversations (Sparkes, 2007, pp. 521-550) to illuminate the message and connect the reader to the story, in order to evoke an emotional intellectual response (Eisner, 1997; Fitzpatrick, 2014). Further, writing faction allowed me “the freedom to explore a familiar set of ideas in a new way, taking [me] to places within … that had previously been silent and remote” (Barnes, 2014, p. 244).

Together Avril and I had gathered acorns from the trees on our city campus planted at least 150 years ago from acorns George Graham brought to New Zealand. We walked through the arch in the wall Graham had designed for the barracks. We walked by Government House where Governor Grey resided, which we knew from
the archives had sat opposite my ancestor Hartog’s home. From letters we read about Hartog tutoring Grey in Hebrew and being a familiar visitor in the home. From census records, photos and other historical stories we knew the ages, whereabouts, friendships and occupations of the various characters in our stories. From Governor Grey’s letters we learn that Grey was an important friend to Kate, someone she confided in, and that she shared his love of books. Sewing Hartog and Governor Grey (Figure 18) together with the fragments of story Avril and I had gathered, I imagined a moment in our shared histories. I imagined colonial Auckland, I imagined a large wooden house opposite Government House. I then drew on the facts to create this fictive scene.

Figure 17: British Soldiers
It is early evening and two men in uniform are approaching the door of a large wooden house. I see an old man sitting inside his living room. The uniformed men knock on the door and one enters.

**Hartog:** Welcome my dear student and friend – so Governor, have you come for another lesson?

**Grey:** Shalom my friend ... not today ... I come to...

There is a shuffle in the corner of the room and Grey turns

.. ah and here is my favourite Jewish princess. And how are you Kate?

A small girl clambers out of a reader’s daze, walks toward Grey and curtsies.

**Kate:** Shalom, Governor Grey.

At the door a young gangly man stands waiting.

**Hartog:** Who’s your friend Grey?
Grey: George Graham’s boy. May I introduce you to William Australia Grey – recently arrived back to Auckland from his studies in England. He’s helping us out with the troubles in the Waikato – speaks fluent Māori and has his father’s desire for peaceful negotiations.

Hartog beckons the young man inside.

Hartog: Shalom William Graham, welcome, haere mai, barukh ha-ba. Kate, go and get the kettle on.

Kate leaves the room.

Grey: I came to see if I could help. I see you’ve taken Kate under your wing. How are Esther and the girls getting on since Abraham’s passing?

Hartog: Kate comes over and keeps me company. She was very close to her father, a serious girl – always tucked away with her nose in a book.

Grey: She must come and visit my library; I need more friends to share my books with.

Hartog: Turns to William. And how is your father William? One day this city will thank him for his foresight when planning the barracks, imagine – a beautiful park in the middle of a chaotic city ... a man of vision.

William: He is well, thank you.

He coughs nervously.

But I would like to talk to you about the goat!

Kate has entered into the room. She starts to giggle. The three men turn to look at her.

Kate: But he was so funny Poppa, Amah dressed him up in Hannah’s old baby clothes.

Hartog: Yes Kate, but it wasn’t very funny for the people coming out of the church on Sunday morning!

Hartog turns to William.

I trust the young soldier has now built an enclosure to ensure Mr Goat keeps out of my daughter-in-law’s garden?

Grey: laughs. Now come here Kate and tell me about what you have been reading.
A moment of reflection

I have been engaged with thread now for several months. Fragments of cloth spill out of their basket onto my floor. The carpet and couch have discarded thread caught in the creases and corners: nagging at my son to vacuum again. My fingers have been pricked as I fight with the thread to enter the needle. And so our story has been summoned to life. It has grown in unexpected ways. As I thread our historic stories into the fabric, another story emerged, would not/could not stay in the background silent. The arpillera demanded more. The ancestors of the land could not be silenced. “Māori need to be represented here. There would have been a lot of Māori here,” argued Avril. “Tāne needs feet to push up the sky,” suggested Melinda.

For Avril, the entanglement of Māori with Pākehā becoming has always been in the foreground of her work (Bell, 2006). For me, Esther, this was a reality I ‘knew’ cognitively, but making the arpillera gave me the opportunity to re-learn this in an embodied and transformational way. I had been concerned primarily with re-materialising my Jewish family ghosts, with de-homogenising the Pākehā story, and less attentive of the Māori–Pākehā story. But, whatever our origins, our becoming Pākehā is already, always haunted by and entangled with the Māori world, a world in ongoing intra-action with the material, the spiritual, and our ancestors. And so again I picked up the thread. Colonial Auckland emerged inside/entangled with a Māori world. In the early era of colonial settlement Pākehā were the minority.

Figure 19: Tāne Pushing up the Sky with his Feet
Importantly in the arpillera I needed to give voice to Māori. Our ancestors learned to engage with the land, with place, through intra-action with Māori. Hence, I threaded those stories of the Māori world into the arpillera (Figures 19, 20 and 21) that are significant in my own becoming. The Māori world was always already entangled, entwined with this place, Auckland. This is the meeting place, Auckland, the place Avril and my ancestors came to, this is the place they threaded themselves into and intra-acted with, a place of an already always multilayered entanglement of material and meaning.

Figure 20: Māui Fishing up the North Island of New Zealand
The Arpillera is not Finished

For this study I (Esther) chose to zoom in on two families at one time and place in Colonial Auckland. Like many cities, Auckland is elastic in its forever always becoming (Ingold, 2009). Auckland, a dynamic identity is a significant player in Avril and my own becoming Pākehā. As wayfarers journeying through the world, our ancestors’ paths became entwined in this place. Tim Ingold describes these threads of multiple entanglements that bind and knot people and place:

[L]ives are led not inside places but through, around, to and from them, from and to places else where ... wayfaring ... describe[s] the embodied experience of this perambulatory movement. It is as wayfarers, then, that human beings inhabit the earth ... human existence is ... place-binding. It unfolds not in places but along paths. Proceeding along a path, every inhabitant lays a trail. Where inhabitants, meet, trails are entwined, as the life of each becomes bound up with other. Every entwining is a knot, and the more that life-lines are entwined, the greater the density of the knot. (Ingold, 2009, p. 37)

![Figure 21: Arpillera of Early Auckland and the Story of a Goat](image)

Are these knots the remains, the traces of thread where intra-action occurred, where our lives have become entangled? I understand Avril and my ancestors as wayfarers through Auckland; the trader and the soldier. The uncanny thing is Avril and I found ourselves back here in this place. One hundred and seventy years later
we pick up the acorns together under the trees George Graham planted. Their roots knotted into the soil. These same trees Kate played beside and watched grow. Our roots too are knotted into the soil of this place. The stories we tell follow the threads of these early wayfarers and trace the entanglement over time. In following the thread we remember the different beginnings, the cultural stories, and begin to disrupt the homogenous hue.

**Early Auckland and a story of becoming**

As a researcher using arts-based methods I use thread to explore the intra-action between Auckland and the emerging Pākehā, an intra-action between matter and meaning, an intra-action between ourselves and our ghosts. Through following the traces left behind we encounter the binding of threads into knots, “a tangled mesh of interwoven and complexly knotted strands” (Ingold, 2009, p. 41). And at every place on the arpillera, where there is ‘a gathering of things’, there is ‘a knot of stories’. Our stories are woven into the fabric. Our ancestors meet again along a path, in intra-action with a place, carving into the land and building places through knots and threads. Governor Grey once again learns Hebrew from Hartog. George Graham designs the barracks with a future Albert Park already haunting his pencil. The Jewish trader sells tomahawks to a Māori warrior. Kate writes a letter about her mother, Esther Isaacs, who dressed a goat in a baby’s gown and disrupts the English band’s parade, early on a Sunday morning. And all the while Tāne pushes up the sky, Māui fishes up the land, and Auckland continues in its becoming.
**Arpillera of early colonial Auckland**

A sewing of my mind

Threading fragments of a story

History patched into a frame

Dismembering a dominant tale

Positioning the counterpoint

The Other story/ies

Inside a Māori world

Tāne pushes up the Sky

*A starfield of visions and dreams*

Māui hauls up his fish

*A land of hope and plenty*

An entanglement of worlds

Conflict, compromise, change

Nothing stays the same

*(Fitzpatrick 2015)*

In engaging with the arpillera, I threaded into the fabric fragments of story of our early ancestors. Those Jewish ancestors whose stories were silent are made visible, the significance of the Māori world is made evident, and a material object has been made for others to interact with. However, this particular story can never be finished.

The creation of an arpillera is a material reminder of our long entangled world. As Auckland continues to evolve, as others also arrive to sew their stories into our landscape, our becoming continues through a process of intra-action and entanglement. This process is a cyclic to-ing and fro-ing between the powerfully still present past and our relations with and responsibilities towards, ancestors and historical events, in our present. Our future is therefore already always entangled with the past, is mutually layered and enmeshed in a mutual becoming.
Selah
The German Connection

Serendipity played its cards one night. I could almost hear Horace Walpole laughing somewhere. When you enter into a relationship with someone you never truly know where it will lead. Because one of my supervisors Katie and I both believed in the importance of establishing trusting, respectful relationships we also developed a friendship and began to write poetry to each other as a form of creative improvisation. There were still a few family stories I had not researched or told. My relationship with Katie eventually led me to uncover one of these. Here are some fragments of poems from an article I am writing with Katie.

Christmas party December 2013

‘They were called Poninghaus’.

‘I’m a Poninghaus!’

Slightly tipsy,

Happy laughter.

Two brothers flee Germany.

Sugar bakers,

Johann Friederick and Carl Heinrich.

Catch a ship to the ‘promised land’,

Christchurch, New Zealand 1865.

Our Great Great Grandparents,

Brothers Poninghaus,

Built fences and dug ditches,

Had families made friends.

We are related.
6 January 2015

Dear Katie

Finding You

It’s spooky stuff

I see my boys in the photo

In your family album

Of my Great Great Grandfather

I read in your history/mystory

A German story of immigration

Filled with hope

Turning swamp-land into garden

I see the tide turn

Destruction of a chapel

Changing of names

Imprisoned for being different

And I remember my Grandfather

A dark wet Wellington night

Devoid of hope

Looking to die

Finding a light

Finding a song

Finding someone to love

Finding family

Esther
Entanglement and the strangeness of intra-action have become important to this work. I reflect back to my role as an educator and the importance of developing these respectful relationships with our colleagues, students and others. How willing are we to listen and learn from these conversations? These relationships take time and energy – they are an investment and a gift.

I entered into the last duoethnography with a focus on the role of a Pākehā educator. In these conversations Stephen pushed me further to tell of my childhood and entanglement with Māori as a juxtaposition alongside his stories. These stories are precious but also need to be treated with care as we touch closely here on Māori–Pākehā relationships in education. Therefore, we asked for critical feedback from our Māori colleagues and friends as part of the process. Following are narratives and poems, scripted conversations from our talks, on what has ‘so far’ impacted on our practice. We leave with a few suggestions for the future.
CHAPTER 13
WE CAN’T LEAD WHERE WE WON’T (FIRST) GO

We can’t teach what we don’t know, and we can’t lead where we won’t go. Malcolm X (as cited in Howard, 2006, p. 6)

I am white. Like all people I am haunted by my past. In an increasingly global world, ignoring the spectre of our past is becoming more and more difficult. Also, advances in technology have resulted in our past being vividly portrayed on the screen. White people have become accustomed to a place of privilege, perhaps without realising we have occupied it; an ignorance we sheltered under to protect ourselves from the realities of colonisation. We have spun a grand story of civilising a savage world, of bringing rightness to ignorant peoples, and bringing order to chaos. But it’s so much more complicated than that. Who are ‘we’? People who often are the assumed ‘normal’ beside which all ‘others’ are measured. The only clear definitions are ‘white skin’ and the word ‘not’, which I suggest is like a prefix to anything whites are not; for example in New Zealand where we are located, to be white is to be not Māori (Indigenous). Yet those who are not have dominated the conversation. In New Zealand we are called Pākehā.

This chapter juxtaposes the stories of two Pākehā educators, Stephen May and me, where, through a series of duoethnographic conversations, we explore our different stories of becoming Pākehā. Both Stephen and I have academic and personal interests in multiethnic and multicultural issues in education. Stephen has researched, written and implemented a practice of critical multiculturalism in his work (for example May, 1999, 2010; May & Sleeter, 2010). We are mindful, as Pākehā, how these stories have the potential to recentre white discourse, rather than, as is our objective, disrupt the dominant colonial narrative. Importantly, then, we also asked a Māori colleague, Te Kawehau Hoskins, to engage with our stories and offer reflection and critique on them. As Pākehā educators we critically interrogate our personal and professional histories to enhance our practice today, encouraged particularly by the work of two white educators in the USA: Gary Howard and Christine Sleeter. Both of these scholars have researched, theorised and practised various pedagogical strategies to counter and disrupt racial inequities throughout their careers. And both have also come to an understanding that, as white educators, we must first know our own histories before tasking others to interrogate theirs.

The duoethnography consisted of three recorded and transcribed
conversations and a series of emails. The data generated from our duoethnography is presented here through a series of scripted conversations, found poems, and personal narratives; a response to some key questions that arose throughout our conversations.

**Those Stories we do not Share**

These stories I write are not meant to be pleasing. They have a job to do. The goal of writing autoethnographic stories is to push against the boundaries of class, race and gender and to perform painful personal experiences (Denzin, 2013, p. 139). Taking a risk, the writer moves back and forth between the personal and the political, the biographical and the historical. Here is a story I don’t want to share.

It was one of those warm fuzzy afternoons sitting in my grandmother’s farmhouse kitchen. The farm was situated at the mouth of the Waioeka River, between the small town of Ōpōtiki, New Zealand and the Ngāti Ira Marae. It was in the late 1960s. I was surrounded by family, great cooking and the hope of an adventure later on. In memory there was a lot of happy talk going on. If I was English it might be described as a Milly Molly Mandy afternoon. But I am not English. Sitting quietly next to me was my Great-aunt Hannah, her long silver hair pinned into a tidy bun and her twinkly blue eyes watching everyone, all the time smiling. I loved her and she was a family legend. To me she was some sort of saint; forgoing marriage to care for orphans for which she had been awarded an MBE; recognition of her sacrifice for the needs of others. Hannah was one of three spinster aunts sent to live in Auckland while my Poppa ran the farm. A fervent member of the Salvation Army, she had put her life’s energies into helping others. Suddenly she leaned over and whispered in my ear, “There’s niggers in the wood pile.” Then she sat up again, not looking at me but just smiling at the company as if nothing had happened.

It is a strange thing, knowledge. These words stuck in my head even though, at that moment, I could not process them. I didn't know the word, nigger. I have only shared this story with one or two people – I have great difficulty with repeating the words she spoke to me; they taste nasty in my mouth. I don't like seeing them on the page here and wonder what you might be thinking when you read them. And wonder too what you are feeling as you bring your own knowledge to that one phrase. Great aunt Hannah was highly esteemed, but she was also haunted by a belief and language that was ugly and carried with it a particular discriminatory perspective on
the world. Somewhere we had family that were Māori. I wonder now if when she attended the local Native School (established for the education of Māori children) she read about the hierarchy of race, or if it happened in the church, or in general conversation with other Pākehā who she worked for/with in Auckland. Or was it all of the above. When she whispered that dreadful phrase I knew it was a family secret she was trying to reveal and yet conceal, and her words haunted her ears. Even back then I was keenly interested in our family history. However, although a young child, I knew not to repeat the words. There was something in the phrase that shamed me, and so I stayed silent.

**Finding your Rhythm**

During our duoethnographic conversations, the idea of dancing was mentioned by Stephen. In one of our conversations Stephen directed me to Gary Howard’s book *You Can’t Teach What you Don’t Know* (Howard, 2006), and there I read Gary’s story of learning how to dance as a white man. After many years of working in multicultural education Gary realised he had spent most of his life “working intensely’ identifying with other cultures and avoiding the ‘distasteful aspects of being white” (p. 24). He then set off on a personal journey to explore his own cultural roots.

The future calls each of us to become partners in the dance of diversity, a dance in which everyone shares the lead. And because we have been separated by race and ethnicity for so long, we may feel awkward at first with the new moves … But with a little help from our friends in other cultures, even White folks can learn to dance again, as we once did among the great stone circles of ancient Europe. (Howard, 2006, p. 13)

It was while dancing in the great stone circle (Stonehenge) in England that Gary “found [his] rhythm, danced through the night, and felt at home” (p. 25).

Consequently, one of the key themes in his recent work is his belief that white educators should explore their own culture and learn ‘how to dance’ from their own diverse cultural heritages. He advises, however, that learning the dance steps is not easy; that the moves are complex and importantly we need to:

acknowledge [our] own complicity and privilege, as well as racism in [ourselves] and our family. [We have] to learn to move with some degree of grace and style to these new rhythms, without stumbling over guilt, denial, or rejection of [our] own Whiteness … (Howard, 2006, p. 26)
Stephen’s and my duoethnographic conversations are, in part, a response to the argument (as put by Howard (2006), Sleeter (2015), Frankenberg (1993b), Webber (2011) and others) that white educators need to know their histories. The narrative above highlights the tensions that are often experienced in deciding which stories, ethically, one should/could share. When critically interrogating this family story of my Great aunt Hannah I am better able to understand how the discourse of race experienced by my early family impacted on their view of the world. I believe that our lives today and our role as educators are still haunted by these particular discourses, and warrant further investigation.

**Hauntology**

Juxtaposing our stories involves speaking with the ghosts of our pasts. Derrida insists that …

In learning to live – between life and death – one *must* talk with or about some ghost (Derrida, 1994, p. xviii emphasis added).

The term ‘hauntology’ coined by Derrida, advocated for ‘speaking to ghosts’ as a subject of enquiry (Davis, 2005; Derrida, 1994). Derrida reminds us that:

> If [we] love... justice at least, the “scholar” of the future, the “intellectual” of tomorrow should learn it and from the ghost. [We] should learn to live by learning not how to make conversation with the ghost but how to talk with him, with her, how to let them speak or how to give them back speech. (1994, p. 176)

**Different Beginnings**

**Stephen’s story**

Stephen’s New Zealand family history is an “interrupted” one. His great-grandmother, on his mother’s side, arriving in New Zealand in the 1880s as the young daughter of British migrants, grew up in Auckland. His grandmother, Jessie, was born in Australia but also returned to Auckland prior to the First World War and resided there for a time. When her New Zealand-born then-fiancé returned from the war, alive but psychologically shattered, their relationship broke up and, heartbroken, she emigrated with her sister to South Africa in the early 1920s. Eventually marrying in her late 1930s she bore Pamela, Stephen’s mother, who grew up in Durban Natal.
There Pamela met and married Malcolm, Stephen’s father, an Anglican minister. It was Malcolm who, as a critic of apartheid, relocated the family to Oxford (a small rural town in Canterbury, New Zealand) in the early 1960s. They later shifted to Timaru and eventually settled in the nearby city of Christchurch when Stephen was nine years old.

Stephen’s education in Canterbury was almost monolithically white – both in terms of those he went to school with and what was studied. Oxford Area School, his first school, was an idyllic experience but comprised at the time almost all Pākehā farming families. His school in Timaru was more culturally mixed but still very Pākehā oriented. A major celebration of Captain Cook’s landing in New Zealand was held when he was there with no reference that he can remember, to Māori. This focus on European/Pākehā colonial history was most evident however, in Christchurch. There Stephen experienced a culture where Christchurch was considered the bastion of the Canterbury elite and very much grounded in the colonial narrative of the arrival of ‘the first four ships’ to which many longstanding Pākehā Canterbury families can (proudly) trace their links. Māori were largely invisible – a feature of the North Island and nothing (much) to do with them. When Stephen ended up attending Christ’s College, an elite private high school for boys, he experienced first-hand the descendants of the ‘first four ships’ – the colonial Pākehā settler origins of Canterbury— and their privileged sense of being.

...all the [Pākehā] families in Christchurch can trace their lineage back [to] one of the first four ships ... it’s sort of [their] historical roots as a colonial settlement but the fact also that they more desperately than most for a very long time ... wanted to identify as a sort of British outpost of the South Pacific. And of course Christ’s College is interesting because the students were the landed gentry that came off those first four ships. Wakefield took, you know got the land, and the colonial settlers had big high country farms and sent their kids to Christ’s College.

This sense of unreflective class privilege was something which Stephen, coming from outside of the Canterbury Pākehā elite community, was acutely aware of. It was only later, during his experience teaching in multiethnic communities, that he would add to that an awareness of their ethnic privilege as well. But more on this later.

Esther’s story

I was born in the small rural East Coast town of Ōpōtiki. I am a fifth-generation New Zealander on my maternal line and a fourth on my paternal line. My family
described themselves as Pentecostal and worshipped often with the Ringatū. Founded by the prophet Te Kooti, the Ringatū represent an Indigenous Māori religion that incorporates aspects of traditional Māori religious practice with the Biblical Old Testament and is closely aligned with Judaism (Binney, 1997; Elsmore, 2000). Neither of my parents completed high school. My father worked for a local dairy company while my mother looked after the home. Home was an old villa they rented on someone else’s farm. My Dad would milk the cows to help pay for the rent.

**Stephen: What were the interactions between Māori and Pākehā like at the time?**

**Esther:** These were my experiences as a small child in a rural town on the East Coast of New Zealand. My mother’s and father’s lives were closely entangled with Māori. And, therefore, so was mine. It is only now as an adult that can I reflect back on this time and answer the questions Stephen asked. As a child, it was all I knew. It was our world; a place somewhere straddling the Māori world we lived in and the stories of the world our ancestors left, which was increasingly being imprinted on this land. My father’s father spoke fluent Te Reo and would often shut himself in his room to kōrero (talk) with the men from the local Marae, about their shared boyhoods and future dreams. He had been schooled at the native school at Waioeka Pa. My mother’s father worked closely with the Ringatū people and often spoke on several Marae. When he died, his tangi took several days as his body was transported to three different Marae so people could say their farewells. My mother’s flower girls were the daughters of a Ringatū elder from Waimana. Māori were our neighbours, our teachers, our elders, our friends, and our whānau.

We had no story of four ships in Ōpōtiki. The only story I really knew was of Muriwai’s cave in Whakatane, which I visited often as a child. Muriwai was the daughter of the great chief Irakewa and journeyed on the Mātaahua Waka, landing in Whakatane some 800 years ago. She is a much loved and respected ancestor of the area and lived for many years in the cave, eventually dying there. Hence, a tapu was placed on the cave (designated a sacred site that one could not enter) and only lifted in 1963, the year of my birth. Many of the people in Ōpōtiki, the Whakatōhea tribe of the Waioeka, are descended from her. My great-grandfather came to the Waioeka in the 1870s. There was a story of him having a train of donkeys and having to cross the Ohiwa channel. He bought a farm at auction – it was confiscated land of the Whakatōhea people. I have only recently understood this.
There was never a time without Māori in my life. I remember Betsy was my best friend in Standard three (4th Grade). She came from the Otara Marae across the river from our school. She lived with her grandparents as a whangai (adopted child), which made sense to me as a child as I was often sent to live with my grandparents for extended periods of time. Growing up I also often visited the Marae where I learnt how to serve others. I learnt my place was in the kitchen. Many years later when living in Dunedin I was invited out for dinner at a hostel, I immediately got up after the meal to help out and the host exclaimed, “What are you doing?” This was not how things worked in Dunedin. A few years back I was discussing this with my friend, a Māori academic, who suddenly exclaimed, “that’s the Māori way”. I was confused. “But that’s the way we do things too”, I answered. I was unsure then where this learning had come from and why I did certain things, or understood things in particular ways. Which growing up story did that come from? My childhood, I suspect, was one of an assimilation of many different ways of being.

My formal education began at a school on the edge of town. The country school had a large population of Māori students and some Pākehā who were mostly the local farmers’ children. The first funeral I went to was a ‘Tangi’ at one of the local Marae, for a student from the school. My favourite teacher was Miss Pahewa who told us stories of Māui (a Māori hero) and taught us how to sing Waiata (songs). I struggled to complete high school. In my penultimate year, my family shifted house four times to three different towns and I attended three different high schools. Much to the angst of my parents I planned to go to university. I was told I had to get a job since university was not something our family did. However, I convinced my parents that I should go to teachers college, which would ultimately lead to a job. And from there I could then contribute to the family.

Entanglement with Other

I was curious about Stephen’s journey. From growing up in the white colonial city of Christchurch to his current position as a Professor of Māori Education at Auckland University. He is a researcher and educator with a keen interest in multicultural education, bilingualism and the politics of language. Using the method of found poetry I poked around at his stories and, using his words, encapsulated the essence of his answer to the following question. I asked him how he got to this place – working in a predominantly Māori tertiary environment. His answer was, “I left”.

I Left

The Art of airbrushing wore me down.

I sought out the wrinkles,
The blemishes,
The shameful scar.

I picked off the bandage,
The story of four ships,
To reveal the waka’s arrival.

Refusing the ski fields,
Choosing the battlefield.

I entered onto foreign soil,
The antithesis of colonial white privilege.

Full of ideals and liberal hopes,
Armed with passion and a critical conscience,
I experienced the brutality

At the coalface.

The hard truth of inequality
Defined by my histories.

I entered into relationship with Other,
Making a critical commitment,
To interact meaningful,
To understand our histories;
An intellectual interpersonal history.

And here I stay.

(Fitzpatrick, July 2014)

Stephen’s ‘battlefield’ refers to significant moments in his history, where full of
“ideals and liberal hopes” he set out to change the world. On completing a degree in English and Linguistics, he went to teach in Bangladesh for a year as an English language teacher and, for the first time, experienced real poverty and inequality. He returned to New Zealand and then, after completing further qualifications in linguistics and a secondary teaching qualification, he deliberately chose to teach at a low socio-economic, ethnically mixed school in Petone, Wellington – at the equivalent of what we would now call a decile one school. Each school in New Zealand is ranked on the basis of a socio-economic indicator and a ‘one’ is the lowest end of the scale.

Stephen went to teach at Hutt Valley Memorial College, one of the lowest of the low. It was here that he first developed meaningful relationships with Māori. He began to learn Te Reo and got involved in the Kapa Haka (Māori performing arts) group. This was also his ‘coalface’ experience where he realised it was a lot tougher to change the world than he originally thought. Through Stephen’s experiences at Hutt Valley Memorial College his commitment to social justice practices increased. He became more aware of how the structural mechanisms of the education system worked to maintain ‘privilege’ for some whilst making it difficult for other students, and their teachers, to make a difference. This was especially highlighted in the assessment processes at that time for University Entrance. Allocation of grades was based on each school’s assessment results from the previous year. So no matter how good Hutt Valley Memorial students were, their final grades were always lower compared to the previous year, and also the grades achieved at more socio-economically privileged schools, such as Christ’s College, Christchurch – Stephen’s old school.

One of his senior colleagues at the school was John Manuel (from the tribe of Ngāti Porou) of whom Stephen says “…[he] took him under his wing and [led] him into relationship with Māori”. For Stephen this was a significant moment where …

I come to sort of be aware and comfortable and wanted to identify as a Pākehā … really [it] is a result of [my] relationship and interaction with Māori, which really began to occur extensively in my first years of teaching. Because, as part of that personal history I wanted to teach … I wanted to get out of Christchurch … I wanted the antithesis of this colonial white privileged unspoken [context that I grew up in] … and I ended up applying for … I was looking for schools to teach, and I don’t think I was necessarily looking at multiethnic schools … but I was looking for liberal progressive schools.
Stephen: How much personal/professional interaction with Māori have you had since you left Ōpōtiki? Is it only since last year, as Course Director for the diversity course, that you started to have a more personal and professional interaction with Māori?

Esther: There is a small brown dove that I greet every morning when I walk my dog on South Titirangi Road. ‘Kia Ora Te Po!’ I sing out. The small brown dove coos back to me. Many years ago when I taught at Titirangi Primary there was a beautiful girl called Te Po, she played in the same netball team as my daughter, and danced in the same Kapa Haka group. I was fortunate to teach her younger brother and came to know the family well. It helped also that they came from Gisborne, a place special in my heart and theirs. I remember one morning sitting outside a local café when Te Po and her mother walked by. Te Po’s mother had a beautiful smile on her face and told me they were having a mother–daughter-day as Te Po had just become a woman. A few weeks later I attended Te Po’s tangi. A terrible accident ripped this young woman from her family. The small brown dove appeared shortly after to greet me on my walks. When Te Po’s mother finished her doctorate I read her thesis, a stunning narrative using Māori methodology, where the story of Te Po weaved its way through and touched my heart again.

Stephen, you ask me not to take your question the wrong way ... so I paused. I thought about your question, tossing and turning it over in my mind. I understood then that you do not know me. Perhaps you only see what you can see or expect to see. It was a good question and it caused me to interrogate my story again, remembering that identity is a complex and multifaceted becoming. There is some truth to your comment that I “have had much less professional/personal interaction with” Māori, but perhaps not to the same degree you understand or length of time. My childhood continued to impact on how I responded to, and made sense of, the world.

As I have alluded to in the story above, my life continued to be entangled with Māori, although at different levels of intensity and purpose. My first degree at Waikato University in the 1980s involved papers in Māori land law, visits to local Marae, an introduction to the Treaty of Waitangi and, as you know, a march down Queen Street in protest at the Springbok Tour. It was very much more an academic engagement with things Māori than a relational one, although I still had Māori friends at university. It was a time of awakening for me to the injustices that had occurred
through colonialisation. One of the tragic things that happened at this time was the death of my uncle that summed up for me some of the tensions that people encountered. On our family farm, in the Waioeka, was a sacred hill that was proclaimed as tapu. My Grandfather had told me never to go there as an important battle had taken place in the Māori wars and many Māori warriors were killed. I stayed away. When my uncle took over the farm, and my Grandfather was dead, my uncle burnt and removed all the trees on the hill preparing it for planting. He died shortly after, an unexpected brain haemorrhage. I supposed he had forgotten about the tapu on the land.

When I went to live in Dunedin for my first teaching job I had massive culture shock. Perhaps my experience was much like what you experienced while at teachers college on your first practicum in Tokoroa, where a Marae was central to the schools ethos, and at that time still largely unknown to you. Mine was an absence of things Māori. I do not remember what I said to the principal about where I came from and what I studied, but he introduced me to the staff as the Māori representative for the school. That was shocking too. Because I knew I was not Māori. I was then sent to all the Māori professional development opportunities – and that was when I understood what the principal meant. I learnt nothing much at these professional development days except, perhaps, that I was different to most other teachers in Dunedin. The same thing happened in Auckland when I shifted there in the 1990s.

Throughout all my primary teaching I kept upskilling and integrating Te Reo and Tikanga (culture) into my curriculum. It also seems on reflection that wherever I went, although into predominantly white communities, I found Māori friends. I had not realised this before you asked this question. And perhaps importantly also I was drawn to people like yourself, who had a care for things Māori.

In 2004, I was invited to teach at the Auckland College of Education. The philosophy of the college was very different to the faculty of today. Māori culture was embedded in the practice and content of what we did for several years. I was the director of a course for the Bachelor of Education degree where a key aspect of the content was the teaching of the Treaty of Waitangi. In another course I taught, Māori pedagogy was an important part of the content. Most of our meetings and gatherings followed Māori Tikanga protocols. I would not say we had everything ‘sussed’ rather, that many of us were seriously engaged with things Māori. Since the amalgamation of the Teachers College into the University of Auckland, Faculty of Education I have
found these things are much more forced than natural, like a tick-box strategy. There is not the same emotional buy-in I experienced when I first came here. However I keep learning.

Throughout my time at the faculty I am continually rubbing up against others, students and colleagues, who teach me more about myself and the world I live in. I remember teaching on the Treaty of Waitangi several years back where there was a particular lesson on the concept of Tino Rangatiratanga. We asked the students to watch a video that imagined a New Zealand of the future where Māori had sovereignty. A group of young Pākehā girls at the back of the room suddenly exclaimed in unison, “We would go home!” This stopped me in my tracks. It was an answer I had not anticipated – I was curious. “Where is your home?” I asked. Their response, again in unison, was “Britain”. My response to them was not considered, I just blurted out (accompanied with lots of hand movements): “Should I pluck out my eyes and send them to Denmark? Tear out my hair and send it to Germany? Scrape off my skin and send it to Cornwall? And where should I send my big Jewish toe? For some of us this place, New Zealand, is our home!” This was the first time I had understood that people might look like me, call themselves a New Zealander, but not see New Zealand as their home.

It is curious how entanglement works. It is not a linear process but rather creeps in upon itself and back again in a cyclic motion. Said’s (1993) musical metaphor is apt to describe the different levels of entanglement we might encounter throughout our lives: intense periods; pauses; crescendos. However, I am also intrigued by Karen Barad’s (2010, 2012) notion of quantum entanglement – the relational transformations through intra-action. Your question has been like a photon blast into my subconscious and caused me to consider and remember, subsequently retelling my story of becoming Pākehā. When I stood in the Dunedin staffroom and was introduced as the Māori representative, I knew I was Pākehā. When I declared to the students that New Zealand was my home, that I had no other, I knew that I was Pākehā. When I cried for Te Po and greeted the dove, I knew that I was Pākehā. I am perhaps as you say an unusual Pākehā, but is there such a thing as a usual Pākehā? Māori are my neighbours, my teachers, my elders, my friends, and my whānau.
You Can’t Lead Where you Won’t go

Significant to this study is how becoming and calling ourselves Pākehā impacts on our practice as educators. As Malcom X stated, “You can’t lead where you won’t go”. How then has being/becoming Pākehā influenced our work as educators? Through our shared conversations there were three key practices that resonated. First, the importance as educators of respecting where the student is at and starting the conversation from there, enabling them to find their own ‘stone circle’, à la Gary Howard. Second, we need to provide space and opportunity for the student to explore their own complicated and entangled stories. And third, we need to provide opportunities for students to experience and learn the importance of developing relationship with others, and learning how to dance with others.

Exploring our histories: Finding the ‘stone circle’

Like Gary Howard, ‘finding my stone circle/s’ has been significant to my understanding of becoming Pākehā. A conversation with Christine Sleeter, in 2014, revealed that for her, as well, exploring her ancestors’ stories had been important to understanding herself as ‘white’ (see Christine Sleeter’s blog at: http://christinesleeter.org). Further, Christine stipulated that, as educators, it is important we provide space for all students to explore their own genealogical stories. However, there was recognition that these stories are often revealing about our historical white privilege and, consequentially, we need to be prepared to understand, explore, and acknowledge this. This resonates with Stephen’s story when he talked about the airbrushing of our Pākehā histories and the creation of “great myths of New Zealand history”. Stephen says ‘one [issue] is that we don’t know our own history very well and that when we do we are not particularly comfortable with it’. He explains this further in relation to his approach to teaching student teachers about the Treaty and biculturalism, as well as racism and other inequalities.

Stephen: So what I used to do with the students is start where they are ... you know: what are your family? ... What is your genealogy? What are your family experiences? ... What, if any, disadvantages/advantages have you experienced in terms of your own experiences as a woman, as a rural person, or whatever they bring to the table as a way of trying at least to highlight that we all come from various [places]. You know... what we bring ... we bring a whole range of advantages ... and sometimes the experiences of discrimination or disadvantage ... whether it’s on the bases of our
sexuality, our gender, our location. [I do this] as a way of trying to get white students in particular to start thinking about these things ....

Perhaps another way of exploring our ‘stone circles’ is through the Māori concept of whakapapa. That which ‘haunts’ our becoming involves more than just our biological ancestors. For Stephen, his family’s experiences with religion, politics and migration are all significant to who he is/will be. However, also significant to Stephen’s story is how he makes sense of these experiences. One of Stephen’s literary ghosts is Bourdieu, who he first encountered when he undertook his master’s degree at Massey University, after his first few years of teaching.

... I’m a Bourdieuean and the importance of habitus of place that shapes us ... that’s where you get that we all come from a particular history and a particular point of view ... and in relation to ethnic identity ... we always come from a particular origin, a particular point of view, history, but we’re not determined by that point of view.... (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992)

[B]ecause I’d done none no educational theory before [in my previous degrees] ... and particularly Bourdieu and they were very strong at Massey on Bourdieu ... they did the first English language collection of Pierre Bourdieu in 1992 (Harker, Mahar, & Wilkes, 1990)... so right around that time... that gave me the explanatory framework for issues of inequality in achievement and issues of ethnicity in education ... his framework was such good work .

An entangled dance

An important characteristic of many populations in postcolonial countries is that many of us are multi-ethnic. Our whakapapa represents a diverse range of beginning points. This is especially the case for many Pākehā who, both ontologically and biologically, represent several ethnic and cultural groups. For several generations our ‘growing up’ has been alongside and entangled with other. For many Pākehā our histories have also resulted in a default identity, an assumption of ‘national’ identity.

Esther: One of the things you said before about the gap that Pākehā have in explaining who they are ... that’s one of the things I’m very interested in ... the lack of knowledge of our histories or the lack of willingness to explore our history. One of my experiences was just a couple of years ago. I was talking about some of my research ... and one student who had just been on practicum told the story of a primary school where the teachers got all the kids out onto the asphalt and said they were going to have a multicultural celebration at the end of the year. The teachers directed the
children, ‘so we’re just going to put you into groups … right all the Māori children go over there ... all the Indian children go over there ... the Chinese children there ... all the Samoans ... go on you’re an Indian go in that group’ ... and then they stopped. There was this group of white kids in front of them ... and the teachers said “what are we going to do with you lot? You don’t have a song and you don’t have a dance”.

I’ve shared this story many times now and people often say something like that has happened to them. Eventually the teachers decided to put the white children in the Māori group. I think for me, I wonder if it’s that inability of the Pākehā teacher, because they can’t explain who they are, and they just sort of default to the national identity, it sort of repeats itself with the children when they are told they don’t have a culture you don’t have an ethnicity ... I think these stories are important to share, as a way of opening up the conversations.

**Stephen:** Of course everyone is bits and pieces of everything ... so one of the other fundamental problems for Pākehā New Zealanders is not only are you acknowledging their Pākehāness but the complexity of their own cultural heritages ... and then saying cos if we reversed and said you are an x y and z how can you ... therefore you can’t speak as a Pākehā new Zealander and they would be outraged ... they try and apply that racialised construction the other way round.

…and that raises another issue that a lot of the rhetoric against things Māori, among white Pākehā New Zealanders, is around perceived privilege, or reverse privilege. I also think there is a compounding factor that is [not often] talked about which is white working class inequality. And so there’s the sense that Pākehā are quite diverse as well. So not only do Pākehā find it difficult to talk about themselves in cultural terms, as to who they are and how they are located and what and how they fit, but there is also then a sense [that] there are widely different experiences of being Pākehā in New Zealand.

**Learning how to dance with other**

**Esther:** How then as Pākehā educators do we teach and lead others?

**Stephen:** I think there is a difference between those who are maybe sympathetic towards things Māori, but given the kind of residential class, status, wealth, segregation that occurs throughout New Zealand society ... it does everywhere ... there’s still even people who might regard themselves as broadly sympathetic or supportive of Māori, they don’t necessarily have extensive relationships with Māori.
I think there are two dangers ... one is around lack of criticality ... that inability to look critically at [our stories], but then the other trap is being completely relativistic you know anything goes ... that’s the kind of hold up ... so I think the challenge of being Pākehā and working with Māori is being aware of valuing who we are and acknowledging a critical awareness.

**Esther:** So I’m only just coming to this realisation of how important it is that we offer our students that opportunity, or all students that opportunity, to have a relationship ... a real sort of experience with Māori ... not a superficial one. I used to laugh when I heard that people would come to do a course at teachers college and would have to go and stay on a Marae for a weekend. Just like going and visiting a museum or something! But now that I’ve talked to people like yourself, Rose and Avril, my two other participants in this study, those were really significant moments for you.

**Stephen:** Yeah. And still are potentially for students. Teaching is becoming more [cognisant of things Māori], but you know there are still a preponderance of white middle class women in [primary] education. I think that’s one of the real challenges for Pākehā in New Zealand society ... and it’s kind of been entrenched in the really significant increases in inequality in New Zealand, and the whole decile preoccupation. We’ve forgotten at an interpersonal level, about what it means [to be in relationship with Māori] and so I think that’s actually got harder.

**Esther:** I think that too.

**Stephen:** But also when we were there, teaching, it was a significant moment, emerging out of the Springbok Tour and that charged political background. It was also highly salient where a lot of the educators at that time had the historical knowledge. Many educators now haven’t really gone through the process of all those years of experience, where they’ve possibly gone to a decile ten school and they’ve
got no personal interaction [with Māori]. All they see is something like the scandal the media portray, and they go “Oh Māori!” So yep, I think we still have some significant challenges. If you focus on things like what’s happened with the scandals, some of that’s around the politics of the tension of owning the language for Māori and opening it up for everyone to speak. It’s a really clear indicator of the fact that we identify with Māori culture as New Zealanders, but not many Pākehā meaningfully interact with it. A better example is how everyone relates to the haka, so that’s a safe kind of attachment ... or when you’re overseas you are more aware or more comfortable about what makes New Zealand distinct ... but that’s at a symbolic level. The real challenge for Pākehā is how we make that mental buy in to Te Reo. It’s [easier] for us because it’s a generational thing, but also because we work in a context that allows for that sort of relationship/interaction.

Esther: But isn’t it more than writing our story of becoming and our practice as Pākehā educators?

Through sharing and telling our stories of becoming Pākehā, what are we hoping to do and provide for our readers? And so I went back to an earlier comment Stephen had made and contemplated. I turned it into a found poem and responded.
You say

It’s not just this [a writing of our experience].

It’s about how we can:

   Acknowledge,

   Engage with,

   Take responsibility,

For those histories;

   Their inequalities,

   Discriminations,

   Consequences.

And our

   Ethical positional response

   As Pākehā (privileged by those histories).

How might we

   Address,

   Remediate them.

I reply

For sure … BUT

   We need to know our histories

   To bring justice.

Not to judge the ‘ghost’ (see Derrida, 1994),

   To make sense of how it haunts us today.

Interrogation begins with me

   Not telling how but

Living the how

   Not as the perfect exemplar but

   As imperfect and becoming
This poem is not finished. As Leonardo said:

Whites traverse the social landscape, threatened of being exposed as bogus racial agents as they round every corner. They know few alternative forms of whiteness outside of the colonial framework, where they are interpellated as the colonizer. As a result, the unbearable whiteness of their being overcomes their search for alternative subjectivities and they become paralyzed to act. (Leonardo, 2009b, p. 97)

In writing the found poem I then began to consider how I respond, in action, to Stephen’s questions. I am of the domino persuasion. As a child I experienced the mass conversion strategies of white men, in white suits, wearing white shoes, dancing their promises across the stage. But I prefer trusting relationship strategies, and these take time. In a trusting relationship one must learn to be humble, to work within an ‘ethics of care’ (Noddings, 1984), and to be prepared to be transparent and willing to be challenged. Such relationships require energy and a giving of self. It is through entangled honest relationships with others that I might bring about justice and address and remediate issues of inequality and discrimination. Through demonstrating first a willingness to engage with my own histories and my privilege, and take responsibility for it, I can then ask others to do the same. It is then that I can create and provide opportunities for my students to begin to engage with their histories and come to some understandings of the ‘ghosts’ that haunt their becoming. It is then that I can engage with an academic audience by writing my stories where the reader can juxtapose their stories alongside. By engaging on a deep and meaningful level I hope to encourage, support and challenge others in their becoming; the domino effect. But is there more?

Leonardo (2015) said we need to become ‘race traitors’. I was unsure of this term at first. It did not sit comfortably with me and so I interrogated it further by exploring the work of several critical race scholars (Connerton, 2008; den Heyer & Conrad, 2011; Garrett & Segall, 2013; Howard, 2006; Leonardo, 2009a, 2015; Sleeter, 2013).
Race Traitor
Such an ugly word.
Which one – race or traitor?
Both.
So does adding traitor to race cancel out race?
Now there is a thought.
Is that what Leonardo was after?

TRAITOR
Such powerful implications,
  Connotations.
Assumption that you once belonged to a particular group.
What happens to traitors?
They are shot,
  Excommunicated,
    Shunned,
      Disinherited,
        Removed from the family Bible,
          Erased from the story.
But what if you don’t believe in RACE?
  In a category that someone created to dominate and control others.
    The homogenising of different groups of people – an airbrushing of diversity.
Are we not haunted by the history of racial categories?
  Now that I believe in.
So perhaps a RACE TRAITOR is one who:
Interrogates white racial knowledge
Disrupts the inheritance of ignorance
Disturbs the forgetting and re-members
Unveils the racial contract
Counterwrites our histories
Engages in embodied practices to seek and understand
Develops positive connections with our historical past
Pursues cross-cultural connections
Rejects white superiority
Makes visible power and ideology
And I wonder if that is what we are doing here when we interrogate and tell our stories. Why did my Poppa shut the door when he spoke Te Reo with his friends? What motivated my uncle to desecrate the tapu land? Who I am is a result of an ongoing entanglement with different worlds. As you say, Stephen, you ‘left’ Christchurch. And I, too, left Ōpōtiki – but Ōpōtiki never left me. My childhood and my faith are an integral part of my becoming.

**Learning to Lead**

Stephen tells me the story of Alison and Te Kawehau’s postgraduate class using ‘sticky questions’ as a pedagogical practice. He tells me of one student they encountered who liked to take centre stage. So I arranged to talk with Te Kawehau about her perspective on this encounter. The following narrative draws on Te Kawehau’s and Stephen’s stories and also uses the strategy of factionalisation to fill in the gaps.

**Sticky Questions**

We can’t teach what we don’t know, and we can’t lead where we won’t go. Malcolm X (as cited in Howard, 2006, p. 6)

Alison carefully placed the box on the table at the front of the classroom. It had a big orange label, ‘Sticky Questions’ on the front. After introducing themselves and outlining the session and purpose of ‘Sticky Questions’, Te Kawehau, smiling, pointed to the box and told the class ‘Put your sticky questions in the box, Alison and I will discuss them with you’. The ‘sticky question’ session was an innovative teaching strategy that Alison and Te Kawehau had designed to enable their pre-teacher students to ask some of those tricky questions about biculturalism, multiculturalism and the Treaty of Waitangi. Those questions students might feel nervous about asking in front of others.

In their role as co-teachers they represented a bicultural duo, Alison as Pākehā and Te Kawehau as Māori. They are good friends; collaborate together in writing and research projects and are both experts in the content being taught.

Alison and Te Kawehau facilitated a collaborative discussion with the class, reading the questions aloud, and then drawing on historical data and theory to consider the different perspectives. They spoke from the heart and from personal experience, moving between insider status and lecturer position on the issues they
encountered. Everything was going well in this particular session and the students were engaged and keenly interested in the topic. There were lively interactions with several of the students and engagement was palpable. Suddenly from the back of the room an older Pākehā man, who had been quite attentive throughout, said loudly, “I just don’t understand why Māori are so uppity?”

Talking to Te Kawehau, several months later about this session, I mentioned that a friend had called this student a “racist red neck”. Te Kawehau did not disagree but, rather, went on to explain the importance of providing a safe place for students to confront those difficult questions. This reminded me of Britzman’s concept of ‘difficult knowledge’. Through recent recognition of pedagogy as always an emotional event, thus as a fragile construction, Britzman directs our attention to the continued influence of history, uncertainty and controversy.

The fragility is that larger historical and cultural forces that have not been metabolized and have not been worked through affect the imaginary of the teacher and student …I think the main point comes in the form of a phantasy: for everyone the boundaries of self are porous and the transference of emotional states is what makes the difficult knowledge difficult to know. The safe bet is that teachers … are always transmitting what is difficult to know, namely unconscious emotional situations that already direct the actors. (Britzman, 2013, p. 115)

Sometimes when Pākehā are face to face with privilege for the first time they don’t know how to respond and may become defensive. Although sometimes, as in the case of the story above, these students are claiming ‘air time’ to vent their grievances, Te Kawehau believed that educators needed to begin their conversations from where the student is positioned at the time. The sticky question session provided the two lecturers with an opportunity to ascertain where some of their students were positioned, although they might find some of these positions difficult to work with. It gave them an opportunity to respond to these different positions thoughtfully rather than judging them. Te Kawehau later added that the session gave students permission to say the unsayable, to express deep feelings of fear, anxiety, what counts as fairness, inclusion, difference and so on. This was a rare opportunity to say these things out loud and to get a considered theoretical, but also affective, response.

Other pedagogical approaches that are being utilised in classrooms draw on the qualitative research methodologies; critical family history and critical
autoethnography. These approaches provide researchers, practitioners and students with a framework to explore their personal histories through interrogating the stories generated with wider political, social and historical factors. These ‘critical’ approaches also require the researcher to consider ‘other’ people groups living in the same vicinity at the time being explored, and to draw on relevant theory. An example of this approach in the Faculty of Education, Auckland, is a Postgraduate course facilitated by Stephen May and Melinda Webber (another bicultural duo). One of the assessment activities designed for this course requires students to write an essay critically interrogating their ethnic and cultural identity. The following quote from a student demonstrates how the course content and delivery, coupled with the students’ own research, provided an opportunity for students to make sense of their identities.

Writing my cultural autobiography has, at times, made me uncomfortable but it has forced me to self-reflect on many of the past events (Chang, 1999). The discomfort is not only around sharing my past, which is a new experience for me. The discomfort is around analysing [sic] how the experiences have shaped who I am and beginning to interpret these realizations. The discomfort is around how I need to continue interpreting who I am and why I am this way.

Through these duoethnographic conversations, Stephen and I have utilised the same strategies employed in critical family history and critical autoethnography. As practitioners and researchers we are continually looking to enhance our practice. And as Pākehā educators, in particular, we are mindful of our position and look for ways we can participate in disrupting those ‘standard stories’ that perpetuate the telling of history through a dominant colonial lens. However, it is not only our practice in the classroom where we can make a difference. The following narrative, “The Hongi”, demonstrates how my interrogation of stories generated through these conversations has brought more focus to how I perform becoming Pākehā in my everyday life, such as in a welcoming ceremony on our campus at the beginning of the year.

The Hongi

I see them gathered together, nervously, at the entrance to the Marae. It is the beginning of a new year and for these pre-service teachers it is their first day at the Faculty of Education. I am sitting waiting with my colleagues outside the wharenui. We are checking on who is going to speak, which Waiata we will sing, and generally
catching up after a long hot summer. I now understand how important this moment is for many of the students gathered. As a child the Pōwhiri, a ceremony of greeting and welcome, was a regular and normal part of my early experiences. I now know that as a Pākehā I was privileged to have these as part of my life.

For both of my Pākehā participants throughout this study, like Stephen in the Duoethnographic Project, their first Marae experience as tertiary students, was a significant part of their becoming Pākehā. And so this year I approached the event differently, recognising that I, too, was a player in this cultural performance.

After the students had been called onto the Marae, after the speeches and Waiata, they all gathered again to walk past us one by one and receive an individual greeting. There were almost 200 of them in the line. Often there is much confusion at this stage. Do we shake hands? Or do we kiss on both cheeks – or one? Or is it a high-five? Or perhaps hongi? The hongi is a traditional Māori greeting where you press your nose and forehead to another, and then you breathe; it is a sharing of the breath of life. Through this exchange the visitor is welcomed onto the campus and becomes part of community. This year (2016) as each student approached me I simply touched my nose and beckoned them to hongi. There were many nods of gratitude and only a few hesitant students. And for the first time in 15 years there were many exclamations of delight and thank yous; “Oh that was my first hongi”. For these students I would quickly add, “It is a sharing of our breath of life – welcome”.

It is important to me that I provide an opportunity for pre-service teacher students to encounter and engage with this cultural experience. That whoever they are, whatever their earlier experiences have been, that their experience of becoming an educator in New Zealand will embrace our entangled relationship with Māori. For many students the Pōwhiri and hongi is something quite removed from their cultural experiences to date. The Pōwhiri is much like an invite: come and let us be friends, let us get to know each other, let us walk together – you and I, Pākehā and Māori, Māori and Other. It is through critically exploring our own histories that Pākehā, too, can become partners in the dance of diversity.
SECTION 4
SELAH

KATHY IN HER RED DRESS

Sitting, perched on my computer keyboard, is a photo of my mother in her red velvet dress. She is smiling. I remember her telling me the story of her mother’s funeral, in a small white church in the Coromandel. How she found it all so hard, so uncomfortable. I remember how she said it wasn’t until the Tangi, the memorial service for her mother on the Marae that she finally was able to grieve, to mourn and to celebrate the life of such a wonderful woman. How the people there took her and held her in their arms. For my mother this was where she felt at home. With her green eyes, her blonde hair, her Jewish nose that she always joked about. This was where she felt comfortable. I can see her on the Marae, pressing her nose up gently to the kuia’s face, pausing, and breathing. Tears streaming down the face.

“Tell them the story Esther” she said as she handed me the brown tattered box, ‘Make a way’. Figure 22 is my painting of her in her red dress.
Figure 22: Kathy in her Red Dress
CHAPTER 14

CONCLUSION: REACHING ANOTHER EDGE

To begin again, to write the last word, I first glance back.


Learning to Live
As a white educator in New Zealand I am haunted by my past and in turn haunt others. This is one response to Derrida’s directive “Speak to the Ghost”.

Learning to live
A tattered script,
Unconsciously binding,
Haunts my becoming,
‘Locking up’
And ‘unlocking’.
Unconsciously I write on children’s minds,
Haunting their learning.

A Theory
I puzzle, ponder, mull.
Thrash against ignorance.
Derrida shouts, ‘Speak to the ghost!’
‘To learn to live … one must speak to the ghost’.
A traveller without a map,
I enter into the other world.
The ‘Touchstone stories’ of my childhood,
The ‘Ancestors of my mind’.
My ‘Embodied self’ learning through,

Being-in-the world,

Remembering being-in-the world,

Being-in-the world with others.
A Method
I search, seek, summon the ghosts,
Down dusty hallowed halls.
   My finger follows the folds,
   A letter, a will, a poem?
   Crafted and kept,
   Smudged by living hands.
   I create a way,
   A language of the Arts.
   As bricoleur I use the tools at hand.
   I select and graft the pieces,
   I knit them together with paint and wire.
   Sew words into a poem.
   I perform the poem
   In the presence of others.
   I dig down deep,
   Secret forgotten places, in muscle and flesh.
I draw out memories,
Fragmented and frayed.

Living to Learn
And for a while we,
Being in the world of story,
Embody the living tapestry,
Transform Art into an ‘utterance’.
Disrupting the bindings, opening children’s minds.
Unlocking, enabling others,
To learn to live.
Finale
The cicadas fill up the air with their persistent chirruping. I am sitting on my deck at home in Titirangi, looking out toward the Waitakere hills and thinking about this serendipitous journey I have been on, thinking about the what next as I bring this phase to a close. Overhead a Tui warbles and a small breeze sends a flurry of white Manuka blossoms over my deck. My mother has arrived.

Kathy: She brushes the blossoms off her red velvet dress. You know we used to call it the Tea Tree and the Tui used to be called a Parson bird.

Esther: Laughing. Yes I remember. These Māori words have become part of our vocabulary now – I sometimes struggle to remember what you called them when I was a child. I suppose this is part of my becoming Pākehā. My identity is a constant dynamic process of change that sometimes I am unaware of.

Kathy: So have you worked out what a Pākehā is? Have you finished this work?

Esther: No Mum. There is no finishing this type of work. Instead I am pausing here to gather the threads of what I have learnt on the journey so far. There is no finishing of Pākehā either, it will continue to become through entanglement and intra-action. And each becoming will be unique.

Kathy: Slightly anxious. OK. So how are you going to end this part of your journey?

Esther: By addressing some of the key questions I started out with, and that I have mulled over for the past few years. And because the journey was cyclic and serendipitous, the questions threaded themselves through the work and are highlighted at different moments.

Kathy: Forever the evangelist. Was it worth all the time and energy? Did you save the world?

Esther: I smile. No Mum, but I have learnt to call myself a bricoleur, a Serendipiter researcher and a Pākehā with whakapapa. I have created ways to speak with the ghosts. Ways to live with the past, to live today and tomorrow – entangled and becoming. And through this work, and in my practice, I encourage others to do the same. To learn to live in this complicated world.

Kathy: Well, just as long as you have tried your best. That’s what your Grandpa Vic always said. She sits back in her seat and begins to massage her hands, and I can smell the scent of lemon.
I smile and nod. I don’t tell her that I have learnt it’s about always reaching beyond your best, to the impossible, past the limits others have put on you and finding a new edge. I think back to Derrida and to all the ghostly encounters on this journey. A journey at the ‘edge of life’, that it is not through just living, but through interaction with our ghosts that we might learn to live (Derrida, 1994). I think back to the art of letting the ghost come back.

Night has fallen and I hear the Ruru call. A large moon hangs above the hills above Titirangi. We are close to heaven here. Around me the fire from the bamboo lamps flutter. More ghosts arrive. *My Jewish mothers come and join me on the deck.*

**Molly:** Ah so she did it then Kathy. She found Kate.

**Ada:** *Thoughtfully.* After all this time I know the name of my mother. I wonder what it was like growing up in Auckland in that fine house in Mt Eden? I wonder what it was like growing up Jewish?

**Kathy:** *Excited.* Well we always suspected didn't we! I suppose Kate’s experience of becoming Pākehā was different to mine. I mean she was there at the beginning.

**Molly:** *With her serious face on.* Yes I suspect all our experiences of becoming Pākehā will be different, we all lived through different times – and the stories of Kate show her desperately trying to fit in to Auckland society. A society dominated by the British. I wonder what she would have thought of me riding the donkey up into the Ureweras to nurse Te Kooti's youngest wife. Did you write about that Esther?

**Esther:** *Contemplatively.* Next time maybe.

**Ada:** Next time?

**Kathy:** *Earnestly.* This is a good story Esther. But there is still a lot missing. I can’t wait for next time!

**The Art of Letting the Ghost come back: Concluding Thoughts**

In crafting this work to its conclusion I am aware I am also in the process of threading together strands of stories into a knot. This thesis will remain as a material artifact, a reminder of this moment in my life journey. On these pages I have inscribed my experience as a Wayfarer, a Serendipiter, and as a bricoleur researcher. I began with the creation of a Wire Pākehā, twisted together to represent the lacuna at the heart of the Pākehā identity story. The Wire Pākehā is no longer
empty. My whakapapa stretches back through time along helices of DNA, through turbulent histories, romantic myths and legends, finding traces of beginnings on diverse distant shores. And as serendipity would have it, I have met other researchers along the way who share similar stories and passions. Through those entangled moments of meeting and those photon pulses of encounter, I have grown as a bricoleur researcher.

I am forever changed. Speaking with ghosts is now a regular part of my life. I notice hauntings. I am comfortable speaking about my whakapapa and comfortable with my ghosts. Following Derrida’s (2006) directive I now have knowledge of the ghosts and the place they occupy. Race is a ghost that still lingers between the words that are said. I notice traces of racial discourse in everyday encounters and I am learning to counter these with stories that provide an alternative view of our world. I am learning to unsettle the assumed stability and integrity of the dominant group through speaking with the ghosts (Coddington, 2011). It is an entangled, dynamic world. My own identity is a complex ‘mish-mash’ of different stories, of different encounters, and of diverse, embodied experiences.

My body is marked by history. It is marked by my experiences of being haunted by a colonial past. It is marked through entanglement with Other. How others respond to me will be influenced by their own haunted past. I am now more aware of how our ontology is haunted (Derrida, 1994) and how our reading of others is haunted. The landscapes of our childhood, our touchstone stories, have mapped into our lives a schema of identification. The language of classification that is still used in our schools, government agencies and media, and in our interactions with others, can be traced back to the Enlightenment. My work in this thesis speaks with the ghosts to disrupt and disturb the power that the Enlightenment’s construction of imagined racial hierarchies holds over our becoming – such as who can become Pākehā. As espoused by King (1999), if Pākehā are those who belong to New Zealand through accident of birth, or ‘growing up’ here (A. Bell, 2005), who are committed to New Zealand, who have no other home, then I believe we need to embrace the possibility of Pākehā identity encompassing more than those with ‘white skin’.

As a material reminder, this work aims to complement other research on critical whiteness studies and contribute to our understanding of some of the complex issues in postcolonial societies. It speaks about the ghost of Enlightenment that
haunts white identity constructions (Dyer, 2003; Frankenburg, 1993a; Leonardo, 2009). It provides a strategy for approaching complex issues and disrupting the ‘paralysis’ (Tolich, 2002) that often inhibits positive exploration and conversations regarding white identity. It considers critically Zeus Leonardo’s (2015) concept of ‘race-traitor’ and begins to speculate how this might apply to Pākehā educators as a productive practice. Through the telling of ‘thick’ stories (waskul & vannini, 2006) I have created a space to encourage critical multicultural conversations (Denzin et al., 2008). Following are some of the key questions that have been central to this work.

**How does critical autoethnographic work disrupt dominant stories?**

Learning how to speak with ghosts, in Chapter 6, I first focus on my own touchstone stories (Maddison-MacFayden, 2013). This work highlighted how our identities are in a process of becoming through interaction with others in our environment. How our sense of becoming and belonging is a process of self-ascription and ascription by others, often according to ‘crude classification’ systems (Flynn, 2010). These stories demonstrated how our becoming is constrained through how we are categorised by others based on phenotypic characteristics, as illustrated in “A Pākehā Haunting 2”.

My body,
The body corporeal
The physical self that clothes me every day.
I am imprisoned inside this mapping,
A historical ‘mish mash’ of DNA …
The memory of my ancestors remain:
Blonde, blue eyed, white skin, Pākehā.

Although ‘white bodies’ existed well before race they were interpellated into its discursive structure approximately five centuries ago, the power of the (f)pigment of the imagination haunted through ‘Enlightenment’ remains (Leonardo, 2009b).

Through exploring these stories of my childhood, the interactions over time with others and our environments, my becoming Pākehā is uniquely mine.
Expectations for who I would become or could become were more than the colour of my skin, they were a combination of being female, living in a strictly religious community, being the eldest daughter, and so on. As educators it is important to recognise that each of our students has their own unique story of becoming. We must challenge a practice of ‘knowing’ others based on stereotypical and historical assumptions of distinct stable identities. And further, notice how the ghost of our colonial past still haunts active elements of the present (Coddington, 2011), for example, through the continual practice of individuals being categorised using ‘stable’ ethnic and racial definitions in surveys, Census forms and other official and public documentation.

Interrogating the personal stories of my ancestors through a critical lens demanded I consider the wider political, historical and social stories to make sense of my becoming. Chapters 8 and 9 provided a critical family history of one branch of my family where I created a layered chronological story to demonstrate how privilege worked. My family benefited from government policies at the time where they were provided with assisted passage to immigrate to New Zealand, supported to purchase the confiscated land of the Indigenous people, and further encouraged into positions of power in the building of new communities. Revealing the layered account of settler stories alongside Indigenous stories demonstrates how, for many of our ancestors, their success was often at the detriment of other groups of people (Sleeter, 2015). Interrogation of factors that pushed and pulled our colonial ancestors, and how they were privileged or punished (Lee, 2013) on arrival, uncovers the ‘human’ story of our complex past. Further, these stories reveal how the power of Enlightenment thinking increasingly privileged colonial populations at the expense of Indigenous peoples. Examining our personal histories reveals how we have been ‘shaped’ by racial discourse (Frankenberg, 1993a). They are stories that enable a deeper understanding of white identity development and provide a bridge between multicultural and anti-racist approaches to these issues (Norquay, 1998).

The autoethnographic project also showed the significant role Māori had in my history. For my family, several generations ‘grew up’ alongside Māori, meaning that my becoming is intrinsically entangled with Māori. Drawing on Traue’s (1990) work, the ancestors of my mind include ancient European tales and the myths and legends of Māori. My whakapapa therefore includes stories from the Marae, Māori myths and legends. These stories haunt my ontology.
How does the duoethnographic work further disrupt?

Through the collaborative conversations with my duoethnographic partners in Section Three, I came to understand my own history of becoming Pākehā as being uniquely mine. There is not one standard ‘way’ of becoming Pākehā. These conversations challenged assumptions I had about becoming and belonging. They also highlighted for me the importance of engagement and entanglement with other.

In the first duoethnography, and the selah that follows it, the historic practice of assimilation was revealed as two of my settler families increasingly became absorbed into the dominant population. I first show this through the work with Avril Bell with a juxtaposition between her British settler family and my Jewish trader family in early Auckland. And then I tell fragments of the serendipitous tale of the entangled relationship between one of my supervisors Katie and myself, highlighting how the story of our German family had in many ways been erased and forgotten.

I read in your history/my story
A German story of immigration
Filled with hope
Turning swamp land into a garden
I see the tide turn
Destruction of a chapel
Changing of names
Imprisoned for being different.

For my Jewish and German ancestors, assimilating into the dominant English culture became important for their survival and progress in New Zealand. First, they had to learn to speak English and get rid of their accents. My German ancestors had to change their names: Poninghaus became Poninghouse, Ahrens became Arnst and Diedrick became Richard. My Jewish ancestors had already changed their names when shifting to England from Amsterdam: Kaysha became Keesing and Hartog became Henry. What I also found interesting in these stories was the similarity with my ancestors’ experiences of settlement to that of many recent
immigrants to New Zealand, who speak another language and practise a different religion. Both my German family and Jewish families tended to stick to their own communities and build their own places of worship, and they were ridiculed by many of the dominant population.

As highlighted in the selah, after Chapter 12, my German families were forced to assimilate during the two world wars due to fear and suspicion; many of them were impacted economically and socially. Both the German and Jewish families married out of their communities into other ethnic-cultural groups several generations later. Hence, as a descendant of these ‘mixed’ marriages, I am a cultural hybrid. How then am I different from those whose ancestors also represent a culturally and ethnically hybrid mix, such as Kelly in Chapter 3 with her Chinese, Irish, Scottish and English settler ancestors? Perhaps only through the phenotypical features people can see. Due to the haunting of ‘whiteness’ and practices of assimilation in New Zealand society I am mostly categorised, by others, through phenotypic characteristics such as the colour of my skin and classified as Pākehā. I therefore ‘pass’ as part of the privileged population of New Zealand.

Pākehā do not have one story of becoming. It is important to recognise how the term ‘Pākehā’, as a uniquely New Zealand identity, is fraught with complexity and fragmented by diversity, and how it is haunted by its historic political relationships with ideologies such as the Enlightenment. This relationship hinders our willingness/ability to shake off historic definitions of Pākehā that are stained by the whitewashing of diverse cultures through assimilation policies and practices. The ‘silent’ criterion of ‘pale skin’ attributed to an authentic Pākehā-ness has subjected our becoming to the conditions of racial discourse. Through speaking with the ghosts we can reveal these imagined boundaries and begin to disrupt those historic criteria.

As New Zealand increasingly becomes multi-ethnic and multicultural, how do we identify ourselves as New Zealanders according to the Treaty of Waitangi? Who might the partners in the Treaty be with Indigenous Māori today? If we were able to rid ourselves from historic racial and ethnic categories, could Pākehā be those people who belong in New Zealand and who are not Māori? And like many descendants of immigrants, in postcolonial nations, their whakapapa includes entangled and complex identity stories.

It is important to understand how complexity and diversity exist in the larger Pākehā story. Through interrogating my particular story of becoming Pākehā,
complexity and diversity are realised. The ‘mask’ of whiteness is peeled back to reveal the multi-ethnic and multicultural threads that have been woven together in this one place to create my story of becoming Pākehā. My ancestors are revealed not as heroes or villains, but as human – people flawed and haunted by their own histories.

As a ‘non-stupid’ optimist (Hotere-Barnes, 2015), I value the richness, paradox and ongoing challenge of my in-between dynamic identity. There is no fixed or stable definition of Pākehā. For me it is unique to New Zealand, where people come, and become, engaged and entangled with Māori. My whakapapa includes threads from different pasts that have knotted themselves into the fabric of this place. Through following the threads back, I notice the power dynamics at play and reveal the hauntings.

Pākehā identity is a dynamic process of becoming along a continuum of entanglement with our diverse histories, touchstone stories, and relationship with Māori. Each Pākehā’s experience of becoming is therefore unique depending on their position on this imagined continuum of entanglement, at any one time. It is a future always entangled with our past, mutually layered and enmeshed in a mutual becoming. Through exploration those silent stories become visible and the knots on the landscape of our becoming, those intra-actions between matter and meaning, between human and non-human, are threaded into place. A place where “every entwining is a knot, and the more that life-lines are entwined, the greater the density of the knot” (Ingold, 2009, p. 37).

Through the autoethnographic and duoethnographic projects, what did I learn through creating and employing a range of arts-based methods to explore my experience of being and becoming Pākehā haunted by a colonial past?

Through employing Derrida’s methodology of hauntology I sought for ways to speak with the ghosts of my past. This required me to speak with my ghosts at the personal level, as well as those wider historical, political ghosts that haunt us. To understand my micro hauntings I needed to interrogate the macro hauntings. Hence, I explored and adopted the role of a bricoleur researcher to enable me to immerse myself in the journey and investigate and design different ways to ‘speak with the ghost’.
What did I learn as a bricoleur researcher? I learnt the art of serendipity. As a researcher I have learnt how to notice. And in that noticing not to make assumptions but, rather, to ask important questions and to make connections between seemingly random thoughts and observations. The tale of the ‘Three Princes of Serendip’, illustrated in Chapter 2, provided a useful metaphor to make sense of the role of a bricoleur researcher. As the researcher I entered into the journey equipped with a range of skills, and a willingness to learn new skills in response to the data generated. I was also open to chance discoveries. As a Serendipiter the journey became an intrinsic part of my daily life where, always humming in the background, important questions and issues pertaining to the role of a Pākehā educator had already been articulated. Throughout the journey acts of noticing and noting were essential. And cognizant with Holloway and Kneale (2008), when summoning up the ghost I needed to be alert and to notice and become immersed in ‘sites’ where I might be enchanted, surprised, charmed and disturbed.

Concurrently I was involved in a process of analysis, where I made connections between the personal and wider historical and theoretical stories, making some sense of the questions and issues through my note-taking and art-making. Early in 2015 I wrote in one notebook: “poetry now just seems to leak into all my work – my writing, my analysis, my emails, my talk”. And the process was cyclic. As the bricoleur I would shift between the data generating, analysis, art-making and storying. In 2016, on the pursuit of serendipity, Kennedy (2016) asked, “How can we get lost?” Arts-based research methods required me to embody myself in the practice of art-making, being in a mess and feeling lost were part of this process. It was through the acts of ‘playing’ and immersing my whole self in the moment/s (and with a note to Eisner) with all of my senses that chance encounters and surprising revelations occurred.

Barad’s (2010) concepts of quantum entanglement and intra-action with the ‘human’ and ‘non-human’ are useful theories to better understand how working in arts-based methods potentially provides a space to interrogate our relationship with the past. Identity artefacts are an important ‘material’ witness to the past. Through engaging with historical artefacts through arts-based methods I implored the ghost to speak. Embodied methods such as painting, sculpture and the making of an arpillera engaged me in deep inquiry and opened spaces to new discoveries. Further analysis was applied through the use of ekphrasis where I was able to tap into embodied
knowledge and through the art-works critically analyse my own stories through reflective interpretation. Through employing creative writing, such as poetry, scriptwriting and factionalisation, I sought to bring the conversation onto the page.

Using creative methods for presenting the findings was utilised to provoke audience and readers alike to analyse their own histories and develop emphatic capabilities. Further, bringing the conversation onto the page, through creative strategies provided a vehicle for the ghost to speak ‘as if real’. In conversation with Bruce Taplin, regarding the story of his Whakatōhea whakapapa, he commented on the ‘liveliness’ of the work I had created and its potential to tell those stories of our ancestors that were often inaccessible.

My aim is to continue to explore how creative methods might further be developed to enable complex theoretical conversations accessible to a wider audience, such as our pre-service teacher students. Hence, I will continue to be interested in the work of those contributing to the production of innovative works, such as Leavy’s ‘social fiction series’ (http://www.patricialeavy.com/the-social-fictions-series/).

How might we then as Pākehā educators enhance our practice and engage students in the process of positive identity development?

As highlighted in Chapter 14, “We can’t teach what we don’t know, and we can’t lead where we won’t go”. Recognising the fluid, dynamic and ongoing process of identity construction, it is important that educators first understand their role as dance partners in this process. For too long many of us from the dominant group have followed a dance pattern without questioning its origin. Through our obedience to the master choreographer we have played a part in maintaining an assumption that Pākehā are the ‘norm’ by which all ‘others’ should be measured. We need to first interrogate who the master choreographer is, and learn, as Gary Howard (2006) argued, our own complex dance. For many of us, like myself, our ancestors incorporate diverse multi-ethnic and multicultural histories. There is not one dance. Also, our entanglement with indigenous Māori over several generations, further complicates our dance.

As an educator I need to find ways and provide space for students to explore their own histories and becoming identities. Importantly I need to equip students with the necessary skills to critically explore these stories and confront ‘difficult
knowledge’ (Britzman, 2013). Exploration of family histories and personal stories should be understood within the context of race and class (Sleeter, 2011) and explore the complex interconnections, gaps and dissonances that occur between our own and other ethnic and cultural identities (May, 1999). And historic events should be situated within a context of power relationships (Sleeter, 2011). As Te Kawehau said in Chapter 14, what is needed is a pedagogical practice that gives students “permission to say the unsayable, to express deep feelings of fear, anxiety, what counts as fairness, inclusion, difference and so on”. Creating these educative spaces require of the teacher a willingness to listen and respond without judgement, and to scaffold the students through a sound knowledge of the issues into their own exploration.

Pākehā are one aftermath of colonialism. When living in postcolonial societies we need to learn to work the hyphen (Fine, 1994). Working the hyphen as postcolonial requires we enter into relationships with Other and engage in the social struggles of our time (Jones, 2012). This requires constant negotiation with our past and confronting difficult knowledge. Critical, arts-based methods are useful strategies for individuals and groups to employ in exploration of ‘difficult knowledge’ and complex issues. I suggest that the art-based methods designed and employed in this study provide a range of strategies that educators might adapt and implement into their practice. The affective response to data generated can be validated and recognised as significant in the process of becoming.

As researchers we engage in a practice of exploring and telling those stories of our embodied experiences, those ‘close to the skin’ where our sensory experiences are valued (Eisner, 2002; Spry, 2011a). Identifying cultural artefacts (2002) and critically exploring those personal stories with links to wider historical and social factors (critical family history) enables individuals to identify and speak with their ghosts. These methods bring voice to those often silenced stories and help us to understand and disrupt stereotypical assumptions and responses.

Significant also, is the importance of creating opportunities for students to engage in productive ways with others, for example in New Zealand it is particularly important for non-Māori to engage with Māori. This engagement involves establishing relationships of mutual respect where the dominant identity positions themselves as the learner. Important in these interactions is an openness to knowledge and an acceptance of difference, where the dominant group develops ‘ears to hear’ the other
as well as humility (A. Bell, 2014; Jones, 1999; Yukich & Hoskins, 2011).

I have been uniquely privileged as Pākehā through my childhood and adult life to have many Māori colleagues and friends who have mentored me. These relationships deserve to be fostered. As exemplified in the work of Alison Jones and Te Kawehau Hoskins, Stephen May and Melinda Webber, bicultural teaching teams in our academies are one possible scenario. However, first it begins with an individual willing to engage and participate in a performance of bicultural practice through their daily life. This was an important finding through this study and, as highlighted through the story of the ‘Hongi’ in Chapter 14, my understanding of who I am as Pākehā is significant to how I interact with others.

**So how does speaking with the ghost bring justice?**

Interrogating my past and linking my personal story to the wider political, social and historical factors, speaks to my today and my tomorrows. We give voice to those silenced histories and remember those forgotten stories. Speaking with the ghost as a continuous practice of remembering – those stories that have been erased and whitewashed – we explore the ‘practices of inscription’ (archival memory) and ‘incorporating practice’ (embodied memory) to restore cultural memory (Connerton, 1987, 2008). We disrupt Pākehā paralysis and instead become participants in conversations on complex issues that pertain to postcolonial societies. We engage with counter-stories in an act of decolonisation (Maddison-MacFaydan, 2013).

Through these conversations we learn to live today through understanding the ‘humanness’ of those people in our past: the faulty, fragile, betwixt and between, haunted settler. We learn about the importance of relationship and of learning from Other. We learn how we might approach and respond to difference today in our increasingly multi-ethnic and multicultural society. We learn to challenge our assumptions and interrogate the ghosts that haunt our meaning-making. We learn how to participate in the dance of diversity (Howard, 2006).
Stop

To be on the edge, is to be on the edge,
Vulnerable, lost, stretched.
And so we create a new way.
I have reached another edge,
A signpost on my journey,
STOP HERE.
But I still have so much to learn!
STOP HERE.
But there are still other stories I need to share!
STOP HERE.
But there is still that book I have not read!
STOP HERE.
STOP HERE.
I stomp my feet a little in frustration.
I look up beyond the edge
And see another signpost,
START HERE.

So I gather my paintbrushes, pens, notebooks, wire and needle and thread. I lay down my account of this phase of the journey, the artifact of a serendipitous tale, and move onwards – me and my ghosts.
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