



Libraries and Learning Services

# University of Auckland Research Repository, ResearchSpace

## Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognize the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

## General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

**Becoming just, doing justice:**  
**The ethics and politics of Māori–Pākehā relations**

**Frances Patricia Hancock**

**This thesis is submitted in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy in Education, The University of Auckland, 2018**



## Abstract

Philosophers, educators and activists argue that, for those of us seeking relational justice, ambiguities, contradictions and tensions are our work. But these problematics also create the conditions for justice to arise. My research explores bicultural approaches to relational justice in Māori–Pākehā relations. This relationship is profoundly significant for Aotearoa–New Zealand; it embodies a shared but troubled history and workings of power that influence how each are now positioned in society. So, what does it mean for Māori and Pākehā scholars, educators, activists and leaders to become just and do justice in their relationships with one another?

In this research the metaphor of working the hyphen (Michelle Fine; Alison Jones and Kuni Jenkins) becomes a site where ethics and politics intersect, and other aspects of the work of justice emerge. I consider what it means to work the hyphen in Māori–Pākehā relations in light of five big ideas: productive power relations (Michel Foucault), ethical responsibility to the Other (Emmanuel Levinas and Te Kawehau Hoskins), ontological becoming in relation (Sharon Todd), a transformative pedagogical orientation (Sharon Todd), and a way of life/manner of being that is constitutive of justice (Aristotle and Michel Foucault).

Weaving together ideas from Indigenous, decolonising and narrative methodologies, I develop a co-research approach to co-produce pedagogical narratives of three pairs of longstanding and esteemed Māori and Pākehā colleagues who actively work the hyphen in their relationships. Re-presented as a collection of composed conversations, these narratives embody relational qualities and pedagogical practices that productively work *with* difference, rather than seeking its erasure. I offer stories and ideas (to scholars, educators, activists, leaders and postgraduate students) that indicate strategies for justice, especially at the level of face-to-face relationships. Relational justice requires a meaningful exchange that is at once always already political, profoundly ethical, deeply human, powerfully pedagogical, and cultivates a way of life that, for some, is spiritual. To become just and do justice in Māori–Pākehā relations is necessarily a life-work *in progress*.

## **Dedication**

In memory of my maternal grandmothers and my mother

*Your work for justice lives on.*

For my son James

*Let the people in this research inspire you to live a good life with justice at its centre.*

## Acknowledgements

This doctorate was a long time in the making. I graduate in my 57th year. Te Puna Wānanga, the School of Māori and Indigenous Studies, in the Faculty of Education and Social Work at the University of Auckland, created a home for me and my studies. The academic and professional staff were always very welcoming, helpful and encouraging. I thank Maryrose Houston especially for her gracious assistance and always being there. Special thanks to Liz Wilkinson, a subject librarian at the university, who is incredibly knowledgeable and unfailingly generous with her time, support and encouragement.

I am very grateful for the doctoral scholarship I received from the University of Auckland. I attended an international storytelling conference at Oxford University, where I presented my work. I taught classes at the University of Maine Orono in the Indigenous studies and peace-making programmes. I visited Wabanaki Elders and others in Maine and New Brunswick contributing to a book on Native–non-Native relationships. I wrote the Afterword for that book and serve on its editorial group. Faculty writing retreats also enabled me to write two papers.

I am also grateful to the Vaughan Park Anglican Retreat and Conference Centre, in Auckland, for a 1-month, scholar-in-residence award that provided a peaceful environment in which to write.

My doctoral supervisors, Professor Alison Jones and Dr Te Kawehau Hoskins, were an absolute joy to work with: hugely inspiring, terrifically funny, always human, and willing to be *in the relationship*, whatever *that* takes. Their wisdom and pragmatism enabled me to navigate the university system with ease. With their unfailing support, I handed in my thesis on the day my scholarship ended. I deeply appreciate your generosity, especially your kindness and your availability.

I owe so much to my co-researchers: Matua Kevin Prime and Patrick Snedden, Matua Sam Chapman and Dr Ann Milne, and Professor Alison Jones and Dr Te Kawehau Hoskins. They were generous, encouraging, patient and willing to go where the conversations led us both. I deeply appreciate your joining me in this study; trusting your stories to me, challenging my thinking and being so gracious when I could not keep up with you. Our ongoing relationships mean so much to me.

I appreciated engaging with doctoral students in the Faculty, especially Rose Yukich, Lincoln Dam, and Hinekura Smith. I deeply value your incredible kindness, wise words, hilarious stories and ongoing interest in my project.

Ann and David Epston, my loyal, wise and generous friends, championed my doctoral studies from the start and offered constant encouragement, welcome support and intellectual stimulation. I previously undertook an apprenticeship in narrative enquiry with David. He and his work remain one of the great inspirations of my life.

I am very grateful for the support and interest shown by other friends and colleagues, and my community. Trish O'Donnell, my longest friend, knows what this doctorate means to me. My dear North American Quaker friend Shirley Hager said, "The way will open," and it did. My local community connections and volunteer mates (especially the "Friends of the Farm" women and my fellow SOUL Campaigners) were a huge inspiration. Also, Rebecca Harrington, Tara Moala, Pania Newton and Janine Nillesen inspired me to leave a memory book on relational justice for the next generation. I hope, we (my co-researchers and I) will publish that book from this thesis.

I am very grateful for the highly adept proofreading, referencing and formatting done by Hilary van Uden in producing this thesis and earlier proofreading by Sue Osborne.

My family, always with me, includes past, present and future generations. My maternal grandmothers, now in another realm, help me to navigate my life. My parents would have been so proud to see me graduate, as are my siblings. You all share this achievement.

Gerard, my partner, was my most crucial supporter and is an intellectual friend. He expects me to be in the world on terms that fulfil the commitments to justice we both share. He helps me to make ethical-political sense of the world in which we live. I could not have done this doctorate without you, Gerard.

The arrival of my son, James, when I was 40, led me to live my way into becoming the writer I always was and to undertake the doctorate I always wanted to do. I am so grateful for James and a future in which he can help to bring about justice in whatever place, space, and profession he decides upon. In our line, James, that's what we do.

## Preface

In her book, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, Māori scholar Linda Smith (2012) critiques imperialistic and colonising research methodologies and outlines 25 Indigenous projects aimed at ensuring the survival and self-determination of Indigenous peoples. Critical qualitative researchers Norman Denzin and Michael Giardina (2007) suggest that these Indigenous projects “turn pedagogies of oppression and colonisation into pedagogies of liberation, hope and healing” (pp. 17–18).

Looking through my eyes, these Indigenous and critical scholars, through their words and their commitments, are like the exponents of taiaha (weaponry) performing the wero (the challenge) on the marae atea (the courtyard in front of a Māori meeting house) during a pōwhiri (welcome ceremony). Visiting their texts calls me to respond to their invitational and provocative performance. I must present myself, show my verve, make clear my commitments. The struggle for justice they write about – fundamentally human and cultural survival, especially indigeneity – connects to the struggle of my Irish ancestors, formidable women and fearless men, who cared deeply for their land, their culture, their language, their faith, and all their generations. I hear the call to embrace a relationship with Indigenous peoples and to take action with them, to progress the work of relational justice as an ethical–political responsibility (Levinas, 1998a; Waitere, 2008).

I began my studies with a statement of intent. Through this research I aim to continue the transformative work of critical qualitative research and contribute to pedagogies of liberation, hope and healing. I strive to co-produce, *with* my co-researchers, a thesis that continues the commitments of my ancestors by embodying the relational justice that it seeks to story and to conceptualise.



# Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Dedication.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
Preface.....	vii
Glossary .....	xiv
Part One: Situating my research, explaining my methodology .....	1
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	3
A Note on Terminology .....	4
A Pedagogical Narrative .....	5
Situating myself – early influences. ....	5
Situating myself – in relation to Indigenous peoples. ....	7
Situating myself – possibilities for relational justice.....	9
My Research Focus .....	10
Linking Theory and Practice .....	11
My Co-Researchers .....	11
Understanding Meanings of <i>Indigene</i> and <i>Settler</i> .....	12
Understanding Meanings of <i>Māori</i> and <i>Pākehā</i> .....	15
The International Significance of My Research.....	17
International Research on Relational Problematics and Possibilities .....	18
Metaphors to think with.....	18
Problematics and possibilities – specific examples.....	20
What My Research Contributes .....	24
A Chapter Outline .....	25
Part 1: Situating my research, explaining my methodology.....	25
Part 2: Composed conversations, theoretical–methodological conclusions. ....	26
Chapter 2: Problematics in Māori–Pākehā relations – persistent troubles .....	27

Earliest Encounters in Māori–Pākehā Relations .....	28
The struggle to understand the Other. ....	28
The challenge of negotiating uncertainties, ignorance and refusals. ....	30
The failure to recognise or perform obligations. ....	31
Pākehā Engagement in Research Relationships with Māori .....	33
Ownership and control of cultural knowledge. ....	33
Problematic Pākehā positioning. ....	35
Conflicting Ontological Styles .....	36
An Unrelenting Colonising Approach.....	38
Conclusion.....	40
Chapter 3: Possibilities in Māori–Pākehā relations – ideas to think with .....	43
Working the Hyphen – A Metaphor for and Site of Implied Ethics and Politics .....	44
1) Productive power relations.....	45
2) An ethical responsibility to the Other. ....	47
3) Ontological becoming in relation. ....	51
4) A transformative pedagogical orientation. ....	54
5) A way of life, a manner of being.....	57
How These Ideas (In)Form My Thinking and My Research .....	60
Chapter 4: Research methodology .....	63
Critical Qualitative Research .....	63
Indigenous and decolonising methodologies.....	64
A narrative enquiry.....	67
A case-centred approach.....	70
Ethical Considerations.....	74
Informed consent. ....	75
Privacy and confidentiality.....	76
Working with Māori. ....	76

Co-Research Conversations .....	77
Face-to-face and email engagement. ....	78
How many is enough? .....	79
Transcriptions as translations. ....	80
Translations as work-in-progress interview texts.....	80
Reading the Interview Texts .....	81
Enacting the Ethics and Politics of Representation.....	83
Exploring possibilities for narrative representation.....	84
Pedagogical narratives as composed conversations. ....	85
How Will I Know if These Pedagogical Narratives Have Done Their Work? .....	87
An Afterthought .....	88
Part Two: Composed conversations and theoretical–methodological conclusions .....	91
Chapter 5: Dr Te Kawehau Hoskins .....	93
Prologue .....	93
First Conversation: Alison Jones Considers Te Kawehau’s Qualities and Their Relationship.....	94
Second Conversation: Te Kawehau Considers Her Own Early Influences .....	99
Third Conversation: Te Kawehau Considers Possibilities in Māori–Pākehā Relations .....	107
Chapter 6: Professor Alison Jones .....	115
Prologue .....	115
First Conversation: Te Kawehau Hoskins Considers Alison’s Qualities and Their Relationship.....	116
Second Conversation: Alison Considers Her Own Early Influences.....	120
Third Conversation: Alison Considers Possibilities in Māori–Pākehā Relations .....	127
Chapter 7: Matua Kevin Prime .....	139
Prologue .....	139

First Conversation: Patrick Snedden Considers Kevin’s Qualities and Their Relationship .....	140
Second Conversation: Kevin Considers His Own Early Influences .....	145
Third Conversation: Kevin Considers Possibilities in Māori–Pākehā Relations.....	150
Chapter 8: Patrick Snedden.....	161
Prologue .....	161
First Conversation: Kevin Prime Considers Pat’s Qualities and Their Relationship... ..	162
Second Conversation: Pat Considers His Own Early Influences .....	166
Third Conversation: Pat Considers Possibilities in Māori–Pākehā Relations.....	173
Chapter 9: Matua Sam Chapman .....	187
Prologue .....	187
First Conversation: Ann Milne Considers Sam’s Qualities and Their Relationship ... ..	188
Second Conversation: Sam Considers His Own Early Life Influences .....	193
Third Conversation: Sam Considers Possibilities in Māori–Pākehā Relations.....	199
Chapter 10: Dr Ann Milne .....	209
Prologue .....	209
First Conversation: Sam Chapman Considers Ann’s Qualities and Their Relationship .....	210
Second Conversation: Ann Reflects on Her Own Early Influences.....	215
Third Conversation: Ann Considers Possibilities in Māori–Pākehā Relations.....	221
Chapter 11: Current and contingent conclusions .....	233
Theoretical Contribution .....	234
1) Productive power relations.....	235
2) An ethical responsibility to the Other. ....	237
3) Ontological becoming in relation.....	242
4) A transformative pedagogical orientation.....	248
5) A way of life, a manner of being.....	250
Methodological Contribution .....	254

Limitations of the Study .....	255
Research Openings .....	256
Last Words .....	257
Appendix A: Participant information sheet .....	261
Appendix B: Participant consent form.....	265
References.....	267

## Glossary

Ahi kā	Keeping the fires burning; title to land through occupation and whakapapa
Ako	Māori pedagogy
Aotearoa	New Zealand
Aroha	All-encompassing love, unconditional concern
Atua	God
Awhi	To give support, nurture, creating the conditions for kindness
Hapū	Sub-tribe, collection of families with common ancestry and common ties to land
Toa	Bravery, courage
Hoā tū tata	A close friend, standing by and ready to assist
Hui	To gather, meet, assemble; also a gathering, a meeting, an assembly
Io-matua-te-kore	Supreme being
Iwi	Tribe
Kāhui Māori	A Māori advisory group
Kai	Food
Kaitiaki	Guardian
Kaitiakitanga	The practice of environmental guardianship
Kanohi ki te kanohi	Face-to-face
Kanohi kitea	A face seen, to have a physical presence
Kapa haka	Māori performing arts
Karakia	Prayer/s, affirmation/s
Karanga	Call
Kaumātua	Male Elder
Kaupapa	First principles, purpose, philosophy, plan, programme
Kaupapa Māori	Māori principles, values and knowledge
Koha	Gift
kōrero	Talk, speech
Kuia	Female Elder

Kūpapa	Peace-maker, also a Māori person seen as too friendly with the Pākehā
Kura	School
Mā te wā	In good time; the time will come; when the time is right
Mana	Unique force, power, recognition, standing, influence
Manaaki	To be hospitable, caring
Manaakitanga	Hospitality, care of others
Manawhenua	Local tribal group/s. Māori with relationships and territorial rights to an area
Manuhiri	Visitors, guests
Māori	An Indigenous person or the Indigenous people of New Zealand
Matua	Father, parent, uncle, chief
Mātauranga Māori	Māori knowledges originating from Māori ancestors, including the Māori world view, perspectives, creativity and cultural practices
Mihi	To greet; greeting
Moko kauae	Woman's chin tattoo
Mokopuna	Child or grandchild of a son, daughter, nephew, niece
Nehu	Burial service
Ngā Manu Kōrero	A secondary schools' Māori speech competition
Ngākau	Seat of affections, heart, mind, soul
Noa	Ordinary, unrestricted
Paraikete whero	Literally a red blanket, also a blanket prohibition
Pākehā	The Māori language term for white settlers to New Zealand and New Zealanders of European descent
Pāua	Abalone, beautiful blue-green shell
Pono	Truth
Pōwhiri	Ceremony of welcome/encounter
Pūhā	Small, leafy plant eaten as a green vegetable
Pūrākau	A traditional form of narrative
Pūtea	Resources, a fund
Rangatahi	Youth, young people

Rangatira	Chief/s, leader/s
Taha Māori	Things Māori
Taha wairua	The spiritual side
Tangata Whenua	Literally “people of the land” or Māori as Indigenous to Aotearoa–New Zealand
Tapu	Sacred, restricted, prohibited
Taonga	Treasure/s; anything highly prized
Tangi	To cry, mourn, weep
Te Puna Wānanga	The School of Māori and Indigenous Education
Te ara whanaunga	The relational path
Te ao Māori	The Māori world
Te ao Pākehā	The Pākehā world
Te Puni Kōkiri	The Ministry of Māori Development
Te Tiriti o Waitangi	The Māori language version of the Treaty of Waitangi, the founding document of Aotearoa–New Zealand
Te reo Māori	The Māori language
Te wāhi ngaro	The Unseen
Tiaki	To guard, to keep
Tika	Right, ethical
Tikanga	Cultural practice, custom, rule
Tiki	Carved figure, image, a neck ornament carved in an abstract form of a human
Tino rangatiratanga	Self-determination, unqualified exercise of authority, chiefly authority
Tohu	Sign, symbol
Tohunga	skilled person, chosen expert, priest, healer
Tokotoko	Walking stick
Tūpāpaku	A deceased person’s body
Tūpuna	Ancestors
Tūrangawaewae	A place to stand
Tūrangi	Place name
Wahine	Woman
Waiata	Song/s

Wairua	Spirit or soul
Wānanga	To meet and discuss, educational forum or learning seminar, ancestral knowledge
Wānanga reo	Learning workshop focusing on the Māori language
Wētā	Large insect of various species found in trees and caves
Whaea	Aunty, mother
Whakaiti	Humility
Whakamana	To enable, give strength, empower, to rebuild one's mana
Whakapapa	Genealogy; origins, source of life
Whakawhanaungatanga	Intentional relationship building; relating well to others
Whānau	Extended family, a collective
Whanaungatanga	Strong reciprocal relationships, kinship, an inclination of care and responsibility to others
Whakataukī	Proverb
Whakawhetai	To thank God
Whare rūnanga	Meeting house
Whenua	Land



**Part One: Situating my research, explaining my methodology**



## Chapter 1: Introduction

My research explores bicultural approaches to relational justice in Māori–Pākehā relations (Bell, 2004, 2007, 2008, 2014, 2017; Hoskins, 2010, 2012, 2017; A. Jones, 1999, 2005, 2008, 2012; A. Jones & Jenkins, 2008a, 2008b, 2011, 2017; Salmond, 2012; Yukich & Hoskins, 2011). This relationship is profoundly important for Aotearoa–New Zealand; it embodies a troubled history and enacts power relations that continue to influence how Māori and Pākehā are positioned in society. I consider aspects of the philosophies of Aristotle (1975, 1995), Michel Foucault (1980, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c, 1997d, 1997e, 2003), Emmanuel Levinas (1969, 1986, 1998a, 1998b), Sharon Todd (1997, 2003, 2009, 2014), and others to explore possibilities in Māori–Pākehā relations for productive political–ethical–ontological–pedagogical–spiritual engagements.

So, what does it mean for Māori and Pākehā scholars, educators, activists and leaders to become just and do justice in their relationships with one another? Aotearoa–New Zealand scholars point to an attitude or orientation, in other words, “the way a person *is*,” which I seek to further illustrate through stories (A. Jones, 2012, p. 108, emphasis in the original). Using the metaphor of *working the hyphen* (Fine, 1994; A. Jones, 2008) *to think with*, I address productive power relations (Foucault, 1997a, 1997d, 2003) and an ethical responsibility to the Other (Levinas, 1986, 1998a). I consider ontological becoming in relation and a transformative pedagogical orientation (Todd, 2003, 2014). I also illustrate a way of life, a manner of being (Aristotle, 1975, 1995; Foucault, 1997a, 1997b).

Locating this study in my country allows me to reflect on the relational nuances at work in the unique Indigene–settler relation in this context. I enlist, as my co-researchers, pairs of respected Māori and Pākehā colleagues who have worked together over many years. Dr Te Kawehau Hoskins is paired with Professor Alison Jones, Matua Kevin Prime with Patrick Snedden, and Matua Sam Chapman with Dr Ann Milne, whom I introduce later. I explore what encouraged them to become so deeply committed to justice and to daily inhabit Māori–Pākehā relations. I invite them to consider what makes their relationships work and to reflect more broadly on possibilities for productive engagements. We discuss how they developed *and are still developing* the “know-how” required to do justice in their relationships with one another (Certeau, 1984).

I see my co-researchers as people and practitioners whose lives and actions have something to teach me and others about what it means to become just and do justice in Māori–Pākehā relations. Some of my co-researchers strongly resisted labels that might position them as exemplars of justice on the basis that being just is not a fixed characteristic of an individual. Instead, I sought to appreciate the substance of their lives and their relationships to better understand what enables them to not only cohere their ethical *and* political commitments but also intersect their lives *and* their work (Ellis, 1997).

In this introduction, I set the scene for my research. I explain key terms used in this thesis. Then, to situate myself, I compose a pedagogical narrative that highlights the motivations for my studies. I explain the focus of my research. I review international and Aotearoa–New Zealand literature to better understand the identities, meanings and implications associated with the terms *Indigenous* and *settler*, and *Māori* and *Pākehā*. I scope international literature on Indigenous–settler relations and identify what my research offers. Finally, I outline the remaining chapters.

## **A Note on Terminology**

In this thesis I refer to *Māori–Pākehā relations* (plural) because this particular human relation is embodied by its own diversities. As the Aotearoa–New Zealand philosopher Lincoln Dam states, “Every Māori–Pākehā relation is singular/heterogeneous/unique but there are many Māori–Pākehā relations” (personal communication, September 4, 2017). Following Todd (2003), I use *Other* (capitalised) to distinguish the alterity of a particular embodied person and *other* (lower case) to describe other persons. I use the following terms interchangeably: *Aboriginal*, *First Nations*, *Indian*, *Indigenous* and *Native*, as appropriate. When referring to the Indigenous peoples of Aotearoa–New Zealand and those of European descent, I use the terms Māori and Pākehā, respectively, which I explain shortly.

In this thesis, I employ particular understandings of politics and ethics. I understand *politics* as the exercise and negotiation of power, which is always in relation. Following Foucault (1980, 1997a), power is strategically exercised through social relations rather than being possessed by individuals or groups. Power is pervasive and diffuse, operating everywhere, all the time, both at a macrolevel in state politics and governance and at a microlevel in face-to-face relations. One of Foucault’s great insights was that power is most powerfully a generative force, not just a coercive repressive action. Here, I focus my attention on the

micropolitical level: how power is exercised productively in face-to-face relations. I also take on the Levinasian idea of *ethics* as a social relation that invokes an ethical responsibility to and for an infinitely unknowable Other (Levinas, 1998a). I understand the challenge of embodying ethics in face-to-face relations as remaining open to and creating space for otherness and difference, uncertainty and indeterminacy. In this thesis, then, both politics and ethics are embodied and enacted in relation. Following Hoskins (2010) *the political* and *the ethical* are expressions of sociality. They coexist in a productive tension and have the productive capacity to challenge one another (Bernasconi, 1999). Their relationality *and* their interplay create possibilities for fruitful engagement at a face-to-face level and the work of justice. These ideas are discussed more fully in Chapter 3 and explored across the following chapters.

Here, the term *pedagogical* means educational engagements that facilitate ethical–political teaching and learning and are themselves sites of knowledge production. Educational philosopher Patti Lather (1991) led me to the cultural studies scholar David Lusted (1986) whose provocative question 30 years ago remains relevant:

Why should pedagogy be of interest to anyone? Few [outside the academy] are familiar with the term. Even aficionados gag on its pronunciation and falter in its spelling. (p. 2)

Lusted argues that pedagogy is more than knowledge transmission and is a site where knowledge is produced. Pedagogy interests me because I want to better understand how to learn and teach the kind of know-how required to create an ethical–political life that seeks to practice relational justice in Māori–Pākehā relations and is necessarily a life-work *in progress*.

## **A Pedagogical Narrative**

*Various influences shaped me as a person, led to me to engage with Indigenous peoples and crafted my commitment to relational justice. Here I consider enquiries I put to my co-researchers, which also suggest motivations for my studies. My reflections are necessarily brief and inevitably subjective and partial.*

### **Situating myself – early influences.**

*I was born at the foot of Maungakiekie, in Ngāti Whātua territory, in the heart of Auckland, Aotearoa–New Zealand’s largest city, where I was raised. I am the second youngest of seven children. Much of my childhood was spent living in accommodation attached to a*

*succession of small dairies (in New Zealand, a local convenience store) that my parents managed or owned. “The shops,” as we called them, were located in diverse communities. Some were situated in low-income, low-lying areas, where many Māori and Pacific Island families lived; a few in wealthy suburbs where mainly Pākehā families enjoyed harbour views; and others in places in between. Housing was an ongoing problem, and so much could be said about that.*

*I was 50 when I realised that, growing up, I had lived in 16 houses in nine communities. We were at once self-styled outsiders (arriving some place, staying a while, then moving on) and partial insiders (due to our residence, however temporary, in myriad communities). Our itinerant life disrupted connections that normally create a sense of belonging to a community. But crossing borders, I began to glimpse what I now understand as social, political, economic, environmental, religious and cultural differences. My parents’ astute observations and those of the people I met in the places we visited awakened my senses and raised my awareness. Our life was an incredible education for a writer/researcher and something of an adventure.*

*In our family, the past was always present and a threat often looming. My father had a difficult childhood and suffered a major psychotic breakdown in his early 20s. He was carted off in shackles to a psychiatric institution miles away, where he received inhumane treatment. On his release, my parents reunited but my father never forgave my mother for committing him. He refused to remember, or could not recall, what she could never forget: his suicidal ranting as he paced the length of the hallway night and day during one tumultuous week, and finally – the tipping point – his threats, quietly reasoned, to kill her and the children.*

*After I was born, my father was periodically hospitalised and out of work. He later had a workplace accident, was off work for months, and lost his trade. He was incredibly hardworking and an exemplary employee but, because of his medical history, he experienced discrimination when seeking employment. For years, money was tight and the stress was terrible. Eventually, financial help from my maternal grandparents enabled my parents to become self-employed. That act of generosity, a form of white privilege, and endless hours of work behind a shop counter, eventually led to financial freedom.*

*During these years we faced other challenges. My mother developed a chronic illness that, on occasions, nearly killed her. My brother and I developed epilepsy and learning difficulties. I could go on. But hardest to bear was my father’s abusive behaviour; his*

*actions breached every trust and alienated those closest to him. So much could be said about that.*

*A university education challenged me to question the power relations operating in the worlds in which I had lived as a child, including within my family. I learned that ideas matter and can save a life. When you separate people from problems, people can breathe instead of becoming problematised (White & Epston, 1990). Crafting counter-stories can help people and communities to see, think, and live differently and cultivate a transformative identity (Nelson, 2001). Viktor Frankl's holocaust memoir taught me that even when threatened, my life, my humanity, could be defined by dignity and freedom (Frankl, 1985). By making critical sense of my situation, I realised that who I was, wasn't forever fixed. I could shape myself and my future.*

### **Situating myself – in relation to Indigenous peoples.**

*When I was growing up, a Māori woman called Mary (not her real name) had a lasting impact on me. Her extraordinary relational presence, huge intelligence and ethical sensibility arrived rather loudly one day and never left. Mary worked for my parents for years and became my mother's other daughter and lifelong friend. Mary was always kind, often laughing and forever telling stories about cultural–spiritual realms I knew nothing of but which felt strangely familiar because I was Irish. Later in life she took up university studies and reclaimed her birth name Mere (not her real name). Mere sat next to me at my mother's funeral and I spoke for our family at hers. Only aroha (an all-encompassing love and concern) can explain Mere's enduring relationship with my family; she witnessed and weathered our storms but never judged us.*

*As an undergraduate student in the early 1980s, during tumultuous years of Māori-led activism, anti-racism efforts, and protests related to Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi, New Zealand's founding document), I became increasingly aware that Indigenous interests and wellbeing were inexorably intertwined with mine. I began to see myself as a Pākehā citizen of Aotearoa–New Zealand and realised that I and my kind had benefited from histories, politics and institutional arrangements that privilege all things Pākehā at the expense of Māori people, interests and ways of being. My people enjoyed unearned advantages and a conferred dominance that came with being Pākehā in a Pākehā-dominated society.*

*In my late 20s, as a new Harvard graduate, I developed relationships with First Nations peoples in the northeast of North America. I contributed to relationship-building*

*initiatives and published a collection of interviews with a Wampanoag ceremonial keeper at his request (gkisedtanamoogk & Hancock, 1993, lowercase g intended). Twenty-five years later I am contributing to another book on that relationship-building work (Hager, 2017). In the Afterword I ask, “How did our relationships survive over so many years and, in my case, across a great ocean?” “It comes down to love or something like that,” Alison Jones suggests in this research, and I agree with her. What kind of love is that? my research asks. A love that calls for “being there for each other to the end,” said Miigam’agan, a Mi’kmaq Elder and my friend (personal communication, August 31, 2016).*

*Over the years, through a myriad of relationships and assignments with Māori, I have come to know myself better, especially the limits of my knowing, and become more aware of the Pākehā-dominated society in which I live and how it works differently for different groups of people and, in many ways, not at all for Māori. I have glimpsed a vast and unique landscape of Māori cultural knowledge (relationships, values, practices, realities, identities, collectivities and so on) that lies beyond what it is possible for me, as a Pākehā, to know. Something I learnt when I was younger has stayed with me; that my views are ever-particular as I look through a dominant Pākehā lens and ever-expanding as I continue to engage with Māori on those things that matter most to them.*

*I constantly marvel at Māori generosity towards my learning and value the privilege of doing work with them that is imbued with a meaning and purpose that in my mind/heart reaches, spiritually perhaps, across the generations – mine and perhaps theirs. I try to co-create relational possibilities that not only seek to understand and address particular Māori interests, and my own, but also have a direct and beneficial impact for their communities, however that is defined by them, whoever they are, and the them and the they always carry complex, partial, changing, and multiple meanings.*

*Daily I encounter the Indigenous people of my country. In my community nearly 20% of the local population identify as Māori (Statistics New Zealand, 2013a). While doing my doctorate, I have been contributing to a local campaign led by mana whenua (Māori with territorial connections and rights) to stop the commercial development of land that was unjustly confiscated in 1863 and which has historical, cultural, spiritual and heritage significance. Three years on, the problematics and possibilities of Māori–Pākehā relations are constantly enacted in the SOUL campaign to #ProtectIhumātao, and I need all of who I am – heart, mind, body, spirit – and my ancestral inheritances to negotiate them.*

## **Situating myself – possibilities for relational justice.**

*So often, these days, I lean on the memory of my mother to sustain and guide me. I recall who she was and the way she was with others, including Māori, and try to understand who I am and how to be with others through my memories of her relational encounters.*

*I learnt so much of the crafts of relational justice and of storytelling from observing my mother. Still I see her – tall, slim, beautiful – leaning across the shop counter listening intently to a story more important than anything else she had ever heard, which is how she listened to all the stories told to her, knowing it was told by someone society ignored. She was always booking up groceries for families who had no money and on occasions a van-load of goods for a tangi (a Māori funeral), bills that could never be paid. She often went to the linen cupboard looking for something to give away and occasionally she brought strangers home to stay.*

*Although my mother suffered, she refused to allow the travail of her life to overcome her dignity or define her. And that was because she was her mother's daughter. And her mother was her mother's daughter, and her mother, my Irish great-grandmother, was her mother's daughter, who was also my great-great Irish grandmother. I was raised to think that I was one of these women, with an identity unequivocally Irish and Made in New Zealand.*

*Being Irish (and, of course, Catholic) meant fierce loyalty to family, faith, land, language, country and especially past, present and future generations, through political activism and community service. For me, now, being Irish Pākehā includes all these things and demands that I critically examine the histories of Aotearoa–New Zealand and respond to its injustices. Ireland and Aotearoa–New Zealand experienced histories of British imperialism. In Ireland my people fought the invaders but in New Zealand my people became the recipients of unearned/white privileges (McIntosh, 1989).*

*I belong to Ireland (my ancestral home, where I am a citizen and my ancestors are buried) and to New Zealand (my place of birth, where I live and will be laid to rest). Knowing to whom and where I belong supports me every day to engage with Māori, for whom whakapapa (ancestral ties) and tūrangawaewae (a place to stand) mean so much.*

*I was led inevitably, I think, to a life dedicated to justice. I embrace the commitments of my maternal ancestors because I want to be like them. The difficulties I experienced growing up are forever etched on my heart but those experiences also taught me to learn from those who have suffered so much, because they have so much to teach about those things in life that truly matter. I was given or developed a capacity to listen deeply,*

*reverently, quietly, for the stories living in another's heart. Wise people taught me how to call those stories to speech and look after them as they make their journey into text by passing through my heart. My father squandered his gift of words, of poetry, but I inherited it and try to use it for good purposes.*

*I invest huge hope in small, everyday acts of goodness because in my childhood their absence or presence had a profound impact on me – and this observation, finally, may best explain my doctoral focus. I follow my heart when engaging with Indigenous peoples because my Pākehā reflexes are often misleading. But growing up, it was my mother's witness that taught me to persevere, no matter what, and that is how I choose to think of my commitment to relational justice.*

## **My Research Focus**

With this background in tow, a PhD in education and on relational justice was perhaps inevitable. I began my doctoral studies in my early 50s in a discipline in which I had no obvious links. My previous academic studies were in social work and psychology (at Massey University in Aotearoa–New Zealand) and in feminist theology and ethics (at Harvard Divinity School in the United States). I was never a teacher, although I mentor community development practitioners, where my professional interests mainly lie. When considering doctoral studies however, I realised that so much of my professional work had been educative by intention.

For over three decades I worked in various roles (including as a community worker/organiser, policy adviser, consultant, researcher and writer) in different fields (community, healthcare, education, business, philanthropy, government, and the not-for-profit sector) and in different geographies (New Zealand, the United States, Canada and Australia). I have collaborated on many storytelling projects with Māori and community groups (such as Hancock 2012, 2013, 2015). I co-authored a book on the Treaty of Waitangi for our government (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2001). I treated my work as a craft, completing each assignment to the best of my ability *for its own sake* (Sennett, 2006). In diverse roles, fields and geographies, I sought to create a life-work *in progress* steeped in the values, commitments and visions of my maternal ancestors. Doing a doctorate allowed me to take an overdue sabbatical.

I embraced the opportunity to study with Professor Alison Jones and Dr Te Kawehau Hoskins at Te Puna Wānanga (the School of Māori and Indigenous Education) in the Faculty of Education and Social Work at the University of Auckland. Years ago, I read Alison's cogent and disruptive reflections on cross-cultural pedagogical engagements (A. Jones, 1999). The significance of her scholarly ideas for practice inspired my long-held desire to work with her. Alison introduced me to Te Kawehau, a Levinasian scholar, whose theoretical work, like mine, seeks to intersect ethics and politics, and is also immensely practical. Our early conversations showed me a way to link theory and practice by studying possibilities for relational justice in Māori–Pākehā relations.

## **Linking Theory and Practice**

In this project I sought to create a critical conversation between theory and practice, to better appreciate the everydayness of Māori–Pākehā face-to-face relational encounters. By theory, I mean the ideas I harnessed *to think with* my co-researchers about productive possibilities for Māori–Pākehā relations in everyday encounters. By practice, I mean what my co-researchers *do* in their face-to-face relations (their micropractices) and how they make meaning of those encounters. Canadian scholar Lynne Davis (2010c) suggests that, “Theory can be a potent source of analysis for practice, and practice can be a wellspring for theoretical formulation” (p. 211). Her point is that, when theory and practice talk to each other, useful ideas emerge for re/imagining Indigenous–non-Indigenous relationships. Alison Jones adds:

Theory requires doing the conceptual work to find language to speak in different ways that will help to shift the territory. ... It's the subtle things that often matter the most ... [including] undoing the work of Pākehā assumptions and perspectives. (personal communication, April 8, 2016)

## **My Co-Researchers**

Years of interviewing diverse practitioners cultivated my interest in learning from those wiser than me who daily inhabit Māori–Pākehā relations. I dedicate a chapter to each of my co-researchers and introduce them briefly here. I explain my decision to include my doctoral supervisors in Chapter 4.

With affiliations to Ngāti Hau and Ngāpuhi, Dr Te Kawehau Hoskins has contributed to education, arts, community and Māori language initiatives. She is an academic at the

University of Auckland, where she heads Te Puna Wānanga, the School of Māori and Indigenous Education, and serves as Te Tumu, the Māori Dean. Her scholarly work contributes to the fields of critical sociology of education, Indigenous studies in education, Māori education, Treaty of Waitangi studies and Māori–Pākehā relations. The scholarly work of Pākehā Professor Alison Jones spans the sociology of education. Her diverse interests include feminist, post-structuralist and new materialism theories, Māori–Pākehā educational relationships and cross-cultural pedagogies. Both collaborate on doctoral supervision, researching and writing, and were my doctoral supervisors.

A kaumātua (Elder) of Ngāti Hine, with Ngāti Whātua and Tainui connections, Kevin Prime has contributed to health, philanthropic, education, environmental, justice, forestry and farming initiatives, and Māori and tribal developments. He has served on government ministerial advisory groups and is an Environment Court Commissioner. Pat Snedden is an Irish Catholic Pākehā who has held senior governance and advisory roles in different fields (including health, philanthropy, education, tribal and Māori development) and acted as a Treaty negotiator for the Crown and for iwi (Māori tribes) as well as being a publisher and an award-winning author. Kevin and Pat met when both joined the board of New Zealand's largest philanthropic organisation, ASB Community Trust, now called Foundation North.

With tribal affiliations to Ngāti Tūwharetoa and Ngāti Porou, and a smattering of English and Portuguese Jewish ancestry, Sam Chapman is a community development practitioner and leader whose work with low-income communities and gang members has earned national recognition and an international reputation. Dr Ann Milne is a Pākehā educational innovator, writer, and researcher whose work has also earned awards and international interest. She is the mother, grandmother and great-grandmother of Māori children. Both worked together for over 20 years at Kia Aroha College in Auckland, where Ann was principal and Sam was chair of the board of trustees.

In this thesis, I refer to my co-researchers by their first name but where I cite their published work, I use their last name, following the convention of academic referencing.

## **Understanding Meanings of *Indigene* and *Settler***

My study focuses generally on *Indigene–settler* relations but specifically on Māori–Pākehā relations. What do the terms *Indigene* and *settler* mean in an international context and what do these meanings evoke? I refer to Australian, Canadian, North American geographies

because these countries experienced colonisation histories similar to Aotearoa–New Zealand.

Pākehā Treaty educator Robert Consedine (Consedine & Consedine, 2012) outlines the use of different instruments and strategies to usurp Indigenous sovereignty: a royal proclamation in Canada, treaties in America and the doctrine, often called *the fiction of terra nullis* (meaning empty land owned by and belonging to no-one) in Australia. Pākehā sociologist Avril Bell (2014) identifies common trajectories, observing that in these countries (and in New Zealand), British settlers soon outnumbered the Indigenous peoples and dominated the social, economic and political landscape. Settlers rapidly created institutional frameworks, which they defined and controlled, imposing *their way* as the new norm. While these countries recognise Indigenous peoples as culturally different, the Indigenous quest for recognition and respect of their political status remains a significant challenge that both troubles settler rights and invokes settler political resistance. Crucially, according to Bell (2014), these nations “share ‘a settler imaginary’ – the set of ideas and values that underpin a peculiarly settler discourse of nationhood, identity and Indigenous–settler relations” (p. 11).

According to the Oxford and Merriam-Webster Dictionaries, the term *Indigene* refers to Indigenous or Native persons/people who originate in a particular geographical area. Australian Aboriginal scholar Karen Martin-Booran Mirraboopa (2003) argues that the ways of knowing, being and doing of Indigenous peoples derive from and reflect their close connections to their ancestral lands and natural resources, their languages, and their ancient customary laws, practices and institutions. Reflecting on its relationship with colonisation, L. Smith (2012) highlights the contradictory nature of the term Indigenous. She argues that it not only groups together diverse Indigenous peoples who endured unique experiences of imperialism but also – positively – highlights the global significance of the experiences, interests, concerns and struggles of Indigenous peoples, drawing attention to their right to self-determination and an international network of belonging.

In Australia, the term *Aboriginal* is used to describe the indigeneity of peoples whose ancestors have lived on that continent for thousands of years and have developed particular tribal identities and relationships in Country (McAllan, 2013). In North America, early colonisers imposed the terms *Indian* and *American Indian*, usages arising from Christopher Columbus’ confusion over where his planned voyage to the East Indies actually landed.

Like *Native America* and *Native Canada*, these terms collectivise Indigenous peoples who have their own tribal identities, supporting Smith's contention above. In Canada, the terms *First Nations* and *Aboriginal* assert the unique status of Indigenous peoples as the original inhabitants of the land. Generational and regional differences, familiar usage, personal and tribal preferences also impact the use of these terms (Hager, 2017).

According to the Oxford and the Merriam-Webster Dictionaries, a settler is a person who settles in an area, understood as a new place where few or no people live. Bell (2014) explains resistance towards the term settler when used in discussions on Indigene-settler relations. Some consider the term outdated or inaccurate, she argues, because it suggests historical peoples and is therefore irrelevant in the contemporary context. Others believe it is too benevolent, given the devastating impacts of colonisation on Indigenous communities, and use the term *coloniser* to highlight this record of invasion.

Bell (2014) argues that the term settler is relevant because the dominant structures of Australian, Canadian, American and New Zealand societies derive from the settlement process driven by white settlers. Whether early or late arrivals, settlers remain the political forebears, if not the biological ones, and privileged beneficiaries of the dominant structures. Settlers, Bell argues, include people of European descent and recent arrivals who have been able to accrue the resources of settler status, including knowledge, political standing, national belonging and so on. But, she cautions, the term settler:

specifies, as it hides, the particular forms of violence – physical, legal, epistemological, symbolic – inflicted on indigenous people in this form of colonial relationship. (p. 7, emphasis in the original)

Bell (2014) notes that settler colonisation was distinguished by an ambition to claim the land itself and a desire to become Indigenous by usurping the unique status of Indigenous peoples.

This discussion suggests that terms such as Indigene and settler function as collective or universal categories (L. Smith, 2012). These labels not only produce a contested discourse but also activate “the politics of location” (Wevers, 2006, p. 3). L. Smith (2012) highlights that different terms are used in different geographies and implicate layered relationships and meanings among different groups. Australian critical scholar Fiona McAllan (2013) argues that global terms imply static, representational and bounded notions of indigeneity and identity that gloss over the complex political status and social, cultural, environmental

and spiritual diversities of particular Indigene and settler groups. She argues that such terms support colonial framing and domination; confuse concepts of identity, ethnicity and culture; and serve an assimilationist agenda. McAllan (2013) observes that:

in the paradoxical structure of lived experience, our incommensurable differences [those of indigene and settler peoples] do not allow for fixed categories of one group or another, we are always on the move, always in a state of flux, always different to each other no matter what. (p. 4)

## **Understanding Meanings of *Māori* and *Pākehā***

Early settler written records penned before 1840 address New Zealand's Indigenous peoples as "the New Zealanders," "Natives" and "countrymen" (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2011). These collective terms acknowledged that people were living here before the arrival of European explorers (Abel Tasman in 1642 and Captain James Cook in 1769) and the first invited English settlers in 1814. A. Jones (2012) explains that the terms *Māori* and *Pākehā* respectively were originally used to distinguish ordinary people from white settlers and, through such use, discursively created the Other.

L. Smith (2012) argues that the term *Māori* draws attention to a colonial relationship between *Māori* and *Pākehā* and, as with Indigenous peoples elsewhere, they already had their own identities. Bell (2004) explains that, prior to colonisation, *Māori* identified according to their *whānau* (extended family), *hapū* (sub-tribe), and *iwi* (tribe) and *Pākehā* settlers claimed the identity of their diverse European backgrounds. *Māori* educational scholar Leonie Pihama (1993) suggests that early settlers used the term *Māori* to collectivise a tribally based society and accelerate a process of assimilation so that particular *iwi* (tribal) stories and traditions, which carried and passed on their unique identities, would be lost. According to *Māori* scholar Charles Royal (2012), although the term *Māori* originally meant normal, over time it developed diverse meanings and is now understood by many as an ethnic group or cultural identity.

*Māori* educator Russell Bishop (2012) explains that the term *Pākehā* highlights an ancestry that connects to the descendants of European colonisers. The *Reed Dictionary of Modern Māori* defines *Pākehā* as non-*Māori*, European, Caucasian but *Pākehā* historian Michael King (2011) argues that these descriptions are negative, inadequate, inaccurate and inappropriate. He prefers the term *Pākehā*, which like *Māori*, signifies what he calls a

unique “cultural stream” in New Zealand with distinct cultural connections, priorities and values (p. 192). For an increasing number of citizens whose main loyalty is to New Zealand, he argues, the term Pākehā represents a growing sense and experience of indigeneity: “another kind of indigenous New Zealander” (1999, p. 239), a “*second indigenous New Zealand culture*” (p. 40, italics in the original). King argues that Pākehā became Indigenous when their sense of identity and commitment became grounded in New Zealand rather than their country of origin. For that reason, he argues, *and* their own historical, geographical and spiritual connections to the land (in his case, developed over generations), Pākehā should be accorded the same status as Māori.

Pākehā literary historian Lydia Wevers (2006) argues against the idea that Pākehā is a fixed marker or identity, suggesting it makes sense only in relation to Māori and a shared history that produced unequal social and economic outcomes. She proposes that Pākehā adopt the complex yet flexible positioning of “a diasporic identity” which accepts the relationship that founded the country and “describes why we [Pākehā] choose to be here, the grounds on which we are here and what we should do about it” (p. 8). Educational scholar Vaughan Bidois (2013) argues that King’s proposal denies the political and cultural realities created through colonisation that undermined the rights and unique status of Māori as the Indigenous people.

The significance of this discussion for my research is captured succinctly by Bell (2004), who explains that these identities have implications for contemporary Māori–Pākehā relations:

the present-day Māori and Pākehā carry with them the history of the colonial relationship that is still very powerful in structuring and colouring our contemporary interactions. This means that old ideas about race and about the superiority of Europeans over “Natives” are still discernible in the way that Māori and Pākehā identities are talked about and thought out by many New Zealanders. (p. 122)

Māori educational philosopher Melinda Webber (2008) and other scholars (including Bell, 2004; Meredith, 1998) draw attention to people with mixed Māori/Pākehā ancestry and challenge the polarised identities of Māori and Pākehā. Drawing on the post-colonial theorist Homi Bhabha, Webber (2008) explains that those inhabiting cultural hybridity occupy an in-between positioning that demands constant border crossings and creates

complexities when naming an ethnic identity. Webber (2008) suggests that cultural hybridity allows for new identities and positions but, at the same time, is “an ambivalent site where cultural meaning and representation is fluid and dynamic” (p. 26).

These different and evolving interpretations of terminology and the complex identities they invoke concern the relation at the heart of my research. Also, the cultural worlds to which they refer are themselves distinctly different and evolving (which I discuss in the next chapter). Today, Māori experience significantly poorer outcomes than Pākehā on health, educational and other wellbeing indicators (Statistics New Zealand, 2013b). Outcome inequalities and disparities point to the ongoing impacts of New Zealand’s colonisation history and add to the moral and academic importance of the above debates. Projected demographic changes, including a steady increase in those identifying as Asian and a gradual decrease in those identifying as Pākehā (Statistics New Zealand, 2017), will inevitably summon new and contested meanings of terms and identities that impact Māori–Pākehā relations.

## **The International Significance of My Research**

The discussion so far suggests that Māori–Pākehā relations are internationally significant because they connect to a much larger story. My study relates to the expansion of European imperialism through colonisation structures and processes, and its ongoing effects on Indigenous peoples and on their relations with settler peoples and societies. L. Smith (2012) argues that the expansion of European imperialism deliberately usurped the sovereignty and political status of Indigenous peoples, denigrating and marginalising their presence and interests. Canadian Aboriginal educational philosopher Marie Battiste (2000) describes “cognitive imperialism” and “cognitive assimilation” as deliberate attempts to colonise the thoughts and actions of Indigenous peoples, and their struggles to resist (p. 192). American Indian scholar Vine Deloria (1999) writes about the disorientation of Indigenous peoples due to land loss, barriers to practising their ways, and concerted settler efforts to destroy their ceremonial life. Wampanoag ceremonial keeper, gkisedtanamoogk (gkisedtanamoogk & Hancock, 1993) links cultural, human and planetary survival to finding a way for Indigenous peoples and settlers to coexist peacefully. He foresees the global seriousness of not learning how to live together; a future in which the natural habitat will become depleted and people will either be forced to share or to kill each other for scarce resources.

My research on Māori–Pākehā relations matters internationally because it provides a particular lens through which to view Indigene–settler relations. It draws attention to the existence and struggles of Indigenous peoples everywhere, signalling what is at stake if settler peoples and societies fail to recognise their Indigenous presence and unique status, and respect their interests. I highlight my particular research contributions further on.

## **International Research on Relational Problematics and Possibilities**

Aspects of the relational problematics and possibilities of Māori–Pākehā relations discussed in this thesis are characteristic of Indigene–settler relations in other colonial contexts. Already I have touched upon aspects of problematics at the macrolevel in Australia, Canada and the United States, in particular globalising unique identities and forging imperialistic and colonising strategies to take over and erase Indigenous societies. Critical researchers (see further, later) in these locations also draw attention to relational entanglements *and* fruitful engagements at a group level (particularly, Indigene–settler partnerships, coalitions and alliances) and at a microlevel (face-to-face encounters).

### **Metaphors to think with.**

Working across a range of disciplines (including education, philosophy, Indigenous studies, law, psychology, ethnography, ethnomusicology, arts research, geography, design, art education), Indigenous and non-Indigenous critical scholars in Canada, the United States and Australia seek to understand the problematics and possibilities at work in Indigene–settler relations in wide-ranging places, spaces and settings. These scholars (often working alongside practitioners) use metaphors to signify the space in-between Indigenous peoples and settlers, and the relational work that goes on there. They also highlight different nuances when using particular metaphors. Todd (2014), whose work I draw on in this project, favours the term *metaphor* over *concept* because it suggests literary and aesthetic meanings, and ontological spaces, rather than prescribing what can happen there.

Some metaphors suggest a hybrid zone or space. Anthropologist Mary Louise Pratt (1992) suggests that the contact zone is where cultures meet and must negotiate their unique histories, concerns and aspirations, and so on. This zone, she argues, is emotionally charged but highly creative, allowing for critical engagements that can challenge assumptions, foster understanding and create alternatives to asymmetrical power relations. While Pratt highlights hybrid possibilities, the critical scholar Paul Carter (1992) sees this zone as a

space in which to “preserve the intervals of difference” (p. 179). He employs the contact metaphor to describe a meeting space that allows for improvising, not merely rehearsing, the dynamics of cross-cultural communication between Aboriginal peoples and early settlers, enabling expressions of difference.

Drawing on Pratt and Carter, the educational philosopher Margaret Somerville and Garby Elder Tony Perkins (2003) use the contact metaphor in their collaborative work, highlighting productive tensions. They see creative potential in “the discomfort zone as an unresolved space,” with moving boundaries within which difficulties and difference can be negotiated (p. 262). (I return shortly to Somerville and Garby’s work as a specific example of relational possibilities.) In a later essay, Somerville (2014) recalls her acute sense of awareness that her world and the Indigenous world “cannot know each other” but processes of *mutual entanglement* and *creative collaboration* can lead to life-changing experiences and personal insights (“I have come to know myself in Country”, she says) that “necessarily implicate non-Indigenous collaborators in the most profound negotiations about land” (p. 9). She describes collaborations that draw on “the synchronicity of ceremony” in which different forms of expression “come together in a particular place” and each “element can evoke the whole” (p. 9).

Aboriginal scholar Martin Nakata (2007a, 2007b) suggests the metaphor of *cultural interface* as a *lived location* characterised by layered, complex entanglements but which also creates space for relational possibilities that can begin to transform colonial relations through ongoing negotiation. Drawing on Nakata, Indigenous studies scholar Colleen McGloin (2009) describes the cultural interface as a *site of struggle* for settlers that demands new sense-making, a reflexive orientation and daily negotiation. American Indian scholar William Ermine (2007), drawing on Roger Poole, develops the metaphor of *the ethical space of engagement*, which can challenge colonial systems and promote genuine dialogue. Among others, post-colonial theorist Homi Bhabha (2004) developed the metaphor of an *in-between* or *third space*, where hybrid possibilities are produced in, and through, language and new positions emerge through negotiation. Critical scholars have applied this metaphor to Indigene–settler educational engagements (such as Webster, Wiles, Civil, & Clark, 2005).

Other metaphors are suggestive of the work done in this in-between space. Critical scholar Henry Giroux (2005), drawing on Emily Hicks, suggests the metaphors of *borders* and

*border crossings* to describe the interplay of cultural politics at the margins where cultures, histories, languages and so on, meet and often collide. The border/border crossing metaphor highlights wide-ranging sites, territories and contact zones where power operates to increase or reduce distance among people, groups and places, while also creating opportunities to transform power relations and public consciousness. At the borders, Giroux suggests, people/groups can examine the particularity and partiality of their own/Other views. They can share insights, co-produce narratives and figure out how to work together to progress collective action. Giroux suggests border crossing as a pedagogical practice and as a resource for robust theoretical engagement and critical understanding.

In Canada, educational philosopher Celia Haig-Brown (1992) develops the metaphor of *border work* to explore tensions and opportunities in working across difference in Indigenous–non-Indigenous relations. Haig-Brown and Archibald (1996) highlight the importance of power and respect when encountering difference, including being willing to negotiate the power dynamics of knowledge production, to listen to and hear the Other’s stories, and to uphold cultural integrity. Border work, they suggest, offers potential for individual and cultural transformation but requires doing crucial emotional work alongside intellectual work. Among others, scholar/practitioner Lily Pol Neveu (2010) suggests the metaphor of *living together* rather than merely coexisting. She argues that dynamics in face-to-face relations can inform political negotiations, showing how people/parties can be together, talk to each other, and even become friends.

### **Problematics and possibilities – specific examples.**

I turn now to specific examples that illustrate relational problematics and possibilities in Indigene–settler relations and further situate my project in an international context. In Canada, an edited collection of case studies draws attention to aspects of the lives of Euro-Canadians including missionaries, government agents and lawyers, ethnographers who, from the mid-1800s until around 1920, worked with, and in support of, Aboriginal peoples and communities (Haig-Brown & Nock, 2006). Highlighting relational complexities and contradictions, these cases uncover individuals who were not only motivated by good intentions towards Indigenous peoples, but also beneficiaries of colonisation processes. They adopted various relational practices to nourish productive engagements and challenge the injustices of colonial Canada. For example, they learned Indigenous languages; listened, observed and learned from Indigenous peoples; made an attitudinal shift that

allowed them to respect Indigenous cultural traditions and knowledge of the land; challenged dominant stereotypes by *talking back* to Eurocentric assumptions in colonial narratives; promoted authentic representations of the Aboriginal peoples/groups; and resisted colonial policies by advocating for fair play in relation to Indigenous rights especially regarding their lands and cultural survival. These individuals also displayed Eurocentric biases, which inevitably meant that good intentions went askew, such as pursuing a goal to introduce Christianity and civilise Indigenous peoples, providing Eurocentric educational opportunities that became another form of oppression, and seeking to record Indigenous ways of life before they vanished. Often, settler respect for Indigenous ways of being only evolved as Indigenous peoples embraced European practices and innovations. Haig-Brown and Nock conclude that these narratives complicate but also resource our contemporary understanding of Indigene–settler relations, and create a historical context for their call for a decolonising project.

Indigenous studies scholar Lynne Davis (2010a) edited a collection of Canadian case studies on contemporary alliance-building efforts to re/envision Indigenous–non–Indigenous relationships. Penned by Elders, activists and scholars (Indigenous and non-Indigenous) these examples interweave theory and practice. In her introduction, Davis (2010b) distinguishes three relational approaches: 1) partners walking side-by-side and exercising different responsibilities; 2) paternalistic governance in which the settlers behave as if they know best; and 3) Indigenous partners leading the way, with settlers supporting their agenda/efforts for self-determination. These approaches are enacted in microrelations, reflect power arrangements and have somewhat fluid boundaries that inevitably merge when, for example, paternalist behaviours take over. Indigenous contributors highlight “the failure of imagination in Euro-Canadian society to move beyond its colonial past” (p. 14). Mohawk Elder Jake Swamp (2010) also emphasises the need for his people to:

overcome their own prejudices, their own anger, and recognise that we are individual human beings, and that deep inside of us there’s a thing called love and understanding. And so we have to learn how to tap into that again. It was not permitted before. (pp. 19–20)

Non-Indigenous contributors suggest various alliance-building practices including: knowing the past; addressing relational power imbalances; understanding and combatting

their own and institutional racism; acknowledging their complicity in the colonisation process and the entitlements they enjoy; replacing old ways of engaging (assumptions, attitudes, styles of communication, paternalistic behaviours; and so on) with a relational orientation that, for some, means becoming an ally or forming alliances with Indigenous peoples; and sharing social capital (such as political influence and expertise). Davis & Shpuniarsky (2010) suggests working in solidarity as a kind of decolonising project that will inevitably create discomfort.

White North American arts educator Kevin Slivka (2015) constructs a pedagogical narrative, like the ones in this thesis, in which he recalls his anxiety when first meeting Ojibwe artist Terry Kemper. Slivka's failure to observe the Ojibwe cultural custom of tobacco-giving led him to reorient himself in his relationship with Kemper. Seeking to decentre himself, Slivka strives to become a humble guest and a diligent learner, one who must constantly negotiate his engagements with his Indigenous colleagues and exercise resilience when he slips along the way. He seeks to engage with Kemper, on his terms, by respecting his culture, sovereignty and self-determination.

Noted earlier, Somerville and Perkins (2003) observe that discussions on Indigene-settler relations often "gloss over the negotiations of collaboration" (p. 255). Following Pratt, they undertake contextualised theorising of different sites and kinds of border work negotiated in the contact zone by Indigenous and non-Indigenous colleagues. Referring to a cultural eco-tourism research project, they explain how colleagues became team members in a partnership between an Aboriginal corporation and a university, and exercised different responsibilities. Perkins, for example, focused on the work of border maintenance, which includes, but is different from, the work of border crossing. He worked to make Aboriginal difference visible and the Aboriginal border accessible. Wendy, a university researcher, described the challenges of crossing borders without a prior relationship or cultural knowledge. Research protocols, she suggested, can mitigate some difficulties but do not protect against vulnerability or explain how to negotiate "a 'two-way awkwardness' of how to talk and work with people" (p. 262). For Somerville and Perkins, charting the spaces and work required by Indigenous and non-Indigenous colleagues in the contact zone is crucial to understanding unique contributions, what is at stake for those involved, and different theoretical understandings.

All of these scholars begin to illuminate evolving but now persistent themes in critically focused literature on Indigene–settler relations. They highlight persistent problematics in the context of the broader politics of land theft-loss and orchestrated attempts to erase Indigenous cultures. They illustrate difficulties, ambiguities, tensions, contradictions and risks facing Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars and practitioners doing border work. They focus on the struggle for control arising from deeply embedded asymmetries of power and colonial ways of thinking. They emphasise the importance of emotional work, including when meeting resistance, being misunderstood, and feeling unease, anxiety, discomfort or ambivalence. They draw attention to illusive, indeterminate, often situationally defined relational practices such as respect and reciprocity. They highlight particular ethical and political responsibilities of Indigenous peoples and settlers. They confront problematics in the work of knowledge production and representation, and the challenge to ensure cultural survival and integrity. They accept and navigate the unknowable difference of the Other.

But these scholars also identify enlivening alternative relational possibilities that emerge when people of integrity creatively and fearlessly negotiate the in-between space. They suggest that new kinds of positionings can emerge in face-to-face relationships (for example, non-Indigenous researchers become learners not experts and Indigenous peoples become co-researchers not informants). Individuals can take up or improvise different ways of being, doing, knowing and thinking. Evolving personal/cultural transformations make new kinds of relationships possible, even friendships. These scholars stress the need to work reflexively and proactively to counter the oppressive effects of asymmetrical power relations, and for settlers to develop an appreciation of specific Indigenous protocols to be able to engage appropriately. An unhurried pace that grows ongoing relationships shows genuine commitment and builds trust. Uncertainty and discomfort are inevitable but can produce productive tensions that signal things to work on.

In summary, these critical scholars contribute to a theoretical thread of international literature that highlights the importance of relationship, especially particular relationships – between particular people and with particular places. Educational scholar, Elizabeth MacKinlay and Yanyuwa lecturer Gordon Chalmers (2104), drawing on Emmanuel Levinas and Jacques Derrida, use the metaphor *being-in-relation*. They affirm what others in the contact zone doing border work hold dear: that “the Other matters”, and for non-

Indigenous scholars/practitioners this means the lives of Indigenous peoples matter, including their histories, stories, relationships to place, ceremonies and so on (p. 74). My research contributes to this broader conversation but is also specific to the historical and cultural context of Aotearoa–New Zealand.

## **What My Research Contributes**

I anchor my study in A. Jones' (2008) application of Michelle Fine's (1994) metaphor of working the hyphen, which I discuss in Chapter 3. Focused at the microlevel, my research contributes pedagogical resources (stories and ideas) that illuminate ways of being, doing, knowing and thinking that productively work the hyphen and support nonviolent coexistence (Todd, 2003, 2009, 2014). These resources interweave theory and practice, offering a productive resonance or difference for scholars and practitioners engaged in Māori–Pākehā relations in diverse locations, disciplines and roles in Aotearoa–New Zealand and for those engaged in Indigene–settler relations in other geographies with similar histories.

My co-research approach also contributes to wider methodological discussions. My research focus and contribution are derived from, and formed by, my methodology, which interweaves ideas from Indigenous, decolonising and narrative enquiry approaches. I used a co-research, case-centred approach to undertake this project. In his book on the renewal of generosity, sociologist Arthur Frank (2004) discusses research intentions that resonate with my approach, warranting a long citation:

“You’ve wandered all over and finally realized that you never found what you were after: how to live.” So wrote the Stoic Philosopher and Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius...If Marcus could not find how to live, of course I haven’t either. But I have collected stories about people finding a good deal of what they are after, and learning to recognise what gets in the way of what they seek. I don’t analyse these stories. I advocate trying to think with them, a process closer to letting the stories analyse us. Stories analyse us by allowing us to notice what attracts us to them and what we resist about them. They show us what we want, and ask us what we need...The examples that stories offer – their heroes – do not tell readers what to do; rather they are examples of struggling to figure out what has to be done and gathering the resolve to go

about doing it... We read them, from where we are, in our uncertainty, facing what we face. (pp. 6–7)

Over many months, my co-researchers and I engaged in deep conversation, face-to-face and by email. We discussed matters of interest to me and to them. When considering how to re-present our conversations, I recalled John McKnight’s observation that “universities learn by studies, institutions learn by reports and communities learn by stories” (quoted in Labonte, 2011, p. 162). I also consulted my co-researchers, who wanted the questions that summoned their stories included in this thesis. To enable this research to be accessible across different sites, I crafted pedagogical narratives as “composed conversations” (my term, explained in Chapter 4) that scholars *and* practitioners can “think with, if they chose to do so” (Cruikshank, 1998, p. 301). During this crafting process, my co-researchers assumed the responsibilities and entitlements of co-authors; some more, others less. In the final chapter I also do my own educational work by *thinking with* the stories told to me in this project (Archibald, 2008; Frank, 2004).

## **A Chapter Outline**

This thesis is divided into two parts. The first part, consisting of the first four chapters, situates my research and explains my research methodology. The second part consists of the composed conversations and theoretical–methodological conclusions.

### **Part 1: Situating my research, explaining my methodology.**

In this introduction, I set out to situate myself, explain my research focus, define terminology, discuss the international significance of my research, review international literature on Indigene–settler relational approaches and consider my contribution to it. I now conclude by outlining the remaining chapters.

In Chapter 2, I consider persistent problematics in face-to-face Māori–Pākehā relations. I examine relational subtleties and complexities of two notable examples, one historical, the other contemporary.

In Chapter 3, I introduce *five big ideas* that illuminate possibilities for relational justice in Māori–Pākehā relations: productive power relations, ethical responsibility to the Other, ontological becoming in relation, a transformative pedagogical orientation, and a way of life, a manner of being.

In Chapter 4, I discuss my research methodology, including how I selected my co-researchers and worked with them. I discuss ethical considerations, and how and why I represented their knowledge as composed conversations.

## **Part 2: Composed conversations, theoretical–methodological conclusions.**

In Chapters 5 to 10, I offer pedagogical narratives in the form of composed conversations. For each pair of longstanding colleagues, the Māori co-researcher is positioned first because *they and theirs* are the first peoples of this land. The first pair is Te Kawehau Hoskins (Chapter 5) and Alison Jones (Chapter 6). The second pair is Kevin Prime (Chapter 7) and Pat Snedden (Chapter 8). The third pair is Sam Chapman (Chapter 9) and Ann Milne (Chapter 10). These chapters show how each co-researcher traverses – with skill, care and commitment – the ethics and politics at work in their Māori–Pākehā relations.

Finally, in Chapter 11, I draw theoretical insights (related to the five big ideas canvassed in Chapter 3) from these composed conversations, to share with my co-researchers *and* with scholars, educators, activists, leaders and post-graduate students. I highlight relational possibilities as well as ambiguities, contradictions and tensions at work in the everyday joys and challenges of Māori–Pākehā relations as witnessed in the lives of my six co-researchers. I reflect further on the methodological contributions of this study, its limits, research openings and the reciprocity at work in this project.

While drawing on literature across the fields of philosophy, ethics, politics, education, kaupapa Māori, Indigenous and settler studies, my main purpose was to co-create new knowledge with people known for their willingness to *be in the conversation* on Māori–Pākehā relations. Why them? The ethnographer Goodall (2000) suggests that those who are willing to share deeply from their lives are the trustworthy ones:

In life's conversations, whom do you trust – the person who never discloses her or his own feelings, who has no interesting life stories to offer in exchange for the details of yours? Or do you trust the person who emerges in the talk as someone living a passionate and reflective life, someone willing to share with you its joys, its pain, its speculations, its ambiguities? (p. 23)

## Chapter 2: Problematics in Māori–Pākehā relations – persistent troubles

In this chapter, I review literature on persistent problematics in Māori–Pākehā relations. To begin, I examine the historical scholarship of Alison Jones and Kuni Jenkins (2008a, 2008b, 2011, 2017), Pākehā and Māori educational scholars respectively, to understand problematics in early Māori–Pākehā engagements. Then, I turn to the autobiographical reflections of the Pākehā historian, biographer and writer Michael King (1985, 1999, 2011), to comprehend contemporary challenges in his research relationships with Māori. To further make sense of these examples, I consider proposals of Pākehā anthropologist Anne Salmond (2012) and Pākehā sociologist Avril Bell (2017) who suggest that coexisting ontological styles produce relational entanglements. Following Māori scholar L. Smith (2012), I conclude that an unrelenting colonising approach continues to trouble Māori–Pākehā relations.

First, a note on terminology. In the field of education, the notion of *problems* is laden with discursive meanings that encourage binary thinking characterised by clarity and certainty. Such thinking pairs *a problem* with *a solution*. The problem–solution binary typically attributes a negative value to problems (because they create trouble) and a positive value to solutions (because they dispose of trouble). A proposal by Pākehā scholar Martin Tolich (2002) provides an example of binary thinking. He defines Pākehā paralysis as a problem facing Pākehā in their research relationships with Māori. Seeking to dissolve Pākehā paralysis (his own and others’), he appropriates “a home-grown remedy” developed by the Māori nursing scholar Irihāpeti Ramsden (p. 176). Tolich proposes Ramsden’s cultural safety approach as a “ready solution” for overcoming Pākehā paralysis (p. 175). But this kind of solution-focused approach limits possibilities for thinking about interminable relational problematics. Binary thinking assumes complex relational problems are understandable and readily solvable; once diagnosed and treated we can put them behind us and move on. But vexing relational concerns are rarely so accommodating or easily fixed. Neat solutions are typically ill-equipped to respond to messy and complex relations.

Rather than try to minimise or solve complex problems, Foucault (1997c) argues that the challenge in the first instance is to understand them. He was not interested in “a history of solutions” but rather “a genealogy of problems, of *problematiques*” (p. 256, emphasis in

the original). To avoid binary thinking, I use a translation of Foucault's term, *problematics*, to refer to those things (including ways of being, doing, thinking, and knowing) that undermine possibilities (including openings, opportunities, pathways and prospects) for productive engagements in face-to-face, Māori–Pākehā relations. I use the term *problematics* to label the interminable anxieties, pressures, challenges, tensions, troubles, difficulties, disruptions, entanglements, fractures, ruptures, breaks, breaches and betrayals that occur in Māori–Pākehā relations. Whatever form they take, in particular situations and contexts, troubling *problematics* signal potential openings for relational engagements and hold pedagogical value.

## **Earliest Encounters in Māori–Pākehā Relations**

In their historical research, A. Jones and Jenkins illustrate *problematics* in Māori–Pākehā relations in the early 19th century. Their studies of early Māori encounters with writing (2008a, 2008b, 2011) and the remarkable adventures of the Ngare Raumati leader Tuai (2017), who bravely traversed Māori and Pākehā worlds, have produced rich stories of human relationships that inform my research. I focus on three kinds of *problematics* plaguing early Māori–Pākehā relations drawn from their scholarship. First, the struggle to understand the Other; second, the challenge of negotiating uncertainties, ignorance and refusals in everyday encounters, and third, the failure to recognise or perform obligations. A. Jones and Jenkins (2008b) suggest that how we interpret early Māori–Pākehā relationships contributes to contemporary possibilities. I focus on the broad dynamics of these relational *problematics* and, in places, provide concrete illustrations by referring to particular but significant Māori–Pākehā relationships, the focus of my research.

### **The struggle to understand the Other.**

Communication was a significant barrier in early everyday interactions, as Māori and Pākehā struggled to understand the other (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2011). The pedagogical tools of language acquisition familiar to Pākehā, such as vocabulary lists and grammar books, did not exist and had to be created; a huge task requiring settlers to rely on the goodwill, generosity and expertise of their Māori hosts. Perhaps the greater challenge was translating concepts that carried different meanings and expectations. Pākehā ideas of hospitality and family loyalty, for example, were not reciprocal with Māori understandings of seemingly related concepts, in this case, *manaaki* and *whanaungatanga*, respectively (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2017). Rote learning (crucial for English language acquisition) was a highly prized

skill in the Māori world, allowing knowledge to be handed on across generations, but writing required considerable discipline and motivation (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2011). Māori were familiar with the physical requirements of intricate carving, weaving, painting and facial tattoos and appreciated their value, but copywriting could not be put to immediate use in the everyday life of te ao Māori (the Māori world). Learning copywriting, like developing language acquisition tools, became another site of face-to-face relations that not only posed considerable pedagogical challenges but also, over time, significantly altered Māori sense-making (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2011).

Different understandings and realities disrupted relations. Māori and Pākehā held incompatible views on almost every topic and the stories they told represented their fundamentally different realities (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2017). Although the early missionaries sought to implant their Pākehā god in this new land, some Māori saw an opportunity to develop literacy skills as “a way to appropriate the Pākehā god and make him Māori” (Head & Mikaere, 1988, p. 19). Other settlers arrived with military might, which Māori also desired. Seeking to fortify their own tribal strengths and gain access to new knowledge, skills, technologies and trading opportunities, Māori sought to introduce the settlers to te ao Māori. Māori performed various roles (including scholar, teacher, debater, cartographer, tribal leader, political strategist and ally, translator and intermediary) hoping the settlers would come to understand them (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2011). Their overarching intention was to draw the settlers into an exchange that would produce educational, social and economic benefits.

Conflicting assumptions underpinned divergent world views and incompatible intentions. A. Jones and Jenkins (2017) explain that Māori wanted to be recognised *as Māori* and integrate the Pākehā things they valued into their world. But it soon became clear that the settlers had limited capacity to understand their Māori world and, in the case of the missionary-teachers, limited knowledge in areas that interested them (such as politics, economics, technology, trade and so on). While Māori showed interest in learning from, and being taught by, early Pākehā settlers, the newcomers often refused to learn from them. According to A. Jones and Jenkins (2017) the settler-missionaries wanted Māori to stop being Māori, forget their (Māori) ancestors and reject their (Māori) gods. Their proselytising mission influenced what they (the settler-missionary-teachers) taught; they were concerned that their missionary enterprise would be negatively affected if Māori

became too familiar with new secular influences (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2008b). Engaging with the Pākehā was often frustrating for Māori and required huge resourcefulness, generosity and resilience.

### **The challenge of negotiating uncertainties, ignorance and refusals.**

Unfathomable differences and unrealistic expectations created uncertainty in relational engagements. A. Jones and Jenkins (2017) explain that the young English missionary Francis Hall developed friendships with two Ngare Raumati travellers, Tuai and Titere, who had made their way to England. Both were carefully groomed by the Church Missionary Society to return home and proselytise their people. Hall had a fanciful vision that they would all work together in Aotearoa–New Zealand to bring about a new society. But such unrealistic expectations and the incompatible demands of vastly different worlds made it impossible for the young travellers to fulfil his dream.

When they returned to Aotearoa–New Zealand, Tuai and Titere must have felt a growing sense of unease, confusion, ambivalence, and eventually deep consternation as they witnessed settler developments, experienced settler refusals to engage, and negotiated the conflicting expectations of their own people (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2017). Inevitably they went their own way and were condemned for fulfilling their own cultural expectations (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2017). Hall summed up the problem facing the missionaries and other Pākehā settlers towards Māori: “There is a mystery in their way of acting which I cannot unravel” (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2017, p. 203). Hall eventually gave up and returned to England, disillusioned and defeated.

Thomas Kendall, the first English/settler school teacher, developed familial bonds with Māori that were rejected by the Church Missionary Society. Living among whānau (Māori families) he displayed familial gestures of concern, loyalty and generosity that for Māori would have symbolised a sense of obligation that flowed both ways (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2011). His close relationships with Māori, including the Ngāpuhi chief Hongi Hika and Tuai, and his interest in their world, ultimately led to his undoing as a teacher. His missionary superiors thought his attachments had become too intimate and had led him astray, and eventually he was fired (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2008b).

Unaware of cultural etiquette or determined to ignore it, Pākehā failed to demonstrate proper recognition and respect for the authority of Māori leaders. When the Ngāpuhi chief

Hongi Hika received a muted greeting in London, he felt humiliated and was bewildered by the Pākehā rejection (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2017). This encounter reminded him of other experiences of Pākehā disloyalty and refusals to cooperate despite his determined efforts to engage. While such cultural improprieties by Pākehā earned rebukes from Māori, something greater was at stake (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2008b). Providing manaakitanga (generous hospitality) to rangatira (chiefs), including offering appropriate gifts and responding to requests, would have symbolised to Māori leaders, including Hongi Hika, that the settlers not only recognised their mana (authority, power, esteem) and appreciated the value of the relationship but also wanted to cooperate (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2017).

### **The failure to recognise or perform obligations.**

Conflicting understandings of agreements also affected relationships between Māori and the settlers. A. Jones and Jenkins (2017) explain that trading muskets and tools, and maintaining weaponry, carried life and death implications for tribes at war. The Pākehā offered Māori access to highly prized goods, such as chisels, large axes, knives, iron, muskets, and gunpowder (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2017). But early settlers either refused to trade certain goods that Māori desired (especially guns and gunpowder) or were selective in their trading (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2011). The Ngāpuhi leader Hongi Hika wanted an armourer to maintain his guns and became angry when he was sent a priest. Despite urgent pleas arising from their concern about possible Ngāpuhi attacks, Tuai and his beloved brother Korokoro were promised settlers who never arrived.

These Māori leaders had strong relationships with influential missionary-settlers, including with Rev. Samuel Marsden who was the leader of the Church Missionary Society in New South Wales, and expected them to oblige their requests. But the missionary-settlers by and large ignored or failed to recognise the implications of their unfair and careless approach in orchestrating early Pākehā settlement in the Bay of Islands and curtailing trade. Their uneven approach annoyed Māori leaders, disrupted hapū (sub-tribe) relations and affected rivalries, including personal relationships, trading alliances, territorial boundaries, and delicate balances of power (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2017).

The strain on face-to-face relationships was significant. The Pākehā maintained a superior stance but relied on Māori for protection and survival. Māori leaders sought to assert and preserve mana as core to relationships; decisions that strengthened tribal wellbeing enhanced a leader's reputation and became a source of pride (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2011).

But Māori leaders who travelled abroad or engaged with the settlers at home faced high demands from their own people who expected them to secure useful resources, knowledge and relationships. Their mana became entangled in their relationships with the Pākehā and could be negatively affected when settlers failed to honour their promises (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2017). Also, Māori leaders often felt misunderstood by the Pākehā. They did not see themselves as the aggressors in their disagreements with the settlers but rather felt they had to respond to increasing settler aggression (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2017).

In 1814, on one of his many voyages, the Ngāpuhi leader Ruatara (a nephew of Hongi Hika) visited Australia, with his uncle and Korokoro (Tuai's brother), at Rev. Samuel Marsden's invitation, to discuss the prospect of allowing settlers, including a teacher, to live in Aotearoa–New Zealand. As he was leaving to return home Ruatara had a troubling encounter that left him deeply worried. In Sydney, a gentleman who had seen the disastrous effects of Pākehā settlement on Aboriginal peoples warned him that an influx of settlers would soon take over his country and either destroy or enslave his people (A. Jones and Jenkins, 2011). Agreeing to permanent settlers was a risky endeavour but Ruatara and his travelling companions recognised that more ships were coming to their lands for trade and they could not stop them. The Ngāpuhi leaders were keen to embrace innovations and assimilate the Pākehā into their world on their terms. Convinced by Marsden that his intentions were benevolent, they remained open to Pākehā settlement and returned home with the settler families (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2011). They offered the settlers their protection, supported the establishment of the first school, and encouraged friendly relations with other Māori. But the dire predictions Ruatara heard in Sydney materialised more rapidly than he and most Māori leaders could have imagined and only few could possibly foresee.

According to A. Jones and Jenkins (2011), the settlers largely rejected Māori aspirations for a reciprocal and pedagogical relationship. Their scholarship not only provides an historical backdrop for my study but also creates a lens through which to view and understand contemporary engagements between Māori and Pākehā. Two hundred years later, the struggle to understand the Other, the challenge of negotiating uncertainties, ignorance and refusals in everyday encounters, and the failure to recognise or perform obligations continues to trouble Māori–Pākehā face-to-face relations, and the nation.

## **Pākehā Engagement in Research Relationships with Māori**

I turn now to a contemporary illustration of a Pākehā attempt to engage productively with Māori in research relationships and the problematics that materialised through those engagements. Over his lifetime Pākehā historian, biographer and writer Michael King developed an extraordinary range of relationships with Māori across the country and wrote extensively on Māori subjects. His autobiographical recollections (King, 1985, 1999, 2011) offer detailed accounts of his work with Māori and include Māori critiques of it. King (1999) recalls Māori *radicals* (his term) rebuking Pākehā historians for ignoring Māori history. Determined to help redress the situation, he set out to increase understanding of Māori history among Māori *and* Pākehā. Over the next decade King completed many book, film, print media, educational and other assignments, but his efforts became increasingly entangled. Subsequent Māori reprimands by influential Māori led King (1999) to withdraw from writing Māori histories. These reprimands focused on matters of paramount concern then (and now) to Māori *as Māori* – individuals, whānau (families), hapū, (sub-tribes) and iwi (tribes), and centred on King's right as a Pākehā to write Māori histories.

### **Ownership and control of cultural knowledge.**

In his memoirs, King (1999) documented Māori concerns relating to his research and writing. Regarding his biography of Dame Whina Cooper, some Māori writers raised questions about who owned and should have access to Māori cultural property. Responding to his biography of Te Puea Hērangi, the Māori activist Syd Jackson questioned who else “could have been and should have been entrusted with the privilege of writing this book” (quoted in King, 1999, p. 182). Māori academic Sidney Mead complained of Pākehā “reaching into Māori culture and taking hold of quite generous portions which they then try to fit into a Pākehā cultural world” (p. 182). When King edited a second collection of Māori essays, Mead perceived “a new sort of do-gooding. Its editor has salved his conscience by making it possible for Māori writers to say what they like on anything of their choice through the missionary-zeal of Michael King” (p. 182).

King recorded views of Māori critics questioning his role, intentions, and practice as a researcher. Some Māori challenged what King was taking from them and feared he would commercially exploit knowledge that was sacred to Māori (King, 1999, 2011). King (1999) reported that one Māori critic accused him:

of being an “academic raider” (though I was not an academic and had no ambitions in that direction), of exploiting the goodwill of those who had helped me (though I continued to receive warm letters and visits from such people), of giving the Māori I had written about false mana (the mana of people such as Te Puea, Whina Cooper and James Henare was long established in the Māori world before I began to write about them), and of lacking an ideological framework (social anthropology) to write about Māori–Pākehā relations. [This critic] suggested that Pākehā writers should restrict themselves to confronting racism in their own society, though how this could be done without writing about Māori–Pākehā relations, she did not say. (p. 188)

King (1999) associated this shifting ground of Māori argument with a new political verve inspired by an emerging Māori Renaissance. In this memoir he reflects on his research engagements, including what he considered to be unthinkable, such as working without appropriate Māori approvals and support on projects that directly impacted on or implicated their interests and, equally non-negotiable, the importance of integrity and professional competence when carrying out the work. Replying to criticism of his book, *Māori: A Photographic and Social History*, King said:

Nobody would answer what seemed to me to be the most relevant question: would anything be different in the book (apart from the selection of photographs) if it had been written by a Māori? I doubted it. I had focused the text on Māori viewpoints from Māori sources. (p. 184)

King (2011) later argued that writing good history required a disinterested and objective approach but he also accepted this matter would never be settled and people could draw different conclusions from the same evidence. What mattered most, he argued, was being suitably equipped to write Māori history, which required the ability to speak the language, understand the culture and do good historical research. But, on completing the *Tangata Whenua* (people of the land) film series, he vowed never again to “interfere so directly in the intimacy of people’s lives, nor play God by advising what bits of them should be represented and what shouldn’t” (p. 115). Yet, he believed deeply in his work on that series and other projects.

Michael King was both of, and before, his time. He responded to a call to action by Māori and dived into an ocean of relational activity that was undergoing a dramatic and rapid sea-change. Relational problematics were to be expected but, to his great credit, in my view, King also developed diverse relationships with Māori at a time and in a relational space in which very few Pākehā were willing or culturally equipped to engage. That said and notwithstanding contested histories, tumultuous current events, and fast approaching futures, which he canvassed in his writing, King chose to record *(his)stories* (my term) of Māori lives and realities, mainly as sole-authored works.

Here I digress, momentarily, to consider a different approach taken at the same time King was writing *(his)stories* of Māori lives and realities. A young anthropologist, Anne Salmond, now a leading Aotearoa–New Zealand academic, chose a collaborative co-authorship approach when recording the life story of Amiria Manutahi Stirling, *as told to her* (Salmond & Stirling, 1976). Salmond concludes the book by critically reflecting on the project. She acknowledges the intimate friendship from which the collaboration had developed and her intention to discuss “Māori experience in a Māori way” (p. 167). Agreeing with the anthropologist Clifford Geertz, whom she quotes, that “lives, like societies, contain their own interpretations,” Salmond had set herself the challenge of representing the meanings that Stirling had made of her own experiences (p. 166). Salmond’s relational research approach coheres in the construction of a collaborative text, not a sole-authored account, and she makes visible her sense of the relationships. Salmond remains highly respected among Māori and in wider society.

As for King, perhaps his work (in its particular social, cultural, ethical and political context) was inevitably destined to be both strongly critiqued by Māori (wanting greater control of research and writing related to *their* histories) and nationally lauded (given the numerous publications and awards he earned prior to his untimely death).

### **Problematic Pākehā positioning.**

Wevers (2006) suggests that a lack of reflexivity led King to overlook his privileged position and role as a “magisterial historian” (p. 7). She critiques King’s authority as a cultural interpreter and his authorial intentions which, by his own observations, swayed from making Māori intelligible to Pākehā (King, 1985) to making Pākehā intelligible to Māori (King, 1999). She suggests that King assimilates his subject’s voice by assuming the place of, and speaking for, Māori. She also contends that he overrides the very agreements

that gave him access to his subjects and their knowledges. King (1999) crafted his autobiographical reflections as a narrative of “being Pākehā” and “becoming a white Native,” which according to Wevers, further perform the dominant cultural assumptions underpinning his work.

While aspects of King’s positioning are problematic, his approach offers pedagogical insights. King thought his work could bridge the great gap in understanding between two cultures, as if knowing the Other was somehow possible. His approach was haunted, if not plagued, by the certainty of his convictions, which undoubtedly contributed to the troubles articulated by Māori critiquing his work. But, in making her critique, Wevers refers to the substance and significance of relationships and negotiations, the intimacy of which only King and his Māori collaborators could speak of, to and from the heart. Labelling King as a magisterial historian problematises him and discredits his historical scholarship. Such labelling makes it “*less possible to think*” (A. Jones, 2005, emphasis in the original, p. 14) about the complexities of his many and diverse engagements with Māori. Such labelling also discourages learning through repetitive critical engagement with his relational approach and work. Some of his work with Māori was clearly problematic but other contributions were productive. Importantly, his story offers Pākehā scholars a critical reminder: whatever the substance and significance of particular research relationships with Māori, Pākehā researchers embody the dominant culture of which we are a part and must therefore work constantly against domineering power relations. My reading of King’s work compels me to embrace a less certain, more reflexive approach.

## **Conflicting Ontological Styles**

The scholarship of Salmond (2012) and Bell (2017) considers the substance, significance and impact of two different ontological styles: te ao Māori (the Māori world) and te ao Pākehā (the Pākehā world). According to Salmond (2012) an ontological style refers to a “state of being (p. 121), “a way of being” and “a dimension of reality” (p. 135). Ontological styles carry different understandings of what matters and how things work. When embodied in everyday practices, familiar objects or taken-for-granted routines they are difficult to apprehend or question. Salmond (2012) argues that different ontological styles help to explain why early encounters between Māori and Pākehā were plagued by contestation and why such problematics continue to trouble their relations today.

Salmond (2012) explains that, prior to European settlement, te ao Māori was “the ordinary, normal everyday way of being” (p. 123). Then, and now, this world activates a social relationality that is unbounded and thrives on constantly evolving networks. In this world, Salmond argues, the breath of life (hau) urges reciprocal exchange (utu) as a way of developing and maintaining a complex web of relationships. Because relational negotiations are constant and ongoing, any sense of stability or balance is always impermanent and conditional. Salmond explains that gift exchanges nourish relational connections and arrangements, whereas arguments and disputes create separations. Pairings, such as tāngata whenua (the people of the land) and manuhiri (visitors), characterise this cosmos and are negotiated in the place of encounter. Salmond (2012) states:

The *pae*, that perilous border zone, the place of encounter, lies at the heart of these pairings, transforming relations. By the exchange of gifts, an enemy can become a friend, just as a friend can become an enemy through an exchange of insults. (p. 121, italics in the original)

Te ao Pākehā arrived with the settlers. Māori soon realised that this new world had conflicting assumptions. Rather than being relationally constituted, te ao Pākehā asserts a fixed essence and creates bounded realities with clearly defined internal divisions. In the nation-states of te ao Pākehā, for example, one was either a citizen with the right to vote, and afforded property rights, or not, and binaries such as modern–primitive produced asymmetrical power relations (Salmond, 2012).

Different connections to whenua (land) created enduring tensions in face-to-face relations. In te ao Pākehā, Salmond (2012) explains, land was a commodity to be bought and sold, whereas in te ao Māori whenua carried multiple associations – including as a source of identity and of mana, as a place of birth, and as a gift of exchange to cement relations or create alliances. The colonising practice of dividing land into blocks with fenced boundaries allowed individual shares to be assigned to newly created autonomous individuals. Such colonising practices disrupted pre-existing Māori relational networks and dismantled age-old ways of being, which presupposed relationality as ontologically prior.

The crux was not simply conflicting ontological styles but also a Pākehā/Western assumption of European “cosmological superiority” (Salmond, 2012, p. 126). The settlers largely rejected the adaptable, flexible and open-minded relational orientation of te ao

Māori because it was different and therefore strange. They also thought Māori knowledges were heretical, primitive, an abomination, or erroneous, and therefore inferior (Salmond, 2012).

Reflecting on Salmond's notion of ontological styles, Bell (2017) suggests that the coexistence of Indigenous and settler worlds produced ontological entanglements. Rather than engaging with one another's different modes of existence to enhance relationship and enrich one another, the colonising project systematically undermined the worth of Māori difference and their "ways of being-in-the-world" (p. 15). In an effort to erase the Māori world, Māori were pushed to the periphery of the encroaching settler society and their very existence became threatened (Bell, 2014). As if an affront to the settler society, te ao Māori became increasingly invisible to Pākehā. While the two worlds coexist today, this invisibility continues, and for many Pākehā, engagement with te ao Māori is limited to superficial or fleeting encounters, such as public performances of Māori customary practices (Bell, 2017).

These reflections indicate that from their earliest encounters until today conflicting ontological styles and the presumed ontological superiority of te ao Pākehā have severely taxed Māori–Pākehā relations, in the political sphere and in face-to-face encounters. These conflicting styles also implicate the enormous challenge facing Pākehā who seek to decolonise our own ontological orientation in order to turn respectfully towards te ao Māori. I return to the notion of ontological styles in the next chapter where I explore the possibilities for positive relational engagements that might flow from the provocations and messy entanglements of coexisting Māori and Pākehā worlds.

## **An Unrelenting Colonising Approach**

The discussion so far suggests that a persistent and pervading colonising approach at work in Māori–Pākehā relations 200 years ago is still in play. A. Jones and Jenkins (2008, 2011, 2017) uncover this colonising approach in their historical research and a deep concern over its ongoing impacts underpinned the challenges that Māori leaders put to King (1985, 1999, 2011). Early settlers and missionaries embodied a superior stance that reflected a colonising approach, which continues to plague a Pākehā orientation and positioning in Māori–Pākehā relations in contemporary times.

L. Smith (2012) locates the colonising project within, and as an expression of, European imperialism. Imperialism, she argues, was systematically progressed through economic expansion, the conquest of Indigenous others and subjugation of settlers to ensure their compliance, and an ideological spirit and hunger for new knowledge with cultural, intellectual and technical aspirations. She harnesses Edward Said's view of imperialism as a discourse about the Other promulgated by the West and maintained by institutions, language, research, images, policies and bureaucracies and other mechanisms. L. Smith also uses Said's concept of positional superiority to characterise a Western attitude, orientation and approach that created relationships with the Other, in particular Indigenous peoples, then systematically appropriated and exploited their knowledge and culture in the same way as other materials were claimed and sold.

Contemporary Aotearoa–New Zealand Treaty claims and court cases agree that New Zealand's founding document, Te Tiriti of Waitangi, signed in 1840, was intended as a basis for an evolving social contract (Waitangi Tribunal, 1983) and an ongoing partnership between Māori and the Crown (New Zealand Māori Council v. Attorney-General, 1987). But the Crown's rapid betrayal of its Treaty commitments and the relationships the Treaty sought to preserve produced devastating impacts for whānau (families), hapū (sub-tribes) and iwi (tribes) and Māori (Durie, 1994). Introduced diseases created rampant epidemics. Land wars and colonial legislation (including the New Zealand Settlement Act of 1863, the Native Lands Act of 1865 and its 1873 amendment) accelerated the alienation of tribal lands (Orange, 1987). Tribal, social and political institutional and customary arrangements were severely disrupted.

Māori used written technologies (such as letters, petitions, proclamations) and initiated other nonviolent action (such as peaceful protests, delegations to Britain, and tribal conferences) to address relational tensions with the settlers (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2011; Orange, 1987). These actions sought to secure their mana and reclaim their sovereignty, and to achieve justice for Treaty abuses but were largely ineffective as the colonial enterprise took over (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2011; Orange, 1987). Within 60 years of signing the Treaty, the Māori population plummeted to less than half of the estimated number in 1840 but, despite paternalistic predictions of a dying race, Māori survived. (M. Durie, 1994). In 2013 nearly 15% of Aotearoa–New Zealand's population identified as Māori (Statistics New Zealand, 2013b).

Māori academic Mason Durie (1997) argues that the challenge now facing Māori is to survive and to prosper *as Māori*. He states:

Whereas one hundred years ago the main problem facing Māori was one of biological survival, the challenge today is to survive as Māori, to retain Māori identity, while still being able to participate fully in society, and in the communities of the world. (p. 41)

Our Pākehā-dominated society claims fairness as a core value but socio-economic inequalities and disparities continue to disadvantage Māori and intensify problematics in face-to-face Māori–Pākehā relations. Thirty years ago, Pākehā historian Claudia Orange (1987) concluded that the damage done through legislative instruments and political processes (including land-grabbing, suppressing political protest, and questioning the status of Māori and of the Treaty) had seriously impacted Māori–Pākehā relationships, producing a deep sense of injustice that remains. In 2003, King (2011) suggested that the nation had not yet created a jointly agreed social contract.

Today there is evidence of incremental change, for example significant Treaty settlements between the Crown and iwi are now supporting Māori development opportunities (C. Jones, 2016). But as of 30 June 2012, 58% of female prisoners and 51% of male prisoners identified as Māori (Statistics New Zealand, 2012). Such statistics powerfully demonstrate a persistent colonising approach at work in our society and confirm that Aotearoa–New Zealand has a long way to go in developing the partnership the Treaty of Waitangi intended.

## **Conclusion**

From first encounters to present-day interactions, Māori–Pākehā face-to-face relations have been profoundly challenged by the inestimable damage caused by colonising efforts to erase Māori ways of being and to undermine Māori interests. The struggle to understand the Other; uncertainties, ignorance and refusals when engaging, and Pākehā failures to recognise or uphold obligations compromised early relationships. Problematics associated with the ownership and control of cultural knowledge and Pākehā positioning plague contemporary research collaborations.

The notions of *te ao Māori* and *te ao Pākehā* offer a way of understanding why and how certain provocations led to contestation and seemingly incompatible conflicts. Different ontological styles produced ontological entanglements that continue to permeate structural-

institutional arrangements, political strategies and myriad everyday encounters, personal and professional. Colonisation still shapes the context in which Indigenous–settler relations function. Writing in the Canadian context, Davis (2010b) observes that:

colonising practices inhabit the interstices of social interactions and find expression at [all] levels, [including the] macro- and micro-analysis of relationships; the global and the local; the social and the personal. (p. 8)

Whether intended, or not, relational breaches and betrayals create myriad effects (emotional, spiritual, political, physical, relational and environmental and economic) that invoke the ever-present dangers of colonisation, its past deadly assaults and its contemporary insidious manifestations (Davis & Shpuniarsky, 2010). Relational problematics demand ongoing attention because times, contexts, circumstances and flows of power are constantly changing. With those disruptions and changes come shifts in understanding about what is, and might be, possible in and through the relation. The knowing stance of early Pākehā settlers and others in their wake challenges me to look for ways of thinking, being, doing and knowing that can invoke relational possibilities.



## Chapter 3: Possibilities in Māori–Pākehā relations – ideas to think with

I now turn to ideas that animate possibilities for productive engagements in Māori–Pākehā relations and are constitutive of relational justice. Rather than utilising a particular theory, I cross-pollinate ideas from various theories and fields. A. Jones (2005) argues provocatively that, in the field of education, good ideas are scarce and require looking in unusual places. By good ideas she means intellectually challenging, critical, confounding, imaginative, encouraging and useful ways of thinking that evolve when different approaches are brought together. Discussing the frame of inequality in education, she offers insights that relate to my study. She argues that, just as current solution-focused approaches can undermine difference, so, too, politically popular, evidence-based approaches can limit ways of knowing to scientific or technical studies. Electing to “stay *with* the relationship” (p. 19, emphasis in the original), Jones challenges me to turn to ideas that open up possibilities for “*how we can think*” and “*what we might be able to think*” when negotiating the Māori–Pākehā relation (pp. 16–17, emphasis in the original).

In this chapter, I examine *five big ideas* developed by prominent thinkers whose intellectual insights assist me to think critically and creatively about the ethics and politics of Māori–Pākehā relations. These ideas (*in*)*form* (that is, inform and form) the work I am able to do in this research project by providing different lenses through which to view and compose understandings of relational justice. These ideas permeated my conversations with my co-researchers (explicitly and implicitly) and orient my reflections in the conclusion of this thesis. They are: 1) productive power relations; 2) an ethical responsibility to the Other; 3) ontological becoming in relation; 4) a transformative pedagogical orientation; and 5) a way of life, a manner of being. When addressing each idea, I highlight concepts that inspire my thinking about relational possibilities. I conclude the chapter by explaining their relevance for my research.

Before proceeding, I want to further set the scene by distinguishing the kind of relational orientation – working the hyphen – I am seeking to more deeply understand and characterise in this thesis.

## Working the Hyphen – A Metaphor for and Site of Implied Ethics and Politics

Aotearoa–New Zealand scholars working in the field of Māori–Pākehā relations use various metaphors to map this terrain and describe the work that goes on there, including: *Journeying into the third space* (Greenwood, 2005); *the space of the beach* (Barclay, 2005); *being in the relationship* (A. Jones, 2012), *meetings at thresholds* (Crocket et al., 2013), *unpaved path* (Crocket et al., 2015), *intercultural hyphen* (Stewart, 2016), and *te ara whanaunga* (the relational path) (Hoskins, 2017). In this research I harness the metaphor of *working the hyphen* (Fine, 1994; A. Jones, 2008, 2012) as a way to think about an ethical, political, pedagogical and ontological orientation to Māori–Pākehā engagements.

The social psychologist Michelle Fine (1994) uses the idea of the hyphen to conceive the complex space at the borders of the Self–Other relation. She understands the hyphen as a space where the boundaries between the Self and the Other become problematically blurred but provoke possibilities for relational entanglements and authentic engagements. Her understanding that *the between* embodies a relationship that is problematic but necessary invites A. Jones (2008) to claim the hyphen as a space in which to undertake fruitful methodological work in Māori–Pākehā relations. To avoid the allure of collaborative approaches that homogenise difference, A. Jones and Jenkins actively work the hyphen in their research relationship as a character requiring ongoing attention (A. Jones, 2008).

For A. Jones and Jenkins (2008b), working the hyphen means striving for “a complex reciprocity” (p. 187). Accepting the tensions of difference, their open but always conditional approach requires flexibility that is constantly negotiated (A. Jones, 2008). In a later essay, A. Jones (2012) observes that collaborative approaches that emphasise *us* may inadvertently or deliberately ignore the hyphen but cannot replace it. The hyphen, she argues, always already exists; it not only embodies difference but also enacts power relations that continue to produce disparities in cultural and social privilege.

Following educational philosopher Sharon Todd (2014), I imagine working the hyphen as a metaphor that creates a particular kind of relationship; one that strives to intersect ethics and politics. Elsewhere Todd (2003) views education as a site of implied ethics:

An implied ethics means that educational practices, technologies, discourses, and relationships always already participate in a field of ethical signification,

that is a domain or realm in which nonviolent relations to the Other are possible (even if not inevitable). (p. 14)

Working the hyphen in Māori–Pākehā relations is a site of implied ethics *and politics*. My approach highlights the relationality and interplay of ethics and politics, while distinguishing the uniqueness or difference of what each has to offer. Just as workings of power always already operate in domains of ethical signification (even where nonviolent relations to the Other are possible), so, too, educational practices, technologies, discourses and relations always already indicate the work of ethics. Hoskins (2010) understands the ethical and the political as intersecting expressions of sociality. Ethics can interrogate politics and vice versa, without reducing one to the other. Such interrogation, she suggests, can lead to ethical–political decision making in service of others. Giroux (2005) suggests that “ethics and politics is a relationship between self and Other” (p. 67). This relationship, he argues, is grounded in difference, requires responsibility to the Other, and focuses on how justice is constructed in social relations and concrete circumstances as well as through wider collective struggles against injustice. Assuming this ethical–political interplay, I now consider concepts that illuminate aspects of relational justice and their significance for Māori–Pākehā relations.

### **1) Productive power relations.**

To be *in relation* is to be in a relation of power. In theorising power relations, the French philosopher, Michel Foucault, focuses on the exercise of power rather than its possession, and highlights its productive force and relational prospects while critiquing its repressive action (Sawicki, 1991). Here, I am not attempting to summarise Foucault’s intricate and complex postmodern analyses of power relations. Rather I want to underpin my research with ideas on power that (in)form my view of politics and suggest possibilities for relational justice when working the Māori–Pākehā hyphen. The utility of his thinking for Indigenous–settler relations is demonstrated elsewhere (for example, Haig-Brown & Archibald, 1996).

#### ***The workings of power.***

Foucault (1997a) argues that power is always already present and refers to a strategic relationship in which someone seeks “to control the conduct of the other” (p. 292). Foucault (2003) outlines that the exercise of power operates on:

the field of possibilities in which the behaviour of active subjects is able to inscribe itself. It is ... always a way of acting upon one or more acting subjects by virtue of their acting or being capable of action. (p. 138)

For Foucault (1997a) power relations operate on various levels (micro and/or macro) and in various ways including the strategic relations outlined above, “techniques or technologies of government” and “states of domination” (p. 299). Of particular relevance to my study, his analytic work shows how relations of power at a microlevel can either perpetuate or resist states of domination through the practice of freedom.

### ***The practice of freedom.***

Responding to asymmetrical relations of power, Foucault (1997d) argues that people can always exercise the practice of freedom. Because people are always free, they can always take action to change their situation. His radical suggestion is that relational struggles and tensions can be generative. As a “permanent provocation” (Foucault, 2003, p. 139), the exercise of power can create (not only constrain) relational possibilities. Here Foucault’s (1997a) observations about homosexual–government power relations help to (in)form my understanding of Māori–Pākehā power relations:

the struggle, of course, is not symmetrical, the power situation is not the same; but we are in this struggle, and the continuation of this situation can influence the behaviour or non-behaviour of the other.... We cannot jump *outside* the situation, and there is no point where you are free from all power relations. But you can always change it. (p. 167)

Where freedom operates as a refusal to submit, power relations can become “mobile, reversible, and unstable” (Foucault, 1997a, p. 292). But where there is a state of domination, with virtually no way to resist, power relations become static, that is perpetually asymmetrical in ways that greatly reduce one’s ability to exercise freedom. Without resistance, he argues, there is obedience, and therefore no power relations.

So resistance comes first, and resistance remains superior to the forces of the process; power relations are obliged to change with the resistance. (Foucault, 1997d, pp. 167–168).

Foucault, like Emmanuel Levinas whom I turn to next, was wary of programmatic approaches. He considered them dangerous because they can inhibit inventiveness or, worse, strengthen repressive action and states of domination (Foucault, 1997a, 1997b). For

Foucault, the challenge of defining conscious practices of freedom is inherently ethical and political. He proposes fields of possibilities in which one can practise freedom in ways that allow for ethical–political engagements.

## **2) An ethical responsibility to the Other.**

Levinas, a French Lithuanian Jewish philosopher, understands ethics as a nonviolent social relation that constitutes justice. Primarily interested in the face-to-face encounter, his ethics invoke an ethical response to, and responsibility for, the Other. Levinas conceives an asymmetrical, non-reciprocal, affective, face-to-face relation between the Other and me. (I address the tension between his notion of non-reciprocity and A. Jones’ idea of complex reciprocity when concluding this chapter). Rather than systematically applying his thinking, I look to Levinasian ethics for inspiration, to better understand ethical responsibilities and the work of justice when working the hyphen in Māori–Pākehā face-to-face relations. I also draw on other theorists who help me to understand his thinking.

Exploring the concept of alterity (being Other or otherness), Levinas (1998a) suggests that experience is underpinned by a radical exposure to the Other. The Other to whom he refers is “infinitely transcendent, infinitely foreign” (p. 194) and therefore unknowable. The Other is the other human being – someone who I am not – who presents as a “face” (p. 50) with constantly changing expressions. According to Levinas (1998a), because I come into being through my relationship with the Other, I have an infinite responsibility to them. Through a face-to-face relation, I am exposed to a face, a person, a stranger, whose humanity is equal to mine. An ambiguity exists however; this particular Other who orders me to responsibility is, paradoxically, the one most disadvantaged in terms of power (Weerasooriya, 2004). My proximity to the Other challenges me to be mindful, alert and attentive to possibilities for exercising my ethical responsibilities (Hoskins, 2010, 2017; Todd, 2003). I am summoned, as someone unique and irreplaceable, to “always to have one degree of responsibility more, the responsibility for the responsibility of the other” (Levinas, 1998a, p. 117).

My ethical responsibility does not diminish when I perform ethical action; rather it increases and expands as I accomplish its demands (Levinas, 1969). For Levinas (1998a) the impossible demands of ethical responsibility ultimately require forgetting oneself, even to the extent of becoming “a hostage to the other” (p. 117). But as I exceed my own limits and seek to respond ethically to the Other, not only do I enable their freedom but also my own freedom (Todd, 2009). Although Levinas (1986) challenges us to exercise radical

generosity when exercising our ethical responsibilities, he does not expect us to fulfill every ethical demand we encounter – no human being could. Instead, he wants us to become ever more aware of our ethical obligations and to privilege ethical action in our face-to-face relations with the Other.

### ***Acts of small goodness.***

Of particular significance for my study, Levinasian ethics focuses on humble, everyday gestures that embody ethical responsibility and foster a relational orientation. Levinas (2006) describes such gestures as “acts of small goodness” (p. 230) and considers them to be of high ethical significance because they encourage a “world of pity, compassion, pardon and proximity – even the little there is; even the simple ‘After you, sir’” (Levinas, 1998a, p. 117). Hoskins (2010) suggests that these small goodnesses signify moments in which the ethical is enacted *and* remind us of our ethical responsibility. Todd (2014) calls them “small moments of grace, those instants of living transformation” that shape who we become (p. 243). Elsewhere, Todd (2003) refers to ways of relating that constitute one’s response to difference and which allow for, and create moments of, nonviolence.

### ***The work of justice.***

Levinas was aware that his own ethical attentiveness and response to the Other could, at the same time, exclude the needs and interests of other Others, and the many, which is why he argues that the work of justice is necessary. For Levinas (1969), the work of justice summons an ethical response to and responsibility for the other Other(s), whom he calls, “the third party” (Levinas, 1998a, p. 104). For Levinas (1998a), just as ethical face-to-face relations embody the wisdom of love so, too, justice embodies the wisdom of love for the other Others. Justice also bears witness to prophetic politics which are located somewhere “between war and peace – totality and infinity – and describes the space and movement between them” (Hoskins, 2010, p. 34).

Like Foucault, Levinas refuses to rely on moral checklists, philosophical prescriptions or even legal frameworks as a means to achieving justice. Such rules, because they are based on general principles, create possibilities for injustice that lead to domination. Inevitably they exclude the needs and interests of particular Others, who are always already socially located and socially constituted. Whatever their form, such rules cannot replace or dictate one’s unique ethical response in a given situation. Bell (2014) suggests that the particularity

of the ethical relation composed by Levinas means that justice must be decided in each case. Todd (2009) explains:

In terms of justice, I decide, evaluate, compare, and prioritize on the basis of my obligations to others, not upon the basis of predefined principles, laws, or rights. (p. 73)

But making decisions on the basis of my obligations to others is not always so seemingly straightforward or easily determined. When confronted with the multiple and diverse demands of other Others, inevitably I must accept not only the limits of my capacity to respond but also, in the process, an unsettled relationship between ethics and politics in face-to-face relations. The philosopher Bernasconi (1999) argues that ethics and politics coexist in tension, each able to challenge the other, which according to Bell (2014) offers generative possibilities. Both scholars recognise that, although the ethical cannot dictate political action, it can provoke ethical consideration that may interrupt the political.

Hoskins (2010, 2012) argues that heightening our ethical sensitivity and affectivity to the Other can lead to political action that respects the Other's uniqueness and cultivates relationship. She cautions, however, that we must always be ready to review rules and recommendations, policies and laws, to consider who may be excluded, how, and the effects of such exclusions for particular individuals, groups and society as a whole. Political practice, then, is necessarily risky and requires those dedicated to the work of justice to be self-reflexive so that each decision, each response – always already political – remains open to critique and is guided by the ethical. Todd (2009) argues that only by creating space for otherness and difference, for uncertainty and indeterminacy, through “an openness to exchange” are new possibilities for justice likely to emerge (p. 155).

### ***Māori philosophical resonance.***

Hoskins (2010) identifies points of resonance between aspects of Māori philosophy and Levinasian thinking. She explains that, in Māori philosophy, human whakapapa (genealogies) are constituted in a relational ontology that activates a social orientation of responsibility and care for others (whanaungatanga). Whakapapa and whanaungatanga are the foundation of human subjectivity, relatedness and ethical responsibility in the kanohi ki te kanohi (face-to-face) relation. The centrality of relationship/s in Māori philosophy reminds Hoskins that she is always already in relation and inside particular relationships.

The *kanohi ki te kanohi* relation of Māori philosophy and the face-to-face encounter of Levinasian ethics provide the foundation for a social ethicality. Both Māori philosophy and Levinasian ethics accept the impossibility of ever fully knowing the Other and recognise that being relationally constituted demands an ethical response. Practices, such as *aroha* (love and compassion), *tiaki* (guardianship and protection), *mana* (power, authority, esteem) enact this responsibility (Hoskins, 2010, 2017). These practices derive from and embody rich histories, multiple associations, complex meanings, and diverse expressions. Here I touch the surface but do so because my co-researchers refer to them in subsequent chapters.

### *Aroha.*

Māori theologian Cleve Barlow (1994) describes *aroha* as an all-inclusive quality of goodness that cultivates new forms of engagement imbued with a sense of the meaning of life. Māori law expert Eddie Durie (2000) adds that *aroha* seeks to understand how the Other or other persons think and act, and represents that understanding in speaking – in other words how they approach them, whoever they be. If needs must, *aroha* will disagree but always in a manner that shows respect and equanimity. Māori theologian Māori Marsden (2003) adds that *aroha* earns honour but carries obligations that may demand the sacrifice of one's life. Hoskins (2012) defines *aroha* as an:

*unconditional* concern and responsibility for others [which operates] in excess of who (culturally, socially, economically) others might be, or what they may have done. (p. 92)

### *Manaaki and tiaki (or kaitiaki, a person or group performing this role).*

Māori legal scholar Carwyn Jones (2016) argues that the practices of *manaaki* and *tiaki* demonstrate ethical responsibility and caring for others. *Manaaki* enacts an ethic of generosity, especially as a host, and nurtures relationships through expressions of respect, kindness, and acts of giving and receiving. *Tiaki* suggests ethical obligations along the lines of stewardship or guardianship, to care for and protect human and non-human forms of life. A *kaitiaki* exercises their duties according to local customary practices, to benefit others (including the non-human forms). Other Māori scholars (such as Barlow, 1994; Mead, 2003) draw attention to spiritual representations of *kaitiaki* (guardian spirits), often an ancestor or animal, who watch over and protect their descendants, sacred places and the natural world. Such understandings suggest engagements in and with spiritual realms.

### *Mana.*

Māori scholars (including E. Durie, 2000; Hoskins, 2010; Marsden, 2003; Mead, 2003; Tate, 2012) highlight various dimensions of the practices of mana (power, authority, esteem, prestige, status). Hoskins (2010) and E. Durie (2000) draw attention to the significance of mana in creating good, peaceful relationships. For Māori, E. Durie argues, what matters is not what the other person does (their professional status) but who they are as a human being, to whom they are related and where they come from. In te ao Māori respecting the mana of others is an everyday practice that nourishes manaaki (mana enhancement) and aroha as a basis for relationship. Failing to properly acknowledge mana is likely to cause upset and conflict, as noted in the previous chapter. Respect for another's mana, E. Durie notes, requires an appreciation of their understanding of their mana.

### **3) Ontological becoming in relation.**

Drawing on Levinas and the feminist philosopher Irigaray, Todd (2014) proposes ontological or human becoming as a transformative relational quality that develops in relation *as practices*. She argues that navigating:

the existential dimensions of pedagogical relationships ... requires a language of in-betweenness, or liminality, that gives full weight to the complex processes of human becoming. (p. 234)

In those momentary encounters with the Other, and others, that awaken our senses, disrupt asymmetrical power relations, question our ethics, challenge us to the core (whatever that means), or have other transformative effects, we are challenged to exceed ourselves. Inevitably we transform the limits of our self-understanding and become someone yet to emerge, yet to be defined.

#### ***A quality of relationship.***

Todd (2014) highlights two qualities of relationship for human becoming. First, “a respect for the otherness of the Other” (p. 241). This quality fosters an ethical (and, I add, political) sensibility that allows for an exchange in which each can move beyond their own limits. Second “a respect for the Other's becoming, that is, a respect for the Other's future—a becoming that is ‘not yet’” (p. 241). This quality highlights that the present encounter invests the future (always unknown, always uncertain) with layers of meaning, opening up possibilities for engagement.

What is crucial here is a risk-taking orientation or disposition that is not only open but also open-ended or forever becoming. Refusing to impose limits on, or set rules for, what the future could look like, Todd's idea of human becoming challenges us to attend to the "liminality of living, existing, and becoming—between body and spirit" (Todd, 2014, p. 242) as we move toward an unknown, unpredictable future. Todd reminds us that the subtle, ineffable *and* material experiences of pedagogical relations take us to the threshold of our own limits. Even as we struggle to approximate in language what our senses somehow intuit or apprehend, these dimensions of human experience require our attention and hold pedagogical value. We are challenged, Todd argues, to (re)imagine and live our way into transformative possibilities for being in relation.

Following Todd (2003), A. Jones (2005) draws attention to the educational importance of the quality of relationships between individuals in Māori–Pākehā relations. Jones argues that:

Educational practice is *always* finally about the affective relationships between people. Those relationships are where we find education's most important and difficult questions. (p. 19, emphasis in the original)

Reflecting on early Māori encounters with Pākehā settlers, A. Jones and Jenkins (2008b) question what it means to be good to one another in the relationship. In their historical research, they provide examples of a quality of relation that, in my view, begins to compose such goodness – a goodness that embodies movements towards relational justice. I find examples of human becoming in relation marked by practices of manaakitanga (unconditional caring for others), friendship, trust, generosity, loyalty, goodwill, care, protection, optimism, thoughtfulness and kindness (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2011). In particular instances between individuals or groups, familial, political and social bonds were created, strong, intimate friendships developed, strategic relationships forged, and powerful alliances negotiated (A. Jones & Jenkins, 2011). Such movements towards relationality (past and present) suggest a future of how things could be.

Hoskins and Jones (2012) provide a contemporary example that shows how human becoming – always relational, always contextual – can produce a quality of relationship that allows for joint work. When challenged about her editorial work with Pākehā scholar Alison Jones on a journal about kaupapa Māori (a Māori philosophical approach), Māori scholar Hoskins argued that such decisions are political and ethical. Rather than limiting

decisions to fixed responses, she argues for an open-minded approach that considers such things as one's particular context, unique relationships and possible outcomes. What mattered to Hoskins was the ethical-political commitments Jones had embodied over decades in her relationships with Māori and her contribution to the evolution of kaupapa Māori scholarship. Hoskins concludes that "*who* Alison is exceeds *what* she is" (p. 5, emphasis in the original). In reply, Jones highlights that the *what* must always be acknowledged and never disregarded. She recalls a history in which Pākehā have often misunderstood, misrepresented, overlooked or dominated Māori ideas. Jones accepts the pervasive threat of Pākehā control of Māori ways of thinking and of Māori voices being undermined. Following Todd (2014), I suggest that Hoskins and Jones (2012) think their way into the commitments and complexities of ontological or human becoming in relation, which, over time, enabled them to co-create a quality of relationship that allowed them to jointly edit a collection of kaupapa Māori essays. Importantly, these scholars do not dismiss those critiquing their joint endeavour. Rather, they demonstrate a respectful openness to ethical-political learning by taking the concerns of their colleagues seriously and offering a thoughtful response.

### ***Negotiating ontological styles.***

If, as Todd (2014) suggests, encounters in the in-between or liminal space express dimensions of relationality that occasion one's becoming, then her idea of ontological becoming creates a way to think about negotiating the unique ontological styles discussed in the previous chapter. Encountering another ontological style challenges me to exceed my limits, to shift the borders of my self-understanding. Salmond (2012) explains that the relationality that constitutes te ao Māori is not unfamiliar to Western ontology. Particular relational concepts resonate across these worlds and produce wide-ranging alliances. She highlights ontological flexibility and transformation, offering examples that illustrate changing relations in te ao Māori. She suggests that ontological encounters can challenge taken-for-granted assumptions in ways that produce more meaningful engagements. New ideas can create new openings for encounters that can create new forms of collaboration, evolving relational thinking and new modes of being.

Bell (2017) also suggests relational possibilities in these coexisting worlds. She critiques the illusion of mastery permeating Pākehā ontology which leads Pākehā to consider they/we can fully know and dominate the world. She challenges Pākehā to become aware of our limited knowing and develop the capacity to relate to other ontologies rather than

seeking to control them. Bell (2017) suggests that Pākehā can respond ethically when encountering a Māori ontology by allowing:

our own ontological presuppositions to be unsettled/affected by it, to bring our Western, science-based ontology into question, to be prepared to think (and be) differently, to think our path of becoming in relation to it. (p. 7)

Bell (2014) contends that Pākehā efforts to respond ethically can interrupt domination in face-to-face relationships, welcome alterity and cultivate relations of generative coexistence. When Pākehā learn to recognise and accept distance in their relations with Māori, the autonomy of difference and new forms of sociality can flourish (Bell, 2007, 2014). Bell concludes, however, that traversing another world is complex work and extending relational possibilities remains an ethical challenge. Hoskins (2010) argues that ethics and politics can intersect to create face-to-face embodied relations that enact different ethical *response-abilities*: Pākehā responsiveness to Māori political interests and Māori generosity, including towards Pākehā learning. Being attentive to our relationships with others and moving away from dominating practices, she suggests, can activate new forms of social ethicality that preserve difference, encourage engagement with Māori cultural practices, and strengthen community, and allow Māori to live *as Māori*.

#### **4) A transformative pedagogical orientation.**

Todd (2014) conceives a pedagogical relation as one that brings about transformation and becoming. She suggests that many relationships can be pedagogical but a student–teacher relationship carries an educative intent that includes an expectation that both will change. These dimensions also apply to Pākehā (and perhaps Māori too) working the hyphen, who are challenged to come to the relationship open to learning and with the expectation to change.

#### ***Pedagogical encounters are emotional/affective encounters.***

Todd (2003) argues that encountering difference creates an opportunity for learning how to become more human, especially through emotion and affectivity. Todd (2014) suggests that:

change can occur in a mixture of disturbance and delight: it disturbs in terms of the unknowingness it opens up, generating feelings of being overwhelmed, and it carries with it an intensity of physical sensation that itself can be unsettling as well as deeply pleasurable and erotic. (p. 233)

Pedagogical encounters with the radical alterity of the Other evoke and perform particular feelings, emotions and experiences of affectivity (Todd, 2003). Rather than taking a psycho-social view of emotions as something that happen to us or in us, critical scholar Laura Micciche (2007) defines emotion as a verb; something we do in relationship and, in that sense, a pedagogical practice. Educational scholar Candace Kuby (2014) conceptualises emotion as complex, fluid and dynamic, with a capacity to shape power relations, personal narratives, and human becoming over time. She argues that emotions are *performed* within relations of power; that is generated and expressed between/among people in ways that produce certain effects. As a performance, emotions are *embodied* or enacted through verbal expressions, facial gestures or physical postures. Also, emotions are *situated*; that is evoked and performed in particular situations and contexts that are exposed to social, cultural, and historical influences. Finally, she suggests that emotions are *fissured*, meaning that often unpredictable emotional fractures or collisions can lead to departures from usual ways of being. Following the philosopher Brian Massumi, Hoskins (2017) explains that emotions partly express affect but affectivity relates specifically to a human capacity to affect, and be affected by, the Other and others, events or experiences. This capacity can also disturb meaning-making and ways of relating that have become normalised.

Emotions and experiences of affectivity that arise through encounters with the Other can become a source of significant pedagogical insight and engagement. Anthropologist Cheryl Mattingly (2010) draws attention to the friction that arises when traversing cultural borderlands, where misunderstandings are rife, but suggests that such encounters can also create opportunities for transformation, change and healing. Kuby (2013, 2014) argues, for example, that emotional collisions can prompt productive engagement and become a site of social justice interchange. Going against the grain can support human becoming and ethical-political action through resistance and transformation. Todd (2003) suggests that such experiences are challenging because they represent ethical encounters with difference. But they can give way to fruitful ethical learning and engagement:

At issue is not only how the learning encounter acts as a site or milieu *in* which good relations across differences are developed – where goodness is always already a pre-established idea – but as a process *through* which ethical relationality to otherness becomes a possibility. (p. 4)

Todd suggests here that feelings, emotions and affectivity can become a condition of possibility, allowing me/you to be touched in my/your encounter with the Other in a way that evokes my/your sense of ethical responsibility to *and* for that person and others.

### ***Learning from the Other.***

Todd (2003) further argues that nonviolent relational possibilities with the Other require “learning *from*” instead of “learning *about*” the Other as a way to productively negotiate difference (p. 16). Learning *from* the Other invites us to attend to the specificities of the relationship in the present moment, recognising that our engagements are inherently located in the past but also portend future possibilities. Todd, and others, contend that a humble response to the demands of ethical responsibility fosters a transformative pedagogical orientation (Bell, 2014; Margaret, 2013; Todd, 2003).

Following Todd (2003) and reflecting on Māori–Pākehā relations, A. Jones (2008) conceives a less certain, more open relationship, based on learning *from* the Other. These scholars turn away from the coloniser’s problematic quest for unity (symbolised in that wistful *us* or a longing for shared conversation) that would somehow hope to, but would never, diminish difference. They also resist an equally troublesome self-effacing stance (a false humility) and reject the desire to hear the Other’s voice. A. Jones accepts that, at best, she can only ever hear and see a measure of what her Māori colleague, Kuni Jenkins, has come to appreciate over a lifetime, not only because she *is* Māori but also because is surrounded by and has direct access to knowledge of things Māori.

Examining creative but challenging transformative pedagogical arrangements, A. Jones (1999) exposes the limits of cross-cultural dialogue in the classroom. She uncovers deep-seated frustrations borne of the power relations in cross-cultural relations and the impacts on the subaltern, including Māori. She recognises in her settler students (specifically Pākehā) a desire for the Indigene Other (here Māori), expressed through their demands for shared learning, which she re-interprets as a desire for a pedagogy *by* the oppressed. She argues for a “politics of disappointment” that requires Pākehā, in particular, to turn away from the interminable quest for certainty and clarity in favour of “a productive acceptance of ignorance of the other” (p. 315).

## 5) A way of life, a manner of being.

Rather than thinking of relational justice as a fixed state (being just), the discussion so far turns my attention toward the idea of *becoming just*. From this perspective, working the hyphen in Māori–Pākehā relations requires Pākehā, especially, to become more relationally orientated and disposed towards enacting goodness *in relation*. Becoming just requires a disposition and practices associated with relational justice.

### ***Becoming just.***

The philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre (2007) explains that Aristotle conceives justice as a virtue, which, like other virtues, is demonstrated through one's disposition and practices developed over a lifetime. For Aristotle, one enacted virtues in pursuit of the good life. The good life was not for individuals alone but for humanity, the *telos* (end, goal) of human action. Aristotelian philosophy is intricate and foundational for virtue ethics but here I note two ideas that assist my understanding of relational justice and help to bring together the preceding discussion.

Aristotle (1975, 1995) suggests that becoming a just person is like learning an art or a craft, which one learns by doing. He states:

In the case of the virtues ...we acquire them as a result of prior activities; and this is like the case of the arts, for that which we are to perform by art after learning, we first learn by performing ...we become just by doing what is just, temperate by doing what is temperate, and brave by doing brave deeds.  
(Aristotle, 1975, p. 21)

Aristotle (1975) connects just deeds to a just character or disposition (I might say orientation). In turn he argues that one's disposition is sustained by certain practices. The person seeking to become just must not only perform just acts but also seek to act as a just person would act, having acquired or developed:

a certain disposition, namely, (a) when he knows what he does, (b) when he intends to do what he does and intends to do it for its own sake, and (c) when he acts with certainty and firmness. (pp. 25–26)

MacIntyre (2007) suggests that virtues are important because they are crucial for a practice to thrive and create a certain kind of relationship between the practitioners of a practice. He suggests three virtues crucial to a practice: *truthfulness/honesty* (the ability to listen to what

others are telling you and what you are telling yourself); *justice* (fairness, doing the right thing); and *courage* (seeking to do what is right in the face of danger, pain, significant harm or risk). Donald Schön (1983), an educational theorist, adds that seasoned practitioners develop a form of knowing-in-practice through reflection on and in action. This knowing informs their response to particular, unclear or troubling situations and develops into an art of practice that is difficult to teach. Cultural theorist Michel de Certeau (1984) conceptualised this art as a kind of know-how characterised by a creative and automatic intuition.

***A way of life, a manner of being.***

Could becoming just and doing justice constitute a way of life? Towards the end of his life, Foucault (1997d) turned his attention to ancient Greek philosophy (and early Christian thought) to consider how to create a life that embodies aesthetic values and ethical–political commitments. Drawn to the idea of “the art of life” (p. 163), he lamented the way contemporary society has come to consider art primarily as an object made by someone who is a specialist, an artist. He states:

We have hardly any remnant of the idea in our society that the principle work of art which one has to take care of, the main area to which one must apply aesthetic values is oneself, one’s life, one’s existence. (Foucault, 1997c, p. 261)

According to Foucault, the purpose of treating one’s life as a work of art was not to discover but rather to invent what he describes as “a mode of life,” “a manner of being” and “a way of life” (Foucault, 1997b, pp. 137–138) in which the artist (in this study: scholars, educators, activists, leaders) and the artwork (working the hyphen) cohere. Foucault conceives of a lifelong relational endeavour and embodied practice that is highly creative *and* inherently ethical and political (Rabinow, 1997). For Foucault, spirituality encapsulates this process of transformation as well as attaining a certain manner of being. Although commonly regarded as a social relation (an idea which Foucault also promotes), he suggests something more, friendship as a way of life that is nonviolent and non-domineering but also deeply enriching and pleasurable. For Foucault, friendship encapsulates the many ways people can offer each other pleasure, including the feelings of unease generated through intense affectivity (Foucault, 1997b).

### ***Practices of self.***

Foucault (1997a) interprets the ancient Greek idea of *a practice of self* as a way to craft an ethical–political–aesthetic life. He reimagines this practice as a set of practices of freedom or *technologies of self* by which one can work on oneself. For the ancient Greeks, he explains, a care of the self requires attending to oneself as a way to come to know yourself or rather to know the limits of your knowing (Foucault, 1997e).

The ancient Greeks adopted various practices of self, including reading, writing, examining one’s conscience, meditation, listening, remembering, and unlearning. Over time, through a slow and exacting process in particular contexts, their performance led to new forms of practice with specific meanings. Practices of self were constituted and sustained through moral reflection and progressively gave life to an ethos of freedom, in other words, a manner of being or way of life visible to others (Foucault, 1997a). In an ideal form, a person’s behaviour was considered “good, beautiful, honourable, estimable, memorable and exemplary” (p. 286).

The ancient Greeks lived their ethos in a multiplicity of relationships with others and were responsible for exercising proper care of those relations. But unlike Levinasian ethics, the care of self was considered ethically prior to the proper care of others because the relationship with oneself was thought to be ontologically prior. Nonetheless, caring for self was essential in caring for others. Caring for others includes attending to (and specifically limiting and controlling) the workings of power relations that exist in every relationship, to create a nonviolent, non-domineering relation (Foucault, 1997a).

Within the realm of Māori–Pākehā relations, Yukich and Hoskins (2011) suggest that adopting certain practices of self can enable Pākehā, in particular, to face the borders of their knowledge without abandoning the relationship. Such practices (including, for Pākehā, being open to Māori difference) convey a humble stance that enhances the quality of face-to-face encounters. These scholars conclude that, for Pākehā, cultural engagement and learning is “an often messy, iterative process of self-critique and exploration, a life-long project still in the making” (p. 70).

Aboriginal scholar Karen Martin-Booran Mirraboopa (2003) explains an Indigenist theory that weaves together ways of knowing, doing and being that, in my mind, further highlight the kinds of practices of self that are needed for a relational life. Ways of knowing are

passed on and learned through “listening, sensing, viewing, reviewing, reading, watching, waiting, observing, exchanging, sharing, conceptualising, assessing, modelling, engaging, applying” (p. 209). Ways of knowing are constructed, taught and learnt in particular contexts, ways and times through pedagogical processes that negotiate the diverse realities of people and groups and their relationships with others. Whereas, she suggests, ways of knowing shape ways of being, and ways of doing reflect ways of knowing and ways of being.

### ***Pleasure and joy.***

In creating a way of life marked by justice, what sustains individuals who seek to work the hyphen over time, when they themselves are always in a process of human becoming? Pākehā educational scholar Barbara Grant (2010) highlights multiple pleasures and enjoyment in the pedagogical exchange of the Māori–non-Māori/settler doctoral supervisory relationship. For the Māori students in the study, these pleasures included sharing kai (food); relating to a supervisor who was responsive to their needs and interests, excited by their work, believed in them, enabled them to develop alongside them, and supported them to overcome challenges and to strengthen their academic and cultural identities. Non-Māori/settler supervisors derived joy, pleasure and enjoyment from a sense of advancing social justice by embodying Treaty commitments, intellectual stimulation and challenge, ongoing curiosity after years of engaging with te ao Māori, being part of an hospitable encounter that went both ways and in which students invested their trust, respect and friendship, or included them in everyday experiences of Māori life not always not readily accessible to non-Māori. This study draws attention to a wide spectrum of pleasurable experiences that support and help explain positive productive engagements.

### **How These Ideas (In)Form My Thinking and My Research**

I began the chapter positing working the hyphen as a metaphor for and site of an implied ethics *and politics*. I then discussed five big ideas that illuminate dimensions of relational justice when working the Māori–Pākehā hyphen: 1) productive power relations; 2) ethical responsibility to the other; 3) a transformative pedagogical orientation; 4) ontological becoming in relation; and 5) a way of life, a manner of being. I conclude this chapter by considering the relevance of these ideas for my research and reflecting on their categorisation here.

Foucauldian insights focus my attention on how power operates, especially in face-to-face relations to foster productive Māori–Pākehā relations. Foucault’s ideas on freedom also challenge me to create a research design that maximises the freedom and benefit of those who join me in the study. Levinasian ethics highlight the significance of, and encourage me to listen for, small goodnesses or moments of grace, that point to upright/ethical face-to-face relations. Māori philosophical resonances also draw my attention to the significance of whakapapa, whanaungatanga, tiaki, mana, aroha for an ethical orientation towards the Other. My research practice must strive to reflect such ethics and create space for these resonances so that this project creates occasions of and for ethical–political learning on matters that matter to all those engaged in it – Māori and Pākehā co-researchers.

Todd’s idea of ontological becoming in relation challenges me to attend to a quality of relationship that opens up possibilities for Māori–Pākehā engagements, including the unique human qualities we each bring to the relation. As a Pākehā researcher, I must be as cognizant as I can be of my own ontological style and human becoming, so that my ways of doing, being and knowing do not disrupt my relations with my Māori (and Pākehā) co-researchers. I am challenged to embody a pedagogical orientation and manner of being that nourishes lively research engagements that will help, if only in a small but meaningful way, to transform all our lives, including our future readers. Foucault’s contemporary rendering of ancient Greek philosophical ideas leads me to try to retrace a/the (relational) pathway that led my co-researchers to seemingly create an ethical–political way of life and manner of being, always already becoming, through transformative encounters and practices of self.

These ideas (in)form my work in this project but their categorisation here is somewhat arbitrary. Arguably, for example, practices of self could be conceived as a transformative pedagogical praxis, and ontological becoming occurs within a pedagogical relation. My categorisation seeks to emphasise particular aspects of complex theoretical concepts and not to provide an ultimate or conclusive account or settle their tensions or differences.

The ideas themselves are also necessarily inconclusive (because they, too, are constantly becoming) *and* coexist in a productive tension. For example, A. Jones and Jenkins’ idea of a complex reciprocity (that is open but always conditional and constantly negotiated) seems to work against the Levinasian notion of non-reciprocity (which presents the impossible demand of an infinite ethical responsibility to the Other that requires me to forget myself). When seen as a counterpoint to each other however, these ideas challenge me, as a Pākehā

researcher, to be open to the Other. I must listen for, and attend to, particular Māori needs, aspirations and interests, while also considering those things (ideas, assumptions, ethics, rules, practices and so on) that create distance in the relationship and could undermine ethically and politically responsible action.

Another striking generative tension concerns Foucault's idea that caring for the self is ethically prior, whereas Levinas privileges an infinite responsibility to and for the Other. The philosopher Hofmeyr (2003, 2010) analysed these ostensibly conflicting approaches for becoming ethical. While she uncovered ontological differences and philosophical complexities, she argues that these approaches are not without meeting points. Levinasian ethics could be construed as a practice of self in so far as enacting my ethical responsibility to the Other creates a meaningful life. In caring for myself, Foucauldian ethics obliges me to care for others. Both philosophers caution against complacency; for Foucault, it gets in the way of freedom and for Levinas it deters my responsibility to the Other. Foucault was aware that creating a life through practices of self was not immune to workings of powers and his critics argued that it led to self-absorption and self-aggrandisement. Levinas accepted the impossibility of an infinite demand but considered this extreme requirement crucial to his ethics. Both approaches produce possibilities for an openness to alterity and when placed side by side make ethical–political nuances more apparent, challenging and interesting.

In the next chapter, I draw upon ideas from all my discussions so far to further construct my research methodology, including why and how I developed my study as I did.

## Chapter 4: Research methodology

My study crafts pedagogical narratives on relational justice in Māori–Pākehā relations. As a critical qualitative researcher, the ideas of Indigenous, decolonising and narrative enquiry methodologies are centrally productive to my research. In this chapter, I further discuss the theoretical underpinnings of my study and explain its case-centred approach. I discuss the ethical considerations I negotiated and how I used co-research conversations as the main means of generating knowledge. I describe my different readings of interview texts and how I came to re-present the knowledge co-produced in this study as pedagogical narratives. I also create a narrative enquiry framework to help me and readers assess if these narratives have done their work (Frank, 2010). This chapter is particularly important in creating a context and rationale for the pedagogical narratives that follow. The bulk of this project consists in the construction, reconstruction and co-construction of these narratives.

Engaging with my co-researchers became a source of methodological interest, challenging me to identify and address problematic tensions (Denzin & Giardina, 2007). Mansvelt and Berg (2010) propose reflexive writing-*in* of a researcher's perspectives, experiences and assumptions, to make clear how these factors shape the research. Here, I remember, reconstruct and recount my engagements with co-researchers as memories, conversational exchanges, critical reflections and *narrativised nubs* (my term for storied experiences that go to the heart of the co-research encounter). Following Land (2011), I weave these reflexive incursions into this thesis, here and in other chapters, so they become part of, and not peripheral to, my research narrative.

### Critical Qualitative Research

My study sits under the rubric of critical qualitative social science research. I join critical qualitative researchers whose work is marked by the intellectual tradition of critique and who challenge the apolitical, objective stance of positivist social science (Simons, 2004). Critical qualitative researchers draw on a range of methodological approaches and use various methods, analytic tools and forms of representation. We seek to undertake politically engaged, rigorous, reflexive research that can not only describe, understand, interpret and evaluate social action but also propose transformative alternatives (Simons, 2004).

My own methodological approach assumes that knowledge and reality are constructed through social interaction, discourses, and narratives. Adopting Foucault's claim that knowledge and power are inseparable (Foucault, 1980), I pay attention to whose truth counts, who decides that and on what basis, and how particular worldviews and interests come to have hegemony or dominance over what is considered to be common sense. I agree with Pelias (2007) who suggests that "all [knowledge] claims are filtered, positioned, subjective, located in interaction, historical, cultural, and so on" (p. 185).

### **Indigenous and decolonising methodologies.**

Indigenous and non-Indigenous critical scholars (including Archibald, 2008; Bishop, 1996, 2005; Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008; Kovach, 2010; Lassiter, 2005; Lee, 2009; Martin-Booran Mirraboopa, 2003; Mertens, Cram, & Chilisa, 2013; Patel, 2016; G. Smith, 1992; L. Smith, 2012), identify political, ethical and moral concerns associated with Western research *on* Indigenous communities. These scholars highlight the intrusion in the everyday lives of Indigenous peoples and communities as well as the misrepresentation, control, exploitation and denigration of their knowledges. In wrestling with these struggles, Indigenous researchers seek to care for and illuminate the terrain of Indigenous knowledge (Mertens et al., 2013). Constituted in and through a relational ontology, epistemology and methodology, Indigenous knowledge is embodied in relational ways of being, knowing and doing that affirm the interconnectedness of all forms of life (Martin-Booran Mirraboopa, 2003). Indigenous ways of knowing are produced, maintained and passed on through various forms of storytelling (Archibald, 2008; Kovach, 2010; Lee, 2009).

Indigenous scholars highlight that the distinct realities, contexts and place-based world views of particular Indigenous groups shape Indigenous knowledge, experience and research practices. In Aotearoa–New Zealand, kaupapa Māori research is constituted within te ao Māori and grounded in two critical traditions: Māori language, knowledge and culture *and* critical social theory (G. Smith, 1992, 1997). Kaupapa Māori research not only responds to the cultural preferences of Māori and adopts familiar cultural practices but also co-creates research proposals with those involved to ensure accountability and wide-ranging benefits to them/their communities (Bishop, 1996). Like other Indigenous research approaches, kaupapa Māori privileges the personal (and specialist) knowledge and experience of research participants (individuals and groups) and evaluates knowledge claims in dialogue with them (Denzin & Giardina, 2007; Denzin et al., 2008).

Indigenous scholars argue for an epistemological shift that requires non-Indigenous researchers doing research with Indigenous peoples to consider our assumptions (ontological, political, cultural), abandon oppressive research projects and develop meaningful relationships capable of co-producing research that forwards the interests of Indigenous communities (L. Smith, 2012). A critical challenge put to non-Indigenous critical researchers is to create opportunities for Indigenous peoples to speak for themselves in their own ways on their own terms on matters of importance to them and their communities.

In this study, I sought to address “issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability” and to act in culturally appropriate ways (Bishop, 2005, p. 109). I was drawn to a co-research relationship with the individuals who joined me in this study; their interests and aspirations shaped the unfolding research design. Recognising that the assumptions and practices deeply embedded in my own (Pākehā) ontological style could easily trip me up, I sought to maintain a critically mindful approach. To engage positively, I worked to balance confidence with humility and knowledge with uncertainty/ignorance (Yukich & Hoskins, 2011).

### ***Decolonising educational research.***

My practice, as a Pākehā critical researcher, is always and necessarily a decolonising educational enterprise. Educational scholar Leigh Patel (2016) describes decolonising educational research as a “relational project – relational to ways of knowing, who can know, and to place” (p. 49) and therefore an ontological, political, ethical and cultural practice. A lengthy quote is warranted here:

Research is always entangled with specific researchers in specific spaces with specific outcroppings. Very little of this dynamic is linearly predictable, and yet, precisely because of the variances among and within dynamics, a closer attention and rigor should be paid to questions of coordinates and ongoing responsibilities and relations among peoples, places and practices. ... while we have a responsibility to understand, contribute to, and be fluent in existing research, we also are responsible for our ontological entry-points and impacts as researchers. Because all research is conducted by living beings, with specific histories, we are beholden to consider and answer, perhaps always incompletely, the three core questions of “Why me?”, “Why this?”, and “Why now?” (Patel, 2016, p. 57)

A decolonial praxis, Patel argues, employs theoretical critiques, analytical frameworks, research methods, creative forms of representation, and ethics that work for Indigenous peoples (Patel, 2016). Such praxis creates relational research that is open to being designed and redesigned through the process with co-researchers. Patel proposes *answerability* as a concept to think with, across three research coordinates: “learning as transformation, knowledge as impermanent, and genealogies of coloniality” (p. 68). She suggests that:

Answerability includes aspects of being responsible, accountable, and being part of an exchange. It is a concept that can help to sustain the coming-into-being with, being in conversation with. (p. 73)

Striving to enact a decolonial praxis in this project challenged me to attend to my relationships with my Māori co-researchers and find ways to combine unique aspirations, mine and theirs. To resist arrogating to myself decisions that were rightfully theirs to make, such as deciding what information to highlight when introducing them, I practised reflexivity as a pedagogically orientated praxis. Ethnographer John Brewer (2000) defines reflexivity as attending to the contingencies that arise when doing research. He explains that reflexivity requires constant critical engagement with the social processes and contexts of the research, the power relations between the researcher and co-researcher, the partiality of interpretations, and the role of the reader. A reflexive orientation, he suggests, requires researchers to consider those things that influence what stories are told and what knowledge is generated, and how stories and knowledge are represented and legitimated (Brewer, 2000).

Aware that power is always operating, I was challenged to compose my own pedagogical narrative (in the Introduction), to name, examine, own and make transparent my own positioning (Mansvelt & Berg, 2010). I researched myself, as it were, by critically reflecting on lines of enquiry I had put to my co-researchers. I realised again that telling intimate stories of *your* life for pedagogical purposes is demanding work. You grapple with uncertainties, ambiguities and tensions. You question the multiple identities and contradictions that arise when particular subjectivities or standpoints intersect (Boylorn & Orbe, 2014). You must make ethical, political *and* narrative judgements about what information to include or exclude. Having a teenage son as a reader suddenly mattered because he knows so little about those early years that shaped me and my life commitments. I chose to be answerable to my co-researchers, to their communities and mine, and to the

epistemic communities who are now my/our reader. I also chose to be answerable to my son by saying what needed to be said here.

### **A narrative enquiry.**

My research is also (in)formed by my understanding of narrative enquiry (Epston, 1999; Frank, 2004, 2010; Mattingly, 2010; Nelson, 2001) and draws insights from Indigenous storytelling approaches (Archibald, 2008; Lee, 2009). Narrative enquiry is more than a research method or a collection of techniques, although it offers these. As a methodological approach, I embrace narrative enquiry as a way to constitute social life as a narrative practice and conduct research as a co-research enterprise aimed at co-producing new knowledge (Epston, 1999; Hancock & Epston, 2008). I use the terms *narrative* and *story* interchangeably. Narratives/stories have a long history of use as data, testimony, aesthetic expression and structured dialogue (Labonte, 2011).

The term narrative has multiple meanings and is used in different ways (Riessman, 2008a, 2008b). Stories are a means of understanding how individuals, groups, organisations, communities and nations think, feel, act, live and interpret meaning, as well as having the capacity to call people to action. Narrative scholar Catherine Riessman (2008a) highlights the functions, purposes and contextual nature of oral stories. Psychologist Jerome Bruner (1986) explores the capacity of stories to express knowledge and meaning. Critical scholars Robin Boylorn and Mark Orbe (2014) emphasise the pedagogical importance of stories and their capacity to illuminate human experience. Mattingly (2010) describes the agentic impact of stories:

They act in and on the world. Stories can have powerful consequences upon how the present is experienced and what future actions seem most reasonable, likely, or appropriate. Storytelling “refigures” events into oral and written texts, and these texts – always performed – may circulate widely in social communities, influencing further actions. (p. 52)

Mattingly (2010) suggests that stories have the capacity to re-present who people are *and* who they are becoming in the ever-evolving present between the past and the future. Her suggestion dovetails with the notion of ontological becoming, discussed earlier, which also emphasises that one’s humanity is constantly evolving in relation, in a particular context, time and space (Todd, 2014). Mattingly further highlights the capacity of stories to explain how and why relational problematics happen *and* how and why relational possibilities

emerge. Also, she notes that stories are crafted in the particular context in which they are told/heard and inevitably “co-authored” (my term) in the sense that the listener influences what is said and how it is interpreted. Enquiry and listening can work to privilege particular interpretive possibilities or disguise them – again suggesting the operation of power.

Frank (2004, 2010) argues that stories do ethical, moral and political work that animates human life. Frank (2010) states:

Stories work with people, for people, and always stories work on people, affecting what people are able to see as real, as possible, and as worth doing or best avoided.... Human life depends on the stories we tell: the sense of self that those stories impart, the relationships constructed around shared stories, and the sense of purpose that stories both propose and foreclose. (p. 3)

I highlighted in the introduction that certain stories show people working out what to do in particular situations and summoning the determination to do it (Frank, 2004). These stories illuminate lives that enact moral commitments (Frank, 2010). They question us, their listener/reader, about our commitments and call us to take ethical–political action. Narrative ethicist Hilde Lindemann Nelson (2001) describes such narratives as counter-stories because they summon respect for the ethical–political commitments they express and seek to resist and repair oppressive identities.

Importantly, a narrative enquiry approach goes some way to addressing Māori concerns about research. Māori educational scholar Russell Bishop (1996) explains that narrative inquiry enacts a strong Māori cultural preference for narrative practice. Storytelling, he suggests, allows Māori individuals and collectives to perform (define, enact, communicate, negotiate) their relations, identities, realities, knowledges and aspirations in diverse contexts. Bishop adds that stories are performed by Māori in different ways, in different contexts, for different purposes, by different storytellers, and for different story listeners. He explains that narrative enquiry positions Māori as research contributors with their own questions and concerns, and with significant knowledge and experience to share. The researcher and research contributors co-construct meaning and co-produce multi-voiced collaborative stories (Bishop, 1996). Their purpose, Bishop explains, is to understand complexities rather than strive for a synthesis.

Drawing on traditional knowledges, Indigenous scholars have developed storytelling approaches for educational research. Kaupapa Māori scholar Jenny Lee (2009) employs

*pūrākau* (a traditional form of narrative) as a culturally responsive approach to narrative inquiry. Informed by kaupapa Māori and decolonising methodologies, she uses *pūrākau* in critical qualitative research to uncover experience and wisdom, express culture and identity, and represent stories of ako (Māori pedagogy). *Pūrākau* embody various expressions of culture, including values and practices. Lee (2009) highlights the need for researchers to use academically *and* culturally “legitimate ways of talking, researching and representing our stories” (p. 8). Educational scholar JoAnn Archibald (2008) of the Sto:lo Nation created the term *storywork* to describe a storytelling approach that reflects the teachings of her Elders. Seeking to undertake respectful and authentic story research that would enable her and others to learn from her Elders, she interweaves cultural values of respect, responsibility, reciprocity, reverence, holism, interrelatedness and synergy. Archibald explains that a story comes to life when people relate its meanings to their lives: “To know a story you must write it on your heart” (p. 140). She also contextualises her work, highlighting various ethical–political issues, including academic conflicts and the challenges of translating oral stories into written text. While these approaches are outside my Pākehā world view, I recognised something of their impulse in my conversations with my Māori co-researchers. Kevin, for example, referred to *whakataukī* (proverbs) and sayings of his *tūpuna*, which do the work of *pūrākau* (C. Jones, 2016). These storytelling approaches drew my attention to the importance of ensuring the integrity of stories as they are told and to represent them authentically so their spirit (*wairua*) can live.

Narrative enquiry approaches (in)formed my main research question and purpose. To understand how my co-researchers interpret and make meaning of their everyday encounters in Māori–Pākehā relations in light of their commitments to relational justice (Clandinin, 2007), I asked: “What does it mean for Māori and Pākehā scholars, educators, activists and leaders to become just and do justice in their relationships with one another?” A narrative enquiry approach also (in)formed my research purpose, which was to offer pedagogical resources (stories and ideas) to scholars and practitioners that indicate strategies for justice at the level of face-to-face relationships. The pedagogical resources co-produced in this research re-presents “knowledge-in-the-making” (Epston, 1999, p. 7); that is humble and pragmatic storied knowledge that speaks to the specific situations in which it is generated, seeks to be useful, and intends to be inspiring not prescriptive. My approach shies away from a cultural competency approach that favours prescriptions and solutions. Instead, it seeks to uncover relational qualities, acts of small goodness,

movements of human becoming in relation, and ethical–political insights that illuminate an orientation, a manner of being, a way of life marked by relational justice.

### **A case-centred approach.**

Narrative enquiry methods are typically case-centred and cases may be individuals, groups, projects, programmes, communities, institutions, or even countries (Riessman, 2008a; Stake, 1995, 2000, 2010). Case study theorist Robert Stake (2010) notes that to appreciate how particular things work requires disciplined research of the particular (Stake, 2010). Jamie Baxter (2010), a geographer, notes the usefulness of cases for understanding phenomena and for developing theoretical concepts. He states that “a carefully chosen and well-studied case can be used to produce very robust, credible, and trustworthy theoretical explanations” (p. 96). Mattingly (2010) insists that a study of individual lives provides a way to appreciate hope (a name, I suggest, for relational possibilities) “in all its vagaries, vulnerabilities, and paradoxes” (p. 233). Māori scholars, Bishop (1996), Webber (2008) and Hoskins (2010) demonstrate the utility of a case-centred approach when engaging in research with Māori on things that matter to Māori *as Māori*.

My research constructed a case-centred narrative enquiry into the lives and practices of Māori and Pākehā individuals who witness certain relational qualities and ethical–political commitments, both always already becoming, that point to relational justice. I wanted to understand the kinds of early influences that shaped them to become the people they are and how they go about constituting a relationship with their paired colleague that is both pedagogically orientated and productive. I developed the following three criteria to inform my selection of co-researchers.

### ***Māori and Pākehā individuals known for their commitment to relational justice.***

As well as a Levinasian-inspired interest in everyday face-to-face encounters, an Aristotelian awareness of disposition and a Foucauldian curiosity for practices of self, three studies led me to the idea of researching particular lives that could illuminate relational qualities and everyday practices that foster productive engagement in Māori–Pākehā relations. Years ago, a study on messengers of respect (Lawrence-Lightfoot, 1999) led me to conduct research on practitioners of hospitality (Hancock & Epston, 2008). Both studies recruited participants who performed different professional responsibilities or organisational roles in diverse contexts and had earned a reputation among their peers,

clients or students for practising respect or hospitality. Their everyday relational encounters witnessed diverse practices, interpretations and meanings of respect and of hospitality.

A third study highlighted the commitments of those seeking to practise justice. An Aotearoa–New Zealand tertiary programme (the Bachelor of Social Practice offered by the Unitec School of Health and Community Studies) had designed a rite of passage for social work, counselling and community development students in their final year of study (Epston, Rennie, & Napan, 2004). These students had to conceptualise the social justice ethics and politics that would guide their professional work using a “Just Practice Framework” (Finn & Jacobson, 2003, 2008). The course convenors invited people they considered to be just practitioners (including me) to address the students. The convenors chose practitioners whose actions suggested that they had dedicated their lives and professional work to justice and were known among their peers to exercise a critical stance by questioning and challenging unequal power relations and by resisting oppressive systems and social practices (Epston et al., 2004).

Taken together these studies focused my attention on Māori and Pākehā individuals known for their commitment to justice generally (Treaty, environmental, social) and relational justice in particular (in Māori–Pākehā relations specifically). To encourage consideration of a range of experiences and to appeal to a diverse readership, I approached people working in various roles and contexts. I focused on those widely known for negotiating Māori–Pākehā relations in their work-life and respected by their colleagues or others (students or colleagues, for example) for how they go about these engagements. I approached people likely to be willing and interested to discuss the political commitments, ethical responsibilities and practical challenges in their relationship/s.

### ***Māori and Pākehā individuals in the third chapter of their lives.***

Following the educational scholar Sara Lawrence-Lightfoot (2009), I enlisted individuals in the third chapter of their lives, aged between 50 and 75 years. In this age group, Lawrence-Lightfoot suggests, life can be at its most generative and transformative, as people harness accumulated (and new) learning, experience and wisdom. Also, people often tell poignant stories that highlight contradictions and paradoxes, risk-taking and vulnerability, disappointments and resilience. My research question sought to invite stories that would illuminate contradictions, paradoxes, uncertainties and complexities in particular Māori–Pākehā relations. I considered that selecting co-researchers in their third

chapter with much wisdom, experience and learning to share would generate rich storytelling that would uncover what nourishes and confounds intimacies of engagement in this relation. In my study five co-researchers were over 60 years and one turned 50 towards the end of the research.

***Māori and Pākehā colleagues who have worked together over many years.***

I also chose a paired approach by selecting Māori and Pākehā individuals who had developed a close working relationship. My assumption was that a long-term, close colleague may observe qualities and tell stories of another that the Other might not disclose because of power dynamics, humility or a sense of cultural impropriety. For Māori, this cultural impropriety is sometimes conveyed in the following whakataukī (proverb):

Kāore te kumara e kōrero mō tōna ake reka

The kumara (sweet potato) does not say how sweet it is;

Only those who taste the kumara can say how sweet it is.

Interviewing Māori–Pākehā pairs who had worked together over many years would enable me to develop an enlarged view of an individual’s relational qualities, practices and commitments, as well as respect cultural proprieties. Stake (1995) identifies benefits in taking a paired approach. First, the researcher can ask each colleague to notice the ordinary as it has been and is lived by them and their colleagues, and to recount their experiences as stories. Second, significant examples may lie within shared experiences; through pairing it becomes possible to again witness and interpret shared experiences from different points of view. Third, studying what relational justice means through pairing would allow me to uncover its everyday contexts, consider its diverse meanings and pass on different accounts to readers so they might engage in similar reflections.

***Inviting individuals to become my co-researchers.***

When considering the gnarly question of how many pairs to engage in the study, I sought the counsel of one of my supervisors, Professor Alison Jones. “A doctoral project is not a life-work,” she said, “but it could lead to one if you strive for relevance, depth and complexity” (supervision session, 8 December 2014). She advised me to select no more than six individuals or three pairs, and not to be swayed by a numbers game that could make my project unmanageable and detract from its epistemological and methodological purpose. I followed her astute and practical advice.

I selected two pairs (four co-researchers) who had worked together over many years and whom I had interviewed for previous research projects (Hancock, 2012, 2013, 2015). Kevin Prime (Ngāti Hine with Ngāti Whātua and Tainui tribal connections) was paired with Pat Snedden (Pākehā). Sam Chapman (Ngāti Tūwharetoa and Ngāti Porou with a smattering of English and Portuguese Jewish ancestry) was paired with Ann Milne (Pākehā). Our existing relationships meant that I had direct access to them via email or phone, and our paths could easily cross at hui (gatherings). We had the advantage of familiarity; they knew me and how I do research, and I knew them and how to negotiate their busy schedules. Nonetheless, I approached them with care so they would not feel obliged to participate, but they immediately agreed.

Recognising their leadership in the field of education in Aotearoa–New Zealand, I recruited my two doctoral supervisors as co-researchers: Professor Alison Jones (Pākehā) and Dr Te Kawehau Hoskins (Ngāti Hau and Ngāpuhi). In the context of a doctoral supervision relationship this decision was unusual. Grant (2003) explains that the doctoral student/supervisor relationship is an intense, situated, negotiated, pedagogical relation in which power is always operating. She states:

In the delicate zone between encouragement and discipline that makes up much of supervision, the workings of identity and desire provide fertile ground for misreadings, resentments, confusions. (p. 187)

But Foucauldian thinking reminded me that exercising power in the supervision relationship need not limit opportunities for engagement and introducing a new dynamic could produce positive effects. Noted already, Grant (2003, 2010) identifies the pleasures and enjoyment in this unique pedagogical exchange. The humility and generosity of my supervisors, our similar age, and my prior experience as a researcher, allowed for a different kind of intimate engagement. They became supervisors-as-co-researchers embedded in the research process with their own experiences to draw on when reviewing my written reports.

### ***What to call the people joining me in this study?***

Initially I used the terms *just practitioners*, *practitioners of justice*, *exemplars of justice* and *just ones* interchangeably when referring to those engaged in this research. Some co-researchers resisted these labels and any suggestion of exemplary status, saying they would never seek or claim such an identity, rather they were/are doing work and living a life that includes relational engagements with Māori or Pākehā. Sam explained his hesitation this

way: “We struggle to know what those terms mean” (interview, June 11, 2017). Alison stated:

The idea of the “exemplars of justice” or “just ones” gives me the sense that they/we have a special characteristic; something noble. When I hear these terms I personally feel anxious; it doesn’t sit consistently with being human, making mistakes, being open, doing your bit. It puts me in a special category and I don’t think that’s correct. I’m a sort of person who gets genuine pleasure out of my engagements with Māori. I simply bumble along living in these relationships and people can learn from my stories. The stories show we have something to tell but if you are not careful the way you set us up could be embarrassing. ... Maybe I can be interviewed for my experiences which often *are* special in that not a huge number of Pākehā get to be with Māori, thinking/talking about ideas as often as I am ...and in such a position of power-that-is-meant-to-be-collaboration. (A. Jones, personal communication, April 8, 2016)

Todd’s (2014) idea of ontological becoming (that our humanity is constantly evolving in relation) strongly supported Alison’s critique against being just or justice as a fixed state of a human being. In respect of the concerns about how she and others might be represented, I decided to avoid exemplar terminology. Instead I use the term *co-researcher* to convey a research collaboration in which both parties exercise decision-making authority and each make unique contributions.

## **Ethical Considerations**

Years of collaborative research with diverse communities has led me to regard ethical considerations as ethical–political concerns. Such concerns must be understood in situ, so that different understandings, contextual factors and developing interests can be addressed, as Māori advise, *tāria te wā* (in time). In this study, the accountabilities of decolonising research meant that, as a Pākehā researcher, I had to not only consider my own interests (including academic requirements and university ethics applications) but also be answerable to my co-researchers, knowing their needs and aspirations could unfold, change or only become clear through the research process (Bishop, 1996; L. Smith, 2012). Critical qualitative researchers Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) emphasise the role and integrity of the researcher:

Morally responsible research behaviour is more than abstract ethical knowledge and cognitive choices; it involves the moral integrity of the researcher, his or her empathy, sensitivity, and commitment to moral issues and action. (p. 97)

Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) focus on *fields of uncertainty* when conducting interview inquiry. Rather than attempting to name and solve ethical problems ahead of time, they propose that researchers address the inevitable questions, ambivalences or tensions when these arise in the research process. Their approach aligns with the idea of ontological becoming, which allows for relational and contextual engagements that, in this case, may shape a researcher and influence their project. Following their lead, I treated University ethical guidelines as “tools to think with in fields of uncertainty, rather than ... as [the] final moral authority that ignores real-life ambiguities and uncertainty” (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p. 93). My ethics application was approved by the University of Auckland Human Contributor Ethics Committee approved in December 2014 (see Appendix A for the participation information sheet and Appendix B for the participant consent form). I now turn to the ethical considerations I addressed in the research process.

### **Informed consent.**

I gave my co-researchers comprehensive information (in writing and verbally) on the purposes and objectives of the study, and how it would be carried out, to enable them to make an informed decision about their participation. They would be required to engage in up to six interviews (or 8 hours in total) over a period of 6 months, through face-to-face meetings and possibly email exchanges. Face-to-face interviews would be digitally recorded and they could ask me to turn off the recording device at any time, to exclude particular information from the research. The taped interviews would be transcribed by me or a professional transcriber who would also be subject to a confidentiality agreement. My co-researchers would have an opportunity to review the transcripts for accuracy and make deletions, additions and corrections.

I advised my co-researchers that only I would have access to their audio material. I would keep all research recordings and written transcripts in a secure office. Email exchanges and developing texts would be stored on my password protected computer. They would receive their audio material and transcripts when the research ended or, if they preferred, I would arrange for their audio material to be digitally destroyed. I also advised my co-researchers

of their right to raise concerns or questions at any time regarding the research, which they could address to me directly or to the University, with contact information provided. I clarified that they could withdraw from the study without explanation up to a certain date.

### **Privacy and confidentiality.**

When advised that the research would create pedagogical narratives for educational purposes, my co-researchers agreed to be named. In a country as small as Aotearoa–New Zealand, well-known figures are often identifiable in narrative accounts even if unnamed. Also, the status of contributors would add to the interest and authority of the research in epistemic communities concerned about relational justice and social change. To respect confidentiality, I exercised care not to use comments said in confidence or take comments out of context. To respect privacy, I changed some identifying details of others who appeared in a co-researcher’s story but the identity of a parent, for example, although not named could easily be traced. Appreciative references to others generally avoided an editorial cut. I anticipated multiple readings by my co-researchers and was confident they would alert me to ill-conceived assumptions that may have informed my editing.

### **Working with Māori.**

Importantly, as a Pākehā scholar working with Māori co-researchers (and their communities), I had responsibilities to the Treaty of Waitangi. These responsibilities included the obligation to identify, understand and respond appropriately to Māori interests, to demonstrate cultural awareness and sensitivity when approaching and engaging with Māori co-researchers, and to develop meaningful relationships that would co-produce relevant research useful to us both. I was particularly aware of an ethical burden on my Māori co-researchers, to work across languages, theirs and mine. My inability to speak the Māori language, apart from particular words and phrases, created linguistic challenges and extra work for them. At times, they graciously endured my poor pronunciation, which I endeavoured to improve. Kevin Prime explained the challenges he faced:

I think in Māori then find the nearest English equivalent. I no doubt understand written English far better than I understand spoken English. Which is why I often take longer to reply because I have to translate in my mind what is being asked, then frame an appropriate reply. I know when I am interviewed by Māori media, I am able to respond immediately. Whereas in

English they often have to stop the camera to wipe the sweat off my forehead before continuing. (personal communication, September 30, 2015)

Where my co-researchers used Māori words and phrases, I worked with them to ensure correct spelling and that I had understood their meanings and interpretations.

## **Co-Research Conversations**

Co-research conversations or narrative enquiry interviews (terms I use interchangeably) were the main means of knowledge production in this research. I understand co-research conversations as a social practice that enables an in-depth study of “the almost infinitely subtle strategies that social agents deploy in the ordinary conduct of their lives” (Bourdieu, 1999c, p. 607). The practice theorist Pierre Bourdieu (1999c) was sceptical of methodological tomes on interviewing; he thought they failed to do justice to crucial elements of research practice such as a honed attentiveness to these subtle strategies, active listening and a refined sensibility that imbues respect for one’s research topic and one’s co-researchers. But, when treated as a kind of technology of the self (Foucault, 1997e), narrative interviews enable co-researchers to articulate their knowledge, examine the workings of power, and construct and perform new and preferred identities, subjectivities and transformative actions (Denzin, 2001; Epston, 1999; White & Epston, 1990). As a meaning-making practice (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995), narrative interviews are better described as *inter-views* in which knowledge is co-constructed by co-researchers, them and me (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015).

Co-research conversations strive to generate new, insightful knowledge through an animated exchange that shows care for relationships and the interests of both researcher and co-researcher (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). Extending the interpretative privilege to a range of co-researchers, and asking questions that generate diverse perspectives and meanings, contributes to fruitful, intellectually rigorous, and engaging research (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995). Co-research conversations pay attention to tensions, ambiguities and contradictions, rather than smooth over or seek to settle them. When considered in dialogue with theoretical concepts such complexities can generate pedagogical reflections and possibilities for future studies.

### **Face-to-face and email engagement.**

Noting a Māori preference for *kanohi ki te kanohi* engagement (Hoskins, 2010), I conducted my first co-research conversation in this manner at a convenient time and location for my co-researchers. We met in their workplace offices, at their homes or mine, or in cafes, and sometimes enjoyed a meal together. On average, our first conversation lasted between 90 and 120 minutes. I suggested either email technology or further face-to-face meetings as possible ways to continue the conversations.

I had successfully combined face-to-face engagement with the use of email technologies in previous research (Hancock & Epston, 2008). When exercised with appropriate manners, email enquiry can “commingle the rigour and acuteness of research with the congeniality and vivacity of conversation” (Hancock & Epston, 2008, p. 488). Because it delivers thoughts-in-text, email technology allows for what Schön (1983) calls reflection on action, and avoids costly transcription. Its flexibility allows contributors to readily engage in their everyday commitments while accommodating the research at will. Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) add that a researcher can address intimate subjects at a safe distance and provide timely follow-up to replies. But, they observe, email technology demands sustained commitment and motivation, and typing skills. Also, a researcher is somewhat handicapped because s/he cannot read the cues of body language and can misinterpret nuances of meanings not always obvious in a written text.

Some co-researchers preferred working face-to-face, others preferred email enquiry or a mix of both strategies. I adopted their preferences and continued in that manner over the next 18 months. The period of engagement was longer than originally expected but served to accommodate busy schedules. I circumspectly sought to create an ethical–political engagement that encouraged my co-researchers (Māori and Pākehā) to speak for themselves as well as deliberate with me (their co-researcher), to collaboratively perform the meanings of our work together (Bruner, 1986). Each conversational engagement was unique as we considered my interests and theirs, and went where the conversation led us. My intent was to create *thick descriptions* of storied accounts (Geertz, 1973), to better understand relational complexities as well as expand theoretical understandings (Stake, 2010).

When using email technology, I would run a line of enquiry with an individual co-researcher over a number of days on a certain topic and repeat the process a number of

times. Using an interview layout, as I did with digitally recorded interviews, I later compiled the questions and answers into a coherent text, including other comments my co-researcher made during passing conversations or when catching up over email or on the phone. Those passing interactions often produced insights that either created enquiries for the next conversation or informed the research design.

Our conversations traversed enquiries that included the relational qualities, early influences, political interests, ethical concerns and transformative praxis that informed, led to and now characterise my co-researchers' engagements with Māori or Pākehā. I was curious about the quality of relation they experienced in their relationship with their colleague (Todd, 2009) and how they negotiated different ontological styles (Salmond, 2012). I was interested in the small goodnesses that nurture their relationships and the impossible demands they face working for justice (Levinas, 1986, 1998a, 1998b). I listened for stories that would show me how they work the hyphen (A. Jones, 2008) and respond to emotional collisions (Kuby, 2013). I listened for stories that spoke of a care of the self (Foucault, 1997a) that makes life and working the hyphen doable, enriching and joyful. I also listened for significant lessons my co-researchers had learned through the skin (A. Jones, 2012).

### **How many is enough?**

In qualitative research, the number of interviews is often a crucial consideration given costs, labour, time constraints, and the burden on those in the study. When considering this matter, I reviewed research by Sarah Elsie Baker, Rosalind Edwards, and Mark Doidge (2012). They asked 14 recognised social scientists and five early career researchers for their views on the question of “how many qualitative interviews is enough?” “It depends!” was the common reply. The researchers agreed that epistemological, methodological and practical issues guide research decision making, including one’s analytical framework and the aims and purpose of the research.

I cannot calculate the hours I engaged with each co-researcher or the time they invested because of the email component, but for some it was longer than originally envisaged. Interview text ranged between 25,000 and 45,000 words per person and their commitment was considerable. Always I was grateful for the luxury of being able to return to our rich conversations, when it was possible for us both to meet given our schedules or when a fresh line of inquiry sparked a burst of new email conversation that riveted our attention. When

our meetings were postponed at short notice, I renewed my conversation with another co-researcher who was free to engage. I assumed we would get to where we got to in our conversations, and that would be that. Periodically I checked in with my co-researchers to ensure they did not feel overburdened, but their interest never waned. I struggled at times to keep pace with Kevin who, despite a busy schedule, never let a day pass without responding to my enquiries. I knew from experience that timely responses can be crucial in making email conversation work for the purpose of research. But Kevin never gave me the impression that my delays interrupted his thinking or enthusiasm.

### **Transcriptions as translations.**

I digitally recorded our face-to-face conversations with the consent of my co-researchers and turned off my recording equipment on two occasions at a co-researcher's request. When I did not use a digital recorder, for example when meeting in a café or talking on the phone, I took detailed handwritten notes. I transcribed most of the interviews myself as soon as possible after we met, from these digital records or handwritten notes. Bourdieu (1999c) argues that transcribing digital records and handwritten notes “represents a *translation* or even an interpretation” (p. 621, emphasis in the original). Punctuation as well as verbal and non-verbal gestures (including voice, pronunciation, looks, hesitations, sighs and repetition) can change the meaning of a phrase, and irony (which relies on layers of meaning or different kinds of symbolism) is often lost in transcription. He adds:

And the same goes for the ambiguities, double meanings, uncertainty, and vagueness so characteristic of oral language, which writing inevitably resolves, particularly through punctuation. (p. 622)

For Bourdieu (1999c), transcription is a form of rewriting. A researcher must be constantly aware that “no contract carries as many unspoken conditions as one based on trust” (Bourdieu, 1999b, p. 1).

### **Translations as work-in-progress interview texts.**

I aimed to produce a faithful and intelligent translation of our conversations as a work-in-progress interview text. I sought to reproduce the intended meanings of my co-researchers as I had understood them. I entered “into a *dialogue* with the text” (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p. 218, emphasis in original), lightly editing what Bourdieu (1999c) describes as:

certain add-on developments, certain confused phrases, verbal expletives or linguistic tics ... which, even if they give their particular colour to the oral

discourse and fulfil an important function in communication ... nevertheless have the effect of confusing and obscuring the transcription. (p. 623)

I pruned superlative descriptions. Although admissible in face-to-face conversation (especially when combined with non-verbal expressions), in text such descriptions could make a colleague appear unapproachable or feel uncomfortable. When Pat read Kevin's narrative of his (Pat's) relational qualities, he replied, "Kevin always was a bit *over the top!*" I immediately emailed his pair, "Matua, read this! It will make you laugh!" Kevin replied, "Pat is a crack up but I speak from the heart there – the head." I suggested some judicious editing. "I absolutely agree," he said. "Please delete or tone down any over the top phrases that Pat used to describe me. I honestly still see myself as a cow cocky or farmer from Mōtatau. That said, I do not think that how I described Pat was in any way over the top. I thought I was being factual." "Matua," I replied laughing, "perhaps Pat would say he was being factual too! I will do some editing, then see what Pat thinks" (personal communications, November 30–December 21, 2016).

Transcribing gave me intimate knowledge of the work-in-progress interview texts. Usually considered a time-consuming and laborious task, I relished the opportunity to revisit our conversations. I noticed intellectual nuances, verbal expressions, pauses, and emotional responses. I enjoyed funny exchanges, including Alison's theatrical groans in response to what she described as "hard questions". I made notations in the texts, such as [pause] or [laughs], to bring the reader a bit closer in to our conversational engagement.

I incorporated new questions, comments or observations into these interview texts, to extend a line of enquiry here, to question an interpretation there, or to provide another point of view for my co-researcher to consider. My co-researchers knew that only text approved by them could be used in the study and that they would have the final say on *their* chapter. Some edited their interview material closely, others accepted my efforts. I cared for all the texts we co-produced as if they were my own (not in the sense that I owned them, but rather that I had the responsibility of guardianship for them).

## **Reading the Interview Texts**

My co-research conversations and readings of interview texts began to straddle one another as our work together entered a new phase and I became more mindful of others who might be interested in our research: scholars, graduate students, educators, activists and leaders. I

conducted two differently focused readings because I intended to use our conversational exchanges for two purposes. First, I planned to craft pedagogical narratives that challenged readers to actively engage in making sense of their possible meanings (Lather, 1991). Second, I planned to write a conclusion to this thesis as a contribution to the fields of education, philosophy, Māori–Pākehā/Indigene–settler relations, and narrative enquiry. In the conclusion I intended to think with these stories, paying attention to those ideas that over the course of the research had settled into my awareness and were now tacitly influencing my attempts to work the hyphen (Frank, 2004).

During my first reading, I identified interview passages to use when constructing pedagogical narratives. I noted narrative plotlines (Polkinghorne, 1997), chronology and episodes (Stake, 2010), and other storytelling features needed for an emotionally touching and thought-provoking narrative, such as evocative descriptions, turns of phrase and critical insights (Ellis, 1997). I also marked my co-researchers' interpretations of their relationship with their paired colleague, and other significant experiences and influences. I was on the lookout for examples of qualities of relational justice as well as stories and reflections that illuminated ambiguities, contradictions and challenges in the relationship (Ellis, 1997).

My second reading of the interview texts was a theoretical review (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). I focused on new interpretations or meanings of the five big ideas discussed in Chapter 3 that could further inform theory and practice on becoming justice and doing justice in Māori–Pākehā relations: productive power relations, ethical responsibility to the other, ontological becoming in relation, a transformative pedagogical orientation and a way of life, manner of being. Baxter (2010) states:

Good theoretical explanations are those that are well rooted in the concrete aspects of the case yet sufficiently abstract that others in similar situations can see how they might apply to their own context. (p. 96)

Through these two differently focused and multiple readings, I became more familiar with the interview texts. Stake (2010) suggests that the process of reviewing dialogues, portrayals, and explanations uncovers critical insights. Dedicating six chapters of this thesis to my conversations with co-researchers meant that readers could join us in conversation and make their own sense of them. My reflections in the conclusion illuminate conceptual understandings that scholars, educators, activists, leaders and graduate students can take from the research to inform how they work the hyphen in Māori–Pākehā relations. These

understandings also contribute more broadly to the ethical–political discourse of Indigenous–settler relations.

## **Enacting the Ethics and Politics of Representation**

While reading the interview translations, I began to consider how to craft pedagogical narratives to ensure their accessibility to a wide audience. I was drawn to the idea of *re-presentation* which conveys “the mediated character of the process of writing research,” including the countless decisions about what to include or exclude (Mansvelt & Berg, 2010, p. 341). In this project, researching and writing became “mutually constitutive practices” that enabled me to re-present co-constructed knowledge in a chosen form (p. 341).

Recognising the importance of power and the politics of representation (Lassiter, 2005) for Indigenous, decolonising and narrative methodologies, I sought to acknowledge, negotiate and, as far as possible, shift the decision-making control in respect of the interests and concerns of my co-researchers. While Ann Oakley, a sociologist, notes the “responsibilities to report what participants say accurately and fairly, not to take material out of context, and not to use anything that may have been said in confidence” (2010, p. 435), the ethnographer Luke Lassiter (2005) argues that the challenge is more than a researcher’s responsibility to get it right. For him, and for me too, representation implicates the relationships constituted through the research, including between particular individuals (researcher and co-researcher) and their communities. Following this approach, the ethical and the political are inexorably interwoven and speak to who is in control. Lassiter (2005) stresses the importance of understanding the particular relationships the researcher/co-researcher have to “a developing text” and to one another (p. 7).

Previous collaborative, text-making projects had taught me that a developing text demands periods of high engagement and, despite their commitment to it, day-to-day co-researchers must navigate other obligations which can interrupt their engagement. Also, deciding how to re-present different interpretations and meanings in a coherent written narrative for a particular purpose can be intellectually challenging (Lawless, 1993). But my research practice has also taught me that the prospect of co-producing an intelligent text carries its own appeal and personal motivations underpinning co-research engagements may evolve with a developing text as its possibilities become clearer to co-researchers.

## Exploring possibilities for narrative representation.

I adapted a question posed by Brinkmann and Kvale (2015) to guide my thinking on how to re-present the storied knowledge in the interview texts as a developing text. They ask, “How can I reconstruct the original story told to me by the interviewee into a story I want to tell my audience” (p. 219). I asked: “How can I/we re-present the original stories told to me by my co-researchers into stories I/we want to tell my/our readers about seeking to become just and do justice in Māori–Pākehā relations?” I wanted to co-produce with my co-researchers something close to a self-interpreted text that would avoid any temptation to “build things up that’s not there” (Kiowa Elder Ralph Kotay, cited in Lassiter, 2005, p. 4). Reflections by Certeau (1984) on the work of the historian, Marcel Detienne, expressed my intentions and deserve a long citation:

He does not examine Greek stories in order to treat them in the name of something other than themselves. He rejects the break that would make of them objects of knowledge and also objects to be known [as data], dark caverns in which hidden “mysteries” are supposed to await the scientific investigation to receive a meaning. He does not assume that behind all these stories, secrets exist whose gradual unveiling would give him, in the background, his own place, that of interpretation. For him, these tales, stories, poems, and treatises are already practices. They say exactly what they do. They constitute an act which they intend to mean. ... You ask what they “mean” (*“veulent” dire*)? I’ll tell them to you again. When someone asked him about the meaning of his sonata, it is said, Beethoven merely played it over. (p. 80)

In a similar vein, Bourdieu (1999a) crafts conversational texts as “self-sufficient wholes” (p. 3). He explains that researchers who are explicit about their research intentions and decision making make it possible for readers to appreciate, as they read, how a text was constructed and the understanding that informed its construction (Bourdieu, 1999c).

I discussed the matter of re-presentation with my co-researchers. Some were more familiar with first-person narratives, while others preferred an interview layout. I tried different variations, which I discussed with them. I reworked an interview layout as a first-person narrative and showed both forms to Alison, asking her which she preferred and why.

I prefer the interview layout because it seems somehow a little more *authentic* – this narrative, strangely, does not sound like me. Does that make sense? ... because I am speaking to you in response mode when I am answering questions, but when it is in a narrative form in the first person it is as though I am foregrounding certain things which I would not naturally do, probably. (A. Jones, personal communication, January 18, 2017)

Others also wanted my questions on record. Sam said:

I think it would be great in every part of the story you are writing if you could include the questions you are asking, so we have the question that led to the stories we tell. (S. Chapman, personal communication, June 14, 2015)

Originally, I imagined three chapters, each containing narratives of a pair of co-researchers. But, human experience is not easily contained in short stories (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015). Bourdieu's (1999a) reflections on the re-presentation of his collaborative study on social suffering also applied to my research. Māori–Pākehā relations are:

*difficult to describe and think about*, and ... simplistic and one-sided images (notably those found in the press) must be replaced by a complex and multi-layered representation ... [Also] we must relinquish the single, central, dominant, in a word quasi-divine, point of view that is all too easily adopted by observers – and by readers too, at least to the extent they do not feel personally involved. We must work instead with the multiple perspectives that correspond to the multiplicity of coexisting, and sometimes directly competing, points of view. (p. 3)

Bourdieu (1999a) suggests that situating cases side by side creates a juxtaposition that draws attention to different points of views, ambiguities and contradictions. Frank (2004) adds that, when set together, stories can enhance their resonance, that is “give beyond what they ostensibly tell ... [and] can show what is possible for any of us at any time” (p. 9).

### **Pedagogical narratives as composed conversations.**

Eventually a chapter-length pedagogical narrative took shape, taking the form of crafted or “composed conversations” (my term). Because these narratives are the primary means by which I re-present the knowledge co-produced in the research, I dedicate a chapter to each co-researcher.

Here I refer to the next chapter to explain the structure of these narratives. First, I offer a researcher's prologue to introduce the reader to Te Kawehau Hoskins and invoke an attitude of respect toward her. I refer to her tribal affiliations, geographical location, family connections, professional roles and recognition, and academic interests. In the first composed conversation that follows, Alison Jones reflects on her relationship with Te Kawehau including her relational qualities. In the second composed conversation, Te Kawehau recalls early influences that shaped the way she is and the life she has come to live. In the third composed conversation Te Kawehau reflects on what sustains her and the possibilities she encounters every day in Māori–Pākehā relationships.

When crafting the composed conversations, I chose “a privileged moment” (Bourdieu, 1999c, p. 613) from a particular line of enquiry and spliced in other reflections to expand and enrich the telling. To emphasise the voices of my co-researchers, develop more in-depth narratives, and control the word count, I reduced and refined my enquiries and limited my interview comments. Following Frank (2004), who favours writing in “a voice of direct address” (p. 10), I embraced the pronouns used by my co-researchers. They often used the first person (I) when telling me (their listener/first reader) a personal story and the second person (you) when reflecting on the meanings of their experiences.

Each co-researcher reviewed their draft chapter and from there, we went back and forth. In some cases, I added fresh enquiries inviting new replies or co-researchers revised their original responses, in both cases to further clarify their meanings. I also invited co-researchers to consider whether particular spoken words (such as expressions familiar to some but perhaps not to a broader readership) best conveyed their intended meanings in a written text. Alison observed a difference between writing her own text and working on the composed conversations:

Writing is a close rewriting and crafting. Trimming an interview is a matter of trying to keep the tone of *talk* which is less organised, less thoughtful, less careful. At the same time — because it is becoming writing — it has to flow logically and also have enough interesting illustrative detail to be gripping. Speaking tends to dart from one idea to another. Writing cannot do that, but how to keep the unexpected in play AND write too? When I write I rewrite almost every word, and I cannot do that for the interview method — it would

read less *authentically* (!) even as we know it is a kind of fiction. (A. Jones, personal communication, March 20, 2017)

Despite its challenges, this process assured me that my co-researchers had the final say on the developing text, which was especially important because they had agreed to be named. Each narrative came to life in its own way; each person is unique, as was my conversational exchange with them. While guided by broad lines of enquiry, I was not tied to a prescribed list of questions *and* I was open to being led by the interests of my co-researchers. The conversations begin and end where they do.

My intention was to try to gain a closer approximation in words of something – relational justice – that I consider to be ineffable. With the permission of my co-researchers, I asked two external readers (fellow doctoral students also studying relational ethics) if they would read some of the developing conversations-in-text. Their comments gave me editorial insights, reassured me that the textual representations had re-presented the voice of the co-researcher (whom they knew) and led one co-researcher to rework a few lines of text to better express the meaning she intended.

## **How Will I Know if These Pedagogical Narratives Have Done Their Work?**

I set out to better understand my topic, not to produce “ultimate, unequivocally verified knowledge” (Flyvbjerg, 2001, p. 139). I hoped to craft narratives that would have a transformative effect on their readers. We took our conversations as far as we could (for now at least) and my co-researchers were satisfied with what we co-produced (as much as any co-author can be). Ellis (1997) led me to Spence (1982) who proposes a criterion of “narrative truth” (p. 28) to determine whether or not a researcher has re-presented human experience to their own satisfaction, and in this case the satisfaction of my co-researchers. Ellis (1997) adds that:

Narrative truth seeks to keep alive the past in the present; through narrative we learn to understand the meanings and significance of the past as incomplete, tentative, and revisable according to contingencies of present life circumstances and our projection of our lives into the future. (p. 129)

I did my best to craft a good story – here, meaning, thoughtful, touching narratives that embodied convictions that I/we hoped would draw the reader into our conversations on

relational justice and have them join us in our narrative work. Coles (1989) proposes that a characteristic of “a good story is its openness – the way you or I or anyone reading it can take it in, and use it for ourselves” (p. 47). Bourdieu (1999c) also considers that:

Being able to touch and move the reader, to reach the emotions ...can produce the shifts in thinking and seeing that are often the precondition for comprehension. (p. 623)

Are the narratives co-produced in this study good stories? Will they touch and move the reader? Will they facilitate learning and teaching on relational justice in Māori-Pākehā relations? Only readers can answer these questions, but the following enquiries guided my thinking when reviewing the narrative chapters that follow:

- Are these narratives *bearable* for you whose stories are told here? When I asked Kevin what he meant when he used the term bearable, he said, “I use the word to mean ‘able to carry it’ or ‘able to live with it’ – but by no means unpleasant.” (K. Prime, personal communication, January 4, 2017)
- Do these narratives draw the reader in and encourage various readings? (Lather, 1991)
- Do these narratives speak of lives and experiences that are *authentic, believable* and *possible*? Do they speak to readers about their experiences and draw out their interpretations and meanings? (Ellis, 1997, p. 133)
- Do these narratives speak of lives that summon respect for the qualities, commitments and priorities of these scholars, educators and leaders?
- Do these narratives help to inform “a forward-looking story” – how one wants to act in the future? (Nelson, 2001, p. 14)

Praxis-oriented research strives for “catalytic validity,” which focuses on the degree to which research encourages reflection, dialogue, praxis and transformational change (Lather, 1986, p. 272). I used catalytic validity to assess my work and return to this matter in my conclusion.

## **An Afterthought**

The research design was constantly unfolding as research activities became interwoven. Always I was thinking through how to co-produce narratives that not only cohere events and feelings but also emphasise the meaning and interpretation that arises from critical

reflection (Bourdieu, 1999b; Ellis, 1997). Listening to my co-researchers brought new ideas to the surface of our “relational flow” (Gergen, 2009, p. 46). I did not set out to prove a hypothesis; rather my purpose was to learn from people I deemed more knowledgeable than me on a topic of intense mutual interest. I accept that my qualitative research methodology challenges the norms of validity, reliability and generalisability long advanced in the canons of positivist social science research (Ellis, 1997). Some researchers and policymakers only judge research on that basis, however (Denzin & Giardina, 2007). Regardless, my project seeks to “make even by its integrity alone, an advocacy for those things we [my co-researchers and I] cherish” (Stake, 1995, p. 136).



## **Part Two: Composed conversations and theoretical-methodological conclusions**



## Chapter 5: Dr Te Kawehau Hoskins

### Prologue

*Te Kawehau Hoskins describes herself “an urban daughter of Whāngarei” and through her father is a member of the Ngāti Hau hapū from Whakapara. Her mother is Pākehā, of mainly Irish and Scottish descent and originally from Wellington. Te Kawehau is one of five children, the second youngest and the only girl.*

*Both her parents are thinkers and were politically active when she was growing up. “I think of them inhabiting a kind of intellectual, occasionally activist class.” After her parents married they settled in Whāngarei. Her father worked at the Whāngarei Portland Cement Works and in 1974 became the first Māori to secure a position in the Department of Labour. He worked his way into a professional class as a senior employment officer and became involved in group employment initiatives throughout the north, as well as doing significant work in the revitalisation of hapū and iwi entities and activities. Te Kawehau’s mother was involved in feminist activities, playcentre and school committees, and worked when she could, while raising five children. In the mid-70s the government designated whānau land at Whangaruru for public parks. Both her parents became deeply involved in the Ngāti Wai Land Retention Committee that was formed to oppose this government action. The Committee’s protest pre-empted the Land March of 1975 in which Te Kawehau’s whānau also participated.*

*Te Kawehau lived in the same house until she left home. Her working-class street “was fairly Māori but with some Pākehā families, and notoriously rough.” After leaving school Te Kawehau worked in community theatre, environmental education, film and the arts alongside Māori language revitalisation and political activities. After a “failed first attempt,” she returned to the University of Auckland in her late 20s, where she pursued Māori studies and education, and earned her doctorate.*

*Te Kawehau is a Senior Lecturer and the Head of Te Puna Wānanga, the School of Māori and Indigenous Education. She became Te Tumu [Māori Dean role] in 2017 and is charged with finding ways to further apply Te Tiriti o Waitangi in the Faculty of Education and Social Work. As well as other publications, she (and Alison Jones) edited a special issue of the New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies (2012) and a recent book titled Critical Conversations in Kaupapa Māori (2017).*

## **First Conversation: Alison Jones Considers Te Kawehau's Qualities and Their Relationship**

*Alison is 10 years older than Te Kawehau and recalls meeting her in the early or mid-1990s. Te Kawehau was a student in Alison's undergraduate class and also in her master's classes. Alison supervised her master's degree and her doctorate.*

Te Kawehau always got very high grades because she was brilliant, and still is! [laughs]. Right from the start I could see she was an engaged critical thinker. I really liked her, and I couldn't get over her astonishing beauty! [laughs]. The views she expressed and the questions she asked were deeply perceptive. She surprised me, and I learned from her. A few students will say something about their topic and I'll think, "Oh, that's interesting; I'd love to know more about that." I found I reacted to her ideas like that all the time.

One of the first things Te Kawehau said in my feminism and social theory class got my attention. In the field of education at that time in the early 1990s, Māori and Pākehā radical thinkers and critical theorists were saying, "Oh, isn't it awful for Māori in education, dumbed down, experiencing oppression, disadvantage, and so on." Of course, you had to agree with all the research and the evidence of your own eyes, but a critical approach can be so relentlessly negative *and* limited. One day Te Kawehau said something like, "Actually, there's a lot of space in government policies and in relationships with Pākehā that allows for interesting experimentation and we [that is, radical/critical Māori in mainstream education] don't take it up enough ... Maybe we're frightened of it somehow." I thought "That's a good point; it's easier and safer to condemn *the system*, and try to locate ourselves (impossibly) *outside the system*. But to actively engage and start doing something unexpected and radical with it is a whole other ball game." Te Kawehau was young and in the class, where there were a number of Māori students, she was going against the grain in what I thought was a very brave way.

### ***What was Te Kawehau drawing attention to and why did that matter?***

By expressing that view (and not taking the standard line that Māori education always *had* to be understood only in terms of oppression and disadvantage) she was turning and standing against that tide, and saying, "Hang on. Let's not position ourselves as victims all the time; let's engage our power." Without yet theorising it in that way, she started talking about what was possible right now and drawing attention to some positive and risky aspects of radical struggle.

She was doing that a long time ago when it wasn't fashionable to do it. It was daring for her to say it in class because if anyone else had said it, like if a Pākehā had asked, "Isn't there wriggle room; what is the space for struggle here?", the Māori women in the room would have said: "It's alright for you to say; there's wriggle room for you," but Te Kawehau saying it meant it could be said, it could be spoken. I was keen to get her to say more and I encouraged her to write. From my point of view as a teacher, her thinking ability, her insights and her bravery had to be nurtured in the university.

Her viewpoint was so full of potential that it sparked my own rethinking. I hadn't properly cottoned on to the way we critical theorists were relentlessly negative in our focus and in doing so were centring yet again the very thing – in this case, the coloniser – we wanted to decentre. When Te Kawehau said that very clearly in the class, something shifted for me. I had been aware in my feminist work of how easy it is to centre men and the patriarchy, but hadn't really transferred that thinking to the Indigenous critique. When something like that happens, in an instant, you're never the same again. You think, "Yes!" The world shifts on its axis and everything from then on is affected by this insight. People who say things that shift my world become my lifelong friends, and they may be people I've never met but whose books I've read. So Te Kawehau became a lifelong friend; I have a feeling for her and a gratitude that she enriches my thinking fundamentally and powerfully.

### *How did your relationship with Te Kawehau develop over time?*

Our relationship didn't really develop until she came into the university as a lecturer. In the early days when she was student, I just knew her and admired her and thought she was fabulous. But in terms of talking to each other in a more sustained way about politics and theory, the relationship really developed when we began teaching together. Nowadays we see each other or email most days and we've had breakfast once a week for the past couple of years. We're writing together and currently doing a book on kaupapa Māori, which has thrown us together even more. I keep meeting new insights that develop as we work together.

Part of what makes Te Kawehau brilliant is her ability to stand up for fresh, critical ideas that are not usually accepted in more conventional critical circles. And she is open to engagement with Pākehā in a way that some of her Māori colleagues would say she shouldn't because they consider it too dangerous [pause]. I feel some responsibility for the response she encounters, and we have spoken together openly about the risks of her work

with me as a Pākehā. She is thoughtful about what she does and I respect her decision to do the work she wants to do. I think the path she has chosen is much more radical, complicated and difficult than the more standard critical route, and I deeply admire her for that.

***How do you show support for the path Te Kawehau has chosen?***

[Pause] Hmm, I don't know how to answer that [pause]. I'd do anything to support her. I'd teach classes, grade papers ...if ever she asks me [pause]. She lets off steam with me, I think, quite a lot of the time. She trusts that I won't gossip to other people. She feels free to express her thoughts, knowing we have a relationship and we're in on the same page.

When I think about it, she doesn't ask a lot of me. We don't ask a lot of each other; it's just unspoken. It's knowing the other person will have your back, debate, discuss, laugh, commiserate – all those kinds of things you do with a friend. When we have breakfast, it's as much about work as anything else. We're not friends in the sense that we go around to each other's houses a lot; we don't *hang out* or text each other heaps. But she is the kind of person that if I got ill and was going to die, then I would say to my husband that he would have to call her and Kuni Jenkins (another close Māori colleague and friend) to help organise my funeral; that kind of thing. It's that sort of relationship.

***[Laughs]. Well, professor, that's the hard bit, isn't it – "it's that sort of relationship" – because that's what we're trying to understand, what sort of relationship it is!***

[Laughs]. Yeah. What is that thing that binds you together? I don't know. I *recognise* people and I don't know what that recognition is. Sometimes you meet people and you feel like you've known them all your life; that strange feeling. Or you feel completely comfortable with them. It doesn't happen often but when it does, it's quite profound and you feel it flowing both ways: "I recognise you and you recognise me". Something is happening there; you have the same sensibility, you're in the same world somehow.

Certainly, I recognised Te Kawehau and that leads to an enormous feeling of relaxation when I am with her. We see the world very similarly; we have very much the same sense of humour. You can crack a joke and no-one laughs except this one person who thinks it's hilarious, and you think, "Yeah, you're on my page." I love the way she is always so irreverent. I'm bit of a swearer and she's bit of a swearer, and I like that too; there's an irreverence we share that I so much enjoy [pause]. Although, I'm never *sure* of my

relationship with her, that is, I do not take the relationship for granted. I wouldn't be surprised if she was critical of me. She could say to other people that I'm this or I'm that, but it wouldn't worry me particularly because she says that to me too, periodically [laughs]. She'll tell me that I'm bossy or middle class, or she'll criticise my dress sense!

***[Laughs]. So, as well as a sense of recognition, you're aware that you are very different people?***

Yes. Te Kawehau and I have a lot *not* in common. She is a complete alternative health nut, which I am quite disapproving of, and of course I tell her that because I don't like to see her suffering. She often doesn't realise she's got asthma, and she's got asthma, and I say, "You've got asthma," and she says, "No I haven't," cough, cough, "No I haven't," cough, cough, and things like that.

When we go overseas, she wants to shop, and I can't stand shopping. So, we have to split up or sometimes I will reluctantly go with her and trudge around the department stores with a little black cloud over my head, sitting like the disgruntled husband on a chair in the womenswear department, saying: "For goodness sake!" She'll come out of the dressing room and say, "What does this look like?", and I'll say, "Great! Fantastic!" Then she'll take photos and send them to her kids, and they'll say, "Nah!" She'll try on 16 things and buy nothing, and I'll think, 'That was a whole morning of my life I will never get back!'

And she's always saying, "I can't believe you're so fit." We'll be walking around London, and while I am pacing through the streets she'll be puffing and I'll hear her say: "You're not even sweating!"

So, in many ways, we don't have much in common in terms of that sort of thing, but [pause] that doesn't matter, and we can go and do our separate things and join up for a laugh later.

***Is Te Kawehau the kind of person you can also rely on to go the extra mile with you, to some degree or other?***

That's Te Kawehau for sure. She's a delightful mixture of staunch and funny and smart. I'd happily go anywhere with her, or take on any project she asked me to, because I know it would work out, whatever that might mean.

*It sounds like there's an ambiguity at work in your relationship with Te Kawehau. If so, what has ambiguity taught you to always remember?*

Isn't there always uncertainty or ambiguity in every relationship that matters? She and I work in a very politicised space, so that fact is present to some extent all the time – what I mean is, there are always flows of power outside any relationship which necessarily have effects on that individual relationship. You cannot escape it – there are always flows of structural and historical power, related to gender, ethnicity, age, indigeneity, status, knowledge ...and these work differently in a range of situations. In this case, and in an academic setting: I am a Pākehā, a professor, older than she is ... there are always opportunities for power to play out, often unconsciously. We're both very aware of that possibility, and so we check in with each other about certain things (and I just love it that we can do this!).

For instance, I might be asked to keynote at a conference, and I will always invite her to share the podium equally. (I even count the number of words we separately contribute to make them even! She says she'd prefer not to write her words down. I insist on it because I'm worried we'll get side-tracked. And then she ignores the script anyway). We both know the score. She says she is the token Indigenous person; we both have a hollow laugh about that. She could decide not to join me, and that is fine. She will weigh up if the event interests her, and whether she will enjoy herself.

Would she invite me to keynote with her at a conference? I doubt it. The opposite situation is never equivalent. She would not invite me to a Māori event where she is speaking, and nor would I want her to. It is one thing for Pākehā to ask Māori to speak and quite another for Māori to ask Pākehā to speak. These invitations have very different meanings, with different flows of power. We like to talk about such complexities; how they work or don't work, and their effects.

## Second Conversation: Te Kawehau Considers Her Own Early Influences

*Te Kawehau began by talking about her experiences at school and their impact on her developing Māori identity.*

My earliest experiences at school taught me that Māori kids tended to be on the margins. Māori were expected to be naughty and not to achieve, and I felt that expectation all the way through my schooling. By high school, we firmly knew that school was for other people, not for us, and a place to leave as soon as possible.

Schooling was complex and dangerous. I was considered a *pretty half-caste* so was alternately harassed by boys and picked on by jealous girls. At a time when most other half-castes would have opted for a Pākehā identity, I chose to be Māori. This meant my identity was, for a range of reasons, challenged on all sides. In high school, I ran with the toughest girls in the school – there were school gangs and almost daily fights on the field. I eventually found a social position in the group as a kind of mascot – which to my relief meant I was less involved in and less a target of violence. For a lot of my schooling I was too busy watching my back to learn. You've got to be at ease to learn.

I remember turning up to an English class studying *The Merchant of Venice*. I hadn't been for weeks, but I expressed an idea that impressed the teacher, who exclaimed that I was "an enigma". I didn't know what that word meant, but I later came to understand that it meant something like a disengaged *bad girl* who surprised with occasional moments of engagement and even achievement. On the whole I didn't care too much about school; I bunked class, set things on fire in the science lab, smoked cigarettes, snuck off to the pub instead of going to geography class and was eventually asked to leave. When I did leave at the start of the seventh form (Year 13), I had only just passed School Certificate and by some stroke of luck got University Entrance accredited.

My parents had a sense of the value of education for expanded life chances and they pressured me to stay at school. For most of my mates, school wasn't particularly important. It hadn't been a place for their parents and, in turn, it wasn't a place for them. When a system clearly doesn't recognise and value you, you leave at the earliest opportunity. For their parents, it was about getting on and getting a job, and it was at a time when you could get a job, so why wouldn't you?

I had another formative experience in my early teens; I became a punk. During my high school years, I had a whole lot of Pākehā friends because punks were Pākehā. I also

maintained my Māori networks of friends at school and from my neighbourhood. I'd be hanging with the punk rockers one night and be in the Black Power pad the next. I enjoyed the company of diverse groups and was constantly crossing diverse social boundaries and identities.

*Te Kawehau, how did you come to choose to be Māori?*

I chose to be Māori when I was about five. I remember starting school and beginning to realise there were these Māori and these Pākehā, and for some reason I wasn't attracted to the Pākehā. Pākehā lived on my street and I could have hung out with them but I chose Māori, and it was a tough choice because it was rough and violent at times. I had some Pākehā friends but my main peer group was Māori, although I wasn't the same as them and of course I wasn't the same as the Pākehā either. I am not even sure I was using those words – Māori and Pākehā – but I was certainly identifying these groups and it was definitely Māori and non-Māori. Other people say, "At the time I didn't even think in those terms with that language." And I've thought, "Maybe I didn't actually have those words either."

We (my siblings and I) weren't generally recognised as Māori by others living on our street because there was little overlap with the class culture and we didn't engage in those daily activities that would have identified us as Māori. We weren't diving for kina (a kind of seafood), and Dad wasn't playing rugby and drinking with the neighbours at the local rugby club. We weren't recognised as Pākehā either because we had experiences in our world related to being Māori, such as my father's iwi (tribal) work. Because Mum was Pākehā, the culture of the home was mostly Pākehā. This is how it was when I was growing up.

I remember if I had money and was going to buy Dad a birthday present, I would buy him something Māori to affirm that identity [laughs]. Once I bought Dad this letter opener from the souvenir shop. He still has it today – 45 years later! It's metal and has Māori designs down the metal part. On the top it has a tiki-like figure (carved figure) with pāua shell in-lay. It was definitely a Māori thing and he's kept it all these years. We see it now and again, and I say, "That is what I was doing then (asserting a Māori identity)!" Both my parents get it, and say, "Yeah, we think that is what you were doing then!"

Within my family, it was every one of us for ourselves regarding those sorts of things. Whereas I made the decision to identify as Māori, my siblings mostly did not. They were more ambivalent and didn't put a stake in the ground that said, "This is my identity." They probably had more Pākehā friends than Māori friends. And, as I said, my decision could

have been to identify with Pākehā too. But that decision did lead to divisions among us as siblings growing up because being Māori in the 70s and 80s was not a very positive identity to inhabit. No-one wanted that identity for me because being Māori meant getting into trouble and being on the fringes of school life. If you had Māori and Pākehā parents you were seen as a half-caste, another identity altogether.

I'm not entirely sure what attracted me to a Māori identity. Maybe it was the dominant identity/group around me; the one that seemed more present and the one that I could see I was going to have to live with, engage with, contend with. Māori also seemed more open, more relaxed and more fun. But also, more dangerous. So I recognised a dynamic that was attractive and compelling, both *good* and *dangerous*.

### *And how did you learn te reo?*

I began learning te reo when I was quite young, from the beginning of the renaissance in the early 1980s, but not at school. At high school, there were Māori girls from outlying areas, such as Pipiwai and Matawaia, who were native speakers. While the school had a huge proportion of Māori students, it didn't offer te reo as a subject except by correspondence for those native speakers. We could take Māori as an option in the junior years, where we learnt a smattering of te reo and did things like make bodices for our kapa haka (Māori performing arts) uniforms. Doing kapa haka at school helped with pronunciation and vocabulary.

After high school I learnt te reo wherever I could. I attended a 6-week total immersion programme at the Kuratini (the polytechnic). Following another course at Auckland University of Technology, a group of students and tutors established a wānanga reo, offering week-long, marae-based, total immersion wānanga for adult learners of te reo. I joined the organising group and we formed a charitable trust, and for over a decade we held wānanga three times per year. It was a hugely rich time during which we worked voluntarily – buying the food, setting the rosters, managing registrations, securing venues, and teaching the classes. I learnt the reo mostly this way and by the time I came to study the reo at *Uni*, I had the language under my belt – not perfect by any stretch – but I found it easy. Learning te reo is a lifelong journey which is so pleasurable and enriching.

*Te Kawehau, how did you develop your political awareness and your commitment to political action in relation to things Māori and the Treaty of Waitangi?*

When I was young I had my identity constantly questioned by Māori and non-Māori alike. Yet as I got older the Māori renaissance was taking off and, in those circles, in which my family moved, being Māori was positively affirmed. Dad was involved in hapū (sub-tribe) and iwi (tribe) development. He established our hapū trust board, and after the 1975 Land March to parliament (to protest the ongoing alienation of Māori land) was involved in the establishment of the Ngāti Wai Trust Board and became its first chair. I often joined Dad on his travels, spent time at marae and at hapū meetings, and did Māori Land Court research. I came to realise that I was tribally local to Whāngarei and a lot of local hapū political activity was going on, in the early 1980s. These were politicising times.

By the time I was 17, I had joined the Whāngarei Māori Women's Collective. We met and talked about iwi and hapū issues, family and gender issues, approaches to alternative economics, Māori sovereignty and the Treaty. We organised art exhibitions, poetry readings, political events, whatever. Many of the women were from local hapū and became another community for me. I was absorbing the ferment arising from thinking about tikanga, having conversations with pro-Māori activists, and learning from other women in the collective.

Those experiences pushed me off in that direction. I went to different Māori hui and adopted quite radical politics. All of this activity meant that I had quite a developed and comfortable sense of my identity and the politics of that identity by the end of my teenage years. Any issues I'd had, I'd dealt with early. I had thought and sifted and felt and grieved. I had been scared and ashamed but also affirmed and encouraged. I had lived through all of my experiences.

I remember a good friend of mine who lived in Australia for a few years and when she returned she was all fired up and politicised. I was political, too, but she had a perverse and nasty joy of pointing out that I had a Pākehā mother, implying that I wasn't really Māori. It was her weapon and she went on about it the entire time. Her approach grieved me a bit; her comments represented the same kind of attacks I experienced in earlier years and triggered feelings I thought I'd left behind. I remember saying to her, "Are you really going to speak to me like that?" We were 19 and I decided then I wasn't going to accept that behaviour again. I felt deeply that her approach was wrong. Wrong personally (at the level

of face-to-face relationships) and wrong politically (a dead end). I decided then that I was not going to buy into that kind of approach by questioning my identity and so on. Nor was I going to make my identity the main focus of my politics.

Although I am now at ease with my Māori-ness, I also think that who I am is not a straightforward or single uniform thing. I am also aware that my sense of identity is unique to my own set of circumstances and influences.

*Te Kawehau, moving across the hugely diverse worlds and groups you encountered in your youth, what else did you come to know about yourself that you now value? What kinds of skills and knowledges did you develop?*

I had connections with a broad range of groups growing up in Whāngarei. Perhaps because it was a small world, I wanted to know them all. Constantly moving across these diverse worlds, I became quite good at working the psychology of the different groupings I encountered. I came to understand and empathise with different people, to understand a little of what makes them tick, their fears and prejudices, and their strengths. I could bridge these groups if I had to; ease tensions, make connections. These groups very rarely interacted, so perhaps I was a bit unique in that way. I've always been able to identify with something in the groups that I've spent time with. I could somehow connect with something in them that I enjoyed.

I became a kind of an *insider-outsider* because of who I was. The parents I had (their ethnicities, their lives, their histories, their education and so on) and other experiences separated me from my peers. I think this ability to be both an insider and an outsider was born out of many disjunctive experiences in my life. I was always noting those comparisons, and differences, and thinking about where I was in all of that and where I wanted to be. At every turn, the point of difference was the point I was observing and experiencing, because I was different. I was forced to open my eyes, whether I liked it or not.

Those sorts of experiences give you a consciousness at an early age. I became a conscious observer of social and cultural differences and a critical thinker, in particular in relation to the experiences of my mainly Māori peers, who had experiences I often shared.

*How did you make it to university when so many of your peers did not?  
What attracted you? Challenged you? What sort of impacts did that  
experience have on you?*

My scant but real educational success at Whāngarei Girls meant that I could *technically* go to university, and I finally plucked up the courage a couple of years after I left high school. I had never been to Auckland before. I had no idea what a university was or how to get around it and find my classes. I was flitting with people who were on the border line like me and spending a lot of time in the Kiwi Tavern, drinking. I felt like a little *hick* girl from small town Whāngarei. I had no idea what I was doing or how to succeed, and as a consequence I failed my courses and dropped out after a year.

I think I went to Uni because the one thing I could do naturally at school was write an essay. I was in the fifth form (Year 11) before I was given any indication that I might have a brain. Before that I believed I was dumb like everyone else. When I wrote my first history essay, the teacher said it was good, and I nearly fell over. After I left school I thought, “Universities are the place where people write essays, so I’ll go there.”

One of the first essays I wrote at university was on the workings of cultural and social capital in my school experience and, therefore, the life chances available. As soon as I had that concept of cultural and social capital – boom! – I realised that was exactly what I had just left in Whāngarei and in school. I got a better deal in school because I had certain forms of cultural capital and social capital that my Māori mates did not have. Even though I was quite naughty, I was recognised by the institution of the school; the teachers put a bit more effort into recognising me and giving me attention, whereas my Māori mates were ignored and pushed out the door at 15. Terrible.

When I returned to university in my mid to late 20s, I was a solo parent and an adult student. But the second-time round, I loved it. I realised when I put my mind to study, I was good at it; I could make good critical sense of things. I had experienced that kind of intellectual engagement in my earlier life, through my father’s and my own activities. Being already politicised and active meant that at Uni I was encountering ideas, imagining possibilities, making critical observations and analysing situations. It was a good time to be at university because I was applying everything I was learning to my real-world experiences and engagements.

I also realised I had missed out on big swathes of learning at school. I was still only working with raw talent. Anything I came through high school with, was sheer bloody inheritance.

***Te Kawehau, to what inheritance are you referring?***

I often ask, “What genes am I channelling?” “What are the social histories and experiences of the people before?” One of my tūpuna (ancestors) is Patuone, the older brother of Nene, and often thought of as a peace-maker or too friendly to the Pākehā (a kūpapa). He and Nene signed the Treaty and tried to provide relational leadership between two peoples in a rapidly changing world. He was also from the old world and lived in that space too.

Patuone is my Dad’s name. That’s quite a strong influence. I see that my Dad has done similar work because he has those skills. His mother had already chosen him as the one to look after the whānau and land interests. Once he’d resettled in the north, the Elders would call him to hui and say “It’s you; you are going to do this work.” He was chosen, I think, because he knew the Pākehā world and was able to negotiate Pākehā systems. But also, he had an abiding commitment to Māori self-determination.

My father is very strong politically. Some people seem to think that if you work in the space of *the relationship*, then some how you’re weak or you want everything to be warm and fuzzy and good, or you want to be Pākehā, or you’re more Pākehā than people who stand on the other side and draw that line. But that’s not true. The space of the relationship is much riskier and, in a progressive sense, more radical. It is also a necessary space, where real work gets done, because there is no purely autonomous space. Thinking about it, this has been my model over many generations, so I guess that kind of orientation gets in you.

***Following in their footsteps, what draws you to work in the often-contested relational space with Māori and with Pākehā?***

I love the work I do directly in the Māori world – with Māori in Māori settings – but I also see the value of, and enjoy the work in, that space you’re negotiating between Māori and non-Māori because of course you can’t escape that. We live in a small country on a small earth and there’s no way on this earth that anything can be all Māori, for Māori, by Māori, at every level. What? Every thought? What? Every bit of language you use? No. There is always this space of engagement and negotiation, and getting real about that, and I like that too because I see that it’s productive and something can come from it.

For so many years we've been saying, "There's nothing without engagement," and that's right, but with engagement comes risks, power dynamics and possibilities for disappointment or for good productive relationships. I have such a strong conviction that Māori people were all about possibilities and opportunities, and for that reason they faced relationships all the time. That is why they fought, because fighting is facing relationships too. I'm interested in relationships, not because I want a cosy togetherness, but rather because I see that it is from here that newness, innovation and difference can emerge. How does anything happen if you don't address this space of relationships in an ongoing way? I don't believe in a quick fix or think things are easy. It's all hard. But it's all great too, when you get somewhere with it.

***Do you think your whakapapa commands or calls you to the life you are living and the work you're doing?***

That's interesting because growing up I had such a random mix of a life; it was never going to be secure, clear or straightforward. The union of my parents, given who they were, was never going to provide some wonderful continuity with the past. Maybe those differences themselves set me up for an interest in the in-between, in the relation. And as I was saying earlier, I do also feel guided in significant ways by my tūpuna. I've been told on several occasions I have ancestors around me who, in particular, guide my political communicative work.

***I also find it interesting how a particular childhood can influence a person's future life-work. And if you live long enough, the passage of time and the passing of seasons will have their own impact. What do you think?***

I totally agree. Since I hit 45, I've become more aware of the time that has gone. I can start to see how meaningful it can be for what I now can offer. Because I have lived and I have experienced and I have suffered and I have tried things out.

### **Third Conversation: Te Kawehau Considers Possibilities in Māori–Pākehā Relations**

*Sitting at my dining room table overlooking the beautiful Manukau Harbour, Te Kawehau began the conversation by talking about her relationship with nature.*

There's nothing like nature to chill me out quickly. What is it about nature that has that effect on me? Oh God, probably something chemical, the ions whatever they are [laughs], the air, the absence of human structures or something. I don't know. I remember living at Te Henga Bethells Beach on Auckland's wild west coast; once you got up on the hills and looked across the valley, you couldn't see another house. You could see the floor of the valley, which is a big wetland, then a huge beautiful range of hills with native trees – so relaxing. Back home, we have *the bush to the sea*; our family is on a large part of the Whangaruru Harbour and we're not about to make a big mess of it. It's so nice to go somewhere that doesn't change and hasn't changed in my lifetime.

*And to enjoy those relationships with the land, the bush and the sea over time and that sense that comes from being somewhere for a long time and looking at the same view, but one that is always changing ...*

Exactly. It gets inside you and becomes part of your structure; I like that. Growing up, I had fun with my brothers in nature. We made huts in the bush, explored local caves, played bullrush on the empty sections on our street, swam in the falls, played and fought in the streets, and stole fruit, all within a 10-kilometre radius of home. So, from a young age I developed a love and an appreciation of nature. Nature provided me with an escape from the stresses in my home and community life – the place I could withdraw to and feel peaceful. Nature still serves me in this way.

There's something about place but, of course, Māori would say that – that place defines who you are. I don't think I make sense outside of certain places. Only in the last couple of years could I say that “I love Auckland” and I've lived here for 30 years. I love the dual coasts – there's water everywhere and anywhere you are you can smell the sea. The smell, the sight and the close proximity of the sea provides an experience that allows you to draw away from the intellect, from being busy and stressed, and to settle, be fallow for a while, and to let in other kinds of knowing. Those other forms of knowing are intuition, affective, maybe also what could be called spiritual.

Home is only a couple of hours' drive from Auckland, so I'm never far from it. I've suffered a bit from being away from home. If you don't live in the north, you suffer from losing track of those *fine-grained relationships*. You lose track of the developments and details of a lot of people's lives. I know a lot of people in the north still, but there are all of these layers of other people and knowledge that I don't have because of not being there in that day-to-day way and not having my work there. Sometimes when I go up I think I'm never going to recover those years. What can you do about that but enjoy what you have?

I will return one day, I think. Going home gives me a lot of pleasure and an appreciation, too, after living away so long. When you go back in, you see things with slightly different eyes and you appreciate those differences. You appreciate the community, and the localness, and the way that people are, when they don't live in the cities and are not middle class and highly educated and all the rest. I have so much to learn from them. Not all of them, of course! But you do find an ethic, a kind of social ethicality, that doesn't seem to be born from reading books, but rather from being in community and committing to people, whether you do that consciously or not, over a long period of time.

Obviously, there's a real comfort in belonging. How many theorists would critique that idea! [laughs]. But if you're living a life and you feel that kind of comfort as a basis for doing things you enjoy and the work of justice that means so much to you, who cares and why not? I'm always interested, too, in the people who don't have that kind of comfort of those relationships because I think it makes for a particular type of person who thinks in particular kinds of ways. Often, they are quite good radical thinkers, in the sense of thinking outside the box, because they're not in a box or a comfort zone in that way in terms of a sense of place or belonging. I think it makes for quite different identities and I am attracted to those identities but at the same time I'm glad I have mine.

*Other significant ways you sustain your ethical-political commitments?*

I experience such joy in being a learner in the Māori world. For me it's about paying attention to the spiritual and to the environment; always pausing to notice, acknowledge, affirm, karakia (pray). This kind of cultural practice is good for the soul. Then there's the joy in continuing to learn te reo and the knowledge connected to it. All of this learning is a constant point of reference for my philosophical work.

And then there's the humour, the heart, the politics; the feelings of oneness with the world, of fellowship with others, of shared purpose, of caring about and attempting to do good in and for the world. All of these things make my life good.

***What did you mean earlier when you referred to “social ethicality”?***

I think the term *social ethicality* means paying attention to the dynamic of relationships in the day-to-day and in the face-to-face. It means attending to those relationships, although I am as selfish as the next person. It means being alert to what you might learn and how you might be altered by others. It also means being present for others, whatever that means, whether it's in the small goodnesses or the kindnesses, being observant, or being responsive in certain ways, as much as you can.

It's an ethic born out of relatedness, a commitment to relatedness (*whanaungatanga*) – to working for and with the people. Blackie Pohatu, a *kaumātua* at the university where I work, told me that the base word of *whanaungatanga* is not just *whānau* (family), it also means to *incline toward others*. That, I think, opens possibilities for social ethicality. If there is an imperative to incline towards others, there is the possibility of ethicality – even if sometimes, even often, it's not achieved.

For the philosopher Levinas, and for me too, it means attending to the other. All you can do is remind yourself of your responsibility to the Other – an orientation to others, which you might call respect – in order to not do violence to them or shroud them in your knowledge and understanding of them but rather to try to maintain or suspend your judgement. For Levinas, all humans can do is try to remember to preserve the otherness of the Other – preserve that radical alterity or difference of the Other – that is ethics – and to be responsible for that. And he would go further, and say that our responsibility for others is infinite and impossibly demanding.

***How does one respond to the infinite, impossible demands of the Other without becoming a martyr, or does Levinas expect us to martyr our lives for justice?***

I don't think that Levinas expects us to become a martyr or thinks that we should kill ourselves in trying to respond. But simply, he suggests, we should remember the demand. Without trying to turn everyone into martyrs, whatever affect that remembering has on you and on your behaviour, and can have on you and your behaviour, is a plus I suppose. Levinas puts an unattainable impossibly demanding challenge in front of us every day to

be responsible for others. He knows only too well that we turn away from that responsibility many more times than we turn to it. And even when we turn to it, we can't fulfil it, because it's unfulfillable. But it's the demand that is important; the demand calls us in certain ways. It's not that we should be trying to fulfil it every day in all ways in our relationships with the Other but rather, Levinas wants us to be aware that the demand exists anyway. For him to have an impossible demand is the only way to keep that responsibility for the Other open. But we will never fulfil it.

There's always a tension between self-preservation and trying to respond to the demand. That demand for Levinas is not a political demand; he recognises there are a whole lot of limitations, political structures and forms that intersect with and reduce people's ability to respond. But he doesn't focus on that, nor does he propose reciprocity, as in: "You do this and I do that." We have to fill in those blanks in the everyday contexts in which we operate. For Levinas, it is just the demand, the demand, the demand, and that is what is compelling and radical about his idea. Just accept the demand as an idea, knowing you will never fulfil it. Then, do what you do, but he doesn't provide specifics. He doesn't say "Do what you do, or do what you can, or look after yourself." What he has given us is the idea of the radical demand of responsibility to the Other.

We simply and absolutely cannot accept every demand; that's impossible. We can't and we won't and we don't. Levinas suggests that because we come into being in relationship with others, with the Other, we're already tied to the Other, we're already bonded to the Other, before and beyond anything else. So of course, I can choose to say I won't help you today. And I will choose that response. And I will every other day but the fact is we are still always already tied to each other. The ethical demand is there whether we respond to it or not. Our being bonded together, according to Levinas, is prior to consciousness, prior to ontology. So, there is always the possibility that I will turn to you, rather than turn away from you. His call to us is to remember that possibility, rather than focusing on what will happen as a result of turning toward the Other or that this week I remembered five times and last week it was only two. His approach is not at all programmatic in that way.

*So, are you, and Levinas, calling for an orientation rather than a code of ethical conduct or step-by-step programmatic response?*

I think all we can arrive at is an orientation, an approach, an alertness, an attending to. I don't think you can get more than that and that's good because it retains an openness that

is needed. If we try to say “you need to do this, this, and this,” and “it will equal that, in a just practice” then our thinking quickly becomes too simplistic. We risk ignoring the complexities in our relationships and in the diverse realities in which we operate. People often want a simple solution, a checklist, a code of conduct, but you have to refuse them. A simple solution is not possible and doesn’t work. People love doctrines, models and principles, but I find them so empty.

*Te Kawehau, how has Levinas influenced your own political practice and face-to-face encounters?*

Levinas has taught me is to be more open-minded in, for example, the way we might write our policy statements, to be less programmatic, put more focus on the relationship, be more open and alert to those excluded by any engagement, governance arrangement or policy. In practical ways, he has not said to me, do this or that, but working with his ideas has had the effect of shifting my political practice.

Now when I am thinking of a Treaty policy or governance arrangement, for example, I recognise a series of exclusions and inclusions. I try to maintain an awareness, an alertness, an orientation to those who are excluded. I consider ways that this policy or that governance arrangement can maintain an openness to whomever is excluded, because no governance arrangement or policy can ever equally include everyone. In particular, I try to be alert to the most violent aspects of any given decision or social stabilisation.

In face-to-face encounters, I focus on the importance of relationship; the importance of genuinely trying to hear the Other, even if that person is expressing racist ideas. That orientation has helped me to turn around my political practice, by actually listening to that person rather than arguing, or dismissing them. I try to speak to them, not through logic and rationality, but more through the heart. When working to structure relationships of power in a governance setting, I try to be more open, try not to nail down everything, try to consider those others who are not so well represented in that structure, and try to foster a responsibility-based discourse, and not a rights-based discourse.

This shift toward a responsibility-based discourse has been a major departure for me. A responsibility-based discourse reminds me that “It’s not just about *us*”. If I am in a situation advocating for Māori, which is advocating for their rights in a way, people can say, from a Levinasian perspective, that I’m looking after my own people. And that is just the way it is; we’re acting in the political and need to shift a whole lot of agenda, policy, law, funding opportunities for this particular group of people, Indigenous people.

Sometimes we, as Māori, are in a privileged position to be able to think of others and be generous to the Other. This requires us not just to be a demanding Treaty partner, as in “You’re responsible for me,” but also a Treaty partner who recognises responsibilities to the Other, as in “I am responsible for you too”. In a political sense and in a Māori sense, if I am tangata whenua (the people of the land) and you are manuhiri (visitors or in this case, Settlers) then I am responsible for you too.

In the political you will never get a clean Levinasian application, but again we can always remind ourselves of his ideas and of course not just him. I have tried to put Levinas in conversation with ideas from tikanga Māori and Māori knowledge and philosophy, because there is a whole lot there to remember and to consider for the political and for other forms of social practice – a huge amount. I’m thinking here of ideas such as aroha, manaakitanga, kaitiakitanga. I don’t like all those *tanga* words actually. I think they have become principled and abstracted from practice. But those big ideas are important for Māori political practice in contemporary times and provide so many ways to shift dynamics.

*Te Kawehau, I see you enacting freedom and intellectual independence as qualities of positive productive relationships. I’m thinking of your determination growing up, and now, to be who you are, with whomever you are with as well as te ao Māori and its relational connections. Are you someone who is fundamentally about relationship?*

[Pause]. Yes. But we are all, all about relationship, aren’t we? We’re social beings, whether we’ve had the opportunity to ponder our relationships enough or a lot?

I do think now, I made difficult choices growing up. Choosing to identify as Māori was not a popular choice, but particular drivers also pushed me to make certain choices at that time.

[Laughs]. I still feel like a girl and I am nearly 50! But I have come to some sense of rightness in me. I don’t mean righteousness, I don’t want to be righteous, and I am not saying I don’t have anxiety or that it doesn’t keep me up at night because those things should. But I’ve come to a deep sense of rightness about some things. That sense of rightness might be deeply unpopular in the current political context or the political discourse of my group at the time, but I can’t turn it aside. I have to own it, which means being prepared to forward ideas that are not dominant or popular, but you feel are crucial.

***What sorts of feelings or ideas constitute that deep sense of rightness  
and what does it make possible in relationship?***

[Pause]. Sometimes, it feels intuitive, *spiritual*, ethical, guided. I don't know. But the deep sense of rightness I've come to becomes a source of good productive ideas and practice, of finding ways to shift things when they are stuck. Sometimes courage to say things that others won't or can't. Maintaining an openness to others in the conviction that people can change.

Other people have that sense of rightness too, but it's not their priority. They do know that this or that orientation or action is not right, but they are not going to focus intently on it, ponder it, deeply feel the effect of it or put energy into that space – that uncomfortable space – of coming to some wisdom in you that says this is the right position to hold and this is not. They might agree with you but they won't feel powerfully about it.

The fact I can feel powerfully about these unpopular or uncomfortable kind of positions I come to, is something to do with who I am, the kinds of relationships I've had to negotiate, the early kind of engagement with these questions, feelings and identities. And may be that is my little thing that I have to offer the world, and I am not saying that others don't have it.

***Te Kawehau, do you think, perhaps, this sense of rightness and all that  
is contained within it and made possible by it, has become the very  
fabric of your being, whatever that means?***

Yes, it is not the distillation but the combination of all of the complex set of relationships and threads and experiences and identities and histories – my own and those of the people who went before me – all coming together in a person in such a way that you have, like you do, this particular little great thing to offer the world; a little great thing that is a crucial unique bit. Even if you think of the scheme of things and the scale of the world, and the mountains, then it's all small but small is good, small is fine. You don't always recognise it or get it right, you make a mess of it sometimes, but that's your little unique bit. Maybe that is a postmodern anti-description of identity – we all share aspects of identities, but what is unique about someone is that crucial little bit you offer the world.



## Chapter 6: Professor Alison Jones

### Prologue

*Alison's parents were English immigrants who arrived in Aotearoa–New Zealand a year before her birth. Her father was “a working-class man from a politically conservative family” from the north of England, who entered the public service as an accountant. Her mother was born illegitimately to a wealthy London woman who left her to be raised in an orphanage in the south of England: “her sad story haunted my childhood”.*

*Alison recalled “many visual and emotional moments of absolute clarity” from her childhood. She was born in Auckland, grew up first in Dannevirke (until she was 10 years old), then Whakatāne. Her family moved to Bethlehem (just outside of Tauranga) when she was 15. She attended Tauranga Girls College where she became Head Prefect: “I was always quite bossy”. Alison completed a science degree at Massey University, in Palmerston North, then moved permanently to Auckland. She taught science briefly at Takapuna Grammar School: “a middle-class girl then, when in doubt, would teach”. Seeking adventure, Alison headed for Tonga. There she visited some “remote places,” gaining profound insights into Pacific Island life. Returning to Auckland, she taught at a secure remand home for girls, where she got “a real political education”.*

*Alison earned her masters and doctorate in education at the University of Auckland, while having children and tutoring, and went on to become a professor and take up university leadership roles. She gained two prestigious Royal Society Marsden Fund grants and worked as Deputy (and Acting) Pro Vice Chancellor (Equity) for 4 years. She won the Jean Herbison Award (2004) and the McKenzie Award (2011) for her research. In 2013 she won a National Teaching Award from the Royal Society, and in 2014 she was awarded the Dame Joan Metge Medal for excellence in the social sciences. Her many books and articles on the politics and sociology of schooling in Aotearoa–New Zealand have focused on feminist theory, teachers' anxiety about touching, and Pacific Islands girls' schooling. Her recent work has focused on Māori–Pākehā educational relationships, resulting in the award-winning He Kōrero: Words Between Us – First Māori–Pākehā Conversations on Paper (2011), and Tuai: A Traveller in Two Worlds (2017), both written with Professor Kuni Kaa Jenkins of Ngāti Porou. Alison prefers to write in an academic partnership with Māori scholars, including Dr Te Kawehau Hoskins.*

## **First Conversation: Te Kawehau Hoskins Considers Alison's Qualities and Their Relationship**

*During one conversation, I asked Te Kawehau to tell me about the relational qualities she notices in Alison that nourish their relationship and Māori–Pākehā engagements.*

Fearlessness – a kind of a courage, a kind of ability to take whatever comes. Not this cringe-feeling you get from some Pākehā who want to work with Māori but are always cowering, and worrying, and hand-wringing, and all of that. I find that quality of fearlessness in her refreshing and I only know a couple of other people who are like that.

And it's born out of a range of things. It's born out of a long-term commitment to relationships, not just in a political sense but in the personal sense of enjoying long-term relationships with Māori individuals. It's also born out of a politics of commitment to Māori aspirations and more broadly a political commitment to the Treaty relationship.

That's refreshing, because some Māori who are very attuned to keeping Pākehā in their place and telling Pākehā how they should be in relation to Māori might not like that attitude because they see it as a bit pushy and, "Who are you to intrude into these spaces." I don't particularly see it as an intrusion but some Māori might.

But for other Māori who might be political too, but are not so attuned to needing to put Pākehā in their place and maintaining this kind of division or opposition, then they tend to like it. I think this is a very Māori way to engage. In my experience, Māori like people to come forward and say "Here I am with my BIG personality. I am really interested. This is what I've got to offer this relationship." I think that is a preferred orientation for Māori.

I think the approach that Alison takes is a preferred one in cultural terms for Māori. She demonstrates a willingness to get a slap around, warranted or not, because people are at different places in their development and critique of relationships with non-Māori. She comes back even though she got slapped around, she doesn't crumple in a heap – well not for long anyway! That kind of willingness requires quite a strong personality.

How do you get that kind of personality? Alison would say she was always a goodie-two-shoes, top of the class, a bossy-boots, a teacherly type of person. However, she became that person, has probably stood her in good stead in these relationships. She has a certain amount of confidence, whether its middle-class confidence or whatever it is that supports that way of working with people.

***Te Kawehau, what is crucial about a long-term commitment and how has this awareness deepened your appreciation of Alison?***

You have to have a long-term commitment otherwise you won't have learned enough or earned your stripes. In a sense, in certain things, you can be trusted because you've been there for a long time and shown you're not just doing a dash and grab in the Māori world for your own purposes. Time is so important to any relationship, isn't it? The time to learn, to grow and to process.

While Alison is pushy, persistent and upfront [laughs], she's also highly reflective. She cringes at how she's behaved sometimes [laughs], but she absolutely reflects on her encounters, and how she has behaved, and can return to the relationship.

Māori respect you if you stand in your own mana. Any encounter is mana to mana. Alison can get down, every now and then, when she has been treated badly by Māori, because it's not like Māori don't treat people badly. People treat people badly. But she brings the fullness of who she is to her encounters and her engagements, and people respond to that fullness. You can see this response in the way that so many people want to keep connecting with her, are excited by a relationship with her and genuinely respect her – and that's because she comes to the relationship not cringing, hand-wringing and full of guilt.

***Do you mean that Alison comes ready to do the work? She doesn't create barriers that Māori have to keep climbing over?***

Exactly. I always think if you need to revisit the politics of Māori–Pākehā relationships, then you will from time to time but you don't necessarily have to keep trawling through all of them before you get to anything meaningful. A relationship might not develop if you do that first. It's a matter of coming with who you are, what you're interested in and your desire for engagement, because that's where ignition happens. Ignition is where the flame is lit, a bit of excitement, a firing off each other that represents the beginning of the possibility of positive productive engagement. We've got to be excited by the people we encounter. Alison excites people; that is why people are attracted to her and why Māori are willing to step up and work with her. Her confidence and enthusiasm in my work has always been encouraging.

Without ignition, I don't see how you can get traction. You don't return to the relationship; you don't make an extra effort to continue it. You just won't get off the ground unless there's a spark of some kind. It's just like any friendship or relationship; if there's

energy there you will feel it and respond to it. It's like when you fall in love [laughs], and I think you do fall in love slightly with people you have that little spark with, it's a type of love, a type of romance, a kind of excitement because, *This person is so cool*. All that desire and emotional stuff is at work, but we don't often talk about it. Because even when we are intellectually turned on, we're turned on all over, aren't we?

***Is "friendship" a word you would use to characterise your relationship with Alison?***

Alison is definitely my friend. It's not a word I use all the time or even often in relation to the idea of Māori–Pākehā relations. It's a tricky word because it sounds like it lacks a certain politics or appreciation of power. And yet for our tūpuna, face-to-face relationships and personal friendships were the basis of political relationships.

Māori–Pākehā engagements that work well, I think, will always be based on friendship; there will always be an element of friendship. If you don't like somebody, if you're not attracted to them in the way you are a friend, then, yes, you can work with them on a professional basis and get through it. But when you have that layer of friendship, there's so much more at work in the relationship and in the dynamic.

I've never been shy to have genuine relationships with people who other groups would shy away from for political reasons. I have a genuine relationship with Alison, whereas other Māori of my generation might not because they'd say: "Yeah, we like you Alison but really you're a Pākehā, so we're not going to invest any energy here." But I don't tend to do that. If I turn up to every Māori hui with Alison Jones, so be it because if she's the first person to ring me and say, "Shall we go?", I'll say, "Sure." I'm not going to say, "No, I have to go with a Māori, so I will look like a Māori" – that kind of thing. I know people do, because I did it myself.

***What is it about Alison (who and how she is) that engenders feelings of joy and pleasure in your relationship with her?***

Her sassy attitude and sharp intellect are a great source of stimulation and enjoyment. I love her irreverence and our shared irreverence for all sorts of things. She is principled and political and cares about social justice but doesn't trot out your usual critical judgements from on high – she is much more interesting than that. I get enormous pleasure being with someone you can trust to say almost anything to. She tells humorous and candid stories

about anything, from her husband's home handyman attempts to excruciating encounters and personal faux pas!

Alison remains one of the best thinkers I know. She's probably more radical in a way because she has a different kind of identity and when you don't have the comfort of the sort of identity I have – the comfort of being Ngāpuhi, of being Ngāti Hau, of being Indigenous, even with all the attending challenges – then, perhaps, you are naturally more transgressive in your thinking. I don't know, either that or she's super brainy, which she is [laughs].

## Second Conversation: Alison Considers Her Own Early Influences

*I asked Alison about early influences that might have prepared her for the life she is now living and the work she is doing.*

I find it very hard to identify clear childhood influences. I was always a very *good* girl, being the oldest. My newly married parents came to New Zealand in 1952 and I was born in Auckland the year after they arrived. My mother had five children in 7 years and I was often her lieutenant, in charge of my siblings.

My mother was very liberal about what we were allowed to do in the weekends. As primary-school-aged children, we would go off on our bicycles for a whole day of adventure. We would catch wētā, watch birds, climb trees, make fires, fire off shanghais (catapults) at our *enemies*, roast huhu grubs or fresh water crayfish or damper bread to eat, get filthy in the mud and swamps around the edge of town, visit the cemetery to get *spooked*, all those things kids love doing. We lived a good Kiwi childhood in that sense. I'm very grateful to Mum for allowing those experiences because I got to feel and smell and love the land around me, and develop a sense of identity, a sense of place.

I never saw myself as English, although my parents tried to make us English. My mother had English middle-class aspirations, and the social rules that went with them – we had to dress and speak in a way she considered socially acceptable. She didn't like us saying "aye" and chided, "Don't sound like you're a Māori." We weren't allowed to be influenced by Māori; we weren't allowed to be New Zealanders in that sense. For my parents it was probably as much a class question (a *lower-class* association) as a race question, but both were tied together in New Zealand.

The family did not have Māori friends and my parents would never go near a marae, not because they did not want to, but I doubt they would even have known about marae communities. We certainly wouldn't have known if there was a marae around Dannevirke. Māori were foreign to my parents; I can't remember them having any sense of curiosity about Māori – though my father had opinions. When we went on drives through the countryside Dad would say disapprovingly of some weedy land, "That's Māori land; they don't look after their land or develop it." I would look out of the window and wonder why they *had* to develop it and how. He referred scornfully to "Māori dogs" (mongrels), "Māori cars" (clapped out), and "Māori colours" (garish). I knew something was flawed in this

thinking because we had Māori kids at school, and I always noticed them in the classroom and liked them. I could not understand his attitudes.

*Can you recall some stories that would give me a sense of your early experiences with Māori kids and their families when you were a young child in Dannevirke, and why you were so attracted to them?*

I used to take my lunch box to school and Maria at least once invited me over the road to her place for lunch. Her family had pūhā boilup, and all sorts of interesting food on the table, and I sat at the table with them and ate shyly from my lunch box. Maria's father was a fisherman and he had brought home some foetal sharks in a container. I was both shocked that he had cut open a shark and thrilled because I'd never seen anything like it; it was a whole other world. And the girls' beds were in such a small room that they were pushed together so you could only get to the back one by crawling over the others. I found that fascinating because it was utterly different to my own more spacious home.

I was most interested in the little girls from the H family. The H girls used to swing upside-down on the bars at school and one day one of the littler ones had no knickers on and her sisters were laughing their heads off as if it was a huge joke, whereas I was horrified. At the same time, I thought, "How wonderful to be so carefree."

I had to walk past their house to get to school. Mrs H used to open her kitchen window and tip out her tea leaves. A huge brown stain ran down the outside side of the house. I thought this was fascinating – tipping your tea leaves out your window so they stained your house was absolutely outside the realms of reality and normality in my world.

Mrs H and her girls were breaking the rules of decency and good behaviour and their actions told me that *breaking the rules* was possible. I was so burdened with respectability, responsibility, achievement and being correct that I was like a little bird in a cage, looking out and longing to be free. "We're the Joneses," my mother would say, "and we don't behave like that." My Māori friends were behaving badly *and* having a good time. I was drawn to their sense of fun, a sense of liberation, a sense of *I don't care what you think*.

There was violence too, of course. I was horrified by vicious fighting that some of the Māori boys seemed to get in to, and once saw a sharpened nail being fired into a girl's leg as she rode around on her bicycle. That too, was far outside my own experience, and added to the sense that the Māori world was an interesting – even if sometimes frightening – one, outside my own.

***Professor, what was life like for you as a young adolescent in Whakatāne? What sorts of observations and sense were you making in relation to your experiences with Māori?***

About one third of the Whakatāne population were Māori, so coming from cold grey Dannevirke into the light of warm, sunny Whakatāne with what I saw as a cheerful Māori presence, I thought I'd died and gone to heaven.

In those days, there was (and there still are) people in every small town who were interested in its history and wrote little booklets. I was in the Girl Guides, so I got a good dose of that sort of thing because a local Pākehā historian would come along and talk to us. I remember I enjoyed him talking enthusiastically about local Māori history. We heard about the land confiscations in the 1860s, and of course we all knew about Wairaka who saved the canoe at the Whakatāne Heads. I thought she was pretty cool.

I remember seeing old Māori women sitting on the footpath in town under the shop awnings in this really comfortable way with their blankets around them. They had come to town for the day from Te Teko or Taneatua or another rural place nearby, and they would be happily chatting and laughing and some smoking pipes. Their faces seemed ancient and many had blue chins etched with moko kauae (women's chin tattoo). That was in the mid-1960s. Those old ladies disappeared quite quickly. I was fascinated, just as I always was as a child, by their sitting on the footpath. It was like the girl with no knickers; they were breaking all the rules and yet they didn't seem worried about it.

So as a child I had feelings and knowledge about Māori at odds with the feelings and knowledge of my parents and family friends. They just looked from a distance and saw people utterly different from themselves and discounted them; that was a standard way of thinking among Pākehā at the time. They just *didn't get it* and how do you get them to get it? You can't. I just thought my Dad (and Mum and their friends) were ignorant, "He doesn't know what he's talking about." As I got older, I added a lot of things to that list, such as the Vietnam War, and the war in Cambodia. As a child of the 60s, I thought a lot of what the adults were saying didn't make sense.

***And your connections with Māori when your family moved to Bethlehem, near Tauranga? And your sense of the world?***

In those days Bethlehem was a sleepy little hollow and we lived on Carmichaels Road, next to the Bethlehem School that was once a Native School. There were two marae in the area, and it had a large Māori population.

I knew some of the Māori kids living around us. I remember having a crush on an older Māori boy who had left school, but I would never have thought about going out with him because his world and mine were utterly different even though he lived down the road. I also remember a Māori girl younger than me who didn't know she was pregnant until she went to the doctor and out came a baby!

I never actually went into the local marae. I'd go past and see a big event on, but I never went. My experience with Māori was always just at school or on the bus or in the playground or whatever, which was all good. My brothers, though, had a very different experience. They said the area was tense, and they were both beaten up by local boys simply because they were Pākehā. Maybe I have a romanticised memory.

I remember seeing on the television stories about South Africa, where awful things were happening to black people, and the Soweto slums were being compared with big European houses. I remember thinking, "It's the same as here; so what's new about that?" On the other side of Carmichaels Road from where we lived was *Māori land* and the families sometimes didn't have running water and were living in shacks, while rich white people were moving into the area on our side of the road and creating kiwifruit farms.

I was always very conscious of these things and even though I was only a young teenager, the contrast was not lost on me. So, again, there was a kind of mismatch in my head between what I was hearing and what I was seeing and I didn't really know how to articulate it because it just seemed unsayable, people never talked about it.

***Professor, what sense do you now make of those experiences and the mismatch you experienced back then?***

Growing up I had multiple experiences of being in relationships with Māori – from attraction and personal friendship, to the kind of exterior view like that of my parents. Unlike my father and mother, I never blamed anyone for their circumstances, nor did I find myself judging them. I had a sense of familiarity which allowed me to accept what I saw, or at least be curious about it, even when it was not ideal. I had been into Māori houses as

a child and as a teen, and unconditionally welcomed there. It was as though I was partly on the inside, whereas my family was on the outside and all they could do was look askance at this other world.

Obviously, I wasn't an insider but I think I did realise that I had some *access* that many Pākehā didn't have: this knowledge of something, which meant that I wasn't afraid or anxious in situations with Māori. When a group of Māori kids approached my Pākehā friends on the street, I didn't feel the unease that they sometimes did. That mismatch between what I felt and what others (Pākehā) around me felt started early, and I sometimes still notice it today.

***Professor, you often use the words fascinating, interested, excited, drawn towards; do these descriptions reflect a kind of curiosity?***

Absolutely, curiosity is key; an intellectual curiosity interconnected with a kind of emotional response – a real sense of attraction, like a recognition. Maybe it echoes something from my babyhood, perhaps an answer to a kind of loneliness. I was quite emotionally lonely because of the circumstances into which I was born, and as a child and as a teenager I saw something I wanted and needed that was lacking for me: an unconditional kindness and absolutely no demands.

If I had been entirely happy in my family of origin, maybe I wouldn't have had that need for a warmth of relationship that I found with Māori friends and their families? That warmth must have been very powerful. Maybe it all came from there, I don't know, but it's certainly part of who I am. So I was an alert and curious kid, and an emotional impetus kept that curiosity alive.

***When you reflect on the stories you've told me, what do you think constitutes the orientation of fascination and curiosity you developed?***

I don't think I took anything for granted; I had a sense of the possibilities of social change from early in my life.

When I was 4 at the kindergarten in Dannevirke, there was an unusual swing like a rocking horse. It was the most exciting thing in the playground. Kids would crowd around hoping for a turn but a few kids controlled access. I had a great sense of fairness, and I decided to put it right. "Everybody stand in a line," I said, "and you can have so many swings and then you must hop off so the next person can have a go." I was four!

The moment they obeyed me, I realised that reality could be changed. It was an incredible moment that was echoed later when I was head girl at Tauranga Girls' College. Every morning I had to settle the students before the teachers came onto the stage for assembly. One morning the students wouldn't settle, so I said, "Right. You are all coming back for a practice assembly at lunchtime." Afterwards I thought to myself, "If they don't turn up, I'm stuffed!" [laughs] But they turned up and I thought, "That wasn't a good idea! Too risky!"

***[Laughs]. What did that experience teach you about power?***

That experience was a revelation; it gave me confidence and allowed me to exercise my curiosity beyond being a fascinated observer. I discovered that not only could I observe the world but I could also actually affect how it worked. I could intervene. What happened in everyday life was not always inevitable. I didn't take things for granted because I knew from those experiences, when I could change things, like get a couple of hundred girls to turn up in the hall at lunchtime, that things could change. You didn't need to take it for granted that everyone would need to crowd around the swing. You could actually do things differently and when you realise that, you do become more curious and more critical in your thinking – well, I did.

***What is it like to live a life oriented to curiosity and critical thinking?***

When I had cancer treatment, aged 55, I imagined myself lying on my deathbed, and I wondered how I would feel about my life. I am very fortunate that I've been able to live the life I want to live, even though I have experienced anxiety. But I don't think it's possible to be genuinely open, curious and fascinated and not be anxious, because the world is a difficult place, and when you see people in poverty and you see gross inequality all around you, and environmental degradation, it's not easy to feel content. Even though I have all the physical comforts you could name – nice house, great husband, brilliant kids, excellent friends, wonderful job – but in my head and in my heart, I am appalled, often, at how things are. How do you guard against despair? Sometimes all you can do is have a good time with friends and laugh together (grimly!) at the absurdity of human beings.

As we've been talking, I've realised, that in my childhood relationships are feelings that are part of my adult life. I remember my two best friends in Whakatāne, Viv who was Pākehā and Jackie who was Māori. They lived in totally different worlds. Viv's father was a real estate agent and they lived the kind of life to which my lower middle-class parents

aspired, and I used to rather like being in the luxury of Viv's house. But it didn't grab me in the heart the way I felt when I went around to Jackie's place, which was full of interesting and unusual things, like carvings and art works done by her parents. Being at Jackie's house demanded more of me in some ways, and less in others. It produced deeper and more complicated feelings; yet it was easier to be around her family. I never felt competitive with Jackie and her family, the way I did with Viv and hers. With Jackie, I felt *I am who I am* and *they are who they are*, and that feeling was wonderfully, warmly, undemanding. These sorts of things still reflect the difference between my being with my Pākehā friends compared with my being with Māori friends. There's a kind of warm visceral engagement with my Māori mates that's always been there.

### **Third Conversation: Alison Considers Possibilities in Māori–Pākehā Relations**

*In our conversations, Alison often returned to the joy and pleasure she experiences in her relationships with Māori. I was curious about what drives and energises her to remain in this complex ethical–political relational space. “Is there a great sacrificial purpose underpinning your work?” I asked.*

Heavens no! I just find deep pleasure in what I do. I genuinely enjoy my work and want to do it. I find there’s an intensity in the relationships, in the work, that gives me pleasure. I see some Pākehā colleagues who act with uncertainty, fear, a lack of knowledge, in relation to Māori; they constantly worry about things going wrong and therefore seem to get little pleasure from their engagement with Māori. I don’t know why I get such enjoyment from it, but I do, always have.

*Being drawn to Māori seems to be a thread connecting important experiences in your life. If so, when you think about the expectations you now feel in your university life and those you experience in a Māori setting what differences do you notice that might shed some light on why you get so much pleasure from being in these relationships?*

Perhaps I’m drawn to Māori because I don’t feel there are expectations of me – or maybe only low expectations of me as a Pākehā! All my life I have been a high achiever with a kind of bossy, direct demeanour that can be a bit sharp. As a result, many Pākehā colleagues and friends treat me with a certain amount of caution – a slight distance or respect maybe because of my academic position. But in a Māori setting it seems different; they come to relationships in a different way. Your heart is what they care about and I much prefer it because I can be myself and I don’t have to live up to anything other than being a good version of myself. If you screw up as a Pākehā, you screw up because that’s what Pākehā do. There’s something weirdly relaxing in that; I feel like I’m off the hook, whatever the hook is. I’ve been told off a few times; that’s not very relaxing, but always interesting.

Paradoxically, perhaps, all this allows for a *being with* ... partly because you can always do better than the low expectations many Māori have of Pākehā, and partly because Māori seem good at just *being* with others when they are no threat.

***When you say “a being with” is that another way of saying being in the relationship? And do these ideas reflect a relational ontology?***

I suppose you could put it like that. Māori relationships with the world do reflect an ontology that differs from the usual Western approach. Others have written about this, such as Anne Salmond, and Te Kawehau and I have too, to some extent. When you experience the material and spiritual worlds as deeply part of you, as communicating with and through you, as many Māori do, then it is fair to say that everything happens within a relational space – whether it is between people, or between humans and the landscape, the sea, wind, building spaces, plants, the ancestors, objects of all sorts. For many Pākehā, the forest, or an object, and even the past, are all distant from the individual, *out there* and can be responded to. For Māori, I think, those things are never so distant, they are deeply present, with their own volition even, and can alter what happens.

So even as an atheist-scientist-Pākehā, which I am, being in that relational space is not a matter of *taking it or leaving it*; to relate properly in a Māori situation, the *relational ontology* is all part of the deal. When Kuni suggests that (due to a flight being cancelled) her inability to join me in a Wellington archive is a *tohu* (signifies something else), maybe an ancestor’s unwillingness to allow something to happen at that time – I accept that, and work with it. I do not think it is weird. That would be like thinking that *karakia* (incantations) are weird. They are what they are.

***You said, “Your heart is what they care about,” what did you mean? I’ve heard Māori say (and you’ve touched on this in your writing as has Anne Salmond): “She has a good heart.” Is that the same heart you speak of? And Pākehā sometimes say, “Her heart was in the right place” – is that idea connected in any way?***

“Heart in the right place” seems quite different from “Your heart being important.” When your heart is in the *right place* it means you have good intentions, or the right belief system. But a more Māori sense of the heart, *ngākau*, seems deeper than that. It is the place of automatic feeling. It is not simply your intentions but also your character, personality, including all the complicated subtle things that make a person who they are: when you laugh, the jokes you make, the boundaries you do and don’t push, when you are quiet and when you speak, when you do something and when you don’t, your automatic behaviours, also what some people might call your *soul*.

A friend of mine in Australia whose heart is definitely in the right place with regard to Aboriginal politics, says she cannot just easily hug someone (an Aboriginal person) she is introduced to without thinking about it. She does not have that sort of *heart*. This is not a criticism, but it does somehow keep a distance between her and the people she dearly wants to be able to relate to better.

*I remember you telling me a story about how you came to be in the School of Māori and Indigenous Education. When the Faculty was established, you had to decide in which School you would be located, depending on your research interests. But you said, “I want to go with my mates.” I imagine it’s the kind of thing you might have said and done when you were 5, 15 or 25. Why go with them?*

My colleagues, who were my friends at the time, were all Māori – Kuni Jenkins, Liz McKinley, Te Kawehau Hoskins, Jenny Lee, Linda Smith, Margie Hohepa, Graham Smith, Leonie Pihama. We had fabulous political and personal conversations and our relationships had a certain energy to them which is hard to explain; the combination of being together, laughing and planning, having our kids around us too, it was totally engaging. Something in my psyche always responded in a very positive emotional way to our being together. That feeling has been fractured over the years by some separatist politics in universities, over which I have no personal control. But when you have that bedrock of pleasure, you can withstand anything; it gives you strength.

I find that bedrock in some key relationships and without them I would be high and dry. Loyalty that gives protection is incredibly important when you’re working on difficult politicised terrain. You can’t afford for people to push you without holding you. You need your friends to be right with you and respect you enough to allow you to be vulnerable, without judging the situation, knowing you are already making judgements about your own behaviour. Those friends are crucial to *doing* Māori–Pākehā work. I could not do what I do without the Māori friends I have.

These things are remarkably hard to articulate on paper. Talking about complex and subtle and shifting relationships ultimately (in the University) comes down to one form of representation: writing. And formal prose writing fixes things, is never adequate to the task of representing emotion, soul, whatever you want to call it, the glue that is our work together – about which we are trying to write.

One thing I notice about Māori engagement is that its *natural* place is in living, spoken language between people. Meaning happens in the relationship, as people are together; it is contingent, never crystal clear, can usually be interpreted in a number of ways, and is always careful to keep things in play. It is against clarity and directness (although it can be the opposite if the speaker does not want a relationship!) [laughs]. Directness might come from facial and body gestures, but speaking is often something oblique, rich, full of possibilities if you are able to hear them.

But academics, we have to write! Writing is not very contingent or relational, and certainly not a fluid medium; it is a process of fixing meaning in words quite separated from those who might *hear* it. All this talking to you, Frances, which will be transcribed and translated and reworked, then pinned down on paper is rather too hard. Its being written down cannot bear the weight of the very thing we might want to talk about.

*A conversational segue. Knowing Alison, and her reputation, I was intrigued to learn how she decides where to direct her energies. “How do you decide?” I asked.*

I can think of a long list of things I *could* do, but that list gets whittled down for all sorts of reasons.

For a start, I know I can be scary. That cuts down the demands on my time from certain people! And I was diagnosed with breast cancer some years ago. That certainly brought priorities into sharp focus. I did not want to spend any more time in meetings, so I became a part-time academic in order to avoid the leadership (rightly) expected of full-time professors. I make myself unavailable for management or leadership that involves committee work because I end up doing too much as a result! Before the cancer, I was a Pro Vice Chancellor at the University of Auckland for 3 years. That experience was fantastic and helped me to realise that management is not for me. Those experiences taught me to listen to my body, because I get a guts ache if I have to sit in stressful meetings, particularly where I disagree with people. That knocks a lot of things off the list!

As for community activism, I do much less of that now. I've been on so many protests (anti-nuclear, women's marches, anti-mining, Bastion Point, and so on) and committees (Home Birth Association, Women's Studies, Women's Health Centre, a Pākehā activist group called *Women for Aotearoa*). I was a co-editor of a newspaper called *Bitches Witches and Dykes*. I went door to door collecting signatures for the anti-nuclear petition for the *Campaign Half Million*; I did prison visiting for a while; worked in public soup kitchens to

call attention to poverty; supported women going to Australia for abortions; helped build a kōhanga reo (Māori language preschool); marched against the Foreshore and Seabed Act; threw paint at sexist billboards ... I feel I have done enough of all that.

These days I mostly write and teach. That is what I have decided to do, and what I like best, and where I feel I can be most effective. I am fortunate to be in the university, for although I loathe so much of its obsession with ratings and systems, it is a place where I can do my work, have discussions with brilliant young people and colleagues, and best of all, research and write with people like Kuni and Te Kawehau.

I tend not to do anything systematically – that is, I do not decide I will *Change the World* in some way. I do not have *A Mission*, and I do not want to lead a project – I tend to do what comes up next. These days I allow my emotions to help me decide what I want to do. If I really *like* someone or some idea, and I have the time, I go with it. If not, I don't. Fairly intuitive really.

*We moved on to the subject of learning. When Alison said she was “not very educable actually,” I laughed. She is AFTER ALL a professor of education! From there we discussed how to learn what you need to know to engage in productive Māori–Pākehā relations. She thinks (as I do) that these things are inevitably ineffable and the relational terrain itself is unknowable, therefore impossible to teach. Still, we agreed, we must try.*

Do we learn by being taught something? I'm not sure there is a linear process, teach > learn. I tend to go with the idea – was it Socrates who discussed it? – that all we do is *recall*, and that learning is a process of *remembering*. Even maths and other technical skills, you learn by building on memories of what you have already been open to learning. It's logical to me that you cannot learn anything without having something to connect it to, some prior memory. Learning is like the lightning going into the ground. Something comes up to meet it and draws it down into the earth. Learning is allowing what's been said to enter in to you.

But occasionally you have a shock that may be described in banal educational terms as a profound *learning experience*. You come to know something *new*, something that takes you in an unexpected direction. This can be disturbing, so sometimes we refuse that newness. It is hard to disturb our memories, which is probably why ignorance is so popular. Generally, I think we accrue knowledge, ideas, thoughts, memories, through our minds *and*

through our skin or muscles, if I can say it like that – we can take it in unconsciously *and* viscerally, in all sorts of places and situations.

What happens between one person and another when something is learned is at the level of the emotion – emotion opens people to learning. All a teacher can do is evoke a desire, an openness to be changed – to enable us to remember things differently, to develop new memories. In a technical sense, whether you teach *A* before *B* or *C* before *D* can be important, but *feeling* brings people into a relationship that is crucial for learning. And you can't evoke openness-to-learning without a relationship.

***And the times in your life when you felt on fire with learning?***

Yes! I have often been in situations where I am listening to someone talk and I feel extremely energised and excited about their ideas or the new connections they are allowing me to make between ideas. When this happens, I find myself falling *in love* with the speaker; I really *like* the teacher. What is liking, if not recognition? So, you are always already available to certain kinds of engagement, when you can recognise something of your own memory and your own being (enthusiasms, curiosities, anxieties, attention) in the teacher and their words; they are always already in you. For this to work, you have to be open to recognising others, and what memories they can set off in you, as they form new memories in you.

***When has this happened for you in a Māori setting?***

A lot, and maybe that is why I enjoy being with Māori so much. I went to a tangi last week. It was a long drive. The road to the remote valley where the marae was muddy and horrible; the rural buildings were ugly and poor, children were playing unsupervised around cars, it was drizzling. But there was something about it; I felt incredibly cheerful amongst the people. Something about the whole place reminded me of something good, something solid, something ancient, and exciting. The smiles or tears on people's faces, the smell of mud, the green paddocks and trees, the solid presence of good women; the strong speeches; the gossip; the seeming endlessness of it all. For some reason, all this evoked a sense of solidarity and aroha – I do not mean it was evoked only in me as an individual. It was evoked, it existed, and I could not help but be taken up by it. It was a feeling of being accepted without anything being said, so I was entirely open to being present and alert and learning from those around me. This does not happen so much in a Pākehā setting for me, not sure why. Maybe I am more alert to tensions and judgement in a Pākehā environment;

maybe my ignorance buffers me when I am amongst Māori? Maybe I am being romantic again.

***And your learning in the context of your relationships with Māori?***

My relationships are a complicated mix and are a product of time rather than anything I might really *know*. I do know a bit of *Māori* stuff. I was taught it by my Māori mates, and my own observations of them, learning from them, over a long period of time. But it is still contingent – what I mean is that the Māori knowledge I have is based in the relationships I have, and it cannot properly live without them.

Once or twice I have messed up some interaction with a Māori person, when I am doing research for instance. I will usually confess to Te Kawehau, and she never tells me what to do or how to think about it. She might say, “Yeah, that sort of situation is always hard.” Her neutral approach allows me to detach a bit from my shame or anxiety. We’re able to look at the difficulty together. She doesn’t have a predetermined position; that’s what openness is. She’s interested in what I have to say, and she is never uncritical. When I recently told Te Kawehau about something I said to a Māori man that did not go down well, she said: “Yeah, Māori men don’t like that,” as opposed to saying, “Don’t say that.” My engagement with her reminds me of something I need to take into account, which is not necessarily *pull back* but *know the territory you’re entering*. She’s great like that.

***Your stories and reflections suggest that your engagements with Māori – the everyday and the forever memorable – are always already emotional and spiritual, therefore inevitably pedagogical. If so, what do you notice, what do you attend to, what do you listen for?***

Engagements are multi-layered and go back and forth in complex ways. You have to go with their movement. Somehow you have to be responsive without being tense, does that make sense? It’s easy if you already like someone very much.

I went to visit a kaumātua in relation to some research I was doing. We sat at his kitchen table, I set down a cake, and tea was produced. I drew out of my bag some documents I wanted him to see. I did not merely plonk them on the table, but held them so I could be guided by his sense of protocol. Food is not to be mixed with important documents, tapu and noa, sacred and ordinary, do not go well together. I just waited. Maybe we were to go to a different room. The kaumātua saw my hesitation and laughed and drew a line along the centre of the table with his finger and said: “Here’s the tapu line.” Food was to stay on the

other side of that line. We did not eat and drink while talking – in my case, not with any conscious planning. I knew how to feel relaxed in that situation, having learned through my skin on many other occasions. The kaumātua felt calm about the line he drew on the table; he determined what was *culturally appropriate* in that situation. I did not make any decisions, I just went slowly enough to be led by him. He would decide how he would be with me, and with our conversation, which was easy and lively.

***What have you learnt about the importance of going slow in your relationships with Māori and of “being led”?***

[Laughs]. I am a very quick kind of person, but I really like slow! Here we may be straying into psychology, but maybe that is another reason I love being with Māori friends and communities. Things can move very slowly – decisions are slow, and may take years; discussions are long, ditto! That is hugely frustrating for many, but because I have the privilege of not being relevant (as I said before) in Māori settings I can just get in to the groove, and watch things turn out as they will. In my experience, Māori can be very philosophical about things, and they are in for the long haul. It is as though *the process is as important as the product*. That is, relationships and being in them – whether laughing or fighting – are the key thing. That’s so different for Pākehā, who tend to want to get on and do things, achieve *outcomes*, and do not want to bother with the slow rituals of encounter. Greetings, prayers, food, reminiscences, jokes, tend to be dispensed with in Pākehā situations where fast decisions or progress must be made. That get-on-with-it-quick is not what interests most Māori in my experience. I know some Māori think this slowness is a pain, you know, some say “Less hui, more do-ey” (less talk, more action). I get that, but the relational slowness is the way it is, and maybe it’s a very good way to be in the madness of the modern world. On the other hand, when Māori are dealing with Pākehā, those two different approaches can clash, and Māori are forced to get in the *move it fast* groove. They can be good at that, too.

Another sense of slowness relevant to this conversation is the length of time it takes for good relationships to come in to being and to be threaded through one’s life and research and teaching. I have known some of my Māori colleagues and friends now for 30 or more years! You know the saying about “Kanohi kitea”? That is about longevity, being seen around the place, hanging in there. That is how people come to know you, and know that you are loyal and interested and not just *self*-interested. You can’t just turn up at a Māori meeting and expect things to happen; you have to be part of events for many years, and

eventually you find you are part of the furniture, and you hear the gossip, and someone might ask you what you think, and that's when you know you have made friends. Some Pākehā cannot understand why they can't go to a meeting and get something sorted out with Māori quickly, or get permission for something. They complain to me: "She said she'd get back to me, but she never did," or "He never answers his email." Well, hang in there for a few years and they might! [laughs].

***How do notions of cultural responsiveness in vogue today in education policy and research fit with your idea of learning "through your skin" by "being in the relationship"?***

*Cultural responsiveness* is a phrase I find difficult to relate to, to be honest. Because being responsive is something you cannot merely learn: do *x* to be culturally responsive: "Don't say *kia ora*, say *tēnā koe!*" "Take food with you!" "Remove your shoes!" As I have tried to point out, relationships come out of contingent and personal engagements, and an orientation to each other, rather than through predetermined rules.

In my research, I found out about the historical Māori–Pākehā relationships in northern New Zealand before 1825, but I have learnt not to be an enthusiastic *Miss Know-it-All* when I meet people from the north. I simply try to listen, even when people do not have the historical information I have. Why? Because I don't think throwing my Fascinating Information around helps. It tips the balance in the relationship. When Pākehā tell Māori their own Māori history, say, something the people did not know before, it can have unpredictable effects. Some love it, they are delighted to hear what I have to say – and that is mostly my experience. But for some, it causes anger or shame at complicated levels. Most important, the preciousness with which Māori hold their ancestors is very deep and emotionally felt. The past is always difficult territory, because the *tūpuna* are always present. Whakapapa has spiritual power; that's its depth and where much emotion resides. I'm aware all the time of the power of whakapapa. I do sense the ancestors' spiritual presence when I'm talking about the past and I am open to those feelings even if they are not mirrored in my sense of my own ancestors. People might talk about something that happened to their ancestors and simply say, "It's sad, aye"; they are sitting with huge sadness. Whereas when I talk about my own ancestors, I can feel compassion for my grandparents and their difficulties, but sadness, or even pride, say, does not inhabit me in the same way. That cultural freedom – or disjuncture – is the strength and the weakness of English settlers like me.

But I find that I do not think about this much anymore; I tend automatically to just go into a different mode in Māori conversations about the past. I just listen, unless I am asked to speak, and I always encounter something that I did not expect to learn, perhaps, say, a metaphorical rather than factual view of the past, or something that had been hidden because of the dominant Western viewpoint usually applied to it, but that is pretty obvious from a Māori angle.

***When you're teaching students, what do you rely on as a critical source of knowledge about being in the relationship?***

I usually draw on my experiences. When I am teaching a class on the Treaty of Waitangi, for example, I try and avoid telling people what to do and how to do it. Instead of saying to the students, “This is what you should be doing in a Treaty-based relationship” or something, I tell them about aspects of my relationships with Māori friends and colleagues, or Māori-related research experiences. I guess what I do is tell stories, and the Māori and Pākehā and other students can get from those stories what they can, because the stories will have different meanings to all of them. And we can only hear some things and not others, depending on our experiences and understandings, and memories.

I do try and talk about how I am grappling with bigger ideas about, say, cultural responsiveness, because students in education are keen to think about that phrase these days. Where does such responsiveness reside? In our heads, as we come to be taught about tikanga (Māori cultural actions)? Or in our hearts as we experience and know tikanga through everyday interactions? Or both?

For me, the big idea about relationships is what it all comes down to in the end. Being in relationships drives me, keeps me going, and gives me energy. I assume it will be the same for the students, whether they are Māori or Pākehā. I try to talk about how I'm grappling with the complexities and the subtleties of a relationship (I talk in generalities of course; I rarely name people). I also talk about the ambivalences that make up any reflection on my own actions and thoughts. Strange as it sounds, while I am decisive about some things, I seem ambivalent about the most important things. I'm not using *ambivalence* in a negative sense – just another way of talking about being never settled, being aware of complexity, being this and then that, *both/and* rather than *either/or*. Life would be easier if I had clearer views, but that would require a sort of dullness of intellect which frightens me more than anything.

*Another segue. Alison was travelling through Japan when unexpectedly she emailed me and we had a delightful exchange about human becoming.*

I am in Kyoto – a wonderful city. We hired bicycles and I am touring the Zen gardens which are divine and good for Thinking about the Meaning of Life. I do think that I can *talk* to the gardens and they to me. I am an admirer of Zen, or some version of contemplative practice, and a very minor practitioner sometimes.

*Professor, what new insights on the Meaning of Life did you have while riding your bicycle and visiting Zen Temples in Kyoto? Sounds heavenly.*

I desire to be like a big old rock in a Zen garden – fully alert, fully present, and fully itself – that is, of course, a mere whisper of a desire because I am not a rock, but a very flawed human being!

*Professor, how do you know that big old rock isn't itself flawed?*

Oh, you of the perceptive questions! I guess that rock is fully alert, fully present, and its fully flawed self! The problem for the human is our SHAME about our flaws. Which swings back to our obsession with solutions, that is, *perfection*. On the other hand, I am not trying to say that ACCEPTANCE is what I am talking about. Does that rock merely accept things as they are? And not care about sadness and injustice? Perhaps its full alertness provides its knowledge of all these bad and good things, while simply in its Being it encourages/allows the world to be a better place. Now, maybe that rock is a just practitioner!

*Your observation brought to mind Adrienne Rich's magnificent poem – Transcendental Etude – and her great last line: "The rock shelf further forming under everything that grows." Do you think instead of being fully flawed, it may be possible that that big old rock and you and me are simply, and will always be, further forming or, as Sharon Todd suggests, ontologically becoming?*

You are so encouraging and inspiring, I have to say.

*Professor, what do you find so encouraging and inspiring? Is it the idea of “further forming” instead of being “fully flawed”? And how does the idea of further forming connect to your “mere whisper of a desire” to be fully alert, fully present, and fully yourself, which sounds rather like an ideal way to be/engage in Māori–Pākehā relations?*

I’m not sure I can make the distinction: further forming OR being flawed, I think we are always already both. But I like your reminder that we and the rock might be fully flawed AND further forming at the same time. I like to be reminded of fluidity and change, even though the rock is doing its changing at a much slower rate and more gracefully than I am!

As for the *ideal* way of engaging in Māori–Pākehā relations, we’re talking here about ideal engagements in ALL human relationships, surely? I am not sure there is anything special about Māori–Pākehā engagements in that sense, it is just that a sometimes-bad history has embedded itself into our engagements over 200 years, and so our relationships are always at risk from the weight of the past. In that sense they are very special, fragile and always compelling.

## Chapter 7: Matua Kevin Prime

### Prologue

*A kaumātua (Elder) of Ngāti Hine, with Ngāti Whātua and Tainui connections, Kevin Prime describes himself as a forester, farmer and bee-keeper. He lives on land at Mōtatau, Northland, that his whānau have cared for over many generations and worked hard to retain. Kevin says he was “one of about 20 kids; number nine of 12 born children as well as lots of whāngai ones” (fostered children). Most of his older siblings were born in Mōtatau and his father moved around for work.*

*Kevin was born in Pipiwai and was a baby when his parents moved to Mōtatau to take over the family farm. He attended Mōtatau Māori District School and Mōtatau Māori District High School where, in 1961, he became the first boy to gain School Certificate. “Education was not high on the list of priorities in local homes at the time.” He attended Bay of Islands College the following year. After he finished school, he worked on the farm, then at the Post and Telegraph in Maungatūroto, and lived for a while in Kawakawa. He took over the farm from his father on 1 April 1973.*

*Kevin and his wife Margaret have 13 children. Growing up, when people asked Kevin’s children, “What does your Dad do?” they would say, “I don’t know. He just goes away and comes back!”*

*Kevin has held leadership roles in a diverse range of Māori and Pākehā organisations across the fields of health, education, philanthropy and conservation. When he became an Environment Court Commissioner in 2003, he resigned from 27 organisations. In addition to his court work, Kevin currently chairs the local steering group for the Reconnecting Northland Project, the first large-scale ecological restoration programme in Aotearoa–New Zealand focusing on the wellbeing of people and the land. He also chairs the Te Kāhui Māori Advisory Bio-Heritage National Science Challenge and is the kaumātua of Foundation North (Australasia’s largest philanthropic organisation) which he also chaired for many years.*

*Kevin’s awards include: Officer of the New Zealand Order of Merit (2016); UNESCO Peace Builders Award (2000); Conservationist of the Decade Award (1999); Northland Conservation Award (1998); Old Blue Award – Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (1994); and Member of the Order of the British Empire (1990).*

## **First Conversation: Patrick Snedden Considers Kevin's Qualities and Their Relationship**

*Pat has known Kevin for many years and I was curious about his sense of him.*

Kevin has been in very tough circumstances often enough and found his way through those circumstances by being quintessentially himself. He is 10 years older than me, and when I think of our childhoods the differences between us couldn't be more extreme in some respects. Kevin grew up steeped in tikanga Māori and lived in a mostly Māori environment in rural Northland. I was raised Catholic and grew up in an inner-city Auckland suburb. Kevin and I joined ASB Community Trust (ASBCT) around the same time in 2000–2001. I knew of him but had never met him. People who knew Kevin described him to me as a highly mannered human being.

Always mindful of manaakitanga, Kevin is wholly inclusive of others and approachable. People can access him from all points knowing he will be polite, respectful and encouraging, especially in situations in which they have no knowledge. I think people would never leave a conversation with Kevin feeling humiliated, even though he holds status in the highest of places in the many diverse areas in which he operates and has significant standing in his own tribal area.

Being highly mannered supports Kevin to engage in robust conversations on a whole host of topics. When discussing a matter of high conflict, people will behave in the face of a mannered leader. Kevin has an unimpeachable air about him; he is so demonstrably fair that people take care when they engage with him.

But Kevin is gentle and tough as teak. He is chosen for significant leadership roles because of his wide expertise, not because of his humble and decent manner. Capable and knowledgeable, he also has the ability to smell a rat! People appreciate the elevated sense of insight and wisdom he brings to what he does. When I'm with him I'm reminded that expertise with humility is a highly potent combination.

*Could you tell me a story that would show Kevin's highly mannered approach in action?*

I recall a time when I and others witnessed Kevin's interaction with a Pākehā leader. Prior tensions, none of which were of Kevin's making, came to the fore in a challenging encounter in which harsh words were spoken. Unbeknown to the Pākehā leader, Kevin had

brought two jars of his own honey – personally worked, harvested, spun and bottled – which he intended to give to him as a parting gift.

“One's natural instinct would have been to silently do nothing and withdraw the gesture,” Kevin said later, “but despite the frosty air I recalled advice from my Elders.”

When Kevin stood to address the Pākehā leader, he observed that, although harsh words were said, his Elders had taught him to “Never hold a grudge” (Kaua e whakamau). “Please accept this honey as a token of appreciation for your work to date. The label reads: ‘Prime Honey; we always provide prime service and products.’”

By Kevin’s own assessment his English did not flow well that day but I never noticed. Witnessing his gracious gesture – so unexpected and so nuanced, I thought, “This man understands the rhythm of relationships.”

Afterwards, Kevin said, “The meeting reminded me of a full-on Ngāti Hine hui (gathering) and I was quite surprised – flabbergasted really – when I received applause before resuming my seat.”

***Over the years what else have you observed about Matua Kevin’s leadership?***

Kevin’s leadership is big picture, highly moral, Treaty-based, and intellectual. When Kevin was appointed to the role of chair of ASBCT, he was an obvious choice. His leadership was needed to fulfil a strong desire for the Trust to become culturally significant. Securing Kevin’s leadership was simply a method to enable a paradigm shift towards being in service of the Other.

In virtually every public space in which Kevin was positioned as the chair, not a single person was unaware of who was in charge; he filled the space. He embodied a commitment to biculturalism by introducing Māori protocols such as karakia (prayer), mihi (greetings), pōwhiri (a welcome ceremony) and other expressions demonstrating an ethic of manaakitanga.

As deputy chair I worked closely with Kevin. His willingness to consider critical questions and be open to new approaches had a profound impact on what we were able to do together. We embarked on a journey together in which we asked ourselves this question: “How do we make this organisation more capable in a cross-cultural process?” We began to conscientise the Trust on the Treaty of Waitangi, and related issues, and encouraged the new chief executive to hire Māori and Pacific staff.

Adopting a much more open and uncertain process, the Trust established a \$20 million Māori and Pacific Education Initiative (MPEI) aimed at lifting their educational achievement. The Trust ring-fenced this resource so it couldn't be used for any other purpose and was protected when the global financial crisis hit. Kevin's oversight of this initiative was both far-sighted and shrewd.

A segue here sheds further light on Kevin's leadership abilities. In 2005 under Kevin's leadership ASBCT hosted the national conference of Community Trusts in Auckland and I believe Kevin's bicultural leadership brought about a break-through in the relationships among the Trusts. His manner was so warm and inviting that people immediately felt at ease in his presence and safe with one another. The following year, when the Community Trusts voted for a new chair, it was heart-warming that Kevin was chosen.

"The process for becoming chair of the chairs was one of self-nomination – where one put forward their name and said how good one was – but that was not me," said Kevin. "I certainly did not think I should put my name forward as I did not feel I had more nous than any of the other chairs."

But others had seen what was obvious to us. Here was a man capable of honouring the terms of reference for Community Trusts but also able to open up existing boundaries, to allow growth and innovation to occur.

***Would you tell me stories of the kind of relational intimacies that have nourished your relationship over the years?***

I tease Kevin and he teases me! I rate teasing as a great indicator of intimacy because it shows you're at ease with one another. During a recent conversation, he sneezed often. "Have you got an allergy to something?" I asked. "I don't think so, but I have been sneezing for a few days." "Perhaps it's seeing me," I said. We both laughed! "When did we last see each other?" "Probably at one of those Trust gatherings?" he said. "It could be. I attended a Trust meeting earlier this year." "You met with the Board?" he asked, sounding surprised. "Yeah. But you weren't there; I think you ignored me!" "I heard you were coming!" "You heard I was coming and you said, 'No, damn it, I'm off!'" We both laughed; the conversation was fun and went on from there.

Our conversations are always so interesting and over the years I've tested ideas on Kevin. "I am writing this," I'd say. "Have I got it right?" And he'd reply, "Yes, you have," or "Not quite, you've missed a bit here." Or I'd say, "I am going to take this action in a Treaty negotiation. Here's what the parties are saying and here's what I think is the common

ground. Do you think my approach might work?” We’d correspond over email or on the phone, and what our correspondence did for me, and I think Kevin enjoyed it too, was to confirm more and more that my orientation was right about what was or wasn’t important in a particular negotiation.

I know I could ring Kevin tomorrow and we’d click, as if we’d been together yesterday. He’d probably say, “I haven’t heard from you in a while, what’s up?” We’d talk and he’d say, “Okay, well perhaps try this or that.”

***What grounds Matua Kevin, do you think? What resources do you see him drawing on when the going gets tough?***

Kevin is grounded in his lived experience of the cultural context in which he was raised and has lived his life. His lived experience has enabled him to understand the nuance of being Māori within his tribal history. I sense that when Kevin is in a tight spot, he’s never alone; when he’s experiencing strife and difficulty he has many resources to call on. He has the historical resources of who he is and where he sits in the scheme of things. He has the psychological resources of Māori spirituality and customary practice. And he has other resources such as the Māori language. Fluent Māori speakers describe Kevin as esoteric in his own tongue. He describes his English as significantly less polished than his te reo Māori (Māori language) and says the Māori language is far more flexible. He says he speaks *old Māori* and, when speaking English, I notice that he uses idiom constantly to describe how to move and do things.

***Matua Kevin has walked in two worlds from a young age: te ao Māori and te ao Pākehā. In what ways, do you think, has this enabled him to engage productively with Pākehā?***

Growing up, learning both languages and engaging in both worlds, prepared Kevin for a lifetime of Māori–Pākehā engagements. He understands the joining points between Māori and Pākehā – the points of confluence. He is reflexively brilliant and culturally mannered in his response. So often when we talk, it is an ordinary discussion between two people *and* it is not at all extraordinary to be exploring this cultural interstitial space. He’ll often remark, “I get what you’re saying; I’ve never thought of it that way.” His honesty is always generous and encourages cultural interaction. I hear him saying, “I’m learning new things in our conversations.” Afterwards I carry his encouragement with me and it helps me to keep doing whatever I’m doing.

*You are both deeply committed to justice. How do you see Kevin's commitment to justice reflected in his service of others?*

Just ask him how long he served on the Bay of Islands College Board of Trustees in the Far North – 23 years. People serve far fewer years for committing murder than for serving the community as he has in education and in other fields. You have to be completely Other-focused to sustain that kind and length of commitment, and unless you are entirely competent, you can't do it. Kevin carries sway in his community because of his service ethic.

People admire Kevin's endurance and toughness, especially his commitment to wanting to do the right thing. He has not pursued power for his own purpose. Rather, he has assumed the roles and responsibilities he's been asked to perform because he thinks it's the right thing to do and the way to serve his forbearers. I see him replicating what his forbears have done. I once said to Kevin, "I bet you were never uncertain about what your Elders thought you were supposed to be doing with your life?" "Most definitely not!" he said, laughing.

## Second Conversation: Kevin Considers His Own Early Influences

*Matua Kevin, would you please trace your whakapapa connections so that I and others can better appreciate to whom and where you belong?*

Our whānau can trace Māori occupation over 450 years. Hineāmaru, the eponymous ancestor of Ngāti Hine, travelled from Waipoua to Waiōmio, taking a circuitous route. Her parents travelled with her but died on the way, so she was leading the tribe when they arrived and settled near the Waiōmio caves. We've been here ever since.

*Development* (my euphemism for preparing the land for lease or sale to the Pākehā) only started when the land was surveyed in the early 20th century, around the time the Native Land Act 1909 was passed. The chief at the time put a blanket prohibition on the sale of land within Ngāti Hine, called a *paraikete whero*, literally a *red blanket*. The Native Land Act deliberately undermined the mana of the chiefs. It allowed any New Zealander to call a meeting of the owners of land and if five people turned up that was deemed a quorum. If a majority then agreed on a sale, the land was sold. Of course, only those who wanted to sell went to the meetings. In our case 13% of the owners turned up to the meeting at which the majority agreed on the sale. Quite a bit of land in our area, including a fair chunk of our land, was sold through that Native Land Act.

When our land was taken, my grandmother was philosophical. She accepted what had happened as being beyond her control but at the same time she also asked herself what she could do to regain the land, then she did what she could. Over the years, she bought back just over 496 hectares (1228 acres) of land her whānau had previously *occupied* within the Whāngarei County. Purchasing was the only way of getting her land back. With the bush gone, she developed the land for farming. Our Dad bought back 946 acres within the Bay of Islands County that was leased off a Pākehā lessor and bought the shares off the other Māori owners of the farm when he took over. I later purchased 98 hectares (240 acres) within the Whāngarei County from a Pākehā neighbour. We now own, more or less, what my grandmother was using prior to the land being taken: 1067 hectares (2614 acres), and have been planting and harvesting forests for decades.

*If I may ask, what was your grandmother's name and why is she such a significant influence in your life?*

My grandmother's name was Pera. I suppose because she married a Prime that made her Pera Prime or Paraima (a transliteration of Prime), but people knew her as Pera.

She had a great influence on me probably because she brought up 15 children on her own. The 15th child was born 7 months after my grandfather died in July 1913 and my grandmother never remarried. She passed away 35 years later, in 1948. Without any formal education, and with so much taken away and having so little, she achieved so much.

I was only four when my grandmother died but I remember her because she called me tokotoko (a walking stick). I was a little skinny boy and she used to put her hand on my head and hobble along with me as her walking stick. She always took me to her place and filled me up with bananas and lollies, which were rare treats in those days.

My grandmother believed that nature provided for all our needs and for that reason she looked after the environment. She believed, for example, that if you planted the tree, then you owned it, but if God (nature) planted the tree, then the community owned it. I would translate *the community* as *the people* or *the iwi* (the tribe). I remember an aunt saying that my grandmother was furious when my Dad cut down kauri trees and sold them. "Those trees did not belong to you; you didn't plant them," she said to him. "They belonged to the people."

My grandmother did not believe in holding her hand out for handouts. She was not religious but had an unquestionable faith in an Unseen One who provided us with all the natural and physical resources we needed. We could call it the Universe, Nature, the Environment, the Unseen. She worked hard to buy back the land she was using prior to the Native Land Act coming into force in 1909. The land was covered in bush, which she used for food, resources and rongoā (medicines). There was no Treaty of Waitangi claims process in those days and if you wanted something returned, you had to work for it. My grandmother, and my parents, would often say "Kaua e totoro tō ringa ki tētahi atu. Ma te wera o tō rae ka oti ngā mahi katoa." (Do not hold your hand out to others. Get things done by the sweat of your brow). I believed in that philosophy and have lived by it.

My grandmother's aroha is legendary. During the 1918–1919 flu epidemic, she lost some of her own children but still looked after many people. My aunty told me that during the epidemic the only fit ones in our area were my grandmother and one of her nieces. At a particular death, further down the valley, they rang Tau Henare (then Member of

Parliament for Northland Māori). He came up on his horse to the home, made a coffin out of a kerosene crate, put the body in the coffin, put the coffin on his horse and brought it up to our cemetery. My grandmother and her niece dug the grave and Tau did the nehu (burial service). Afterwards they all went home. Everyone else was too sick to participate in the tangihanga, the normal customs pertaining to a death in the family.

Everyone spoke of how generous my grandmother was. Sir James Henare (a son of Tau Henare) gave us written documents about the legacy she left the country. One time, Tau Henare and Sir Āpirana Ngata (then Minister of Māori Affairs) visited her place (the farm we're on now), and said they wanted trees to build a carved meeting house on the Treaty grounds at Waitangi, the place where Aotearoa–New Zealand's founding document was first signed in 1840. My grandmother was known as a person of few words. "Kua oti. Haere mai. Haere!" she replied: (It's done. Welcome. Good-bye!). [laughs] After they left, she organised her workers to cut down the trees and take the logs to a place where they were rolled into a large pit and sawn by hand into slabs. The slabs were taken to the Mōtatau Marae where they were carved, then transported by railway to Ōpua, then by barge to Waitangi, where they were used to build the existing whare rūnanga (meeting house) on the Treaty grounds. That was her koha (gift) to the nation.

My grandmother relied on her connections and got by with what she had. My older brother Jim said she used to keep her money in a Bycroft biscuit tin, which meant she probably dealt in cash. Tau Henare, his son Jim (later Sir James) and another nephew Peene Tipene did her books and often came across cheques that were stale because she didn't know what the bits of paper meant. She could count money but couldn't speak English, which tells me in retrospect that she didn't need the English language to achieve the things she needed to do. Sir James said she hired people she could trust, who knew what to do in their different fields.

My grandmother was also determined and resourceful. The house I lived in when I came back to the farm, she built. She called it "Kua oti" (It is finished). She had another house she built up the road called "Taku Aroha" (My love for the people) and then there was a cowshed which she named "Kua mā" (Always clean). She had signs professionally made that were very stylised, and probably created by Pākehā sign writers; that, too, was a legacy she left. When my grandmother finished all the work she wanted to do on this earth, that was it and she was happy to move on. One of her nephews came to her to name one of his twins after they were born. She named the child Te Mutunga o Ngā Mahi a Pera Paraima

(The end of the work of Pera Prime). We called him Mutu for short but he often proudly referred to his full name to emphasise his links to our land and whānau.

*And your parents, Matua?*

Going back 12 generations, Dad was a descendant of Hineāmaru and Mum was descended from Hineāmaru's brother, Tamangana. Theirs was an arranged marriage to further cement the ties between Ngāti Whātua and Ngāti Hine.

After my grandmother died, my Dad took over the farm. He was a man before his time, inventing things and trying many ventures like dairy farming, tongue oil, tree tomatoes, market gardening, dry stock and planting pine trees. A man of very few words, he would only speak when there was something to be said, whether it was at home, at meetings, at hui, or at tangi, and often only spoke when final decisions were to be made.

Mum said when we returned to Mōtatau he made a rule in the house that the children had to speak English to him. Dad's English was limited and he spoke Māori to us most of the time. Mum, taught us English with her limited grasp of the language. While my older siblings spoke Māori, I and my younger siblings were brought up with English. Māori was spoken all around us all the time however, and we learnt it naturally. When aunties and uncles spoke to us, it was always in Māori and we always replied in Māori to them. In Mōtatau and the surrounding Ngāti Hine areas everybody spoke Māori. But at school all the teachers were Pākehā, so there we spoke English. We were the clever kids because we knew what the teacher was saying in English and understood what to do. I attribute my achievements at school to my Dad because he made the huge call to have his children speak English. I understood later that he made that sacrifice because he wanted us to have a reasonable education and be able to succeed in the Pākehā world. I was 35 years or even older before I was game to speak Māori to my Dad, although he knew I spoke Māori.

Mum lived for another 24 years after our Dad died. Like my grandmother, she had a strong faith and prayed often. She had no idea how to manage money but exercised influence to get many things done. I remember one time she called the family together and said, "me hanga he marae mō tātou" (let us build a marae for us) and we did, whereas many communities struggle to raise funds to build a marae.

I followed my father on to the land after Margaret and I were married. Ever since I was little I had that taha wairua (the spiritual side) and before returning home I dreamed constantly about the farm, the water, the trees, the bush, the ducks, the cattle, and the pheasant. I would see myself on the land and knew I was supposed to be at home. One day,

my Dad and my aunt came to see me. Perhaps because his English was limited, my Dad didn't talk much. I remember they came into the house and sat down, and my aunt said, "Ko te take i haere mai ia, ki te inoi atu ki a koe ki te hoki mai ki te kāinga (The reason he has come here is to ask you to return home). I knew then if I didn't return, my Dad intended to sell the farm and divide the money between the kids. I decided to go home but it wasn't a hard decision.

*Matua, growing up what sorts of connections did you have with Pākehā and how did your experiences compare with those of your parents and their siblings?*

We had limited contact with the Pākehā. Our first contact was with a Mr Harold Hadfield who came to milk cows for our Dad as a sharemilker. He was married with two daughters who were 3 and 5 years older than me and went to Mōtatau school with us. Our Pākehā school teachers mixed well as did their children. Two other Pākehā, who leased Māori-owned land in Ōpahi, were part of the Mōtatau community and one was the treasurer on the Mōtatau school committee. Their children attended the school. The only other Pākehā we came into contact with were people like stock agents or insurance agents.

Growing up, I found most Pākehā very approachable, amicable, patient, courteous, helpful, considerate and obliging. My experience was in stark contrast to our Dad's and most of my uncles and aunts, who harboured open bitterness, resentment, suspiciousness, distrust, and dislike of all Pākehā. Our Mum experienced blatant abusive racism in public contexts (from teachers at school; from staff at hospitals; and even from doctors (and nurses) at their surgeries). Clearly the Pākehā who chose to live and mix in Māori communities needed to get along well with Māori, and the ones I knew did, which gave me a different perspective to that of my Elders.

### **Third Conversation: Kevin Considers Possibilities in Māori–Pākehā Relations**

*When I first mentioned this research to Kevin, he said, “Go for it. Life is too short to plan for too long. Don’t wait for things to happen; dive in and make things happen. I would be pleased to help and support you in any way I could.” Was his response also a way of expressing how he lives his life and fulfils all his commitments?*

I live by the idea that nothing is impossible – just make a start, take one step at a time and see where the journey takes you. I can still remember my father’s reply when I said, “I can’t.” He said, “Nā te Pākehā tēnā kupu hei karo i te mahi. Ki te mea koe e kore e oti i a koe tētahi mahi ka mana tuturu tēnā kōrero. Kāhore hoki he mahi e kore e taea e koe.” (The Pākehā invented the word “can’t” to avoid doing work. If you say “it can’t be done” that is definitely what will happen – you will not be able to do it. Nothing is impossible unto you.) “Mahia te mahi, ka tūtuki.” (Do the work and it will be achieved.) We can make things happen and they will happen, or we can do nothing and things will still happen.

Some things you end up doing unwittingly. I was 40 when I had my first taste of being on a Pākehā Board. I received a letter inviting me to join the Bay of Islands College Board. A year later I became the chair and while I certainly did not strive for this position, I did not shirk from the responsibility either. In my Māori community, I was usually *saved* for the secretary or treasurer roles, or both. I had never been a chair before and I relished the opportunity.

When someone asks me to do something, I usually say “No problem.” If I don’t know how to do it, I assume I will figure it out. I remember one day walking down the street in Kawakawa and Sir James Henare saw me. “He mahi tāku mōu!” he said. “I’ve got a job for you.” They always spoke Māori to you in those days and me, being a typical cocky young person (I was 41 then), I replied: “Kāhore he raruraru!” (Not a problem) and passed on. Soon after, I received a letter from Dr Beasley, the chair of the then Northland Area Health Board, asking me to chair a Māori Health Service Development Group. Our brief was to develop Māori Health Plans for the next 10 years: 1986–1996! “Oh,” I thought, “what have I got myself into! Me, who said, ‘Not a problem!’” I wasn’t enthusiastic about working in the health field and had no previous health experience. I ended up chairing a disparate group of Māori (including a kaumātua) and Pākehā, most of whom were women. It was an interesting exercise not only because of the mix of talents but also because the mid-1980s was a time of significant Treaty developments.

Those kinds of experiences taught me that if you say you will do something, and work towards achieving it, all sorts of things happen in the proper sequence. Perhaps a cynic would call them coincidences but I say te wāhi ngaro (the Unseen) makes those things happen. Mainly I don't have the heart to say no, especially when I can do the job. I can be quite orderly and get things done quite quickly. Whereas if *so and so* was given the responsibility, it would never get done. Sometimes, of course, it's strategic to ask *so and so* to do something because you know it will never get done!

***It sounds to me that the heart you have is one that says yes because it wants to make a difference. If so, how do you seek to make a difference in your work?***

I came onto the Environment Court thinking that I might be able to make a difference to the world. But once you enter the bureaucracy, you find you are but a small cog in a big wheel. Meaningful change can happen in surprising ways however.

Recently we had our conference in Blenheim and one of the judges led a discussion on whether or not the court should begin and end its proceedings in te reo Māori (the Māori language). He gave me this example to consider: "If two Pākehā were arguing over a section and nobody else was involved, would you insist on the use of Māori protocols?" "If I was totally in charge, I probably wouldn't," I said, as I could not see how it would assist the situation. Another judge spoke up. "We should use te reo Māori because it shows a commitment to the Treaty." The others, all Pākehā, agreed. They wanted the Māori element slowly brought in, which told me change is under way. We discussed alternatives and I adapted the reo for the context, with the agreement of the other judges. This example shows a willingness to change. Both Māori and Pākehā members were willing to speak up, listen to one another, and engage in a conversation that has allowed the court to become a bit more bicultural in its approach. The sincerity and determination of my Pākehā colleagues demonstrated their genuine commitment to the Treaty, rather than a token gesture.

In your own way you make a difference through your being and your demeanour. I prefer not to be pushy about Treaty or Māori concerns but to let Pākehā push themselves. I wonder sometimes if I was another kind of person, someone whose behaviour was aggressive, would I have turned them off?

Mainly I think you can achieve the same objectives and often more or better outcomes by adhering to the values of aroha, tika, pono (love, righteousness, truth); being polite and pleasant to people; walking the talk (action rather than words); leading by example; and

engendering trust. When these values are exercised, people are more likely to say, “He’s got something there that works and maybe I can have a bit of it.” Perhaps a mannered approach, as Pat calls it, is only possible if, in the first place, one has aroha for others.

*In your health work, what kinds of support did you most appreciate from your Pākehā colleagues, and why?*

So much of what I achieved in health relied on the efforts of my Pākehā contacts. I was at a national hui at Ōtaki, representing the Northland Māori Health Group, when I was introduced to Bob McKegg, an epidemiologist from the University of Auckland. He had helped to set up a Māori health initiative and wanted to do more. Bob understood that for us, *as Māori*, health not only refers to physical health but also to the health of your mind, your wealth – making good use of your resources, your social interactions, your spiritual side, being personally happy and so on. Many things relate to health and all of those things are part of being healthy. Bob saw possibilities for achieving positive outcomes and pushed me into driving health initiatives. We set up a health initiative and he did all the paperwork.

I also recall chairing a group that was very pro-Treaty. The secretary, Denis Snelgar, was a Pākehā who was married to a Māori. He was a very good writer and many of the documents attributed to me were the result of his spade work. In that group, many Pākehā were very articulate when it came to voicing Treaty and Māori concerns, far more articulate than me. I appreciated what my Pākehā colleagues said when those matters were raised. Although I was raised to rely on my own efforts and not a treaty, I identified with and understood their concerns. As the chair, I always represented the views of the group I chaired, regardless of my personal views. In this case I made clear to the government that the Treaty of Waitangi created certain obligations on the Crown in relation to Māori health.

John McLeod was another key contact. He was, for a time, the general manager of the Auckland Area Health Board and later became an adviser to Simon Upton, the then Minister of Health. He was also a family friend for years and became part of our whānau. John planted pine trees with us, attended our family reunions and came to my Mum’s 80th birthday. As he climbed the ladder in the health system we remained good friends but did not always acknowledge knowing each other publicly in respect of our individual responsibilities. On one of our hunting trips, while sitting on a hilltop looking down the valley, John said, “I want to be buried there,” pointing to our whānau cemetery. He died in a car crash and we buried him back home according to his wishes.

I recall a conversation between John McLeod and my father that affected me. “How come you’re a doctor but you don’t make people well?” my Dad said. “What do you mean?” John asked, taken aback. “Well, every time Māori go to hospital, they die. Why is that?” John was dumbfounded; he often confided in me and later asked what my Dad had meant. “Māori do tend to go to hospital and die,” I said, “and that’s why there’s a fear of going to hospital. Our current government health policy does not focus on Māori health promotion and illness prevention.” “What would help?” he asked. “Well, for a start, knowing why we get sick.” In retrospect, the Pākehā I relied on were the ones, like John, who asked questions that mattered to us, *as Māori*.

Those kinds of conversations got me thinking more seriously about the importance of health promotion. Knowing the simple causes of ill health was the defining moment; smoking, alcohol, poor nutrition, lack of exercise. I knew it was possible to stop many health problems by having healthy habits, but at that time very little funding was invested in health promotion and illness prevention. I remember attending a two-day Māori Health Hui in Wellington and afterwards I tallied the cost. In my report to the Crown Health Enterprise Board, I stated that I did not see what use I had served in attending that hui. I suggested that the \$4,000 cost of my attendance would have been better spent on the whānau sleeping in the back of a van in Pipiwai. Instead of spending the bulk of the health budget for Northland on surgical and medical services, I argued, we needed to focus on telling people how to stay healthy.

My Pākehā contacts also taught me that government would react far better if you had robust scientific data to support your funding requests. When we established Ngāti Hine Health Trust we did a comprehensive health status survey. We uncovered valuable information, for example a high degree of sugar diabetes in particular communities, and we called hui to address those issues in those communities. We learnt that some of our people didn’t have running water, or electricity in their homes, or an inside toilet. We heard stories of people filling up large cans of water (the old 6-, 8-, 10- or 12-gallon cream cans) at the local creek for their household water supply. All that was needed to establish a healthy household water supply was spouting and a tank to collect the rainwater off the roof. Was that considered a health initiative? There was no funding for spouting and tanks, so we had to find ways to fund that kind of thing. Collecting robust data enabled us to focus our health initiatives on the particular needs of our people and gain funding from the health authorities for health promotion.

The Pākehā I worked with closely were willing to listen to and support the concerns I raised. In health, I led action on Māori concerns that were important to me such as promoting the idea of having a kaumātua to guide tikanga (cultural practice) for the Northland Area Health Board. Achieving that goal and getting a full-time paid position for a Māori Health Liaison Officer took about eight years. Now, every hospital in Northland has someone doing that work and Whāngarei Hospital also has a Māori Health Unit. Things have moved a long way and that's a credit to the people who worked alongside me and those who came after me, both Māori and Pākehā.

In retrospect, the Pākehā offered various kinds of value. The value of useful advice; the value of accessing funding opportunities we might not have pursued otherwise and completing the funding applications or finding people to do it; the value of connections and using those networks; the value of rolling up their sleeves and doing the work, whatever it was, but especially the paperwork; and the value of moral and ethical support for the concerns that mattered to us *as Māori*. These things cultivated the value of gaining trust and enabled relationships between us to develop.

***Some Pākehā walk on egg shells around Māori, fearing they will do the wrong thing. But your relationships with Pākehā seem to be more robust? If so, what values would you highlight?***

Our relationships *were* robust. Most Pākehā I worked with closely had an enthusiasm for helping Māori. One told me he read the book, *Go Ask That Mountain: The Story of Parihaka* (by Dick Scott), which tells the history of the Taranaki land wars, and that's what "set him off." In most cases, these Pākehā saw their contribution as "righting the wrong" (whakatika i te hē) in a small way. By that I mean the wrongs of history such as discriminatory legislation and government policies.

My Pākehā colleagues were honest with me. I believed in doing everything myself but they said, "Kevin, you can't do it all yourself. You have to access money and resources so you can do more and do other things using other people." They challenged me to be more strategic.

I think the most important value is aroha, which not only means love, caring, compassion and service but also includes seeking to understand and being willing to do something about a problem or an injustice. Where genuine aroha exists, people commit to *walking the talk*, in other words, doing exactly what they say they will do without deviation. Aroha often requires us to lead by example, which not only includes a commitment to a

shared vision but also a willingness to progress it. With aroha, there is no room for hidden agendas and no room for hatred, fear, resentment, bitterness or anger.

I think many Pākehā share the value of aroha and other values which follow including pono, whakaiti, manaakitanga and kaitiakitanga. Working with Pākehā, like Bob, Dennis, John and Pat, taught me that these values are not the sole ethical domain of Māori and that our different ways of thinking about these values can enrich one another. These are the things you learn in retrospect.

*Matua, you often refer to “learning in retrospect,” is that a bit like learning from experience or by looking back?*

Well, that’s the odd thing about the Māori Language. The word *mua* means *in front and in the past*. So, *a muri i te tēnei* means *after now*. But *muri* also means *behind*. What that tells me is that Māori tend to look back to look forward; but the nuances of that concept are hard to explain in English. For example, most mistakes are learnings in retrospect. My Dad once said that I did not have to make all the mistakes myself in order to learn. I could also learn from the mistakes of others. The most important part of his advice was to *learn the lesson*. I know of an Elder who dwelt a great deal on how much he was beaten by his father and later deserted by a first wife and then a second. Undoubtedly, he had other learning experiences that he did not appreciate as such. We can choose to take the lesson and learn from all our worldly experiences or we can choose to focus on how hard we had it and wallow in grievance. I have chosen the former approach and take the lesson.

Of course, you can’t learn everything you need to know in one lesson. Raising our children, I learned that you can only give them so much but there is always a lot more to learn. Not long ago I led a wānanga for our whānau on the history of our land and how we’re all related in the valley. It’s not until you explain something to them, that you realise they don’t know the background that you know. You begin to appreciate that learning happens over time, in various ways, in different contexts. You have to keep filling in the gaps, when and where you can.

How do I learn? I have always enjoyed reading and am able to read fast, and learn that way. When I was on the Conservation Board, every Thursday I received a thick file of papers from the secretary including the most current scientific reports and conservation plans. I read them all and, as you know, the more reading you do, the more informed you become. All of this reading helped me to realise that people like my grandmother knew this information long ago but it is now presented as new science. I have come to the conclusion

that there's nothing new, but rather something quite old that can be better understood in contemporary times through current research and education.

Most of the wisdom I have retained is in te reo (the Māori language), which means it must have been spoken by our Elders. What we consider wisdom from our Elders may have been no more than common sense to them at the time. The recognition of wisdom comes in retrospect, which is why it is important *to look back to look forward*.

***Matua, how do you take care of yourself given all your responsibilities?***

I'll be 73 this year and never felt better. I used to run all over the farm and along inner-city streets before dawn when I worked in town. Now I do 150 press-ups, 150 squats and 150 pull-ups every day. I do the sequence, which takes about 15 minutes, and I feel okay for it.

I'm one of those people who can go to sleep in two seconds. When I'm flying, I try to do a medium Sudoku before the plane takes off and a hard one before the plane lands. Usually, I drop off to sleep just before or after take-off, drop the pen and, according to Margaret, I start snoring!

I tend to work until around 1 a.m., answering emails and so on. I try to do things straight away or pass them on to someone else, then the job is done. I always put dates in the diary, and do things like that.

At home I look after 11 or 12 beehives, just for fun. Bees are so amazing and help me to keep my sanity. You open a hive and see them all working together: the cleaners, the guards, the bees gathering, the bees bringing back, the bees feeding the young, the bees feeding the queen – everyone doing their bit. If you ever want to see how communities should work, look at nature; look at bees, look at ants, look at other animals, and see how they work together. They manage very well indeed. Bees teach me so many lessons: to plan well ahead, be flexible and adjustable at short notice, take opportunities when they come (make honey while the blossoms are flowering; later is too late!), be industrious, grow and operate from surpluses rather than debt, and have a contingency plan. Bees also remind me that leadership is essential (a hive can reproduce a new queen in 16 days if necessary) and more is achieved through working together than working alone.

*Matua, how did your appreciation of taha wairua (the spiritual side) develop and is it a source of strength for your life-work?*

Yes, it is a source of strength, most definitely. Since childhood I've had lots of those experiences, although initially I rejected them. When people died, we called it *poke*; it was like feeling haunted and I saw the spirits of people who had passed on. When I grew into adulthood, and after I married, these sorts of things continually came to me. I pushed them away, determined to raise my kids differently. When I knew a bad wairua (spirit) was in the house, I would say to the kids, "It's just growing pains." I would pray on them and they would go to sleep. I knew when something was pressing on them and I felt it, but I was able to work with it.

Over time, I grew to accept these experiences as taha wairua. I read widely and learned from many influences including education, philosophers, sages, books, movies, television, internet, manuscripts, sermons, speeches, observations of nature and people, experiences (worldly and spiritually) and lessons from the extensive wisdom of others. I came to a realisation that our own mind controls our own reaction to any stimulus. We can choose to react positively or negatively to any situation; the choice is ours. I try to see the beauty in everything rather than look for negatives. We have far more tools at our fingertips than our ancestors and daily I realise how little we do know.

Taha wairua is my sixth sense. Ethical responsibility I believe is determined by our sixth sense. It is my firm belief that every one of us was brought on this earth for a purpose. Our ethical responsibility is influenced by our upbringing, our worldly experiences, and our attunement to our taha wairua – or at least mine is. Ethical responsibility is that responsibility that sits in your heart while you are doing other things and is waiting for its own time to act. When the time is right, it will happen.

Because of my taha wairua experiences, I feel certain that our tūpuna are here now and around us all the time. I believe they have always been with us and are always keeping a watch over us. Their presence continues to guide, influence, challenge and teach, encouraging us to focus on what is most important – to think of the wellbeing of the land and the next generations – and, when faced with difficulties, to persevere and respond as a kaitiaki would, just as our tūpuna did. But, now and again, when I want them to help me with my public speaking, I think, 'My Pākehā ancestors have deserted me!'[laughs].

*Matua, what is most important to you in your life right now? And why?*

The future – leaving our planet for future generations in a better state than we received it. This means sustainably managing our natural and physical resources for humanity to inhabit our planet well into the future. I look to my own land, to my own whānau, and to my own mokopuna (grandchildren), and the bigger picture I see is that we, as responsible adults, should exercise responsibility in thinking of our planet and future generations. Our main objective as a whānau is not to make big profits but first, to retain the land within the whānau; next, to sustainably manage the land for future generations; then receive economic benefits while at the same time enjoying the land we care for. What I would love my mokopuna to enjoy in the future is what I would love the mokopuna of others to enjoy: a pristine environment for all future generations to inherit and to pass on to their mokopuna.

These ideas inform how I think about justice. In my mind justice is not just knowing what is right, it is doing something about it. Justice is the manifestation of aroha in all its forms. When I think of concepts to describe *relational justice* I think of the actions of being a kaitiaki. Kaitiakitanga is an individual responsibility towards a collective outcome. It is not doing your own bit and feeling smug about it. Rather, it is doing your own bit and hoping that the example shown will inspire others into that same feeling of responsibility – not an easy task.

Kaitiakitanga means caring for our environment in a responsible manner. My grandmother would have heard the distinctive sound of the pīpīwharau (shining cuckoo) and known it was time to plant. The seeds would already have been set aside after harvesting and the soil would already have been turned and tilled, ready for planting. Ki tiaki koe i te taiao ka tiaki te taiao i a koe (If you care for the environment, the environment will care for you). I know I can do my bit but I also need to get others to do their bit – that is more difficult. I suppose this is where your whole approach and your demeanour can make a difference, by encouraging people to be more responsible.

Knowing what is right and just, I think, is instinctive and guided by our values. I have 11 siblings and a number of whāngai (foster children) were raised with me. We all heard our Dad giving the same messages but those messages were understood and acted on differently. That is the miracle of life – that we are all made up differently. So, the main value was undoubtedly *aroha*.

*How would you describe the feelings that arise in you when you witness actions that fulfil your grandmother's wishes?*

Kua oti (It is finished). Kua tūtuki (It is fulfilled). Kua ea (The debt has been paid). Whakaiti (humility). I have often said that the success of a person can be measured by the success of their children, their grandchildren and the legacy they leave on this earth. That view has not changed. A whole chapter of observations tell of how various Māori families, siblings and descendants turned out because of the actions of their parents and grandparents. If our whānau carries on the legacy of my grandmother's environmental and sustainability commitments, I think she would be happy.

When I see my children learning te reo and ensuring that their children have a good grounding in and understanding of te reo Māori, I ask myself if I have any regrets? I did not teach our children te reo because I did not want them to be like many of my school buddies who struggled at school because they could not understand the Pākehā teachers who spoke only in English. If Margaret and I ever argued, that was the thing we argued about. She always said to me, "Talk Māori to our children; you've got it. The reason you can deal with so many things is because you can understand both cultures and they want your input." I realised later that Margaret was right.

While I have some regrets, I do not dwell on negativity for long. Instead, I look at the positives. Our children were given a better understanding of the English language than I had; they were taught life skills (like how to cook, how to survive from the land, how to manage money, how to care for the environment), they were taught integrity and social skills (especially respect for Elders and respect for others) and, most importantly, they were taught family values and the strength of whānau and hapū. They see me being able to move easily in both Māori and Pākehā worlds and I think that has encouraged them to learn te reo. They acknowledge that, although I had relatively little formal education, I managed to achieve what I was asked to do by others through perseverance and pragmatism. If I am consistent with the notion of aroha the words of a well-known sage must have pre-eminence: "Murua o mātou hara, me mātou hoki e muru nei i o te hunga e hara ana ki a mātou." (Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us).

I don't think I can take a lot of credit for what I have accomplished on the farm or in any other field because I have been influenced by the people around me who were already doing things, especially my grandmother, my parents, my aunts, my uncles, and others, like Sir James Henare. Sometimes I would love to take the credit for particular outcomes but

the fact is we owe our success to many other influences: a supportive wife, a supportive family, a supportive community, Elders who gave encouragement instead of disdain, recipients of help who expressed appreciation, people who gave their time. We have so much to be thankful for.

Māori do not have a word for *thank you*. The word *whakawhetai* means *thank* but is only used for thanking God, NOT people. That in itself tells me something; we should all express gratitude and be thankful to our Creator for the untold blessings we receive. We should not expect thanks for what we do to improve the environment for future generations because it is an obligation.

***Would your grandmother be reassured or surprised that you have dedicated your life to the wellbeing of the land, your whānau, your people, and our nation?***

The answer to that question you learn in retrospect. She would probably say, “Ko koia hoki tēnā te mea i mea atu au ki a koe!” (I told you so). She always said, “Don’t cut down the trees by the waterways.” She left stands of trees by all the springs and where the waters ran down to the waterways. I discovered the merits of leaving trees along waterways through my work on conservation boards and environmental projects. The roots absorb the nutrients and the shade keeps the water cool so you don’t get the bugs that grow in spirogyra (algae) in the warmer water. Whereas the cool water gives life to other bugs that keep the water clean.

We’ve learnt those lessons. We do want clean pristine water teeming with water life; we do want healthy land; and we do want luxuriant forests loaded with fruit to feed all sorts of native species. To achieve those aspirations, we must think of the next generation when we make decisions. We have to undo much of what we have done in the past – for our whānau that means we must plant fewer pine trees and more tea tree, grow more native bush, establish more beehives to assist with more seeds, and so on. So, our grandmother would probably have said: “Ko koia hoki tēnā te mea i mea atu rā au ki a koe.” (That is what I’ve been telling you all along) [laughs].

## Chapter 8: Patrick Snedden

### Prologue

Patrick Snedden, known as Pat, comes from a formidable Irish Catholic family – generations of lawyers and national sportsmen – and was one of five kids. He lives in Auckland with his wife Josephine, whom he describes as the great love of his life and a moral guide for his engagements. “We have five widely diverse kids who all get on, share values, have different views and are engaged in the world. They and their partners surprise and delight us with their resilience, courage and moral purpose.”

Pat studied accountancy, economics and anthropology at university. He learnt the art of publishing while he was the executive manager of Zealandia, the Catholic Newspaper, and later established and sold publishing companies. He has performed senior corporate governance roles, including in the areas of health, education, housing, philanthropy, and water and wastewater city infrastructure. He maintains a Treaty consultancy, has negotiated major Treaty settlements and worked alongside Ngāti Whātua as a business adviser over many years. Pat was a founding director of Mai FM, which promotes Māori language and culture and is now the country’s largest urban radio network.

Since 2011 he has applied his entrepreneurial approach to the Manaiakalani Education Trust, which seeks to improve educational outcomes for school-aged pupils in low-income communities (especially Māori and Pacific Island learners) by using innovative teaching methods and high-end technology. In 2017 he became the chair of *The Big Idea*, an online community for Aotearoa–New Zealand creatives. He chairs a National Science Challenge called E Tipu e Rea (grow and branch forth), which aims to find ways to respond to the impacts of obesity and low literacy in the first years of school, and to support adolescence mental health resilience. Pat expects its ground-breaking research to significantly shape government policy within 10 years.

In 2006, his book, *Pākehā and the Treaty: Why it’s our Treaty too*, won the Aotearoa–New Zealand’s prestigious Montana Book Award for Best New Author, Non-fiction. In 2017, Pat became a Member of the New Zealand Order of Merit for his services to education and Māori.

## **First Conversation: Kevin Prime Considers Pat's Qualities and Their Relationship**

*When Kevin and I began discussing his relationship with Pat over email, he quickly got to the heart of the matter by reflecting on Pat's heart.*

Pat Snedden has that *ngākau*, that aroha, for the wrong to be put right; for the dis-ease to be corrected. Literally, *ngākau* means the heart and can also mean the mind, but I was just recalling the other day a conversation at home between an old kuia (a female Elder) and my Dad that took place about 45 years ago and that reminded me that you don't always translate literally. This kuia was talking about her mokopuna (her granddaughter) and she was trying to translate that something was wrong with her mind. She translated her understanding as "Ki ahau ko tōna mate kei te ngākau" (To me her ailment is within her mind or in other words, her will; her will power to do things). *Ngākau* refers not only to your heart, your mind, but also to your soul, your will to want to do something that is right for someone. Pat is someone who demonstrates *ngākau*.

*Matua Kevin, could you tell me some stories that show some of the ways in which Pat demonstrated "that aroha, that ngākau" so clearly to you? And reflect on the meanings of aroha that those stories convey to you?*

Pat should have been the chair of ASBCT – he was the natural choice, but he chose to step aside to let me take up that role and then he supported me in it. Pat always had my back covered; when I struggled to express myself in English, Pat was always able to articulate my thoughts so they would be better understood by others present.

I remember the time we were interviewing for the Trust's chief executive position. I had a six-week Environment Court hearing in Gisborne and couldn't return to Auckland during the week. Pat understood; he and others pulled together and did what needed to be done. When the new chief executive took up her role she asked Pat to whom she should report. She'd seen more of him than me because I'd been away. "You report to Kevin," he said. "I've just been filling in while Kevin was busy doing other work."

These examples show me that Pat has aroha. When I use aroha in this context I mean empathy and understanding. But it is more than understanding alone; it is understanding and doing something about it – that is aroha. You can understand something and say, "Yep, I know that" and do nothing about it. But aroha requires you to act and often entails going

the extra mile to make sure something does happen; it signals follow up. Kei i a ia te aroha. Kei a ia te hōhonutanga o ngā tikanga o te ngākau Māori. He tangata whakatutuki i te kōrero. Pat has that depth of cultural empathy for the Māori psyche. He does not just talk about what needs to be done but does what needs to be done. In Māori, *whakatutuki te kōrero* literally means *making or fulfilling the talk*.

***Matua, how did Pat's commitment the Treaty of Waitangi and to Māori influence and support the work you did together in the philanthropic arena? How did he walk his Treaty talk?***

Pat pushed Treaty commitments within ASBCT – not me, the Māori Board member. Pat was well known and respected in Māori circles, especially his work with Ngāti Whātua. Through these connections, he developed a deep understanding of Māori interests and concerns. He had a soft spot for Māori and was committed to working with Māori to achieve our aspirations.

I recall one strategic planning meeting during which a board member asked if the Trust could do something to lift the educational achievement of Māori and Pacific Island children. Pat didn't just reply with a sweeping statement, "Māori and Pacific Island education levels are in dire straits and we need to do something about it." He put his mind to work while others enjoyed their lunch and returned after the break with a proposal.

"People," he said, "I have an idea! Let's do something big and bold. Let's set aside a large sum of money to fund a small number of projects aimed at lifting the educational achievement of Māori and Pasifika youth. We've had a good year financially, so let's lock in \$20 million for Māori and Pacific Island education and start a process to address this need." He suggested that we do things differently by inviting Māori and Pacific Island communities to create and drive new approaches.

Pat's proposal aroused people to attention and invigorated our discussions. He chaired the Trust's Investments Committee, so his excellent grasp of the financials gave people the confidence to take a risk. The energy and enthusiasm he ignited that afternoon continued throughout the MPEI journey. Pat's audacious leadership gave us the freedom to live with a host of uncertainties as we explored an uncharted path with Māori and Pacific community leaders and educators.

***And Pat's response to Don Brash's infamous Orewa speech in 2004?***

We had been working together for a few years when Pat had the audacity to speak out against Don Brash's Orewa speech. Don Brash was a National Party member and a potential Prime Minister. His speech was creating a groundswell of opposition to Māori receiving what he considered as far too much money from the public purse. Pat helped to nip this opposition in the bud.

Instead of paying lip service to Māori issues pertaining to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Pat travelled the country explaining to New Zealanders how important the Treaty was to us all and how lifting Māori social and economic status would benefit the nation. He then wrote an award-winning book on this subject from all those conversations, to raise further awareness. Pat's actions told me that he was not concerned about political backlash or falling out of favour with politicians. Instead, he did what he thought was right at the time and spoke out.

At the time, a new movement of Māori leaders was under way and they also spoke out. Their critical voices contributed to a change in attitude and these issues remain on the government's agenda. Without this kind of critical response, the potential for racial tension within Aotearoa–New Zealand could well have escalated into more extreme expressions of discontent.

***Matua, you told me once that you receive numerous messages every day and respond at a convenient time. How do you rate a call from Pat?***

When Pat calls I reply immediately. What he has to say is always important; he doesn't call just to have a yarn; there's always a deep reason. When I'm on the farm I have to climb the hill to get cell phone reception. The other day we had a power cut and I took that as a tohu (sign) to stop what I was doing. I drove up the hill to call the power company and among the many messages I received was a text from Pat asking if we could have *a conversation*. I rang him immediately.

Pat said he was preparing to address the chairs of all the Biological Heritage National Science Challenges on Vision Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge) and wanted my thoughts on his thinking so far. I had recently presented similar information to a Science Challenge governance group. I immediately thought, "Now Pat will push my message from

a different angle and coming from a Pākehā like him will add a great deal of credence to what I had presented.” Our conversation supported a message I was already promoting.

Taha wairua is always working elsewhere to make these things happen and I believe my tūpuna are walking with me. They’d have flicked the power off somewhere and said, “This will get him up the damn hill!”

***[Laughs]. How does Pat push your message from a different angle?***

Pat is an eloquent orator who can articulate issues to Māori and to Pākehā. At times, he has endorsed my views, making them more palatable to governing groups. He makes inroads in understanding where others meet roadblocks, these advances open doors that allow us both to reach a wider audience. I would not have made the same inroads into that Science Challenge were it not for Pat; his speech encouraged openness and what followed is history now. As a result of Pat’s address to the National Science Challenge Chairs, the Chair of the Bio-Heritage National Science Challenge Governance Group asked for a copy of the paper the Kāhui Māori (a Māori Advisory Group) had worked on to circulate to his board. I can see now a greater willingness to work with Māori and to understand Māori scientific beliefs and Māori sciences in this National Science Challenge.

***How would you describe Pat’s leadership?***

Pat has mana (recognition, standing and influence) within Māoridom and credibility within the Pākehā world. One cannot buy mana, nor can one inherit mana. Mana is earned; it is accorded by others commensurate with one’s deeds. Through his deeds, Pat has earned mana. In te reo I would describe him in this way: He toa (A brave warrior). He tohunga rongonui (A known expert). He rangatira nui rawa (An esteemed leader).

***And your relationship with him?***

We’ve always had a collegial relationship. Since we first met we’ve tended to share similar views regarding ways to improve the quality of life for humanity. Our friendship expanded in subsequent years when we both realised that we shared similar interests in the health field, mainly through meeting at various hui or at airports around the country. In describing my friendship with Pat, I would say, “hoa tū tata”. *Hoa tata* would literally translate as *a close friend*, but *hoa tū tata* means *a friend that stands close by and is ready to support or help as required*.

## **Second Conversation: Pat Considers His Own Early Influences**

*We met at Pat's warm, welcoming home, where multiple generations live under one roof. Stories I had heard before again captivated my attention and called forth new insights.*

My forbears, on my father's side, came to Aotearoa–New Zealand on the *Matilda Wattenbach* in 1862. They arrived in Port Albert with few resources and Māori fed them, looked after them and sheltered them. A plaque at the Port Albert wharf acknowledges that Ngāti Whātua Kaipara provided manaaki to them. My Irish side comes through my mother and we lived as Irish Catholics but actually had dual Celtic heritage which was Scots Presbyterian when Snedden landed in New Zealand and changed to Catholic via marriage at end of the 19th century.

Being Irish connected us, especially my parents and theirs, to raw experiences of being included and excluded in society. Our family was influenced by the Catholic moral tradition and open to social justice issues. The ethics of honesty were powerfully palpable in our family; lying was regarded as dreadful. The Marist Brothers taught me at high school and were reasonably open on matters of social justice but quite conservative.

My mother was a superb woman; she was bright, tough and nurturing. She was well ahead of her time as a Catholic mum; she had very few hang-ups about sexuality and was open to conversations about all sorts of things. She once told a Catholic priest that when her children turned 16 they would be responsible for their own decisions and she expected them to make up their own minds on moral matters. Dad was much more conservative. He was a lawyer who read Catholic theology during his lunch break. He had a great mind and a highly developed sense of moral reasoning. A terrific thinker, he was open to discussion and a formidable intellectual opponent on many issues. We disagreed a lot.

Our family life together was simple in many respects and I remember my childhood as being entirely happy. My parents gave us unconditional love, a warm house, food on the table, a bed to sleep in, access to friends and ideas, an education, and the sense that you could get on with your life because you were all right. We were part of a community and enjoyed an annual beach holiday. We knew we could develop in whatever way we wanted, and we were expected and trusted to do so. We were never preened about or led to believe that we were the only people in the world who were useful or somehow special, above all other people.

Over time, with these fundamentals in play, you discovered what love looks like in a family; what getting on with your four siblings entails; what happens when you hit hardship

and how you deal with it. You also discovered the loss and gain of relationships, and that you have the personal capacity to act. Those were enormously important assets to take into adulthood. Those assets also gave us a huge amount of flexibility to get a few things wrong and learn how to make them right.

The family table was the place where we had the great conversations and where robust engagement was considered a normal way to build a healthy view of life. We were introduced to the rules of discourse, trained to articulate and contest ideas, and learnt how to win people over. Family and coherence in the family were hugely important to my mother, so she set the agenda: “Everyone must come for Sunday lunch and there will be no debate while we eat,” she would say. Once the dishes were washed and put away, the debate was on. Around that table everything was debatable but you never betrayed your family by leaving in the midst of a raging argument. You stayed until the debate was over.

Ours was a family that paid attention when people were not getting what they needed. We were raised with an understanding that there was a moral requirement to do well *for people* and do well *by people*. Mum served on the women’s committee at church, which helped families who were having difficulties.

#### ***And your experiences with other cultures?***

Mum and Dad were very friendly, and our household was very friendly, with a Samoan family who lived in our street. We grew up with their kids and they were our best friends. We attended the same church and schools, and shared a passion for sports, especially rugby and cricket. My relationship with the Gascoigne family gave me an intimate doorway into *fa’asamoa* (Samoan ways). Things that might have looked strange as an adult were fairly normal for me by the time I was a teenager, such as hair-cutting ceremonies, the presentation of fine mats, and exposure to, and the exchange of, odd bits of language. Hospitality went both ways and was very strong – their kids were constantly in and out of our place and we were in and out of theirs. This experience created a very good platform for understanding difference, working with it, and not being afraid of it.

Growing up, there weren’t a lot of Māori in our household but I met Māori kids at school. I remember a Māori classmate in high school. At no stage in our educational development did anyone make a connection between this young man and one of the first Ngāpuhi chiefs to sign the Treaty of Waitangi. In our midst was someone not only representative of the Māori side of the Treaty process but also, through his whakapapa, a significant player. Such was the lack of knowledge of early New Zealand history at that

time (1960s) that nobody had the slightest insight or reason to make connections that would have been wholly valuable for our class to know and honour that person's background. When I met him later in life, he said it was an out-of-world experience to be in a school system in which no-one had any idea of the importance of his whakapapa. When I left school my awareness and knowledge of things Māori was very limited and any interaction with Māori happened mainly at the rugby club.

*How did your foray into political activism begin?*

We didn't have a history of political activism in our family, although one story drifted down the generations. My grandfather, Nesbit, was a highly principled person who forfeited his position as selector of the New Zealand cricket team because he thought the right thing was not done in a certain circumstance. With our strong sporting whakapapa, including family members who had represented the country in cricket, the issue of New Zealand playing sport with the then apartheid South Africa was on our family's doorstep. The interplay of the Catholic moral tradition and the importance of sport became hot topics of disagreement in our house, but the discussion was always well managed. The debate was polarised between the freedom of people to do what they like versus limitations on that freedom because of an ethical and political responsibility to challenge a country's unjust race relations.

My parents knew I had an activist streak in me and I attended my first anti-racism protest while I was still at high school. As a 16-year-old, I joined other protesters outside the then InterContinental Hotel in downtown Auckland. A bus full of the country's best rugby players was about to depart for the airport, to begin the 1970 All Black tour to South Africa. I remember banging on the side of the bus to encourage a sense of discomfort about their decision to go. On the bus were two Māori players, Sid Going and Buff Milner, and a Samoan player, Bryan Williams, who were classed as *honorary whites*.

I was 21 when I protested against the 1976 All Black Rugby Tour to South Africa. I was in a senior football team at Takapuna Club and put a motion to the Club's Annual General Meeting that we withdraw from the Auckland Rugby Competition in protest at the All Blacks going to South Africa. The chair tried to squash the motion but allowed me to address the meeting. When I stood to speak, people shouted at me but I followed my intuition. Pointing at one player after another, all of whom were of Māori or Pacific Island heritage, I said: "If we were in South Africa today, you and you and you would not be in this conversation." The tone and tenor changed dramatically. Embracing the sudden

silence, I talked about the inclusive ethos of rugby; that everybody had an equal chance and no matter where you were in the social structure you could play together and be respected for your capability. “In South Africa right now,” I said, “that is simply impossible. By provoking them to change their system, you improve the capacity of people to play rugby in a way we all agree it should be played.” Chris Kennings, captain of the club, supported my position. When a show of hands was called, over half the audience stood with us.

That experience was a salient moment for me. It was the first time I assumed a public leadership role by pushing an issue in a context where people could have easily turned against me. I had a sense of being in the wairua (the spirit) of the circumstance. I learnt that day that if you trust your instincts, the words will come when you need them. Also, standing for justice and finding ways to articulate your commitments so that your audience can hear you, is an effective way to change minds. By exercising the courage of my convictions, I could help to lead that change. I also learnt never to underestimate the power of your own voice.

***You exercised courage in the battleground between Ngāti Whātua and the Crown in the 1980s. Could you tell me about that experience?***

I joined the protests against the 1981 Springbok Rugby Tour to New Zealand. Inevitably I and others found it impossible not to apply the moral concerns of the South African racism debate to the New Zealand context.

In 1982, as a 28-year-old, I got arrested for trespass during the second occupation at Bastion Point in Auckland, led by Joe Hawke. Rene Hawke, Joe’s wife, and their daughter Sharon, were among 13 arrested, and they asked me to represent the group in court. To politicise the trial, they decided to dress as clowns, making it difficult to recognise them in the courtroom. I was uncomfortable with that tactic because I was raised to respect the law, but I agreed to represent them, much to the chagrin of my father.

Mike Corry, a prominent defence lawyer, acted as my *McKenzie friend*, providing legal advice while I carried out the representation. I took my cues from Perry Mason (a TV lawyer) who asserted his confidence by striding across the courtroom. A pantomime unfolded. During one of my peripatetic moments, I noticed a policeman outside the courtroom door, flicking through photographs and looking through the window at the accused. “He’s not allowed to do that, is he?” I said to Mike. “No, he is not!” I approached the judge and said I wanted to call the policeman in the hallway. The judge was cautious but agreed.

“Could you tell us what you were doing just now in the hallway?” I asked the policeman. He went bright puce. “Just take your time,” I said. “I was looking at photographs,” he admitted. “Are these photographs of the accused?” I asked. “Yes.” “And are you allowed to do this, prior to being examined about your ability to identify the people accused of trespassing?” The judge intervened. “He most certainly is not,” he said. “Case dismissed against all the defendants except you, Mr Snedden. You are convicted of trespass and fined \$120!”

When I questioned the judge’s decision, he said, “We know perfectly well who you are Mr Snedden and you have never made any secret of the fact that you were on the land and arrested at the time in question” [laughs].

*[Laughs]. What sense do you now make of that story?*

That moment crystallised a lifelong family friendship with the Hawke family and an enduring relationship with Ngāti Whātua. The critical bit always in these processes (when you are, if you like, engaged in what amounts to a cross-cultural discourse) is what you do, rather than what you say. In a symbolic sense, I put myself at risk at the same time Ngāti Whātua whānau put themselves at risk, to protest the re-occupation of their land by the government.

It was a moment of integrity testing. Theologically, I felt that a gift had been given to me; being arrested at Bastion Point forced me into a conversation about what that occupation meant. I found that was I happy to be in the conversation and had a perspective that others valued. That experience opened a door into Ngāti Whātua; they decided that here was a person with professional skills who could be trusted because he was prepared to do the thing for us, that we were trying to express for ourselves. I met Sir Hugh Kāwharu, who I came to value enormously as a colleague and as a close friend. These relationships put me in touch with the domestic experience of the being Māori in urban Auckland. The renaissance of Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei has been the great Auckland story of my lifetime and their education of me has been a gift which I have sought to reciprocate in my work with others.

The integrity testing worked both ways. My father was furious when I was arrested and doubly furious when I, a non-lawyer, represented the group in court. He sent my youngest brother Martin, also a lawyer, to watch the proceedings. Martin left my father with the impression that I was quite skilful in my defence. Dad wrote me a letter afterwards, saying, “I completely disagree with what you are doing. But although you got convicted,

you showed a fair amount of skill by getting the other charges dismissed, so you deserve credit for that” [laughs]. It was one of the great moments of my life. Although my father was fiercely opposed to my anti-racism activities, he recognised the integrity of my actions. Seen through his moral lens, I had followed through on my commitments.

*Pat, you are involved in many fields but you have a particular passion for achieving better outcomes for Māori in education. What turned your attention in that direction?*

While I was at university, as a young student (probably 20ish), I had an experience I vividly remember. At the time, the government funded local work trusts and a friend in the Department of Internal Affairs asked me to visit a work trust based in a house called Māngere Homestead in South Auckland. A group of Māori women aged 14–19 years ran the trust. They produced Māori motif tableware and wanted support to create a business plan.

I recall feeling awkward as I introduced myself to the seven Māori women. To break the ice, I said, “Why don’t you do some work here for a few hours and I’ll return later and look at what you’ve done. Then we can start to talk about the elements of pricing, costing and marketing.” When I returned I asked, “What time did you start?” I thought the silence that followed reflected the dynamic between a young Pākehā fella and these lovely young Māori women. I tried another approach. “What time did you finish?” Again, no answer. An idea dawned on me. “Can any of you read the time?” There wasn’t a person in the room sufficiently able to tell the time such that they could measure the length of time between when they started and when they finished.

I left shell-shocked. How was it possible in New Zealand that such promising young people could go through a decade or more of education and not learn to tell the time? How could our education system leave one section of the population so disadvantaged? I decided then that that was my life’s purpose – to work out what that was all about and do something about it, and I am still on that journey.

At university I married Jo, who encouraged me to study anthropology alongside accounting and economics. Studying anthropology broadened my focus and deepened my understanding. I felt better equipped to respond to the challenge I set myself. Jo made a pivotal suggestion at a pivotal moment in complete support of my life’s purpose, and it’s been that way through our whole married life. I rely enormously on her wise counsel and unqualified support.

*So, all of these experiences significantly influenced the direction of your life?*

They set me on a journey that significantly shaped my life. This journey has taken me into the lives of very many Māori and, more latterly, Pacific peoples. It has encouraged governments of all sorts to invite me to do all sorts of things on their behalf, including running very large-scale government organisations. It has led me to become a Treaty negotiator, both for Māori and for the Crown. It has enlivened my life in a way I could not possibly have imagined as a 20-year-old. I'm now in my early 60s and while I do not feel young, I do feel energised. There's just so much going on in my life that is so positive and interesting.

### **Third Conversation: Pat Considers Possibilities in Māori–Pākehā Relations**

*My conversations with Pat covered wide-ranging topics and inevitably returned to what he's learned from engaging with Māori. I was interested in how he views his life-work and the broader context.*

I have found that applying myself to the task of understanding why New Zealand with its Treaty history hasn't been kinder to Māori takes a life journey to understand. It remains slightly less complicated than it was when I first undertook the journey, but nevertheless has evolved significantly over my lifetime. When you commit yourself to learning over many decades, you become wiser about the matters at hand. You develop deep relationships with people who have revealed their lives to you. You understand something of the apparatus of power that enables some people to thrive and others to strive to thrive but do not. Inevitably you witness significant social change.

The shift in New Zealand from my generation to my children's is quite profound. Some Treaty activists might feel despondent at times because we don't see enough of the fruit of our imagining of the Treaty process, but what exists in our country now is quite substantial. Te reo Māori is recognised as an official language. Māori educational institutions operate at all levels. The Waitangi Tribunal has advanced a world-leading Treaty justice process. Treaty settlements and clever Māori entrepreneurship has contributed to a significant Māori economy. Many more Māori are doing better than they were doing 30 years ago.

But, I also think, Māori remain secondary to the main conversation in New Zealand. We still have a diminution of Māori speakers because schools are not required to teach the Māori language. We still have a sense of Treaty ennui, of people feeling like they are *over it*, when they ought to feel like they have been educated about their own history. We still have high rates of Māori imprisonment and poor rates of Māori educational achievement and health outcomes. We seem to have lost the capacity to understand and build a consensus on how to work as a state system to ameliorate the circumstances of those in the poorest 30% of the country, many of whom are Māori. We experiment with communities in a way that is disrespectful to them and to their circumstances. My touchstone for social change and progress in Treaty relationships will be the emptying out of the prisons, which means ensuring Māori succeed in the education system.

But – and it’s a very big *but* and a positive one – without the Treaty activism that started during the 1960s, which began to impact the country in my early life, these things wouldn’t have happened.

***Starting out all those years ago did you receive any advice that, with hindsight, you see has significantly (in)formed your engagements and work for justice over the years?***

During the early days of my anti-racism work, my father said something that informed my approach to influencing change. “It seems to me you want to be an activist,” he said. “Yes, probably I do,” I replied. “Well, become an accountant.” I felt confused. “Why would those two things line up?” I asked. “Pat,” he said, “in your future, when you go into a board room to talk about the things you think are very important, the first thing the people around the table will want to know is this: Do you do anything they do, that they can absolutely align themselves to? If you can read a balance sheet, and a profit and loss sheet, and you can articulate what that means, you will gain their professional respect. At the point at which you want to take your conversation into areas about which they feel apprehensive, they will trust you because you have already earned their trust in the matters that they know something about and think are important.” I followed my father’s advice and have found that when I take people into risky areas, the areas in which they feel less comfortable, they have that psychological backdrop to the conversation which enables them to be open-minded about what I am doing.

My advice to the next generation is to become good at something so that you can be in service of others. It’s hard to make a meaningful contribution if you don’t have the skills and confidence to do what needs to be done.

***Could you tell me a story in the sphere of Māori–Pākehā relations that shows me what you mean by becoming good at something such that you develop a level of confidence in your ability to do what needs to be done?***

I recall negotiating one Treaty settlement that took me to quite an isolated part of the country with staff of the Office of Treaty Settlements. We met with members of a hapū to talk about aspects of the Treaty process and the proposed Treaty settlement. I always take a translator with me in those circumstances; I want to know what people say in the reo about what is going on. Often, in my experience, Māori are able to be most authentic in that

process when speaking in their own language. In this context the adversary, you could call him, laid into the Crown officials and myself in the reo, describing us as “the barking dogs of the Crown.”

In those moments, you either fall apart or you take it on for what it is. I chose to reply. I greeted them according to the cultural context with a mihi whakatau (a form of greeting), then broke into English. I said one of the great privileges of coming onto the marae is that the wharenuī is truly the space of open discourse where one is able to say exactly what one feels, so I will take the opportunity to tell you exactly what I think of what I just heard. I said the dog wasn't barking when I was arrested at Bastion Point and in the jail cells with Ngāti Whātua. And the dog wasn't barking when I went directly to the Prime Minister and said, “What you are proposing to settle here for this group is wrong because it's too low?” And the dog wasn't barking when we took the position of your iwi at the Waitangi Tribunal against the Crown. And, next to me is a person who has spent their entire working life over the past 13 years trying to resolve your claim, and there were no dogs barking then.

The narrative took off from there and when I later closed in te reo Māori, the kaumātua sitting with the man who had introduced the kōrero, walked across the whare (meeting house), stood next to me and performed a waiata (song) for me. You know you're in the grey zone when things like that are happening in your life. People recognise truth no matter whose mouth it comes out of. Afterwards the man who made the remarks apologised to me. I find I have lots of experiences like that in my life, where telling the truth has been the best possible defence to the allegation.

*Pat, you often talk about “being in the service of others”, what do you mean?*

I am expressing my preference to work with social groupings in society who find life most difficult and in New Zealand that includes by a large measure Māori people and communities. My skill is to find ways to improve their lives without pretending I am part of their communities. That is extremely important because if you're not willing to exercise a *seeking permission* approach, to do what you can do, then you're better off doing something else. I am working at the moment with Manaiakalani because I have the permission of the people there to do what I do. They give me rights of access and rights to speak but they can withdraw those rights at any time – the power is with them, not with me. I'm always earning those rights and that's a particular way I want to work.

*How do you negotiate the asymmetries of power in those relationships?*

When I work with Māori, I am very conscious of the asymmetries of power because the asymmetry means you either enable or swamp the people you're working with. When you're in radical support of their kaupapa, you must accept their right to go down the route they choose to take, while also reserving the right to pull out.

Pākehā must be careful not to take on control of the decision making but rather focus constantly on being in support of their agenda. I cannot stress this enough; you must be dead self-conscious, otherwise you risk confiscating their power. Even when a Māori individual appears to act incompetently, you must refuse the strong rescue reflex that tempts Pākehā to intervene. Māori have ways for dealing with incompetence; they will always hear and respect the person, then gently take a side step and move on.

I never mistake relational power for institutional power. Relational power is wholly about the influence of an individual or group of people at the time they are in the space of engagement. Institutional power outlasts you. If you are going to lead something that is socially important and consequential, then you have to give your time to it sufficiently long enough for the change to happen. To embed significant change within an institution, such that people accept it, demands endurance to stay the distance and, often, at least a decade.

Longevity is one of its great deliverers of the cross-cultural process. Building trust is a long and deep process that requires you to stick around. People who do stick around inevitably encounter all kinds of complexities that hone and tune their reflexes over time so that they come to know how to deal with very difficult challenges. You cross into the cultural chasm, where you both occupy space that is neither yours but is both yours, without time or expertise. People have to experience you as being a person who is prepared to go to that place, and when they do, they respond to it.

*You often talk about the importance of authentic integrity as a quality of relation required for productive Māori–Pākehā engagements. What do you mean by authentic integrity?*

Authentic integrity is the ability to be who you are and for people to experience that. Wherever you are, whether it's in a boardroom, on a marae or in the supermarket, the quality of the encounter makes a difference and depends on you being who you are. When you know yourself and what you stand for, you are better equipped to judge whether the

thing you are doing is the right thing or the people you are working with are the right people. I think we grow into who we are; it doesn't just come with a ringing bell. But you grow to trust your instincts or intuition – that inner knowledge that sounds like a warning bell when things are not so good but that also encourages you to keep going when things are.

Integrity requires you to back yourself, demonstrate authenticity, and be fearless when faced with truly difficult circumstances. Also, timing is enormous in people's lives and unless you are present you won't be able to recognise its significance or the opportunities it presents.

If you fail to be present, you risk becoming oblivious to the asymmetry of power in the relationship. You think people are being civil and nice and cooperative with you because you are a decent person and not because you exercise a role that carries weight that will affect outcomes of interest to them. You have to practise being aware of power relations by connecting with people outside of the role context and in a person-to-person context.

When I speak at public functions or to groups, I'm consciously focused on being present. I pay attention to signs; the person introducing me may give me a clue as to what interests the audience. I see someone nod in response to something I've said. I hear a murmur and it takes me to that place in the audience. I get in the groove but if you asked me afterwards how I got into that groove, I couldn't tell you. I think *speaking by feel* happens to be my skill. I don't attempt to try to analyse it because if you are too self-conscious, it will trip you up. The greatest challenge is to decide to allow yourself to go into the context and be in what you're in and trust that you will have the right words or the right gesture at the time something needs to happen.

Because I am sitting in the position of being Pākehā, generally speaking most of the atmospherics around the conversations I'm in tend to reflect the world view in which I've been raised. You have to be fully present and critically conscious to be able to put yourself in a position where you are able to encourage and amplify the Other.

### ***What do you mean by “the atmospherics around conversations”?***

By atmospherics, I mean the unspoken cultural rules. The language default is English, the meeting manners are mostly those observed in Pākehā settings, the relationship management between the participants works within Pākehā timetables, and decisions are made observing Pākehā conventions. None of this is necessarily hostile to Māori interests but it is mostly not bicultural in its intention or dynamic. As someone striving to become a competent, trustworthy, cross-cultural practitioner, being critically conscious means asking

critical questions. First, “Who is being served by this process?” and second, “Are some interests being consciously or unconsciously diminished through actions or inactions that lead to decisions that are exclusive to the interests of a dominant group?” This challenge is not specifically a Pākehā issue and operates in all contexts where dominant cultural constructs are in play.

*And “amplifying the Other”?*

Amplifying other world views is about ensuring people are able to exercise their voice. The default position in the cultural context of New Zealand is that the Pākehā voice is the default voice. So, when you’re in situations that call for insights that aren’t from the dominant culture, you have to be alert to how you can promote and encourage those other voices without enacting the condescension that comes when you think you have all the levers necessary to make something work. Although Pākehā is the dominant culture, it is not always in the dominant position in the interactions taking place. Therefore, you have to have a clear head and sharp insight into how to make these interactions work.

*Could you tell me a story that illustrates the kind of atmospherics and amplification you’re talking about and reflect on its meanings?*

I recall a kaumātua who had brought his mana as a major tribal figure to an initiative I was involved in. He was dying and, when I arrived at the hospital, he was surrounded by his family. My response to this situation came from years of training. I didn’t go into that hospital room presuming to do what I did, but as I sat next to the kaumātua and began talking to him quietly, something happened. His wife said, “Speak up, so he can hear you.” To my knowledge he was unconscious, so I read his wife’s gentle instruction as an invitation to do whatever I chose to do. I stood and performed a mihi (greeting) to him and told him about the impact he’d had on the initiative, especially on its strength and moral purpose. I then did a waiata (song) to finish what I was doing. I did all this by the bedside surrounded by his family.

I suspect many people would feel deeply uncomfortable walking into that moment in the hospital room because of not quite knowing the rules of encounter. Of course, the family are making up those rules of encounter as they go. Sure, there is shape and form to them but they are ameliorating the rules all the time to encompass people and to provide space for themselves. They rely on tikanga to provide space and they rely on the relaxation of the tikanga to incorporate people who may not be entirely cognizant of what’s happening there.

This kind of flexible cultural excellence is in operation all the time and Māori are very good at it. Their inordinate flexibility offers a way to manage such situations, providing people are respectful.

I think the impact of a Pākehā feeling able and comfortable in that space to claim it for that purpose is quite unnerving and quite reassuring. Unnerving because people are on edge, anxiously wondering if this person knows what he's doing. Reassuring because, even with a degree of clumsy reo (language) *and* talking in English, you are able to convey in an idiom that is familiar to Māori, what you think of somebody. In my experience, recognising a person's mana through the use of their own idiom catapults you into a position of trust and accessibility. Whānau observe a person whose actions suggest that he understands something of what matters to them. And in this case, the doing of that mihi, and the claiming of the space to do it, is precisely a Māori idiom. In a situation like this, unlike other situations, you don't ask for permission, you take permission.

In the sense that tikanga is an equivalent of Pākehā manners, you are operating in a mannered way within the context. In the same way you, Frances, brought food to the house today knowing our meeting was near lunchtime. Your gesture says we understand each other; we understand the role food plays in binding people together so they can get on with one another. We recognise the centrality of hospitality. Even a small gesture can communicate that understanding.

It's a very grey area however, which, in my anthropological days, I would have called an interstitial area. You often find Māori profoundly uncomfortable in a Pākehā context where the rules of encounter as they know them are simply not practised. How often do you go to a meeting where there's no attempt to ritually open the meeting and to welcome people in a way that gives them their voice and ensures that everyone knows who is there and the process itself enacts the human encounter? When I'm in that space I try to act in way that communicates connectivity. It isn't saying to people that I'm sorry I don't know what to do here, nor is it apologising for being who you are, rather its taking responsibility for understanding that if you are going to work in this space then you have to get to somewhere proximate in being able to engage appropriately.

There is metaphor everywhere for this kind of interstitial space between Māori and non-Māori, and Pākehā and non-Pākehā, where the two manage to convey intent, integrity, the willingness to cooperate, and the recognition of the Other in their shape and form without having to *be* the Other. And that's okay and it's normal; it's not performance, it's

not thin, rather it's ordinary and it's necessary, and the way you bind people to a common purpose.

***Pat, what does “idiom” mean to you?***

I use the term *idiom* in different ways. The rhythm of Māori language in sophisticated kōrero is almost sung in the way it is delivered. It finds space for recollection, in order for the next thing to be said in a way that makes an impact and a difference. It's the way people cough a lot or pause a lot. When I speak in English in a Māori context, I slow down. I try to find the right metier for what I'm attempting to express; the verbal response and gesture in English that best responds to the poetry of the reo that someone has just translated for me, so I can appreciate what others have said. When the speakers use metaphor, I often use the same metaphor in my reply in English, to indicate that I've heard what was said and I'm trying to meet its challenge. Listening and watching in this context are skills that require patient expansion to develop sufficient quality to engage meaningfully.

***Reflecting on your years of working with Ngāti Whātua, were there particular relationships from which you learnt over time how to enact a Māori idiom as you understand it?***

My years of engagement with Joe Hawke and with Sir Hugh Kāwharu were vital in building up a knowledge stock sufficient for me to know what to do in different and difficult circumstances.

My conversations with Joe focused on the tactics of activism to enable you to get what you needed. Joe and Rene Hawke had a capacity to see through the complexity of difficult circumstances and the courage to act on those insights, which for me was both supportive and inspirational. For example, when Pākehā people see other Pākehā acting in these contexts they often say, “That was a brave thing to do,” but for Māori to act in the same context is a matter of survival of their cultural insight and way of doing things. For Māori, it's the recovery of tino rangatiratanga writ large. No-one is going to *give* tino rangatiratanga to Māori; they have to hold it and if it's somehow been taken, they alone have to recover it.

Hugh and I met every month or every other month for around 6 years before he died, typically on a Sunday morning at his home. Our long conversations were set in a wider picture and catalysed by our work in the Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei Treaty claim. “How do we manage ourselves to do the things we need to do,” we asked. Our discussions were always

very interesting because they went both ways. Hugh was a New Zealand authority on the Treaty of Waitangi and he sought to understand the ground on which we, as a nation, could increase the mutual understanding of Māori and Pākehā relations, and the positioning of each, within the context of the Treaty. Over time, I came to appreciate his intellectual analysis on what the Māori–Pākehā cross-cultural interchange might look like. In return, I shared my knowledge of how to apply business disciplines to the kind of opportunities that were in front of Ngāti Whātua. As an economic adviser, I offered Hugh governance support for managing the business of Ngāti Whātua to extend its prospects. I chaired boards on his behalf while he was sat at the table as a board member.

Many chapters in my book grew out of our conversations. I hadn't intended to write them in that way but so comprehensive were our discussions that when Hugh read the draft manuscript he recognised the kind of thinking that had developed in our conversations. "Is there anything wrong with what I've said?" I asked, to which he replied, "I think this is an authentic piece of work looking through your own eyes, as seen through your own cultural lens. Provided it's perceived like that, I think it's a valuable piece of work." Hugh was not saying that, "You understand us completely", rather I think he meant, "You have enough of an understanding to know about the things you need to enquire about".

We developed a trusting relationship that, over time, moved closer to a partnership and eventually became a deep friendship. Nothing was sacred; you could talk about anything and get to the bottom of things. Hugh was a social anthropologist and I had studied anthropology, so we drew on a common language. When he was dying, which happened very rapidly, the family asked me to speak at his tangi from beneath the eaves of the wharenuī. I felt deeply honoured.

*Working closely with Matua Joe and Sir Hugh, how did you understand your mandate to act?*

When working with Māori, I've always understood that my ability to be useful is entirely based on the consent of people to have me in the process. With Ngāti Whātua, each time the board renewed or reconfigured itself, my role as an economic adviser was up for auction. I came to understand that that process of change facilitated a process of consent which gave me the mandate to keep going.

Over the years, I always asked Joe or Hugh, "Are you happy for me to give this audience the piece about Ngāti Whātua that we share?" In effect, I gave them the right to say no, and I don't recall a time when either of them exercised that right, but I would never

do that presentation without their permission or consent. I've learnt over the years not to assume the right to speak on particular subjects no matter how familiar I was with them because in a particular situation another point might need to be made and it's not that one.

The presentations I did with Hugh were as much playful as they were knowledgeable. You get to playfulness in your relationships with Māori, the same way you get to playfulness in any other human relationship. Over time you develop a level of intimacy, where you know what makes the other person tick and you learn to work with that. My children know they can say almost anything about me in public and I will rise to it and enjoy it! That's the virtue of intimacy, and the intimacy I am referring to here is about friendship, it's about love, it's about familiarity, and fundamentally it's about trust – all those things are available to all of us in relationship.

***If people are willing to make the investment?***

Sure. That's the life journey; the life journey is there for the investment. Something I recognise in my own journey is my self-conscious training for this work. I deliberately chose a pathway that would help me to understand the things that are important to understand in this context and to work hard at them. I needed to find my levels of comfort because, in doing the work that I do, I want to be able to find myself in contexts that don't knock me off my stool.

***Levinas talks about the impossible demands one encounters when responding ethically to the Other. How do understand those demands?***

I recall a conversation with a senior politician I respect, who described conflicts and challenges that had caused him/her to consider whether or not to carry on.

“Just listen here,” I said, “this is not Syria. You're not living in a tent in a desert, forced out of your home after it was destroyed by barrel bombs overnight. You're in a situation of temporary difficulty because of the circumstance in which you find yourself. People like us get into difficulties from time to time but our lives are infinitesimally the experience of people in real trouble. You have to remember that fact and move on. Think about the people you are seeking to serve and who are relying on you to help make a difference to their lives. Go home to the person you love, to the children who love you, and give yourself a little time. We all need breaks and holidays from time to time. But really and truly our personal courage, our integrity of self, and our identity are not under constant threat and in very large parts of the world that is the daily experience. So, don't for a minute think your

circumstances warrant the kind of exit strategy you are contemplating. You are exercising a privilege and you have to exercise that privilege in a way that is in service of the community. You can only do that if you're in harmony with yourself in a right way."

***The work of justice can take a considerable toll. How do you negotiate those demands and take care of yourself?***

The work of justice can and does take a toll, and you have to pay attention to that. Occasionally I say to Jo, "We're in the zone now," which means we're in a focusing moment. We ask ourselves, "What do we believe, what are we on to, what are we doing with our lives?" The strongest motivation for me to keep doing what I am doing is for Jo to keep saying, "This is the right thing to be doing and you must continue it." When Jo says, "That's enough," we'll probably call it quits.

My relationship with Jo has been fundamental to my work as a cross-cultural practitioner. We both see this work as important in our lives and we don't have any sense of dissonance in relation to it. We deliberately choose to put ourselves in circumstances to experience cross-cultural stimuli and complexity, and we are reflexively ready to support people who need support in this context. Whether they're under fire or they need some guidance on how to engage, we've found that the best and easiest way is to accompany people. We endeavour to lead them into the cross-cultural context so they can learn to appreciate what it looks like and feels like.

Because the difficulties you encounter are not straightforward or easy, it is important to give them a name, engage in truth-telling, gather evidence in support of your ideas, show how things can be done differently and use the tools at your disposal (including access to ideas, people and resources) to make a difference.

As I've gotten older, I have realised that everything has its time. I've been sacked 13 times in my career and although those experiences had their moments of grief, being sacked is not a bad thing. When people pay respect to you because you are the chair of a big board or you earn a lot of money or you have a public profile or you are a spokesperson, it's easy to be sucked into the idea that you are important. I have tried to maintain a strong discipline about not getting into that frame. I do not network as a matter of regularity with people who are very powerful in society. It is not an exact science; I know people who are powerful decision-makers and whose company I enjoy. It's so easy for someone in my position to inhabit a space where you experience a lifestyle and share ideas about what life is about

with people who, generally speaking, are well heeled. When you do, it's easy to make assumptions about people to their detriment.

Going to Tamaki every week is a salutary reminder that the kind of privilege and experience I've had in my life needs to be the kind of future opportunity for the kids in that community, and I make sure I do not forget it. When you put yourself, your reputation and your effort at risk in service of the community in order for that future to become possible for those kids, generally speaking you will be on safe ground. Something that weights on my mind is that I don't muck up to the detriment of the people with whom I am working.

A Māori world view has taught me three things that truly matter. The first is whanaungatanga – the quality of the relationships between people. The second is the kaupapa, what you want to share with them and what you want to achieve together. Always, the third thing is the putea (the resource). If you focus on the money first, you quickly start to sell something to somebody. I am interested in creating public good partnerships that people join because they believe in the quality and expertise of the people involved and the value of the kaupapa being pursued. When the need for money becomes clear, the journey to get it becomes easier.

***Where did the conversation land with your Dad, in relation to the life you are living and the work you are doing with Māori?***

My father was often perplexed about my anti-racism and Treaty commitments, and the work I do with Māori. He'd say, "My Māori clients don't seem to have the agitation that your Māori associates have" and I'd say, "How old are they?" and he'd say, "They're about my age," and I'd say "That's why. They're being polite; they've grown up in a position of respect and they respect the things you are doing for them. But how often have you asked them about their lives and the things that are important to them?" "Well I don't suppose I've ever had those conversations," he said, to which I replied, "I engage in those conversations all the time."

In his last year we had a poignant conversation. "Do you think we're going to work out this Māori-Pākehā relationship?" he asked. "Yes, I do," I said, "I feel confident we'll be able to work it out. As a nation, we're not at war and we've now got a truth-telling mechanism in place through the Waitangi Tribunal. More New Zealanders are slowly coming to understand more of our history and what constitutes the issues of difference. I witness Pākehā learning how to negotiate those difference in their relationships with Māori."

It was lovely to reach a sense of equilibrium with my father about what I was on about before he died. Both my parents always found my push difficult and they didn't live long enough to see the best of what I could do.



## Chapter 9: Matua Sam Chapman

### Prologue

*Haami Chapman, known as Matua or Uncle Sam, identifies as Māori and also cherishes his English and Portuguese Jewish ancestry. His iwi tribal affiliations are with Tūwharetoa and Ngāti Porou, his hapū is Tūrangitukua, and his marae is Hīrangī.*

*Sam was raised in the small rural town of Tūrangi in the heart of Aotearoa–New Zealand’s North Island surrounded by whānau. He had a happy childhood but experienced a severe speech impediment. He left school with no educational qualifications and moved to Wellington, where he completed a painting apprenticeship and met and married his Irish Pākehā wife, Thelma. Responding to a deep sense of God’s call, they committed their lives to living among “some of the most undervalued and underutilised individuals” in lower socio-economic communities. Their work, side by side over four decades, and their four children, reflect the diversities of two unique people groups coming together.*

*Sam has spent his life striving to understand and live what he describes as “the Jesus Way – where in all the moments of my days, I live and move and have my being.” Among other initiatives, he and Thelma helped to establish a community law office in Porirua and a bicultural early childhood centre in Ōtara. For decades, they have worked alongside those in prison or on parole, including members of the Notorious Chapter of the Mongrel Mob. Sam also co-founded the High Tech Youth Network, an innovative after-school youth programme operating across Aotearoa–New Zealand and the Pacific. Sam advocates “the exchange rather than change approach” to enable individual, family and community transformation.*

*Among other acknowledgements, Sam received the Inaugural Kiwi Bank New Zealander of the Year Local Hero Award in 2010 and the Queen Service Medal (QSM) for services to Māori in 2012. He now lives in Tūrangi.*

## **First Conversation: Ann Milne Considers Sam's Qualities and Their Relationship**

*When I asked Ann how long she had known Sam she said, "I'd need to look that up! Since the early 2000s, so not for hundreds of years." I was interested in how they met and developed their relationship.*

I first met Sam in the days of a government-led initiative, Strengthening Education in Māngere and Ōtara (SEMO). An Educational Review Office (ERO) report had slated Ōtara schools but was full of deficient information on Ōtara and our schools. Following negative publicity, the Ministry of Education (the Ministry) established SEMO, which was led by a principal who rode into Ōtara on his white charger to fix us up. The Ministry met with the community and, I believe, set us up. Over time it became *the community against the principals*. We, Ōtara principals, sat through awful meetings during which we were attacked by the community we had previously had good relationships with. Sam was one of the many people the Ministry dragged in. So, I first met Sam in one of those meetings and I was furious with him! [laughs].

I can see him now standing in the front of the meeting tearing a newspaper into strips to demonstrate the ripping apart of communities and of people's hearts. Afterwards, I went up to Sam and challenged him. It wasn't that I disagreed with what he said in the Ministry meetings but that he had been seen to be taking the Ministry's side, when he didn't know what was happening in the schools.

As the meetings continued, I visited his house and sat around that huge table that he and his wife, Thelma, had at Awatere Street. When he did learn about what was happening in our school, he became a great advocate for what we were doing and we gradually found that we had synergies in common.

### ***What were/are those synergies?***

We're both passionate about a better deal for Māori children in Ōtara. We've both been engaged with this community for many years, so understand its richness and vibrancy. We both share that positive view of Ōtara that is not always shared by others, particularly education officials, who think of communities like ours in terms of deficits. We both think that young people in Ōtara deserve the best possible deal in education, and that a narrow focus on literacy and numeracy that denies them their cultural knowledge is not that *best deal*. Right from the start, Sam *got* the school's critical focus, not as the means to *escape*

from the community, but as crucial to teaching our youth how society works to continue to fail them. We both share an absolute conviction and faith in the ability of our youth to change that.

***As your relationship with Matua Sam developed, what did you grow to appreciate about his contribution to the school?***

Sam became a trustee of the school board and stayed through all our changes of school status even though he didn't have kids at the school. Sam was invaluable on the board, and so was Julie, its current chair. We would park ourselves in the Ministry and argue with its officials. "We're not going to sit back and send emails or write letters," we'd say. "We're here to talk." Sam and Julie clearly articulated to the Ministry that the community was driving the change of school status. It didn't matter what the Ministry threw at us or how many times its officials said no, Sam and Julie always asked, "Okay, now what? Where do we go from here? What's our next step?" They never gave up.

Better than anyone else Sam can articulate what the school is about in ways others can't. His experiences enable him to see things from a range of perspectives and connect to various audiences, whether it's a group of parents, or the board, or the Ministry, or ERO. When ERO comes to visit, Sam has to come; he's a treasure and the ERO reviewers are in awe of him. He challenges their thinking about education but does it in a way that doesn't make them feel uncomfortable. One Māori reviewer said he could sit at Sam's feet all day and listen. Another former Ministry adviser said, "Sam raises issues that I hadn't considered before and has made me rethink the Māori-Pākehā relationship."

Sam encourages people to rethink issues through gentle conversation. He always gives people a way to get themselves out of the corner they have backed themselves into. For Sam, it's always about the other person. He can be riled up by somebody but he talks in ways that allow the other person to recover from putting their foot into something. He will always offer a way to make them feel better. In Māori terms that is *whakamana* – to rebuild their mana.

Always with Sam, and he says it over and over, "What you focus on becomes your reality." If you focus on the negatives, that is what you will get. If you focus on the positives, you will get more of that. He would say that in everyone's past something worked and it might be a long, long way back.

***What qualities do you recognise in Matua Sam that you consider may account for his appreciation of others?***

His wisdom, his intelligence, his empathy, and all of the words that go with them. He is such a genuine, authentic person. I can always rely on Sam to understand what I sometimes fail to say.

Sam has experience that comes with having walked the walk; it's not simply his age, he has earned respect through his work. When I introduce him, I describe him as our wise kaumātua who is such a supporter of what we do. I use the word *wise* because it embodies all his intelligence whereas the word *kaumātua* reinforces his cultural understanding and his humanity. Sam has a depth of cultural knowledge and an absolute conviction that he knows who he is, he knows himself.

I recall an awkward situation and my needing to know that it didn't make any difference to the mutual respect and reciprocity in our relationship. Sam went out of his way to reassure me and keep me informed. "You didn't have to do that," I thought. The way he reached out to me in that situation told me he values our relationship highly and I can always trust that he will do the right thing as far he can. He's community through and through, which means it's never about Sam. It's always about everyone else: whānau, doing good for other people, often to his detriment, health-wise and so on. You know he will always be there.

***When I asked Sam how he had sustained his commitment over so many years to people (individuals and communities) whom some in society would rather banish, he said, "I trust what God is doing in the Other." "But Matua," I replied, "Sometimes when you witness certain behaviour you could be forgiven for thinking that God was on holiday!" He laughed. "I trust anyway," he said. His stories remind me to be kind, forgiving and open-minded.***

That's right, but without the God bit! And that's another good thing about my relationship with Sam – he knows that I'm not a believer and that I don't share his faith-based approach, and that's fine.

He doesn't talk religion to me and probably does to you, and that's cool too. I don't talk about my beliefs to him, either. I understand and respect where he's coming from and

I think he does the same with me. It's not that we avoid the subject; we talk philosophy and all sorts of ethics, and we each bring our own beliefs to those conversations.

I've never disagreed with Sam, nor him with me. We work out what we each think, and that's okay. I often have conversations with him about critical pedagogy and he's right there. Sam is not only a genial lovely person, he is also highly critical in his thinking, particularly in relation to the strength and struggles of Māori and what is needed to overcome those challenges.

I remember a standoff with the Ministry over the architectural design of the school. The Ministry wanted us to build the Taj Mahal of technology blocks like everyone else, but we wanted multi-purpose, flexible spaces. Ministry officials came to visit us. "What about this and what about that?" the senior representative argued. "And what about what we want?" I argued back, while Sam stood there. When we reached a standoff, Sam quietly intervened. "I've got this mate who is an Aboriginal fella in the outback of Australia," he said. "I asked him one day, "How do you keep cattle contained in cattle stations in the outback?" He looked at me and he said, "We sink wells and the cows come to the water" [laughs]. What Ann is trying to tell you is that we want technology wells." At that point the Ministry guy relented.

I love the way Sam sits and listens. At the very end of a discussion, after everyone has been talking for hours, he will come up with a succinct summary of the whole issue, usually a story that says everything you tried to say. Sam has all these fabulous stories and I think he makes up 90% of them! [laughs]. They're always so good and so perfect for the situation, and clever.

***Does your relationship with Sam create a sense of possibility or give you heart for Māori–Pākehā relations in our country?***

My relationship with Sam could perhaps be considered as an example for what Māori–Pākehā relations in our country can be but it doesn't give me heart that we are any closer to achieving the possibilities for those relations. I don't know if the fact that *Sam is Māori* and *I am Pākehā* features hugely in our thinking. I recognise and respect his Māori knowledge, which is huge, but I also value him as a person, and vice versa, I think. We each know who we are and we each have an understanding of the depth of our own culture and our own identity. We don't have anything to prove to each other because we know each other really well, so it's a comfortable relationship built on trust.

*What have you learnt from your relationship with him?*

To listen. Sometimes we listen with our ears but not our hearts. As someone who is Pākehā I am always in the borderlands and often off-side with my Pākehā counterparts because I say things that make them feel uncomfortable. At the same time, I am not Māori and I don't pretend to be Māori, so I am in this in-between space and always very careful of my position. I would never assume that I could speak for Māori. I feel that I am in that space by invitation. I absolutely trust that if I ventured out of that place and put my foot wrong, then I would expect Sam (or my children) to tell me. I would expect him to be honest with me and I feel I can be honest with him. I recall a situation when I said: "Sam you messed that up. You need to do this or that, and do it now. And be more stroppy!" Those moments have been a good test of our relationship. My willingness to be honest with Sam in the difficult times, also gives him an opportunity to do the same.

So, it's that kind of a relationship. We are very good friends who have each other's backs and are allies. Often over the years, we have worked together to challenge an issue or to achieve a goal, against barriers and the odds, so my idea of how Sam and I work is in solidarity, in the struggle, for what works for our young people. Although Sam has returned home to Tūrangi to live, I never feel that he's moved on. I know if I pick up the phone and say, "We need help" or "I need help," he'll be right there. And I would always respond if Sam asked me to do something. Always.

## **Second Conversation: Sam Considers His Own Early Life Influences**

*I arrived late to Sam's home, feeling flustered. He greeted me with a big grin, a cup of tea and biscuits. When I asked him about early influences that shaped the man he has become and the life he has come to live, his stories of his father reminded me of the person who had greeted me at the door that morning.*

Just after I was born, as my Dad held me in his arms, he said to my Mum, "This one belongs to God." I was number nine of 10 children. The others before me were committed to God and connected to Christianity through an Anglican or Presbyterian ritual that gave them a sense of belonging. But when it came to me, my Dad said to my Mum, "No-one will have him; he belongs to God." My father named me Haami after an uncle of his on his Māori side, who was a priest of the ancient order of priesthood, a tohunga. Before I could open my eyes, my Dad was fulfilling the heart and the desire of the Creator for me, which I embraced. He expected my life to become a spiritual journey and when I began to show that sort of interest, he encouraged me.

*What could you tell me about your father than would help me to appreciate your respect for him as well as his influence on your life?*

My Dad was a hardworking man and a provider. Although he didn't have a formal education, his mind was active in an academic and a practical sense. He made sense of the world in which he lived through reading *and* he was a master of his world – a hunter, a man of the elements. He understood nature and could survive in the bush for weeks.

As an adult, his fascination led him to take an electrical engineering course by correspondence. He achieved results in the 90s, but his studies affected his mind, so he chose to walk away. His family was his reason for being; his priority, his value, his worth. We were the reflection of him and his grandchildren were the mokopuna, the reflection that is seen in the waters of the spring.

Some of my proudest moments growing up were bringing friends home to meet my father. I loved it because he had such an impact on them. He was a man of mana; one of those people who stand out when you walk into a room. His words, his wisdom, always created meaningful conversations. If he was expecting you to visit, the kettle would be boiling when you arrived. There would always be something on his table for you to eat; cabin bread biscuits were his favourite and about all he had. He would greet you with a big

smile, especially if he knew that you knew me. If you knew me and it was on my recommendation that you were calling in to say hello, then he would treat you as if you were his daughter because you were family.

My father had a great love for my Mum; she was part of him. My mother not only brought gentleness into their relationship but also fun. She was the cheeky one! Mum was a beautiful woman with a beautiful heart. She loved goodness and kindness and was a member of the Rātana Church.

My strongest memories are of my Dad and my Mum protecting us from values and practices they disagreed with. They kept us away from bars and booze parties so we weren't exposed to the negative impacts of alcohol. My father had experienced that kind of life when he was growing up and as an adult he made a choice to move away from those influences. His life was defined by certain priorities, values and beliefs, and he protected us as much as he could from other influences. My parents' generation were people of responsibility and commitment. They were committed to the concept of whānau and whanaungatanga. They understood that what was of greatest value was the *we*, not only the *me*, and the *me* found its greatest fulfilment in a commitment to the *we*.

***How did your parents respond to the pressure to conform to the ways of te ao Pākehā?***

Both were fluent in te reo Māori and English. They spoke te reo to one another but rarely to their children. Whenever whānau came around they would speak in the reo but with us they spoke in English. They consciously wanted us to learn that language. The Pākehā led them to believe that, for their children to succeed in the new world that was coming, they had to learn the ways of *the white man*. They were told that the white man's ways were of far greater value than our Māori ways. They were prepared to sacrifice their ways because they loved their kids. Doing so, they thought, would be much better for us.

I remember discussions with my Dad later in life during which he expressed a sense of regret that he hadn't encouraged us to learn the reo. We could never blame him for that decision or hold him accountable for it; those decisions were made in their time from the level of understanding that my parents had then. Later on, they would have made a different choice.

When my parents realised the consequences of their choice, they never blamed the Pākehā. There were things about the land and so on that they saw as unjust and unfair, the law for example, but they always looked for the good that had come through the process of

change. I remember my Dad saying to us, “I wouldn’t change the electric light bulb for the old days of having a candle.” He knew the hardship of not having those things. I loved their whole approach because it meant we didn’t grow up angry at the white man. I came to see the huge impact that colonisation had for good and for bad.

***Matua, how did having a speech impediment affect your early life?***

Growing up I couldn’t speak properly. Because of my stuttering, I wouldn’t ask questions, talk or read in class. I was very reserved because I felt shy and embarrassed. Kids teased me. Stuttering undermined my ability to learn te reo Māori at school. I struggled to make the sounds of the letters: the Ps, the Ts, the Ms and so on. I tried hard but the teacher would become frustrated, the kids would become frustrated, and I would feel totally frustrated. I hated it. Although I am an orator, if I was to try intentionally to use those letters now, I would stutter.

I’m 65 and I still long to have the language. I’m conscious that language contains the memory of who you are. I’ve tried to grasp the tikanga of being Māori (by which I mean the values, the beliefs and all of those things that I know instinctively are there in who I am and what I am within my DNA) but my understanding is limited because I don’t have the language. I am still fully Māori in every other way and I’ve learnt that I have the God-given reflection of being Māori.

***What do you mean, “the God-given reflection of being Māori”?***

It’s possible for me to be Māori because I know my whakapapa (origins, genealogy). Both of my parents had Māori and Pākehā heritage. My Dad is Ngāti Porou, but having a name like Chapman meant he had to be something else from somewhere else. His surname was Ihaka or Isaacs, and he came from a whaler. I often joke that my great grandfather mistook a wahine (woman) for a whale and jumped ship! He was a Portuguese whaler, so that was the European side.

Mum’s maiden name was Smallman. Her Pākehā father married into a Māori family. Her whakapapa is from here in Tūrangi on her mother’s side. The tikanga of our hapū is that the women are the kaitiaki of the whenua that sustains our whānau; a responsibility that goes back six generations of women. We returned to Tūrangi to continue this tradition and are guided by the values and beliefs of my parents.

Whakapapa is origin but my origin doesn’t begin with when I was born. The whānau, hapū, iwi I was born into is not the beginning of my origin either. I understand that the

beginning of my origin is Genesis; I am created in the image of God. This knowledge gives me the sense of who I am and my sense of being. These images are reflected in being Māori. I am at ease with who I am.

The experiences of our childhood mould us. I grew up with a strong Māori identity; we were Māori kids and those other kids were Pākehā. My parents accepted their Pākehā heritage but they saw us as Māori. You were Māori simply because of whakapapa.

***Matua Sam, you told me the greatest influence in your life was the conscious awareness of the presence of God that you received from your parents. How was that awareness developed in you?***

My parents developed that awareness by *being*; love, kindness, prayer, faith are all reflections of the Creator. In their worst moments, I saw my parents lean on God, 24/7.

My first revelation was of Io-matua-te-kore (Supreme Being). My next memory is of a picture of Jesus on the wall in the lounge with kids sitting on his knee and the words, “Suffer the little children to come unto me.” Another picture showed Jesus knocking on the door. “Behold I stand at the door and knock, if anyone hears my voice and opens the door I will come in and I will sup with him.” I memorised those verses as a kid and later discovered that that door was the door of my heart and the handle was on the inside. Just as God would never force His way in, I would never proselytise anyone. I share my faith only when asked.

I never went to church growing up, but people of faith came to the house. Sister Quail and Sister Miller brought soup when Dad injured himself and were a big influence on our family. They were wonderful missionaries and sung us little choruses from old hymn books. I’ve never forgotten their practical expressions of kindness and the positive influence of Christian culture.

***And within your family, how was kindness cultivated?***

Ours was a loving, caring family. I constantly experienced and witnessed kindness in my family life. We were surrounded by extended whānau; our cousins lived up the road, and between Tūrangi and Tokaanu. During tough times, when Dad was ill and couldn’t work, we relied on the garden and would hunt rabbits. My older brothers milked the cows, and Mum took a cleaning job and did laundry. We had enough money to pay for essentials like flour and bread, so together we functioned as a family and cared for one another. As a consequence, we had a great childhood. My earliest memories of the mystery of learning

come from the creativity and imagination we exercised all around our home, exploring our natural environment and being together. When we played sports, we were the team and the opposition! We were there for each other.

### *Other significant influences?*

Going to Christian youth camps and playing the guitar in Christian bands strengthened a sense of identity and belonging that encouraged my self-confidence. As an adult, I attended world Christian gatherings and participated in Indigenous conferences, where I met people who hungered to be authentically themselves; to speak the language of their culture and be Christian. I gradually realised it was possible to be both.

Diverse individuals and communities had a profound impact on me. I think of the honour I experienced in getting close to Roy Dunn, President of the Mongrel Mob Notorious Chapter, and getting to know the guys – sharing their breath, their tears, their joy, over many years. I'll always remember sitting around a campfire on many a cold night with a bunch of old Māori men who, during the day, were farm hands and freezing workers. As we feasted on the leftover remains of sheep guts, we watched the fog come across the Waikato River and marvelled at God's presence.

### *And your life with Thelma and the work you do?*

My 44-year relationship with Thelma has been a journey of two unique people groups coming together – Māori and Pākehā. We were told not to marry because a cross-cultural relationship wouldn't work. Our love for each other refused to accept that assumption. We envisaged what our future together could look like and chose to go against the grain.

We were a young married couple with a baby, living in a nice little house in Wainuiōmata. We bought a section, had house plans drawn up and were going to become Mr and Mrs Utopia. Then, God knocked on our door and in walked Ike Samuels, who became our Elijah. He invited us to join him in his work. We felt a deep sense of being called as a couple: *Come sit with me; come see what I see, come feel what I feel, hear what I hear, allow your heart to break with the things that break my heart.* We put aside our plans, sold our section, packed up our things, and moved into a caravan in Cannon's Creek. Ike modelled a way of living for us and we wanted to be like him.

Ever since, we have opened our home to the most marginalised and alienated communities in our country, inviting them to come and sit for a while, to share the journey together, and to go away knowing that there was a place they could call home and belong.

Over 500 people visited our home last year and they came from all over. Over the years, we've been so blessed in so many ways that I now think the kind of life we're living was meant to be the norm, not the exception.

### **Third Conversation: Sam Considers Possibilities in Māori–Pākehā Relations**

*I asked Matua Sam if he would talk about what kindness means to him and what he's learnt about how to become kind as a quality of relation?*

We've lost the meaning of kindness. We've exchanged kindness for performance. We perform, we try to impress, we try to be assertive in presenting our agendas. But kindness isn't like that. Kindness is standing with people who have, for whatever reason, been robbed of their dignity. We stand with them and honour the dignity that is there. That's kindness.

In the story of the prodigal son, the context is fascinating. A young Jewish man demands his inheritance from his father. By making that demand, in that culture, the son was effectively saying to his father that as far as I am concerned, you are dead. He takes his inheritance, and goes off and lives the high life, and blows it all. He ends up in a pigsty, eating and smelling like pigs. The son realises that even the servants are living in far greater comfort than he is and he thinks maybe his father would allow him to work as a servant. He heads home and when he arrives, he sees an old man waiting. The old man runs towards him and he realises that it's his father. What fascinates me is that the father never saw a prodigal, nor did he wait for a prodigal to return. The father only ever saw a son and waited for a son. This story reminds me that kindness is the expression of honouring who we really are, not what life might have made or dictated for us.

Kindness sees past human judgements of failure and ugliness, which is often the way society judges people, and expresses itself in different ways. Generosity is a reflection of kindness; so is acceptance and respect – the intangible things. How can people know what kindness is like, if it's not part of their experience? We journey with families who have no idea what kindness looks like. From a Māori and a Christian point of view, kindness and generosity are akin to one another; they are both reflections of what love looks like. Love is wanting what is good and right for the Other, not demanding your own way. Kindness and generosity come from that source. But we only know it in part, so we only see reflections in part. Kindness to me is a bit like grace, that undeserved favour. In our work, we're not waiting for someone to come up to what we think they should be. They simply become a recipient of our kindness and we become the beneficiaries of theirs.

You're attracted to kindness when you see it. Why? Because it's beautiful. Kindness is in our DNA; you recognise it when you see it but the mystery is this: How can I be kind? How can I be generous?

***We've talked before about the philosopher Levinas who suggests that in exercising ethical obligations we are called to radical generosity. He also emphasises small acts of goodness. Could you tell me a story of a small act of goodness, of kindness, that would help me to appreciate a bit more, your understanding of radical generosity?***

One day some Mongrel Mob whānau were at our home and Thelma's Irish mum came over with a bunch of flowers. "Hi Ma," everyone said, when they greeted her. Thelma's Mum saw Mere (not her real name), the wife of the Mob chapter president, and offered her the flowers. Looking surprised and slightly embarrassed Mere said, "No-one has ever given me flowers before." "That's fine, love," said Thelma's Mum, in a broad Irish accent. Now and again I heard Mere say to the other women sitting near her, "No-one has given me flowers before." The next day I went to visit the chapter president and his wife, and on the table, near where Mere was sitting, were the flowers in a tin mug. Her big smile reminded me of her comments the day before.

This story is an example of radical generosity becoming normal. Radical because two most unlikely worlds encountered one another and exchanged kindness. In a society alienated by prejudice and offences of history, over time a mobster's wife and an old Irish woman had come together, shared their lives, enjoyed kai (food) and rediscovered kinship, where shared respect, kindness and generosity could meet.

Giving the flowers was an act of kindness *and* receiving them was also an expression of kindness. Mere's acceptance of the flowers was an acknowledging and valuing of this old white woman. "I can receive from you, because today I see you – a beautiful old Irish woman, and not my enemy." Thelma's Mum didn't intend to impress, to persuade, to convert, or do anything other than be hospitable and generous through her kindness as a way to acknowledge Mere's dignity. It was an encounter that restored the memory of what God intended her to be; that she could be a recipient of *that* gift, that she could be a recipient of *a* gift. There are times when we have an encounter with someone or something, and we realise just how wonderful it is to be human; it was one of those moments. I was reminded that that encounter is how relationships are meant to be – *an exchange*.

***Matua, witnessing this exchange, what did you feel in your heart?***

Joy and a deep sense of pleasure. I felt a deep sense of being part of something that was meant to be; a sense that this is what a relational exchange is meant to look like. If reporters

had been there, they would have recorded all the ugly things, but in that moment, all of creation witnessed the beauty. I smiled, I think.

When I see those expressions of radical generosity and kindness, and I'm privy to that kind of exchange, and become part of it, that's what I feel – a sense that this is what life in all its fullness was meant to be, beautiful. I can enjoy those moments of exchange because they are beautiful and they challenge the negative assumptions of who the Other is. I see beauty because I look for beauty.

It was a moment of being together and, as I see it, all of our history comes together again in that moment. The depth of meaning wasn't that Thelma's Mum was the first person ever to give Mere flowers – of course that was important, but what was more important was the giving and the receiving – an exchange that makes you feel good. Those things, you feel; I don't think you can reason them.

Those possibilities happen every day and we often fail to see or acknowledge them. But they are blessings that come to us every day and I think God has brought us to those moments in which there are possibilities for relational encounter and exchange. Unless we intentionally stop and take stock, we will fail to see them.

***Matua, how do we orient ourselves to become more aware of and open to those everyday blessings you point to?***

We can begin to orient ourselves in our relations with the Other by cultivating the recognition that oneness is not sameness. Unity is not uniformity. There is a beauty in the diversity of who we are and it is manifested when we make a choice to come and sit together and begin to learn from one another. I love Mother Teresa's statement, "We have forgotten that we belong to each other." But we don't have to be the same to belong.

What does belonging mean if it's not sameness? In a Māori context it's talking about whakapapa, which as I explained before, is not just genealogy but also the source we share in common. Over time our common origin has continued to express itself in diversity, but we belong to each other because of that common whakapapa. The further we wander away from that idea, the further we entrench ourselves in our own self-centredness and the more we push other people to the margins and say "Let's all love each other from a distance."

My own orientation comes out of my understanding of my relationship with God and a belief that we have to trust what God is doing in the other person's life, long before I got here. People ask, "How do you work with the gangs, knowing how ugly the scenes have been?" I don't close my eyes to those realities but I believe that God is far greater than all

those things. I may not know it or see it or understand it, or even appreciate it, but I believe God is already here. That's a wonderful place to be because you don't determine how you will respond to the Other simply because of their performance, their actions, their attitudes.

*How do we begin to see the Other as they are and learn from them?*

In the communities in which I work, and in Māori–Pākehā relations, it's crucial that we facilitate the kind of environment where all those who participate are both teachers and learners. When I sit with someone, I may have information or knowledge or expertise or whatever that they may need, but they also have things to share that I need. When I allow them to contribute what they know, it enhances what I know. I become the learner. That is an honour and a humbling experience; it removes any expectation of my trying to be the expert because I'm not. Instead I'm challenged to be the servant, both the teacher and the learner.

The process begins with honouring who they are and what they know as a way to draw out the beauty within. That's why I use the word *awhi* a lot. *Awhi* seeks to nurture, to care for, but more than that, *awhi* is the environment that provides the opportunity to respond to what is in the DNA, love and kindness. As a practice of relational justice, *awhi* requires us to cultivate a conscious continuous awareness that we're always there by invitation. Our stance must be very intentional and certainly with humility so that we do not overstep our role or impose ourselves on the Other. I've been in situations where information was poured all over people. To me, that's an abuse. I might be lucky to absorb 5%. I would rather sit with a person and share the 5% they can handle, knowing that's enough for that moment in time.

Often, the *aha moments* are to do with emotion; they're not just a mental assent to something. Experiences from the past can become *aha moments* when recalled in the present or people drag emotions from the past that disrupt opportunities for a relational encounter leading to an exchange.

*Could you tell me a story that shows how emotions work to disrupt a productive relational exchange?*

When we moved home to Tūrangi, we settled into an old hospital building, on land that had belonged to my grandmother. Slowly, over time, the gang communities we had engaged with in Auckland came to visit us. We began to host them at home as part of our family. After a while the chair of the local community board phoned. He said some of the

townspeople wanted to meet with us to discuss the presence of gang members in the local community. “That’s interesting,” I thought, “because gang members have been here for decades.”

Some gang folks were visiting from Auckland, so I invited them to come with us to the meeting. When we got there, a member of our iwi approached me. “Uncle, do you know why we’re having this meeting?” he said. “We’re here to have a conversation, I guess.” “No,” he said. “We want you to move your programme out of town.” “Well, we’re going to have an interesting conversation then,” I replied [laughs].

We met for around 90 minutes. Ten of us met with around 15 members of the local community including local community board members, the police, probation officers, some members of the local iwi, local Māori, and service providers. The police spoke first. “In the last 9 months, we’ve had a 30% increase in crime,” one said, then he explained the statistics. A probation officer said, “It’s added all this extra load on probation with these guys coming into town.” Other officials and the townspeople also spoke. “We feel intimidated by their presence, walking up town with their patches on, going in to the shops.” Another person expressed fear, anger and a loss of control. They all had a reason why the members of the gang communities shouldn’t be around. The townspeople gave us a clear message: This is *our* town and we want *them* to leave. Everyone assumed that Māori gang members from out-of-town were responsible for the recent crime wave.

Sometimes your mind plays tricks in a situation like that. I kept thinking of the old 1960s song, Harper Valley PTA, about the girl who gets called up in front of the school board and they criticise her for all this stuff. It was funny thinking about it in the midst of the meeting and I wanted to laugh at myself. I couldn’t get the song out of my mind! [laughs]. That scene was playing out in front of my eyes; our guys were being blamed for everything.

***Would you describe this encounter as an emotional collision? If so, how did you respond productively rather than fuel an explosion?***

It was a huge emotional collision. They dragged all their emotions from the past into that moment. We could have told them where to go and what to do. “Stuff you,” we could have said to them, “We’ll do what we want.” Instead we listened to their cares and concerns – the good, the bad and the ugly.

Three gang members told the story of their 20-year journey of transformation with us. They didn’t judge the townspeople, instead they acknowledged their concerns and said they

understood their anxieties. They also talked about what they/we were doing to support the transformation of our communities.

I responded in different ways. I spoke as a parent. “When our children were growing up I discovered this wonderful truth: You can’t isolate your kids from external influences but you can insulate them. If my kid was climbing the fence to go off and fool around, the answer was not to build a higher fence but to create a place at home that he preferred to what was over the other side of the fence.” I questioned the prevailing assumption about who was responsible for the crime. “I find the increase in crime interesting because 9 months ago we weren’t here and our programme wasn’t operating.” I gave information. “This is who we are and this is our kaupapa. Most of the guys come to us from prison; they’re finishing their sentences and we offer them a home to come home to and an experience of being part of our whānau.” I affirmed their sense of responsibility to themselves and to the community. I said to the police, “Do your job; if they break the law, arrest them.” I said to the probation officer, “If they break the expectations imposed on them by the Courts, send them back to jail.” I also invited them to participate with us. “Come any time, meet with us and the guys, and have lunch with us. You’re welcome any time.”

***How did your response bring people into a sense of belonging? Did you, for example, affirm their freedom to act as well as your own?***

Yes, absolutely, we affirmed their freedom to act, always. And ours, always. In encouraging them to do their jobs, we affirmed them and restored to them their role.

What is crucial is *how* you respond to an emotional collision like this. It was a challenging experience. My job was not to try to persuade the officials or counter their arguments, or convince the townspeople, or justify what we were doing. I was there to join God in what He was doing. I was saying, “Speak to us and show us what’s in your heart, *and* allow us to respond in a way that acknowledges their [the gang members] right to be who they are.”

Instead of focusing on the conflict, we drew attention to what I call the envisaged future. “What would the relationship look like if that conflict wasn’t there anymore?” In response to a concern about intimidation, I said that gang members are legally entitled to walk around town wearing their patches. I acknowledged that for some the patches are a symbol of ugliness, violence and abuse but for the gang members they are a symbol of

belonging. I suggested another approach, “If you want the ugliness, violence and abuse to go away, then give them an alternative: a place of belonging.”

We created space for gang members to speak for themselves. They had the most to share about what a different future could look like and how to get there. They articulated values they had learnt on their journey with our family over many years. What kind of values? Hopefully values that express and reflect a love for God or how God loves. But, certainly, values that the officials and the townspeople could relate to, such as respect, understanding and concern for others. Instead of trying to justify our presence in the town, my message was this: “Do your job and let me do mine, so I can fulfil our kaupapa. The longing in my heart is that these men will come home and find a place to belong. You can’t put conditions on people as to what they need to become before they can come home. They come home just the way they are and however they arrive we welcome them into our hearts and our home.”

***How did they respond? Did you notice a change in their stance?***

We noticed a change. I don’t know if they became more open but our response to their concerns silenced their argument and hopefully we left them with a lot to think about. The policeman was furious when he discovered the guys hadn’t been there 9 months before! The following week a newspaper article reported that a local Pākehā man was arrested for the burglaries (not that his ethnicity should matter) and the arrest happened while we were in that meeting! We also encountered concerns from the hapū and that was probably the most hurtful.

It took me two weeks to work through the emotion of it all: the sadness, the anger, the hurt. Those things I had to try to handle in myself and not allow the emotion to bleed all over everybody. I turned to, and leaned on, what I know to be true: the knowledge I have about how the spirit of God works; the scriptures, the history, the story, so that what I know works could come to the fore, rather than some momentary emotional response out of anger or frustration or fear or whatever. And to crucify that momentary response, I had to die to those emotions, and it took me two weeks to die.

***What do you mean, “die to those emotions”?***

Those emotions are governed by my own sense of self-preservation and self-centredness; my own interest in justifying myself and what I am doing. We say to ourselves, “They are

wrong. I have every right to do this because I am doing the just thing, the right thing, the loving thing.” That self-justification is what has to die and it took time for that to happen.

As kids we loved playing cowboys. We had an imaginary shootout in a bar between the goodies and the baddies. The outlaw comes into the bar, looking for one of the goodies. Everyone scatters. They face each other and draw their guns. The outlaw gets shot. He grabs himself, stumbles across to the bar, knocks over the table and the chairs, makes his way out the bat-wing doors, trips over the dog, tries to grab his horse, hauls himself onto his saddle, the horse starts to move up the street, he slumps over and finally falls off the horse, dead – and on the way, he bleeds all over the place. Over those two weeks as I made my way through life I stumbled over to the bar, knocked over the tables and chairs, tripped over the dog and bled all over the horse and my family too. It happens every time.

So, the key to any difficult verbal exchange is to die and do it quickly, because you can’t offend a corpse! [laughs]. I love that line! In our circles, I say to the guys, “You fellas have been on a marae, eh, when there’s been a mate (death) and the tūpāpaku (the deceased person) is lying on the marae? Family and friends speak to the tūpāpaku. They recall stories about the person that are hilariously funny and mischievous, or that others didn’t know. But there’s no expectation that the person lying in the box is going to respond because if he did, they might all flee!” [laughs]. If I die quickly, then whatever anyone says (whether it’s harsh words, judgemental assumptions, negative stereotypes, offensive comments) won’t affect me. I experience what humility could look like; humility is the fruit of that choice. I say to God, “This is yours.” This kind of relational approach is counter-cultural; instead of trying to win all the time, I am willing to lose, willing to sacrifice, willing to die. It’s a powerful thing.

### ***How do you sustain this kind of relational approach?***

I am at peace with who I am. I don’t have to justify anything. Instead I say, “This is who I am and this what I am doing.” I think we are what we are; my sense of being, my sense of serving, comes from being loved for who I am and from knowing how much God loves me. Just as St Paul said, “The love of God compels me,” so it is with Thelma, I am driven and sustained by her love for me. She expresses her love for me in her role as a wife, as a mother, as a partner, as a lover, as a co-worker, as a friend. I think that’s how the world goes around and somehow in response we may love a little in return.

In the milieu of everyday life, its blessings and its challenges, Thelma and I constantly remind ourselves of what we’re discovering individually and collectively. Sometimes

Thelma shares thoughts from poetry, theology or scripture and we mediate as a family. You could call it a spiritual practice but it's not a formal, official, every Monday night we do this, sort of thing. When we're in those long dark nights and days, our meditations give us the assurance that God is holding us in the palm of His hand. At the end of the day it just helps us to know how loved we are. Our hope is that little by little we can become what we were designed and created to be. With each new day, we simply try to move in that direction.



## Chapter 10: Dr Ann Milne

### Prologue

*Dr Ann Milne, known as Whaea Ann or Nanny Ann, is a Pākehā educator, writer, researcher and consultant. She is also a mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother of Māori children. The school experiences of her children highlighted educational inequities that led her to question her own classroom pedagogy. She became a critic of deficit-driven explanations of achievement gaps and Māori and Pasifika under-achievement.*

*Ann's 33-year relationship with Kia Aroha College, a designated-character secondary school, included 22-years as principal. The College is located in the predominantly Māori and Pacific Island community of Ōtara, Auckland. Ann's leadership activated whānau and community engagement and cultivated culturally responsive, critical, social justice pedagogies. She advocated for flexible and architecturally designed learning spaces marked by the beauty of the cultural groups who use them. Their languages appear on signs everywhere.*

*After four decades in the teaching profession, Ann took sabbatical leave. She wrote a book entitled: *Coloring in the White Spaces: Reclaiming Cultural Identity in Whitestream Schools* (2016), based on her doctoral research and a lifetime of educational leadership. In 2016 she retired from her role as principal to focus on educational consulting, research and writing.*

*Her college farewell was a huge community celebration and culturally rousing affair with deeply moving tributes from past and present pupils, community and academic leaders, and teaching colleagues. This special event powerfully demonstrated how much Ann is loved and respected at the school and in the community. "She's created a legend and she is one," says Keu Iorangi, a past pupil (Hancock, 2015, p. 162).*

*In 2015 Ann received the New Zealand Principals' Federation's prestigious "Service with Distinction" Award, which recognises "outstanding service to education in Aotearoa–New Zealand." Ann is also the recipient of several national research awards and scholarships.*

## **First Conversation: Sam Chapman Considers Ann's Qualities and Their Relationship**

*I began by asking Matua Sam about Ann's relational qualities. What was it about who she is and how she conducts herself that had enabled them to work so well together over the years?*

When I first met Ann, I recognised her passion for education and her anger at injustice. I think there was a mutual recognition, not just mutual respect, but a recognition of our need for one another, and I hope that can be communicated in a right way. I valued her insights and her ability to speak into a context, and hopefully that was mutual. We needed Ann's insights and abilities in our community because the challenges we were up against were huge. You don't have all the answers. You need the Other who is able to see a different perspective. I am not an institutional person, so for me understanding how the institution worked was challenging; that's what I valued about working alongside Ann – she understood these things. Her ability to name her experience sharpened your own approach.

Ann is a strong and determined woman, a very capable and courageous leader, especially when dealing with difficult situations. She is driven by a set of values and beliefs and when she sees those commitments compromised and devalued, she feels outraged. When you see the Ann of outrage in action, you see a woman prepared to stand alongside and with her community. Ann doesn't put up with fools, nor does she pussyfoot around. These qualities make her attractive as a colleague because, in the context of working in community, you need that kind of leadership, that kind of calibre, that kind of colleague. Her qualities drew me to the privilege and honour of journeying with her.

There are not too many people you can talk to and journey with at that level. By that I mean, Ann has an understanding of the importance of relationship and she expresses her understanding in her own unique way. You didn't have to be forever trying to explain yourself and that was a relief. Often you sit with people and half the time you're wondering if you should be having this conversation. With Ann, you knew you were sitting with someone who had journeyed in your world. That was very attractive to me because of my faith and my theology. I saw reflections of the intentions of God's heart, of a God who joins us in our humanness and not because we're a problem to be fixed. When I see someone take on my humanness in my cultural context, someone choosing to come and sit with us, that's huge for me because it expresses the meaning of whanaungatanga. Ann was strong on that.

*Matua Sam, could you help me to appreciate a little bit of your understanding of whanaungatanga and how Ann was able to demonstrate to you her commitment to relational justice through whanaungatanga?*

Whakawhanaungatanga, kinship, is belonging to a circle of compassion where nobody stands outside. It is a compassion that stands in awe at what these people have had to carry, rather than stands in judgement at how they carry it. Over the years, I've learnt that the measure of compassion lies not in service of those on the margins but in our willingness to see ourselves in whanaungatanga with them. Ann demonstrates this kind of whanaungatanga.

Aroha is an element of whanaungatanga. We loosely translate aroha as love but that is an English way of thinking. For Māori, aroha is the coming together of two words: *aro*, meaning to face, to turn towards, to pay attention, and *ha* which means the essence or the breath of a person. Aroha is about turning towards and recognising the essence of the Other. I choose to turn toward, to recognise and to honour the essence of you as a person – that is the meaning of aroha. Similarly, manaakitangi is commonly defined in English as hospitality but Māori understand this element of whanaungatanga as giving mana to the Other, that is, honouring and upholding the mana of the Other. Awhi is often translated as nurturing but we think of awhi as creating an environment in which people can express themselves and grow.

As an expression of relational justice, I think whanaungatanga has been Ann's life-work. Ann chose to stand in this place – the margins of society, especially in a community like Ōtara, and especially in regard to education for our Māori and Pacific Island kids. She chose to stand with kids whose dignity has been denied and whose burdens are more than they can bare. She chose to stand with kids who have become demonised by society and she chose to stand long enough until the demonising stops. She chose to stand with kids who are deemed disposable, believing that the day will come when society will stop throwing them away to a life spent in the refuse tips of our prisons.

Ann also understood in a Māori world view that whanaungatanga was what we, as Māori, were on about. She embraced the challenge to create an environment of whanaungatanga that would allow the community and the kids she cared about to have an exposure and experience of aroha, of awhi, of manaaki, not in theory but in the presence

and practice of those values. I honour Ann for her stand, for her courage and for her sacrifice. In her we truly see reflections of a just presence.

***Matua, could you tell me a story that would show me how Ann acts to restore whanaungatanga?***

On many occasions, Ann has advocated on behalf of others. Particularly when she came up against the Ministry and challenged its officials over what was best for our kids. She fought many long and hard battles over the years.

During a recent event, huge pressure and demands were placed on Ann at the last minute due to a group making assumptions and taking liberties regarding the use of the kura (school) way beyond her expectations. Tensions were high and responses were emotional. As chair of the organisation responsible for these tensions, I apologised deeply for the situation in which Ann found herself. I instructed the group to put it right; to honour Ann no matter what the cost. Not only did Ann have the courage to stand her ground as an advocate for her staff, and the kura and all that it stood for, but at a hastily called meeting on the Monday prior to the event which was scheduled for Thursday, she had the grace to help create and accept a peaceful resolution. My view was that we had nothing to celebrate on the Thursday if we could not honour and care for each other earlier in the week. The event turned out wonderfully well thanks to Ann's courage and grace.

One meaning of grace, as in the grace of God, is undeserved favour. For me God's grace is a reflection of a loving heart towards those who are loved, just the way they are, not because they earned it or deserved it. In this story, Ann reflected elements of that undeserved favour in her relationship with the group and the kura. The feeling of grace was one of relief and of gratitude; by exercising grace Ann's presence and actions compelled others to respond in a like manner which, in turn, created the conditions for peace.

***What does this story suggest to you about the work you were able to do together over time, and in and through that work the kind of practitioner Ann has become?***

Over time you see and appreciate and value the craftsmanship of the work we did together. Ann is a craftsperson; she would never give up until the work was done and done well. We did a lot of work together while waiting for the evidence of hope, and it was good work. The craftsperson is always waiting, always preparing, always crafting. They don't focus on fixing a problem, instead they are aware of a future they want to attain.

I love the word *wait*. I associate this word with a scripture passage from Isaiah: “But they that wait upon the Lord, shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint”. It comes from a cultural context of mending fishing nets. If you visited someone and they were outside mending their fishing nets, the people would say, “He’s out the back waiting.” Waiting is preparing for the catch that you know is out there but you have to be prepared for it; you need the right gear, the right equipment, and they must be functional. You can’t just sit around with your fingers crossed and holes in your nets hoping you can still catch fish when the weather becomes favourable for fishing. A lot of work goes on in the waiting. The word *wait*, here, points to Ann’s craftsmanship, her willingness to wait and her enduring commitment to the kura.

What I appreciate most about Ann’s willingness to wait is that she gave it time. Ann shows us the consequence of time in her commitment to the kura *and* in the fruit of that commitment. Over time she produced insight, wisdom, commitment and the capacity to stand with the community. I constantly experienced a sense of newness, a sense of surprise, while journeying alongside her. I learnt that if we leave ourselves open to the relationship and welcome it, as Ann did, instead of fighting it, we can learn from it. Part of Ann’s scrap with the Ministry was because the system and those in it were unwilling to embrace another way of learning. Ann had designed and created an alternative approach to educating Māori and Pacific students but she was up against a paradigm that said there was only one way to do it. Being open and willing to engage with the Other, and learn from them, enables alternatives to show themselves.

Ann is a warrior, and I think, driven by her heart. She has a heart of passion, of compassion, of empathy for a community reflected in her upbringing and her own children, and she stood up for that, she is that kind of warrior. She is a woman who got on and did the job, and did it well, because it was the right thing to do. The school, the kura, is a reflection of her.

***How would you describe your relationship with Ann? And does your relationship with her give you hope for Māori–Pākehā relations and if so, how?***

Ann and I are colleagues; there was always a respect with Ann. I would have loved to have known her socially; to sit around, have a meal together and share stories. We never had that privilege outside of the work context. We lived in two different worlds and our encounters

only allowed for a professional relationship, and that was okay. But because of the calibre of who she is, Ann created a hope that was very meaningful and that enabled us to journey together professionally and to influence our community. A belief in God was not a criterion for our relationship but I appreciated knowing that I could join her with my faith. We were both comfortable with our acceptance of the Other and we never abused or violated that kind of commitment. As I said before, we recognised each other; neither us had all the answers and we needed each other to carry out the work in front us. Ann's faith in her ability and her belief in the work of justice was just as real as mine.

I hold the view that God's intentions for relationship, including the Māori-Pākehā relations, already exist. We have yet to discover what these intentions are *and* there is still so much to discover. We have to create an environment in which the things people were designed and created for can begin to show and people can discover for themselves what healing can look like – and not try to fix people. Ann never tried to fix anyone; instead her presence and actions brought hope and healing.

## **Second Conversation: Ann Reflects on Her Own Early Influences**

*We met at Ann's home and I asked her about early influences that contributed to her lifetime of engagement with Māori and her work for justice in the field of education.*

I grew up in a small coastal Northland Māori community. My father owned the bus that went from our beach community into Whāngarei each day, and he was the bus driver. We were poor and the bus was the only vehicle we had. His job was not a position of authority or importance in the community.

I went to a sole charge primary school with never more than 16 kids and a series of awful teachers, and one or two who inspired me. All my friends were Māori and I experienced a real sense of enjoyment in these relationships. They were also the only kids in school but I felt a real sense of belonging. We were one of the very few Pākehā families living in the area and considered part of the community. My parents never separated us from the Māori community in which we lived or their families. We went to stay at our friends' houses and hung out, learning things together. I learnt to play the guitar and led the kapa haka group in primary school. I went to secondary school some distance away with other kids in our area and the rural bus timetable meant we missed an hour of class every day and could never participate in after-school activities.

I never questioned our Pākehā privilege but, with hindsight, I was aware of it. We were invited to everything in the community but when we got there, we found ourselves sitting at the top table or served first and we felt important because we were the Pākehā family. It wasn't until years later that I thought about our sense of importance, and the privilege that was assigned to us and that we accepted as ours and as the norm, when there was no reason for it other than our being Pākehā.

I became interested in being a teacher when I found myself teaching the school in Form Two (now called Year 8). Our teacher was often drunk, so I stepped in. My parents didn't want me to be a teacher; my father called teachers "educated idiots," based on his experience of a succession of teachers who lived next door. But I was determined to leave home and become a teacher. I had been in this tiny community since I was five and all my experiences were in that community.

I was 16 when I went to Auckland to take up teacher training. I was the oldest child in my family and the only one who went to university. I gravitated to the Māori students and became involved in the kapa haka groups. During my teacher training, no-one ever challenged me to think about inequity or injustice; that conscientisation happened two

decades later. Later as a teacher, I always had all the Māori kids in my class and got along well with them. I never thought anything of all this until my own kids, who are also Māori, went to high school.

Neither of my parents went to school beyond 12 years of age. My parents had a tough time and could also be quite racist in their attitudes; they were people of their time, absolutely. I have always had a strong sense of fairness and integrity, and a willingness to work hard, and I learnt those values from them. The rest of the family – my sister and brothers – also developed that sense of integrity but didn't have the same feelings I had about things not being fair or being inequitable. We all took different pathways. My siblings think I'm a bit different [laughs], but also honest, stroppy and radical. As we've gotten older we've all become more tolerant. My parents example taught me that nothing is impossible.

My early life experiences, and my choices and experiences since then, have all contributed to my sense of justice, my confidence in the goodness of people and my belief in their right to determine their own journey. But I don't know where the stroppiness comes from! [laughs].

*[Laughs]. Nanny Ann, could you tell me a story that shows what set you on the path of relational justice and directly affected your approach as a teacher?*

My personal wake-up call was the day my oldest daughter came home from school crying because she had been called racist names. She was the only Māori girl in an accelerate class at Manurewa High School and the class was full of white kids. Students called her racist names and the one that will stick with me forever was *no milk* (like *black tea*). I was outraged and went to her school to do battle.

I asked the principal to remove my daughter from that class. I told him that my daughter now hated going to school because of the racist behaviour she was experiencing in class. The principal told me I was a bad parent; withdrawing her would deny her the opportunity of accelerated learning. "I don't care," I said. "I don't want her accelerated, thank you. I want her to be with her mates. I don't want her in a racist environment." The principal didn't like my response and I was constantly doing battle with him. I became a member of the school's Parent Teacher Association and found the same attitudes there.

We had just moved to Auckland. My other two kids were in the school where I was teaching (it was an intermediate school then) and the remaining two were in primary school.

My daughter had won Ngā Manu Kōrero (a secondary schools' Māori speech competition) in the English section in the third form in Whāngarei and had just entered the fourth form in Manurewa High School. We deliberately sought a school that we thought would give her continuity in her Māori language. Back then there was no internet; I rang numerous schools in Auckland asking about their Māori language programmes but the opportunities were almost non-existent. Manurewa High School was one of the few schools that had a programme, but they didn't tell me a Pākehā teacher taught the programme, nor was I told that in a school of 80 or so teachers, there was no Māori teacher.

That standout moment challenged me to begin to reflect on my own role as a teacher. I was a fairly good teacher and had always taught in communities where Māori lived. I always had the so-called *naughty kids* in my class and did a pretty good job of engaging them, or so I thought. I now had to ask myself tough questions: In my class, am I doing any of the things that now outrage me? Are the things I am strongly objecting to in my daughter's class also operating in my classroom practice?' I began to realise there were concerns.

The way I was trained to be a teacher was inherently white and inherently racist. Some of the things I was taught as good practice weren't good practice for Māori kids. The more I thought about it and started to read about it, I decided I needed to do something. "What could I do?" I asked myself. I was never going to influence Manurewa High School; I was a thorn in their side; one of those awful parents forever complaining, and I was never going to be that parent before I had kids. I decided to change what I was doing in my classroom and that decision was the start of the journey for me.

My experience at Manurewa High School was repeated over and over, through my journey with my kids' education. It wasn't that the problems didn't exist in their primary school years in Whāngarei, rather I wasn't as aware of the issues then. As they got older, they were able to articulate what made them feel uncomfortable or what they didn't like. Listening to their stories, I felt a mother's protection, a mother's indignation, a mother wanting her kids to have what everyone else had, and why shouldn't they? Being able to articulate my aspirations for my kids was very important. I often berate myself for not realising sooner the significance of cultural identity.

***How did your critical awareness and understanding develop over time?***

I thought about my daughter's experience more and began to see more in it. I became aware of other examples. I began to ask myself critical questions and answered them as honestly as I could. As I did more learning, I became more brutally honest with myself and threw out certain educational practices.

Before I became the principal of Kia Aroha College, the then principal initiated an awful process that enabled him to choose the dux of the school, as if you needed one, and an awful prize-giving ceremony at the end of the year. He put the kids through their paces; they had to write things about why they deserved this prize, make speeches, go to his office and account for themselves, and so on. "Do I have to?" a Māori girl asked me one day. "I hate that." "No, you don't," I replied, recognising the cultural impropriety of what she was being asked to do. This girl had been brought up by her grandmother, whom I knew well because she had been a strong advocate for starting the Māori bilingual programme in the school. Again, I got hauled into the principal's office and was lectured for being a terrible influence on this girl's life. It was the same experience I had had with my daughter's principal.

I had a conviction that the misuse of power wasn't right – it didn't fit and it wasn't what I wanted for my children, so why would anyone else want this practice being used against their children. As I moved into school leadership I embraced the opportunity to influence a team and do things differently. I became a senior teacher and although I never became a deputy principal, I was doing that role in the school. Later when I became principal I was able to exercise a wider influence. My decision to put myself forward for the principal's role was driven by the community's demand for something different for their kids.

***How did the community express their demand for something different and how was your approach different from your predecessor's?***

When the principal's job became vacant, a large delegation of parents arrived at my house one evening and insisted that I apply for the role. I told them there was no guarantee I would get the job. I didn't want to raise their expectations; the previous year I had applied for the deputy principal role, but was unsuccessful and left the school to lecture at the University of Auckland.

But the parents wouldn't budge. They had aspirations for their kids; they highlighted innovations we had developed together, including a Māori bilingual programme, and they expressed dismay when these initiatives vanished under the current school leadership.

I had to listen to the parents. Although Pākehā, I was also a parent of children who identified, first and foremost, as Māori, and who had encountered both individual and institutional racism in their secondary schooling. I, too, had had to *shop around* for a school that fitted our whānau aspirations for their learning and had found that our education system fell way short. I, too, was *in the struggle* personally. I saw a long road ahead of me, but my relationship with these parents called me to take action.

I applied, got the job and had the worst possible introduction to a principal's role. I held my ground and withstood the challenges. I was determined to listen to the parents and work with them to create a relevant education for their kids. We wanted to grow a commitment to whānau, to whanaungatanga and to whakawhanaungatanga, to create strong reciprocal relationships of trust with/within families and communities that offered mutual benefit. We asked ourselves this question: "What do families want us to do to make us fit in their lives and work for them?" Not vice versa.

When I was a senior teacher, parents had advocated for their kids to stay at the school longer because they couldn't find continuity for them elsewhere. "I don't care what my son does," a parent said, "I would rather have him sitting in the corner of the classroom here, than getting into trouble at the high school." Another parent said their child had been expelled from high school. When I became principal we forced a change of status so the school could keep kids from Year 7 through to Year 10. Ten years later, when parents of Year 10 students came back with the same request, we said, "There's no way the Ministry of Education will let us extend our year levels to senior classes. "They did before," the parents said, quite rightly. So away we went again. We had three major battles with the Ministry and each time we listened to parents and took our lead from them.

As someone who is white, I understood my ethical responsibility was to listen to and learn from whānau, and especially to understand what was integral to the whānau in our school. I've learnt from the people of Ōtara that culture is the knowledge that lives in the community. At school we always put culture first, to enable our students to make sense of their world, their role in it and the importance of it.

*Nanny Ann, what have you learnt from living in two worlds, te ao  
Māori and te ao Pākehā?*

I can see two starkly different perspectives. Sometimes when the two worlds do come together they simply collide. The powerful majority gets its way. What outrages me is the way the two worlds have to operate with completely different expectations. The Māori world has to understand the Pākehā world, but the Pākehā world doesn't have to understand any other world than our own. I see my role as one that pokes holes in our own Pākehā comfort zones. I'm always explicit about being white. It's not for me to say what's good for Māori or Pasifika communities. Those communities hold the autonomy to speak for themselves. As a Pākehā, I understand I am always there at the goodwill of Māori and Pasifika communities.

It's hard for Pākehā to imagine other worlds. We don't know the realities for Māori and Pasifika whānau and we don't have the same stories. We are there for different reasons. Pākehā hold the institutional power and privilege, and the fight we fight is not the same. I am very aware of working in a racist environment and that racism takes many forms. It can be blatant and *in our faces*, or dangerously insidious, like the hegemonic takeover of technology from a white perspective that negates our kids' culture and Indigenous culture. Indigenous knowledge is even more crucial in the 21st century unless we want everyone to become the same. The challenge, as I see it, is how we as Pākehā can become allies in the struggle. *Doing good* for some is merely salving the prickle of conscience. Our Māori and Pasifika communities don't need us to *save* them.

### **Third Conversation: Ann Considers Possibilities in Māori–Pākehā Relations**

*Ann completed her doctorate while working fulltime as a high school principal. “Is that even possible?” I asked. “It must be,” she said, and we laughed. “Why is learning so important to you,” I asked. “And how did you learn to negotiate your relationships with Māori?”*

Learning has always been part of my journey and intellectual rigour is a strong anchor for my work with others. A commitment to learning has allowed me/us to develop an educational environment and pedagogical practice that is both relevant to our students, families and community *and* grounded in research and theory. Intellectual rigour keeps you honest and humble; it challenges you to ask critical questions and to be innovative. There’s not much point in taking a stand for justice if you can get shot down because there are great gaps in your argument and you can’t back up what you’re saying.

Learning was always about becoming better informed. Early on I started listening to Māori and Pacific Elders, leaders, academics, and teachers who shared their perspectives and pointed out cultural differences. I valued those lessons and related that learning to lessons I didn’t realise that I had learned growing up. I received valuable information, but I didn’t always know what to do with it or even how valuable it was. Sometimes you only begin to fully harness the lessons you learn, long after you learnt them.

I gathered key people (Māori, Pākehā and Pacific Island) around me and they supported and challenged me, and over time honed my thinking and learning. I was very fortunate to engage with people who would be honest with me and tell me what I needed to know. The more I listened, the more I heard and the more I thought about what I was doing. I had to take a whole lot of steps and none of them are easy. I didn’t get it right all the time, I definitely did not. But I kept going and wasn’t put off.

Becoming better informed led me to develop networks with strong like-minded North American social justice educators and we interact regularly. I gain strength from them and they from me. We learn together and I can vent emotions with a safe crowd.

***What was a critical lesson that stayed with you over time, enabling you to engage more productively with Māori?***

A critical lesson I learnt growing up was that Māori are all about whānau. If, as a high school principal, I was to take on board the Māori perspectives I began listening to, then I had to think much more about a collective response. A collective response requires us Pākehā to respond *with* the people or the whānau who are impacted by an injustice. You don't respond *for* them or *about* them or *to* them. It's about becoming and being a member of *a* whānau whatever it is. It could be your personal whānau (connected through whakapapa or genealogy) or the whānau who connect around a common purpose (like schools or parents' groups or whatever). Either way you have responsibilities to whānau. For me, being just is about being called into the membership of whānau; being in the day-to-day struggle with them and being accountable to them, first, whereas seeking justice in that struggle includes questioning assumptions, speaking out, challenging systems, and confronting our own white privilege.

I'm very aware that nowadays teachers and school leaders are challenged to be culturally responsive. Many Pākehā struggle to know what this means in practice. You can go to university and learn the theory in your head but if doesn't touch your heart, your practice won't change. I strongly believe you cannot be culturally responsive if you don't understand your own location. So many of us Pākehā haven't done that work. We don't see our culture because it's all around us. I say to Pākehā, "Start with who you are and learn to notice your own culture."

When you find out who you are and to whom you belong, and you begin to realise how important that knowledge is to your own life. You begin to understand why it is also important to the kids you teach or the people you work with. It becomes harder for your whiteness to permeate every nook and cranny in your classroom – you hope.

***During your 33 years at Kia Aroha College, how were you able to develop a more critical, culturally inclusive pedagogical approach?***

Being appointed to the principal's position allowed me to lead. The process of change and the outcomes along the way cemented for me that we were on the right track. In later years, we sought to show how our approach was working. The challenge was to develop our own Māori and Pacific ways of measuring and describing those skills.

I started asking the teachers, “Why did you choose that boy to speak at the pōwhiri (welcoming ceremony)?” “Why did you pick that girl to do the karanga (the call)?” Staff would reply, “I don’t know,” but others agreed with their choice. The kids they chose were often not the ones I would have chosen, nor were they necessarily the kids with fluency in te reo Māori. We all became fascinated with the process and after another 6 months we concluded that staff were using intuition I had no knowledge of and that intuition implicitly recognised Māori skills and knowledge needed for cultural roles. We began asking, “What are those skills and knowledges?” We didn’t know, except “Her Nanny can karanga” or “There’s something about his presence.” We debated for another year whether or not putting measurements on these things was a Pākehā thing to do.

We eventually decided we wanted to be able to put the same value on the learning the kids were doing about themselves, their identity, their relationships, their whānau, as the value the Ministry placed on their literacy, numeracy and other educational achievement results. We wanted to give that change and growth status and credibility so others could appreciate it. We spent more time reviewing academic research, identifying relevant identity markers, developing a computer programme and a process by which we worked with families. Eventually we showed that when cultural identity takes off, about a year later literacy follows, then numeracy.

When I went to United States and showed the graphs that mapped our students’ cultural learning on top of their other learning, my colleague Dr Jeff Duncan-Andrade and other educators called it a world first. We didn’t realise that our approach was radical.

### ***Why does a radical approach take so much time?***

Because you’re constantly engaged in the cycle of conscientising, resisting and transforming described by the Māori scholar Graham Smith. I have committed my life to that challenge but I think we are all always in that cycle. You become aware of an issue you might not have thought about, you raise your awareness, and start to resist the status quo. The more your awareness is raised, the more you want to change the situation, and that change is transforming. Graham Smith says you start where you start; it is a continual and never-ending process.

When I deliver presentations, or visit schools, I sometimes sense that people want a quick fix. I remember talking to teachers in another school about what it meant to be culturally relevant in the classroom. A week later a teacher emailed me, saying she had listened to what I said and changed what she was doing. She now had all the Māori boys

doing gardening. “How did you get there?” I thought, horrified. Her comment was a stark reminder that an audience can interpret your ideas in ways you never imagine but which suit them. We Pākehā can put a white spin on what we’re told and reinterpret lessons in a way that we can understand them. I never said Māori boys would be good at gardening. The teacher interpreted that idea probably because it tapped into a racist assumption she already had that Māori are good with their hands! [arrgh].

All you can hope to do is to raise awareness and stress the importance of context and time. I constantly say to people that things work differently in different communities and schools, and what worked for us may not work for them. But I can guarantee that whatever is done to facilitate transformative change will take a lot of time and often a long, long time.

The struggle for justice for our Māori and Pacific learners might take a long, long time but over the years I have become very impatient. I have grandchildren who are fluent speakers of Māori and great-grandchildren who don’t speak any English. I live in this bubble and I sometimes think, “Wow! Things are changing!” But outside that bubble, things are not changing much, if at all, in some places.

My grandson and his partner decided to raise their daughter exclusively in te reo Māori for the first 5 years of her life. Three years ago, *The New Zealand Herald* published an article on them during Māori Language Week. A torrent of abuse followed, including descriptions of their decision as a form of child abuse. That kind of white backlash hasn’t changed across three generations – from my daughter’s experience at Manurewa High School to her granddaughter.

People often say you can’t rush change; it must be incremental. I understand that perspective, but whānau have been waiting for generations for us to change the way our whitestream system educates their children. We play at change, I think. We’re so busy trying to make everyone comfortable that we forget that Māori kids have been uncomfortable for generations. While we, Pākehā, try to get our heads around the change, we do more damage. We wouldn’t tolerate the problem if Pākehā kids were bearing these consequences.

***The philosopher Levinas talks about impossible ethical demands. How did you think about the demands you encountered with the Ministry, at school or when working with whānau?***

The impossible demands – *the head up against a brick wall demands* – were the demands of the Ministry and its officials who did not understand, value or agree with what we wanted or were doing. They rejected our difference and privileged their own approach. Their response negated our community’s intelligence and knowledge, as if our parents and teachers weren’t clever enough to generate innovative thinking.

I never saw any impossible demands in my interactions with whānau and the school, but I certainly encountered major challenges. I was surrounded by the realities of our Māori and Pacific families and couldn’t ignore the challenges they faced. Our practice was to try to find a way to work around or make a difference to those challenges. My first reaction when I faced a major challenge was to say: “How do we do this?”

I think it’s your job to respond to major challenges no matter how difficult they are. If you only want *the possible*, then you are not doing your job. Principals and teachers can and do ignore the major challenges; they often don’t appreciate, feel or take on board the everyday realities of whānau. Others are motivated by the wrong reasons; I call them missionaries. They are the Pākehā in the community seeking to do good works for *the poor brown children*. Their work is not about the kids; it’s about them. I often say that our kids don’t need Pākehā missionaries to save them; they need Pākehā to raise their own awareness of the realities of poverty, assimilation, inadequate resourcing and other problems in communities like ours. Those realities are symptoms of inequity and racism that play out in the community, but they are not the heart of our community. We too easily ignore the strengths of our Māori kids; rich family traditions, rich cultural traditions and rich identities. They don’t need Pākehā missionaries poking their noses into their worlds. They see through the benign good works approach straightaway because it focuses on deficits. If you’re coming in to save our kids, consciously or otherwise, you’re coming in from a position of deficit. There is no other way to frame that position and it means you think you are superior, and you are not.

Sometimes, but not very often, I am blunt! [laughs]. When I run out of other ways to say something important, I name what I see. Naming the white spaces in our schools progresses understanding of the realities for non-white students. Naming is an exercise in power relations – when you name injustice, hegemony and racism, you expose power

relations which can no longer stay hidden or covert. I intentionally use the word *white*; it is provocative but it makes Pākehā think. White goes with things like privilege and supremacy; words we Pākehā don't like to use. We think we're colour blind and neutral, but we're not, we're white.

***Levinas also highlights the importance of the face-to-face encounter and, for Māori, Hoskins observes, kanohi ki te kanohi (face-to-face) is a preferred way of engagement. What importance do you place on face-to-face encounters, and why?***

At the start it was always kanohi ki te kanohi because that approach doesn't allow you to escape. You can't hide behind anything. You are there *in the encounter, in the engagement*. You have to be able to take the flack, take the questions, and respond. You have to be able to read the body language. Body language is such an important thing for Māori; a volume of words can be said with the raise of an eyebrow. We Pākehā have this idea that we can communicate effectively by writing things down, sending an email or phoning people. We assume people will get back to us when it suits us. Our whiteness assumes there is one way to communicate – our way, what works best for us. But those methods often won't work because they will not allow you (or the person with whom you are communicating) to *see* a raised eye brow. Without kanohi ki te kanohi, you have no way to read and gauge people. Of course, kanohi ki te kanohi is often more difficult; it takes more time and is complicated.

Once you have a relationship of trust, you can have different sorts of communication but first people have to get to know you and be able to trust that you will listen and you will do what you say you are going to do. Productive engagement comes back to listening and being part of the community, only then can you begin to develop an understanding of the realities of those around you, from an authentic position and not a saviour position.

***How do you understand an authentic position? Authentic relationships?***

An authentic position has credibility and trust. It doesn't judge; it is willing to listen and seeks to understand what people are telling you. As a principal, I often met families in the most awful situations and I made sure I didn't impose my judgement or preconceived *and often very white* ideas, on their situation. If you start thinking, "How did they get themselves in that situation?", you are taking a blaming-the-victim approach.

Instead, you must begin by recognising the many things you don't know, and will never know, about their lives, *and* be willing to learn. Only then, can you begin to understand the multiple and complex reasons why families are in that position. It's not because they have no skills or that they don't care about their kids. I have never met a parent who didn't want the best for their kids. But what they want might not match what you think is best.

I always asked myself basic questions: What is this family trying to tell me? What commitments and concerns matter to them? What do they want? Am I listening? Am I the best person to listen? Is there someone else who could listen better? Why do I need to be the person who listens every time?

In truly authentic relationships, you have to be willing to step back so others can step forward or when others are the right people to lead. You are not always the person who should stand up and speak up on behalf of others or the problem that concerns you both. The more you surround yourself with people who have similar perspectives, then you can support them to take those stands. Being willing to give up power is hard for school leaders and teachers. The thinking goes that if you give up power to someone else, you will have none. But it's not about giving up; it's about deciding to exercise power differently – as power *with* rather than power *over*. When the community gives you a position of authority, you must never misuse that responsibility.

I was often the mouthpiece for change driven by parents. I resisted the status quo by using my knowledge of how the system worked, who and when to challenge – those sorts of things. Being a mouthpiece can be a lonely, isolating and frustrating position, especially when your colleagues wrongly assume you are driving the change.

Whatever the challenges, the people you work with have to be able to trust you. You can't blow back and forth with the wind; people who are tentative, and on the journey with you, have to know that you're not going to shift the goalposts. Along with being trustworthy comes consistency, honesty and integrity – all of those things that are about loyalty and that you come to rely on and value so much, especially in long-term relationships.

***Other relational qualities or practices that have sustained your ethical–political commitments over time?***

Pig-headedness, stubbornness and bloody-mindedness! [laughs]. I often think of myself as being dogged and relentless. I never give up. I don't think of myself as patient; that is not a virtue I possess! In responding to our struggles with the Ministry I often practised passive resistance, but sometimes my response was not very passive!

You start out thinking, “I will do this; I will act, I will intervene, then it will be over.” But it’s never over. There is no over. You scratch at something and expose more layers and levels, and you have to just keep going somehow.

I don’t think there is an escape clause, and I don’t want to suggest that you want to escape. Once you’re in it, you’re in it. You’re in the struggle for freedom, for justice, for making change, for doing what is right, for the right of our youth to have an education that is relevant to them. What this means is you don’t get to opt out.

If you are truly authentic and truly committed, you stay with it. It becomes part of who you are; so much so that you can’t envisage doing anything else. That kind of awareness and commitment comes with time. That sort of struggle is not something you can get passionate about for 5 minutes and then, a year or two down the track, say to yourself, “Well, I’ve had enough of that, whatever it is, now it’s time to get passionate about something else.” That ongoing struggle is a lifetime commitment and is the reason why you can’t be a part-time activist. This commitment runs all of the time, not some of the time. It’s an ethical, moral and human responsibility requiring courage, conviction and the will to change. For me it’s been a lifetime work.

What kept me going for 33 years at Kia Aroha College was my outrage at the product we serve up as an education system, which we think is *good enough* for Māori children when it isn’t. Outrage alerts me to an acute sense of injustice, to what’s not fair, and keeps propelling me to act. You develop a super-sensitive antenna to injustice and inequity that gives you messages. Some people haven’t had the kind of conscientising experiences that I have had and don’t necessarily receive that alert or those messages. Sometimes you wish you didn’t either, because you feel you have to respond.

My response is driven by a sense of the enormity of the problem and a sense of the absolute seriousness of the situation. Over the years, I have become more acutely aware of the generational impact our educational practice has on the Māori whānau we damage. I feel the urgency of what is at stake – the life and death of our kids – and that it’s essential to do something. I can’t sit back or stand on the side-lines when I know something needs to change. Graham Smith says: “We don’t have the luxury of being the voyeurs of our own crises,” and I agree.

You learn to fiercely guard what you achieve. At school we had a saying, *Tūturu ki te kaupapa* (be true, be steadfast to the philosophy), which keeps what is important right at the front of your thinking and your work. Kaitiakitanga protects that process and ensures it

continues to resist the enormous pressure to become complicit in perpetuating our whitestream education system. Kaitiakitanga is being ever vigilant and always on watch.

Kaitiakitanga is also being open to opportunities and possibilities that not only protect the kaupapa but also extend its influence. While I am very impatient for change to happen, over the years I've been conscious of the need for patience and perspective. I have developed a practice of watchful waiting. Watchful waiting requires you to be alert to and aware of new resources, new thinking, new people and new ideas. It also requires you to wait for the right time, for people to be ready to take action, for things to pan out as you hope, so that change is not for the sake of change but rather for some meaningful purpose that develops over time. Watchful waiting requires attention to the possibilities so that when they come, you're ready for them and the scene is set.

Māori often refer to mā te wā. I understand this to mean something like “in good time” or in other words, the time will come; the time will tell; the time will be right for a decision, for change, or for whomever to take that next step, whatever it is. The idea that “something will happen” doesn't mean that you do nothing however. Behind the scenes you're always doing things, such as making strategic decisions or taking steps to make things happen without forcing them to happen. To be effective, you need others to bring along key people and to take the necessary steps, rather than blundering forward. When you go where no-one has been before, you need to be aware of where everyone is and look out for them, so they go with you on the journey and won't be left behind.

***If your Dad was alive today what do you think he would make of your life?***

My father was passionately interested in my work, but often horrified! He was always nervous that I would get fired. “You just have to learn to be quiet,” he'd say [laughs]. “If you don't stop working, you will wear-out your brain,” was another of his favourite sayings. But, my getting into trouble was the big thing.

I also worried about getting into trouble but I never told Dad. I did not deliberately seek conflict and never felt comfortable being off-side with my peers and colleagues. I later understood that people are often afraid of and threatened by change. I recall establishing a working party that included a Māori adviser from the Ministry. We wanted a second change of school status but the local high school principal opposed our proposal. I said to the Māori adviser, “What is the problem? We've got kids who want to be here; they are telling you that they are engaged in the learning we provide for them, so what's not to like?” “Ann,”

he said, “have you ever considered that your success might be a problem for some people? If your approach is right, it means others should change but not everyone is willing to change.”

As I became surer of my ground and more aware of the sheer size of the resistance to change approaches to educating our Māori and Pasifika kids, I gave up worrying. Whatever isolation I experienced was pathetic alongside the marginalisation our children experience every day in our schools. I got over myself! [laughs]. I focused on and became more aware of the importance of what we were doing at many levels including building authentic relationships with whānau, teacher training, professional development, and policy and systems change. You are never fully aware of the ripples of your work; how challenging it can be for some and how it can encourage others to embrace change or support what you’re doing, despite the uncertainties and the risk.

***Nanny Ann, I asked you once before, “What life are you living in the work you doing?” Do you remember your answer? Any afterthoughts?***

I do remember. I said I was living a joyous and a hard life, but also an inspirational one. I recalled many testing moments fighting the system but also a huge sense of personal fulfilment in being able to be part of this journey. “You don’t get to joyous living without encountering the struggle,” I said. Surviving the struggle makes you resilient and resilience enables you to keep fighting. Because of the struggle, you value the achievements even more, because you have achieved in spite of the struggle. What sustains me in the struggle is the joy and the wonder, the achievements along the way, and especially my relationships with whānau and with community.

I shared these thoughts with a group of amazing teachers in North America, at the opening ceremony of their new school, which is modelled on Kia Aroha College’s experience. Our time together began with an Indigenous ceremony led by a Native American speaker, who was followed by a Mexican Elder who performed the ritual. The teachers sat in a circle and a few of us from New Zealand joined them. We were asked to talk about why we did what we did. I recalled my conversation with you and said, “I hadn’t thought about joy until we discussed it. My answer had surprised me,” I said, “because a lot of what we do is far from joyous. But the more I thought about it, the more that word fitted. Joy is the reason why I do what I do.” So, I wished that group of amazing teachers joy in their journey.

After a lifetime of engaging with Māori, I have learnt that the joy is the engagement, the thinking, the being together, the being yourself. When my kids were small, we got involved in Māori performing arts. We never said: “Oh, that’s a Māori thing, so let’s do that.” We got involved because it was something we enjoyed. We became increasingly open to learning new things we didn’t necessarily know. That way of being or approach to life stuck.

*Shall we end with joy? [laughs]*

Yes! Let’s end with joy! [laughs].



## Chapter 11: Current and contingent conclusions

North American commentator Rebecca Solnit (2016) reminds those of us striving for justice that:

Problems are our work; we deal with them in order to survive or to improve the world, and so to face them is better than turning away from them, than burying them and denying them. (p. 22)

In this project, I redefined problems as problematics, arguing that complexities trouble the alluring problem–solution binary. To situate my study, I discussed meanings of terminology (Indigene, settler and Māori, Pākehā), international literature on relational approaches, and persistent problematics in Māori–Pākehā relations in Aotearoa–New Zealand’s “sometimes-bad history,” as Alison calls it. The main focus of my research however was to better understand relational possibilities in particular Māori–Pākehā relations. The relational problematics and possibilities rehearsed in my country join with experiences of and conversations on Indigene–settler relations in other contexts with similar histories.

My research aim was to resource the thinking and practice of those who daily strive to work the hyphen in Māori–Pākehā relations. This research offers justice-seeking scholars, educators, activists, leaders and postgraduate students (hereafter, scholars and practitioners) rich insights into productive Māori–Pākehā relations as lived, negotiated and considered by three pairs of longstanding and esteemed Māori and Pākehā colleagues. The carefully composed conversations, and theoretical–methodological conclusions here, contribute philosophical thinking to the fields of education, philosophy, Indigenous studies, Māori–Pākehā/Indigene–settler relations, and narrative enquiry, among others.

In this final chapter I take up the methodological challenge put by Frank (2004), to *think with* the stories in this thesis. I recall Archibald’s (2008) reflections on stories told to her by her Sto:lo Elders:

They tell me enough to keep me curious, to keep me coming back to them for more teachings, and then they let me know that I must go away and make meaning from their talks. (p. x)

I, too, had to go away and make meaning from my conversations with my co-researchers, to “share back” my theoretical conclusions with them and “give away my learning” to

scholars and practitioners (Archibald, 2008, p. 143). Stories carry multiple meanings that emerge when put to work in different settings, at different times, by different people, for different purposes. Indigenous scholars and practitioners who analyse the stories in this thesis are differently and more appropriately placed to draw theoretical insights from their particular perspectives.

Here, I offer a critical Pākehā scholarly review of the composed conversations, focusing on the five big ideas outlined in Chapter 3, which also permeated my conversations with my co-researchers. I address each idea in turn: 1) productive power relations; 2) ethical responsibility to the Other; 3) ontological-human becoming in relation; 4) a transformative pedagogical orientation; and 5) a way of life, manner of being. I highlight points of resonance across the composed conversations and concrete manifestations of those “joining points” in the “cultural interstitial space,” as Pat called it. I also attend to ambiguities, contradictions and tensions because, as Alison argues, “The contradictions are where the liveliness resides – difficult, but rewarding! And worthwhile.” (A. Jones, personal communication, November 30, 2016). To round off my study I consider its methodological contribution and limitations. I suggest openings for future studies and consider the reciprocity co-created in this research.

## **Theoretical Contribution**

Following Foucault (1997c) I ask these questions: What is the ethical substance of this research? What is *the material worked over* in my conversations with my co-researchers and in my reading of political–ethical–ontological–pedagogical–spiritual ideas that can lead us (scholars and practitioners) to a closer approximation of relational justice when working the hyphen in Māori–Pākehā relations? The ethical substance of this research is inseparable from its political substance; it derives meaning by intersecting ethics and politics while also appreciating other aspects. At heart, this research values particular and everyday face-to-face engagements that provide insight into how to intersect the ethical and the political in Māori–Pākehā relations, or what to avoid.

The meaning-making and theorising in this research turns against mastery (Bell, 2014, 2017) – be it mastery over the ideas themselves (impossible if ideas are partial, subjective, complex, evolving), mastery over power relations (impossible if power is a permanent provocation), mastery in exercising an ethical responsibility to the Other (impossible if one

accepts its infinite demands and the need for unique ethical responses), mastery over ontological differences (impossible if we accept the unknowability of the Other and our own human becoming); mastery in enacting a transformative pedagogical orientation (impossible if one considers it as a lifelong endeavour framed *in relation* and as learning *from* the Other) or mastery of the self as the condition for an ethical–political life (impossible if becoming just and creating friendships with our Māori and Pākehā colleagues are both conceived as a relational pathway without end). What, then, does the meaning-making and theorising in this study turn toward?

### **1) Productive power relations.**

My research challenges scholars and practitioners not to allow a troubled history or disruptive relations to restrict the work for relational justice. As if following Foucault, my co-researchers agreed that Māori–Pākehā relations are power relations that *can* produce transformative change rather than only oppressive effects. In their relationships with one another they strive to activate and embody this creative impulse.

My co-researchers described everyday encounters that allow scholars and practitioners to better appreciate Foucault’s powerful insight that power *can* be exercised in ways that impel people to become more open-minded and to practise freedom. When local officials and townsfolk challenged Sam (about the presence of gang members in town and an ongoing crime wave), he agreed to meet. He listened to their accusations and offered them different ways of thinking about the situation causing them so much angst. He created space for gang members to speak for themselves, rather than shrouding them with his knowledge of them, as the townspeople did. The gang members surprised their audience by expressing concern and empathy. Foucault (2003) argues that the first act of freedom is resistance. In this encounter, Sam and the guys refused to be alienated or problematised. They resisted unfounded accusations, negative judgements and outright hostility with an ethical–political response that was neither aggressive nor defensive but rather anchored in their mana, shared values (including respect, empathy, generosity) and a fundamental human right to be part of a community. Their ethical–political response interrupted the relations of domination in that encounter (Bell, 2014) and challenged the officials and townsfolk to engage human-to-human, not human-to-problem/enemy.

Sam chose consciously to uphold the practice of freedom – that of the Other, “always,” he said, and his own, “always.” Foucault (2003) argues that when “faced with a field of

possibilities, several kinds of conduct, several ways of reacting and modes of behaviour are available” (p. 139). Sam upheld the freedom of those condemning him and the guys he loves by encouraging the officials to enact their professional responsibilities, “if” anyone breaks the law. He did not assume “when,” when anyone breaks the law, as his audience did, rather he chose again to bear witness to the goodness, empathy, and humanity of the guys and to awhi them. Sam insisted on his right, and that of the gang members, to retain their freedom by stating his intention to continue his kaupapa and their legal entitlement to wear their patches. He also suggested an alternative; that the townsfolk offer the gang members a place of belonging and not treat them as threatening outsiders. Sam’s provocative proposal, respectfully put, challenged the officials and townsfolk to think differently, more creatively, about how to negotiate troublesome power relations without further marginalising the Other (gang members) or inciting violence. Levinas (1986) would describe Sam’s (and the gang members’) response as an act of radical generosity. Elsewhere Hoskins (2010) suggests that Māori are called to this particular ethical–political responsibility.

This story reminds us, scholars and practitioners, of our ethical–political responsibility to address asymmetries of power when working the hyphen. Recognising the complexity of power relations, Foucault (1997e) argues that:

My point is not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous, which is not exactly the same as bad. If everything is dangerous, then we always have something to do. ... I think that the ethico–political choice we have to make every day is to determine which is the main danger. (p. 256)

To expose oppressive power relations and their effects, Ann adopts the practice of naming what she sees working against the whānau and communities she serves: injustice, hegemony, racism, white privilege. Ann refuses to *pussyfoot around*, buckle under pressure or be controlled by states of domination. Like my other co-researchers, she maintains an extraordinarily honest, sharply-focused, forward-looking, intellectually rigorous, justice-seeking approach.

Pat alerts scholars and practitioners to dangers facing Pākehā who work the hyphen. He names various risks including being lulled into a sense of self-importance or assuming control of decision making that properly belongs to Māori, or swamping Māori with our (Pākehā) presence and expectations, or succumbing to that strong rescue reflex that tempts

Pākehā to intervene. To enact conscious practices of freedom, Pākehā, as a critical necessity, must become aware of and learn to control such temptations and reflexes. Pat seeks to become more critically conscious by asking critical questions. He takes action that will amplify other world views (te ao Māori specifically) and ensure that the Other has the opportunity to express their voice. To increase his awareness of his (Pākehā) privilege and keep his assumptions in check, he stays closely connected to the communities he serves. Critically, he accepts the right of Māori to decide on the path they want to take, while reserving his freedom to go his own way. Pat, Ann and Sam seem to be saying, that for freedom to work, it must work both ways.

## **2) An ethical responsibility to the Other.**

Because these sorts of political gestures in everyday face-to-face relations seek to moderate the ill-effects of asymmetries of power, they also “bear witness to the ethical” and enact the work of justice (Levinas, 1986, p. 32). Levinas and Foucault would rejoice that the composed conversations/pedagogical narratives in this thesis certainly do not provide a script, a set of rules or a step-by-step guide to working the hyphen in Māori–Pākehā relations. Quite the opposite. These stories challenge scholars and practitioners to resist false promises of clarity and certainty embedded in the fantasy of formulaic responses. Instead, Māori and Pākehā working the hyphen must commit, over and over again, to uncovering, understanding and enacting particular ethical response-abilities to the singular Other/others in the specific place, time, and context of their everyday engagements.

At most, the stories in this thesis offer openings, pointers perhaps, towards “an approach,” “an orientation,” as Te Kawehau puts it, that can become a way of life, a manner of being, a quality of relation that is ethically-politically-pedagogically orientated, *and good*. Hoskins (2017) observes that, “Ethics whispers an orientation for the political, but without providing instruction – to do so would be to subsume ethics within politics” and inevitably exclude the other Other(s) (p. 143). These stories can help those of us negotiating Māori–Pākehā relations to find our bearings, to orient ourselves, *to feel our way through* the contradictions, ambiguities and tensions we encounter in our relationships with Māori or Pākehā, and *feel our way into* their pleasures and joys. Sam suggests that our work together in this study does not create “a rule book but a life-book” (S. Chapman, personal communication, June 11, 2017). He means a book that can help its readers (scholars and practitioners) to cultivate possibilities for an ethical–political life that creates goodness, joy,

aroha, manaaki, awhi, whanaungatanga, kaitiakitanga, and like values, which Aristotle (1975, 1996) and MacIntyre (2007) call virtues.

The ethical–political possibilities suggested by my co-researchers cut across the limitations of cultural identity politics that might hinder or discourage efforts to work the hyphen in Māori–Pākehā relations. Te Kawehau’s decision to jointly edit a journal on kaupapa Māori with a Pākehā scholar (Alison) *against* criticism from some of her Māori colleagues reflects a fearless intellectual freedom. When doing the work of justice, “ethics must interrupt and exceed the political” (Hoskins, 2017, p. 143), and here Te Kawehau “fulfils her talk,” which according to Kevin is a paramount ethical responsibility we all share. Elsewhere, Hoskins (2012) challenges the imposition of limits on ethical–political responsibility, stating:

If our identity politics reject ethical responsibility to others on the basis of relative identities, then the basis of social ethicality is compromised as is the culture difference we may champion. (p. 6)

In this research, Te Kawehau adds to this discussion when she states that a “deep sense of rightness” guides her approach to ethical responsibility. She accepts her decisions may be “deeply unpopular in the current political context or the political discourse of my group at the time” but she stands by her ethical–political commitments simply because *she must*. Enacting that deep sense of rightness is an expression of *who she is in the world* and a fulfilment, that is never an arrival but always a becoming of who her tūpuna expect her to be. That deep sense of rightness allows her, commands her, ethically and politically, to be in uncomfortable and difficult spaces that others choose to avoid. That deep sense of rightness also provides her with “a source of good productive ideas and practice, of finding ways to shift things when they are stuck”. In fulfilling her talk, Te Kawehau embodies a challenge to Māori (and Pākehā) scholars and practitioners “to practise courage” and remain open to others, even, and especially, in difficult encounters (as Sam and the gang members did). She holds on to the belief that people can change. That she is able “to feel powerfully about these unpopular or uncomfortable kind of positions” she comes to is, she thinks, the “little thing that I have to offer the world”. She gently reminds scholars and practitioners that that little thing, when enacted, has the power to become an audacious force for change.

Following Levinas, and guided by the Māori philosophical notion of whakapapa (origins, genealogies), Te Kawehau draws attention here to the singularity, the irreplaceability, of

each human life. I hear her saying that the uniqueness of who we are has implications for the work of justice. Each one of us, she suggests, has a “particular little great thing to offer the world”. This “crucial little bit” is “the combination of all of the complex set of relationships and threads and experiences and identities and histories – my own and those of the people who went before me – all coming together in a person in such a way” that each one of us has something unique to offer. This little great thing that is a crucial unique bit when put to work for justice is profoundly important, profoundly meaningful. Put in context, she argues, “when you think of the scheme of things, and the scale of the world and the mountains,” that particular contribution you and I make may be “small” but “small is good, small is fine.” Her suggestion is profoundly important because the little bit that each scholar, educator, activist, leader, post-graduate student can offer the world matters, *and by extension a singular life also matters*. Te Kawehau seems to be saying that, when we enact our unique offering to the world, we enact our belief in the possibility of change, our hope in the possibilities for relational justice, even when our attempts fall short or we may never see the fruits of our work for justice.

How we enact that crucial little bit, which is ours to give, can take different forms over a lifetime, and “that’s okay,” says Ann, who is driven by a deep sense of the enormity and the seriousness of injustice and is aware that so much still needs to be done to counter it. While others retire, Ann has begun a new career in writing, lecturing and consulting. As well as being an academic and doing university administration, Alison has engaged in all kinds of community activism, but is now focused again on teaching, research and writing. After decades in other places, Sam has returned home to Tūrangi, “to become the ahi kā” (the burning fires of continuous occupation), so that others will know they have a place to return to and belong. Now in his 70s Kevin keeps saying “No problem” when anyone asks anything of him. According to Te Kawehau, Levinas does not expect us to martyr ourselves when responding to impossible ethical demands. Rather, he wants us to remember our ethical responsibility to the Other and others, and do our little bit to change the world, to bring about justice, especially in face-to-face relations.

While Pat acknowledged the personal toll of the ethical demands he encounters, he quickly put them into a wider perspective and up against “the real trouble” others endure in other parts of the world, which he never forgets. Thinking of those other troubles experienced by greatly impoverished others leads him to consider the demands he faces as “situations of

temporary difficulty,” albeit with “their own moments of grief”. He accepts what comes and pushes through his temporary difficulties. He takes breaks, takes stock, seeks wise counsel, in short, he does what he needs to do to respond to the ethical–political call of his relationships with the communities he serves, to *somehow and simply keep going*.

Ann called the impossible demands she meets “the head up against a brick wall demands” perpetrated by institutions, policies and officials that reject difference and privilege a *one-way, their way* approach (my interpretation in italics of what Ann said). Whānau may present “major challenges” but Ann never treats them (the whānau or the challenges they present) as impossible demands. It is her job, she says, to work *with* whānau in ways that will enable *them* to overcome the challenges *they* face. When Ann and Sam met impossible demands in face-to-face meetings with Ministry officials, they refused to give up or give way, asking instead, “What’s next?” They assume that a way exists to overcome the asymmetrical power relations and rejection of difference they meet. Their stories challenge Māori and Pākehā scholars and practitioners to exercise a resilient orientation that makes its own impossible demands *for justice* (including by maintaining a determined and hopeful attitude) when encountering a state of domination that is intent on erasing difference and upholding asymmetrical power relations.

Te Kawehau strives to live her ethical politics in everyday encounters by attending to otherness and difference as conditions for justice (Todd, 2009). She describes how she goes about doing justice as a political practice (in face-to-face relations and in policy work) guided by Levinasian and Māori philosophical thinking. Her reflections challenge those of us working the hyphen, Māori and Pākehā, to become more mindful of those ‘Other others’ (Levinas’ third party) who risk being excluded in decisions we make, are a party to, or are made on our behalf, including as citizens. Such exclusions, especially in the case of Māori, not only enact the violations of the past but also become new forms of injustice. Dam (2017) reminds scholars and practitioners however, that such violations can also become openings for the work of justice. We must harness opportunities to remedy such violations at whatever level and in whichever realms we operate.

Māori philosophical values (such as aroha, mana, awhi, manaakitanga, kaitiakitanga) not only create possibilities for ethical–political practice but also contribute to their understanding. Working the hyphen, Kevin suggests, can enrich Māori *and* Pākehā understanding of Māori values and encourage their application. In te ao Māori (the Māori

world), and Archibald (2008) reminds us in other Indigenous worlds also, what seems to matter most is the *doing* of these values, which Kevin describes as “fulfilling the talk”. This may explain why my Māori co-researchers agreed that aroha is a paramount value because aroha cries out to be enacted. Elsewhere Hoskins (2012) argues that aroha is “a powerful ethical force” (p. 92) that can preserve ontological difference and the radical alterity of the Other through an orientation of unqualified respect and concern for others. Kevin suggests that aroha is a manifestation of justice and a prerequisite for a mannered way of being that is itself an expression of aroha. Pākehā scholars and practitioners are challenged to slowly grow an awareness of Māori philosophical values, learning from Māori how and when to enact them as everyday practices. But, without assuming 1) that it is possible to ever fully know all their subtle and multi-layered cultural meanings; or 2) that what seems to work in one situation will necessarily work in another. When appropriately enacted, Māori values not only bring comfort to Māori, whose indigeneity and ways of being are affirmed, but also open up possibilities for transformative relational encounters by honouring difference.

Sam suggests that generosity and kindness are expressions of love, of aroha. Relational justice, he seems to be saying, calls for *an exchange* that allows radical generosity to inhabit our lives and become an everyday practice, *that is a necessity* when working the hyphen. Sam’s story of Ma’s gift of flowers to Mere shows us (scholars and practitioners) how to work the hyphen in a seemingly humble encounter. Spending time together, enjoying a meal, sharing our lives with one another creates the conditions for a powerful, transformative exchange in which Māori and Pākehā rediscover their human kinship. This exchange works because it expresses an openness to and concern for the Other and an orientation of care, kindness and generosity.

In Sam’s story, an exchange is made possible through the giving *and* the receiving of kindness. This exchange challenges the negative assumptions of who the Other is and offers an alternate lens through which to approach and see them, *beauty*. When we (Māori and Pākehā) approach the Other, looking through the eyes of beauty, we see their beauty, a point also stressed by Kevin. The goodness of beauty evokes a smile, a feeling in the heart that is beyond reason. We are called to awhi the Other by drawing out the beauty, the goodness, we see in them. Sam suggests that this kind of exchange, like those acts of small goodness that Levinas (1998b) salutes, are available to us every day and are blessings of God. I hear another name for these encounters, “every day blessings” that are available to

us all, all the time. Explaining their importance, Hoskins (2010) suggests that such gestures remind people of their ethical responsibilities. Sam agrees but cautions that “unless we intentionally stop and take stock, we will fail to see them.” We can orient ourselves in our relations with the Other, he suggests, by recognising that “oneness is not sameness” and that our uniqueness, our diversity, while uncommon, is also a source of beauty, of goodness.

### **3) Ontological becoming in relation.**

I now return to Todd’s (2014) notion of ontological becoming in relation. This idea reminds those of us working the hyphen that we are human. Our humanity is not a fixed state, according to Todd, but rather constantly becoming in relation, in particular places, contexts, times, and, Kevin reminds us, in spiritual realms.

My research suggests that, because we are constantly becoming in relation, any upbringing can serve the work of justice. This modest but profound idea excludes no-one and allows anyone to embrace an ethical–political call and commitment to relational justice. My co-researchers each experienced a unique upbringing and identified an array of early life influences. Alison’s parents emigrated from England and her family lived in different towns. Her parents were critical of Māori but, wherever her family settled, Alison was drawn to relationships with Māori kids. Te Kawehau consciously identified *as Māori* when she was five and growing up she was drawn to experiences that affirmed this identity. But at school she encountered racism, violence and low expectations. Such diverse beginnings suggest that various early influences can prepare individuals in complex and unexpected ways to work the hyphen in Māori–Pākehā relations. Although our backgrounds are profoundly important however, other things also matter.

My co-researchers display diverse human qualities. Working the hyphen requires Māori and Pākehā to engage with all manner of human beings, including those (all of us, actually) who from time to time forget our manners. Kevin shows through his actions that things can get done, as effectively if not better by exercising one’s manners, enacting paramount values and remembering the wisdom of your tūpuna. Pat has that ngākau – that heart, that mind, that soul – that combines empathy, understanding and moral determination *with* action. Ann’s quality of moral outrage alerts her and others to an acute sense of injustice. Sam has a capacity for extraordinary kindness. Te Kawehau demonstrates a rare intellectual freedom. Alison retains a fascinated curiosity from her childhood.

As different as they are from each other, I notice in all my co-researchers those virtues that MacIntyre (2007) identifies as being crucial for a practice to survive and for a particular kind of relationship to develop between practitioners, which I would further highlight: an *extraordinary* honesty, a *huge capacity* for courage, and a *passion* for justice. I also witness other qualities of relation: a critical stance and ethical conviction that fuels their work for justice, a big tough heart that is deeply caring, a willingness to work incredibly hard for the particular relationships and causes that mean so much to them, a terrific sense of humour, and, underpinning all of this, a profound respect for the Other as someone who is good and with whom they share a belonging, a human kinship. I recognise MacIntyre's paramount virtues, and these other sorts of qualities, in others working the hyphen. The list and mix of qualities may be endless and perhaps must be for inclusivity, but what also matters is a willingness to be in(formed) – informed and formed – by the relationship itself, in other words a preparedness to exceed yourself, to become a better person and a truly relational colleague (Todd, 2003, 2014).

A kind of *recognition*, a sense of attraction that goes both ways, between the Self and the Other, draws particular Māori and Pākehā into an enduring relationship. When Sam met Ann, he *recognised* her passion for justice, her outrage at injustice. This recognition, he thought, was “mutual” in the sense that it embodied “our need for one another” – the Other's perspective, skills, knowledges, networks and so on – in the broader struggle for justice. Ann highlighted what she called her growing awareness of their “synergies in common”. Alison also spoke about the “recognition” she experiences in her close relationships with Māori. It is a “kind of warm visceral engagement,” “a strange feeling” that “flows both ways,” unusual (meaning rare) and profound: “I recognise you and you recognise me,” she says. Alison feels as if she has known Te Kawehau all her life and is completely comfortable when she is with her. They “see the world similarly” and enjoy “a shared sensibility” that is embodied when one cracks a joke or the other swears, and they both “get it” and enjoy a laugh together. This sense of recognition, whatever it is exactly and it will likely mean different things to different people, offers multiple possibilities for a relationship that is both pleasurable and deeply meaningful. Those of us working the hyphen must become attuned in such a way that we *can* “recognise” those synergies, that warm visceral feeling, that is perhaps longing for, and calling us to, a relationship. The challenge is *to go there*, as Alison did when she chose to go with her Māori mates when deciding on which school within the Faculty to locate herself in.

Such recognition is not without ambiguity, however. Alison never takes her relationship with Te Kawehau for granted. She is aware that her close relationships with Māori are “at risk from the weight of the past, [and] in that sense very special, fragile and always compelling”. Knowing this, Pat enacts a seeking permission approach and will only act when Māori give him a clear mandate, including from those whom he counts among his closest friends. Ann, too, recognises that she is “in that space by invitation”. These Pākehā make clear that they are *not* Māori and do not pretend to be. They value and maintain the distance between themselves and the Other. As if following Bell (2007, 2014) they recognise that by accepting the-distance-between, symbolised in the hyphen, their, and the Other’s, singular difference can flourish *and* new ways of relating can emerge. Like staying the distance, their relationships with Māori allow certain things to happen (such as the way all my co-researchers gradually and over time co-created trust, respect and affection with their paired colleague) that in turn allows other things to occur (such as Pat seeking advice from Kevin on how to conduct a Treaty settlement negotiation or Kevin opening himself to learn those things that perhaps in this/his lifetime only Pat might teach him). They never “put to bed” that “sometimes-bad history” that Alison suggests remains “embedded” in Māori–Pākehā encounters, rather they allow it continually to teach lessons that enrich their relationships. Those lessons make a future together, at a micro- and a macrolevel, a bit more possible.

### ***A quality of relation.***

This research suggests that specific qualities of relation (Todd, 2014) are required to work the hyphen productively in Māori–Pākehā engagements. Here I highlight a few.

For Pākehā, “being in the relationship” may simply mean *doing whatever that takes*, for which there can be no detailed explanation (A. Jones, 2012). Alison is willing to do anything to support Te Kawehau, “if ever she asks me”, always respecting her self-determination. Sam values Ann’s ability to “speak into a context” that is unknown to him and “name her experience” because it sharpens his approach. Kevin named “various kinds of value” offered by his close Pākehā colleagues, including useful advice, access to their networks and generally “rolling up their sleeves and doing the work, whatever it was, but especially the paperwork”. Kevin particularly appreciates the way his Pākehā colleagues show moral-ethical support for those things “that matter to us *as Māori*”. This politically responsive, ethically response-able approach enables what Kevin highlights as a “robust” engagement, which Te Kawehau suggests is a preferred approach for many Māori. Pākehā

scholars and practitioners seeking to work the hyphen must be prepared to provide the kind of support that matters most to our Māori colleagues, always conditioned by unique situations and often impossible to predict.

Alison intersects love and politics to highlight an agentic, decisive quality of relation necessary for productive Māori–Pākehā relations. She emphasises a political will to make the relationship work, over time, over geographical distance, over a plethora of other things that can further divide, separate and prevent productive engagement. In another conversation she states, *“What is the political will? It comes down to love or something like that. We enter flows of power, flows of passion, in different ways and decide to run with it.”* Here Alison seems to be highlighting a political dimension of love that fuels that “powerful ethical force,” Te Kawehau spoke of earlier, and leads to ethical–political action, as well as sustaining relationships. The challenge to scholars and practitioners who choose to work the hyphen is to decide to exercise that political will, over and over, in this encounter and the next, to open ourselves to the all-encompassing love of aroha and enter the flows of power, the flows of passion, the flows of ethical force that constitute productive Māori–Pākehā relations and command our particular response-abilities to the Other.

Another quality of relationship opens up possibilities for exchange by recognising the mana of the Other (their authority and power). Sam employs the practice of “gentle conversation” when someone “backs themselves into a corner,” talking in ways that allow them to “feel better” and “rebuild their mana” (whakamana). In situations where people have no knowledge of things Māori, Kevin will always be respectful and encouraging, and never leave a person feeling humiliated. When Kevin encountered a Pākehā leader who spoke harsh words, he chose to follow the advice of his Elders not to hold a grudge. Leading by example, he performed a Levinasian act of small goodness. He graciously acknowledged the mana of the Pākehā leader, recognised his contribution and gave him a parting gift of his own home-made honey. E. Durie (2000) explains that upholding the mana of others is necessary for peaceful/good relationships and for Māori usually requires some form of manaakitanga (respecting and caring for their wellbeing). Kevin’s extraordinary generosity in this difficult situation challenges Māori and Pākehā working the hyphen to remember that only by recognising and respecting the mana of the Other, can each of us hope to stand upright in our own.

### ***Negotiating ontological differences.***

Encounters with the Other inevitably show up human limitations. According to Te Kawehau, Alison sometimes “cringes” when reflecting on her behaviour in particular engagements or she feels upset when treated poorly. Te Kawehau recognises these challenges but does not tell Alison what to do; her empathetic non-judgemental stance allows Alison to live and think her way into a new way of being. Te Kawehau admires Alison because *she does reflect* on her engagements with Māori and *she does accept* what comes in those encounters. Other times, and it depends on the situation, Alison will stand her ground when she meets the kind of challenge that Pat did in the story he told about the Treaty negotiation on a Northland marae during which a Māori adversary described him and his government colleagues as the “barking dogs of the Crown”. Pat, Alison, and Ann will speak the truth as they know it when they feel they need to, as Māori do. Te Kawehau explains that, “Māori respect you if you stand in your own mana... It’s not like Māori don’t treat people badly. *People treat people badly*” (emphasis added).

Te Kawehau’s point here draws attention to the human condition and seems obvious enough but is also radical in the context of fiercely argued identity politics that hold difference as primary. People treat people badly, Te Kawehau says, as if espousing the kind of inalienable truth my Pākehā co-researchers rely on when fiercely challenged. Just as she did when she was a student in Alison’s class, Te Kawehau saying “it” means it can be said, it can be spoken instead of remaining unsayable, and in so doing she affirms human kinship. Of particular importance, is Alison’s recognition that her own humanity is “flawed” and “further forming”. She, too, makes mistakes, as Pākehā often do in Māori–Pākehā encounters. Knowing this, as deeply as Alison does, allows for a forgiving (and self-forgiving) approach when one is needed. Kevin reminds us that human relations, including Māori–Pākehā relations, cannot survive or flourish without forgiveness. Kevin also seems to be saying that scholars and practitioners who work the hyphen should always remember these simple things.

Faced with a different ontological style, Pākehā are challenged to recognise and accept the Other and their world *as is because it is*. Alison accepts that her friend Kuni’s explanation for a cancelled flight, a tohu (a sign), requires acceptance of and respect for her world. To relate properly in a Māori situation, Alison suggests, Pākehā must accept that the relational ontology of te ao Māori “is all part of the deal” (Bell, 2017). This means gradually developing more of an ability to work respectfully within Māori cultural parameters.

Pat sometimes stressed “cultural competence” in our conversations, which sounds like mastery and seems to contradict the impulse of this research which emphasises the unknowability of the Other (Levinas, 1998a) and getting comfortable with uncertainty. But what I heard was the importance of exercising prudence so as to avoid becoming “one of those Pākehā” who, according to Te Kawehau are “always cowering, and worrying, and hand-wringing”. When we Pākehā impose our insecurities and anxieties *on* Māori, we create discomfort *for* Māori (a “cringe-feeling,” Te Kawehau said) and another barrier for them to climb over.

My Pākehā co-researchers have known their Māori colleagues for years but still they reach out to learn from and be taught by them. Kevin responds immediately when Pat calls because “there’s always a deep reason” and “something important to discuss”. For years Pat met regularly with Sir Hugh Kāwharu to “nut out” difficult tribal and Treaty matters together. Learning in the context of longstanding relationships with Māori individuals enables my Pākehā co-researchers to notice and accept complexities, contradictions, and tensions, without pretending to understand their layers of meaning, immediately or ever. Those who stay the distance inevitably encounter complexities that, according to Pat, allow them to “hone and tune their reflexes over time” and become more familiar with how to respond to challenging engagements.

Of critical importance, for justice-seeking scholars and practitioners, is a commitment to being in the relationship *until the end*, whatever that means, but according to my co-researchers it means a very long time. For Mattingly (2010), “border crossing is a long-haul practice” (p. 233). In this research working the hyphen in face-to-face Māori–Pākehā relationships intersects with the work of justice, the work of transformational change. Ann spent 22 years as a principal embedding culturally responsive, critical, social justice pedagogies into Kia Aroha College. She appreciates that considerable time is required to gain a sense (always developing) of what one needs to know to engage productively and show others that you are genuinely committed to being in the relationship. Ann said, “You start out thinking I will do this; I will act, I will intervene, then it will be over.’ But it’s never over. There is no over. You scratch at something and expose more layers and levels, and you have to just keep going somehow.” Pākehā who keep going, keep learning, keep seeking to respectfully be in the relationship (in spite of mistakes – theirs and others) are

the ones Māori most respect because their fidelity is trustworthy. Working the hyphen is slow work that has no end.

#### **4) A transformative pedagogical orientation.**

My co-researchers learn from a whole range of sources – people, books, encounters, taha wairua experiences (the spiritual) and so on. Sam, Kevin and Te Kawehau are guided in significant ways by their tūpuna. Sam reveres the courage of his maternal ancestors and embodies his father’s wonderful manaakitanga, Kevin’s life reflects his deep appreciation of his grandmother’s kaitiakitanga. Te Kawehau walks the peace-making path travelled by her ancestor Patuone and her father. They also acknowledge other kinds of knowing, “intuition,” “affective,” and “spiritual”. Alison’s learning takes different forms (knowledge, ideas, thoughts, memories) and is remembered and accrued, “through our minds *and* through our skin or muscles,” both “unconsciously *and* viscerally, in all sorts of places and situations”. Pat trusts his “instincts or intuition – that inner knowledge that sounds like a warning bell” or tells you to keep going. Long ago Ann gathered knowledgeable people around her and developed networks with strong, like-minded North American social justice educators. She embedded herself into the community and committed her life to a cycle of conscientising, resisting and transforming. Like Ann, Te Kawehau relishes “the kind of social ethicality” she meets in communities that is not drawn from books but from “being in community and committing to people,” over a long time. This research challenges scholars and practitioners to pursue learning that is embodied, relational, transformative, reflexive, situational and ongoing.

My co-researchers learn in multiple ways but, whether Māori or Pākehā, listening, watching and reflecting are crucial aspects of a transformative pedagogical orientation. Ann highlighted the practice of listening she relies on (head and heart) when seeking to learn from her Māori colleagues or to understand the aspirations of parents for their children’s education. Ann’s practice of “watchful waiting” is a form of kaitiakitanga challenging her to be open and attentive to fresh possibilities (including ideas, people, resources, opportunities) and be prepared to harness them when they arrive. Kevin learns *in retrospect*, reflecting again and often on relationships and encounters in this world (past, present, future) and in spiritual realms. Along with Archibald (2008), both Ann and Kevin know that some lessons are only learnt years after an encounter or become enriched with time.

This research also challenges scholars and practitioners (especially Pākehā) to become more critically conscious in the here and now of each encounter. Pat suggests that “being present” requires careful observation and self-discipline. He attends to the “atmospherics” surrounding particular encounters and takes his cues from Māori. He enacts a practice of “speaking by feel,” adopting the idiom of the Māori speaker addressing him, to convey that he heard and understood what was translated for him. Growing up he learnt the value of having the “flexibility to get a few things wrong and learn how to make them right.” Pat’s story of visiting a kaumātua in hospital, like Alison’s story of discussing research at the kitchen table with a kaumātua, recognises the inordinate flexibility of Māori as they adjust and perform tikanga in ways that include the Other, a practice that A. Jones (2008) calls “negotiated flexibility”. Such flexibility, especially when exercised with the Other/others who are unfamiliar with their cultural protocols, expresses a Māori ethical response-ability and embodies radical generosity.

Emotional collisions are inevitable when working the hyphen in Māori–Pākehā relations. Sam was deeply affected by his “emotional collision” with the officials and townsfolk. Although riled, his mind was curiously entertained by a 1960s song that mirrored the problematics at work in this encounter. Rather than “bleed all over” the people around him, he chose “to die” to his emotions but it took two weeks to let go of the hurt and anger aroused by that collision. My co-researchers, Māori and Pākehā, accept emotional intensity and its effects as part of working the hyphen. Emotional collisions, fraught moments, fractures, and tensions, whatever you call them, often have the most to teach but Sam’s story signals again the importance of the passage of time, as Te Kawehau says, “time to learn, to grow and to process”.

In another conversation, Alison observed that while difficult encounters teach her a lot about engaging with Māori, mostly she learns about herself and her own anxieties. She said:

I KNOW that it is not that one is “a Pākehā” that is the problem – WE see it as that, but I am not convinced that it is. I know enough to know that this critical sort of “being with others” is common for Māori, and is a way of responding to the WORLD, not to you (or me) or anyone as individuals even if it is couched in those terms. (A. Jones, personal communication, December 11, 2016)

This returns us to and signals another quality of relation; Pākehā scholars and practitioners must become open to rather than reject Māori modes of being and value them for what they can teach. After years of working the hyphen, the Pākehā ethno-musicologist Richard Nunns (2014) observed that “it was important to remember that challenge – testing relationships, testing conclusions, forging relationships – is a natural way of relating in Māoridom” (p. 18). Ann regards challenging encounters with Sam as a “good test of the relationship”. At some level, she says, Sam being Māori or her being Pākehā “doesn’t feature hugely in our thinking”. While Ann recognises and respects all that Sam is and all that he contributes *as Māori*, she also values him “as a person”.

### **5) A way of life, a manner of being.**

Foucault’s (1997d) rendering of ancient Greek notions of living suggests possibilities for a way of life that embodies ethical–political commitments constitutive of relational justice. Some co-researchers described working the hyphen with their longstanding colleague as a friendship, for others it is a spiritual journey.

#### ***Becoming just.***

In this project I came to think of becoming just as “a relational trajectory” (Hofmeyr, 2010, p. 43) or, as Hoskins (2017) suggests, *he ara whanaunga* (a relational pathway). My research suggests that becoming just and doing justice in Māori–Pākehā relations is bound up within what it means to live a way of life, a manner of being, which calls people to be good to one another (A. Jones, 2008b). Becoming just and doing justice, Kevin says, is “doing what needs to be done” but always with the next generation in mind. His thoughts remind me of Aristotle (1975), who says that it is in doing justice, we become just.

The Māori philosophical notion of *kaitiakitanga* nourishes understandings of becoming just and doing justice, and intersects with the earlier discussion on an ethical responsibility to the Other. For Kevin, relational justice is personified in the presence of a *kaitiaki* who exercises *kaitiakitanga* as an individual ethical responsibility seeking a collective outcome, such as caring for the environment. That particular little crucial bit we offer the world, that Te Kawehau spoke of earlier, comes into play here. “I know I can do my bit,” Kevin says, “but I also need to get others to do their bit – that is more difficult.” Speaking to scholars and practitioners, Kevin emphasises the importance of “your whole approach and your demeanour” as a way to “inspire people into that same feeling of responsibility,” so that

they will also do what needs to be done. Aristotle (1975) called this kind of demeanour “a certain disposition”.

### ***Practices of self.***

This research alerts scholars and practitioners to the ancient notion of “practices of self” (Foucault, 1997a), which offer pedagogical, ethical and ontological possibilities for becoming just and living a good life. Attending to the relationship with myself, through practices of self, enables me to craft modes of being that are more relationally orientated and can help sustain my ethical–political commitments. Pat suggests, “You can only be in service of others if you are in harmony with yourself in a right way.” As if following Foucault and the ancient Greeks, or Māori philosophical wisdom, my co-researchers stressed the importance of being yourself, of knowing yourself, of knowing the limits of your knowing. Pat and Ann highlighted the practice of “authentic integrity,” which allows people to experience who you are and, as a quality of relationship, requires you to be that person in any situation.

My co-researchers spoke of wide-ranging practices of self that challenge, nourish and sustain their ethical–political commitments and cultivate a justice-seeking way of life. Some perform bodily or physical practices, such as Kevin’s daily exercise regime. Others perform various spiritual practices. Sam’s family meditate on poetry, theology or scripture. Te Kawehau finds being-with-nature soothing and uplifting. Alison is drawn to the contemplative practice of Zen. My co-researchers also highlighted rejuvenating practices. Pat advised his weary political colleague “to go home and be with the family you love and the children who love you” because “we all need breaks and holidays”. Kevin loves his beehives and learning from bees. Ann enjoys Māori performing arts. While not uncommon, these practices are nevertheless unique to each co-researcher. Scholars and practitioners, Māori and Pākehā, are encouraged to review *and* embody their own practices of self, to sustain their ethical–political commitments and live a good life.

My co-researchers highlighted the importance of intimate relationships in refreshing their commitments and anchoring who and how they are in the world, what they stand for and have signed up to. Many emphasised family relationships (Pat, for example, relies on his wife Josephine for “wise counsel and unqualified support,” especially when he finds himself “in the zone” of “a focusing moment”). Ann gains sustenance from a deep sense of connection to Ōtara – the place and its people. My Māori co-researchers spoke of

whānau/hapū/iwi (family/community/tribal) relationships anchoring their work for justice. Being surrounded by and embodying whakapapa connections (origins, ancestral ties) enables them all to be strong in who they are.

***Friendship as a way of life.***

Foucault (1997b) suggested that friendship could become a way of life, an idea that resonates with this research and, I think, a way to sustainably work the hyphen. My co-researchers used various terms (in Māori and in English) to describe their relationships. The sense of collegiality between Kevin and Pat developed over the years into a friendship through shared interests (in health, education and the Treaty), face-to-face encounters (at airports, board meetings or other gatherings), and deeply enriching phone calls. Kevin describes Pat as “hoa tū tata” (a close friend, standing by and ready to assist). When he calls Kevin, Pat said, “we click, as if we’d been together yesterday.” Sam described the deep sense of respect he experiences in his relationship with Ann, which over the years has created “a very meaningful hope”. Ann referred to Sam as a “very good friend” and “ally” with whom she works “in solidarity, in the struggle” for justice; theirs is a “comfortable relationship built on trust”.

Alison and Te Kawehau also spoke of friendship. Alison’s relationship with Te Kawehau, like her other close relationships with Māori, is sustained by “a bedrock of pleasure” and “loyalty that gives protection”. But, she says, writing about things such as “emotion, soul, whatever you want to call it, the glue that is our work together” is a confounding challenge and not really possible because “academic writing cannot bear the weight of the very thing we might want to talk about”. Te Kawehau recognised tensions in using the term “friendship” when working the hyphen with Pākehā; it could be construed as soft on asymmetrical power relations. She observed however that “for our tūpuna (ancestors), face-to-face relationships and personal friendships were the basis of political relationships.” She certainly is a friend of Alison’s and describes a sense of “ignition,” of excitement, a firing off each other, a spark of something that, from her point of view, energises their relationship. That feeling of energy contains an intensity that sustains her, and my other co-researchers, especially through the difficult times.

Like Foucault (1997b), Alison and Te Kawehau begin to break open the idea, the possibility, of pleasure in particular Māori–Pākehā relationships. This move is provocative because it goes against a prevailing narrative of plagued relations, despite examples to the

contrary. In Chapter 2, I recalled Thomas Kendall, the first Pākehā school teacher in Aotearoa–New Zealand, who lost his position because of his close relationships with local whānau, hapū and iwi. Te Kawehau and Alison seem to suggest that pleasure is constitutive of relationship, a lasting relationship, any relationship, including particular Māori–Pākehā relationships. For them, it is the intensity of the relationship that gives pleasure. Pat and Kevin have fun teasing one another. Ann relishes “the joy of the engagement – the thinking, the being together, the being yourself”. This pleasure, this joy, is not forced, rather it arises, as it does in other relationships, in the midst of the engagement and expresses an deep affection – aroha perhaps – for one another.

Such ideas, such emotions, such experiences, Te Kawehau suggests, are not often discussed and, Sam cautions, can be easily misunderstood. For Te Kawehau, such emotions are “a type of love” that is bound up in who the other person is and the way they are and, perhaps also, who you are and the way you are when you are with them. Kevin and Alison highlight the Māori philosophical concept of *ngākau*, which Alison describes as “that place of automatic feeling” that includes your intentions, your character, your personality, your unique responses and behaviours which, for some, are wrapped up in the idea of soul and essentially draw you to a particular Other or them to you. Here *ngākau* inclines us towards aroha, an all-encompassing love and concern for the Other, and above all a deep respect for their singularity, their irreplaceability, and especially their goodness.

What does all this mean for becoming just and doing justice in these particular Māori–Pākehā relationships? My co-researchers uncovered diverse human qualities and particular qualities of relation that impel individuals, Māori *and* Pākehā, to work the hyphen in their relationships, and sustain them when negotiating asymmetries of power and seemingly impossible ethical demands. By practising freedom and embracing an ethical responsibility to the Other, my co-researchers each offer their own crucial little particular bit to the world. My co-researchers embody an ontological–pedagogical orientation that recognises something – goodness, beauty – in the Other, to which they are impossibly drawn and called to awhi. They fearlessly negotiate another world, that other world of the Other, “the strangeness of difference” (Todd, 2003, p. 11) because that is the work of relational justice and it is characterised by an intensity they enjoy.

Learning *from* the Other *in relation*, they co-create a relational pathway that enables each individual, Māori and Pākehā, *to become a bit more human, together*. A way of life was

revealed in my conversations with my co-researchers, a life of friendship that offers a huge source of sustenance, of meaning, of pleasure, of enjoyment and of hope (Foucault, 1997b). This way of life is a life-work *in progress* that seeks to open up relational possibilities. Foucault considered this kind of life to be spiritual and my co-researchers would agree; spiritual in the sense of holistic and all-encompassing, if not religious. I now think another name for relational possibilities *is* hope. Solnit (2016) reminds me that, “Hopefulness is risky, since it is after all a form of trust, trust in the unknown and the possible, even in discontinuity” (p. 23).

## **Methodological Contribution**

This research shows that a case-centred, co-research approach that pairs of longstanding Māori and Pākehā colleagues can produce a lively, deep and ongoing conversational exchange that, when re-presented as composed conversations, can become accessible to scholars and practitioners. In this project research informants became co-researchers with the responsibilities and entitlements of co-authors. The intensity of their relationships, pleasurable and demanding, became embodied in our collaborative research experience.

I started out imagining that I would write a thesis on/from my conversations with co-researchers. My supervisors encouraged me to keep an open mind. Gradually I realised that if I followed my original approach I would have to extract the stories told to me in this research from the relational engagement that summoned them. The idea of re-presenting our many discussions as carefully composed or crafted conversations evolved over time and was strongly influenced by the wishes of my co-researchers, who wanted the questions that summoned their stories to be included in this thesis. Their wish conveyed to me, among other things, a respect for our relationship and the bit we each contributed to this project. My reading of Frank (2004, 2010), Certeau (1984) and Bourdieu (1999c) also led me to privilege the conversations themselves, to let their stories breathe and allow many readers to make their own sense of them. Lincoln Dam also suggests that “this approach takes Levinasian philosophy seriously by leaving things to the Other’s singular reading” (personal communication, October 4, 2017).

I/we sought to keep the spirit of our conversations and the power of my co-researchers’ oral stories alive in a written text. I also did my own educational work, to offer something back to my co-researchers and to other scholars and practitioners (Archibald, 2008). On another

day if I were to re-read the narrative resources re-presented in this thesis and *think with them* in light of a current experience of working the hyphen, other meanings would likely come to me. Stories that are any good have a capacity to keep talking to us, teaching us, enriching our lives with new meanings (Archibald, 2008; Frank, 2010).

My research aim was to resource scholars and practitioners with narrative resources that catalyse thinking on relational possibilities. How often are we afforded the luxury of coming into closer proximity with highly esteemed others, who for years have worked the hyphen of Māori–Pākehā relations *and* are willing to share intimacies of their engagements? My co-researchers tell touching stories and meditate, explicitly and implicitly, on theoretical concepts, at length (such as Te Kawehau’s discussion on Levinasian ethical responsibility) and fleetingly but with no less depth (such as Alison’s reflections on the meaning of life, which relate to ontological becoming in relation). Their stories and ideas signal relational possibilities and emerged *in conversation* with those seeking to “show (Do), respectfully and rightfully (Being), what we know (Knowing)” (Martin-Booran Mirraboopu, 2003, p. 210). These possibilities, and how they are talked about, are constantly evolving in a multiplicity of engagements, conversations and locations between particular individuals who are always already becoming. I hope these stories and ideas will transform scholars and practitioners in whatever way and at whatever level that is possible.

## **Limitations of the Study**

A critically oriented researcher must reflect on the possible limitations of their research. Case-centred studies and other forms of qualitative design are often criticised for being time-consuming, labour-intensive, subjective and costly (Stake, 1995). While these factors apply to this study, I do not interpret them as criticisms or as limitations. Nor do they necessarily negate the academic and ethical–political value of my research. My study highlights the slow work of change in striving for an ever-elusive, ineffable relational justice and accepts that labour, subjectivities and costs are *what it takes* to conduct this kind of case-centred narrative enquiry research.

A case-centred design also tests the politics of legitimation. I decided on a small number of cases emphasising the “critical uniqueness” important to the case and chose co-researchers willing to disclose, exchange, emerge and share their lives in conversation with me (Stake,

1995, p. 44). Recruiting three pairs allowed me to highlight diversities and complexities in a collection of Māori–Pākehā relations. Nuances are inevitably lost *and found* when focusing on a small number of in-depth cases. But the point of my research was not to provide a statistical basis for generalising, which a small number of cases cannot do. Rather, my purpose was to better understand a complexity of interpretations and meanings, and generate storied knowledge to inform theory and practice. What matters when conducting this kind of critical qualitative research is whether or not the research is valued by my co-researchers (it was) and by our epistemic communities (including critical theorists, Indigenous and decolonising researchers, narrative enquirers, educational philosophers, and social justice practitioners).

Creating opportunities for co-researchers to meet would have enriched their relationships and the knowledge generated in the project. At Pat's suggestion, he, Kevin and I enjoyed a wonderful evening together. As they shared stories with one another, I was reminded that some things can, or will only, be said when people meet face-to-face, *but who can know what those things are?* That memorable evening was a highlight for me and their gestures embodied their enjoyment. For joy, if for no other reason, next time I would bring together the pairs and, extending this idea, all my co-researchers, to reflect on and collectively interpret ideas arising in our individual conversations.

## **Research Openings**

An obvious research opening is to continue the study I/we have begun here, in particular generate more stories of the intimacies of every day engagements that illuminate particular orientations and micropractices that can teach so much. Such is the significance and complexity of Māori–Pākehā relations for Aotearoa–New Zealand and Indigene–settler relations internationally that building up this archive of pedagogical narratives carries ethical–political importance and deserves a bigger project. Doing so will not only enrich an appreciation of influences, understandings and meanings that permeate particular relationships but also further illuminate relational possibilities and ambiguities.

Significant scope remains to co-research and re-present troubling encounters as pedagogical narratives. Todd (2009) suggests that if we care about justice, then those things that create potential for disharmony, suffering and violence in the relationship warrant our full attention. Noted earlier, Slivka (2015) re-writes his failure to observe cultural protocols

when meeting an Ojibwe artist as an ethically response-able account. Such stories can teach Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples how to negotiate disharmony, suffering and violence by showing us ways of being, doing and knowing that command respect (Nelson, 2001). We often learn more about ourselves from our most troubling encounters or at least those lessons stick.

My research hints at a relationship between pleasure, joy, enjoyment *and* relational possibilities. Perhaps existing research does not focus enough on these sorts of qualities. The cultural anthropologist Paul Rabinow (1997) draws attention to the significance of Foucault's idea of pleasure: "For him, pleasure seems to function as a kind of ethical heuristic, in the sense that he suggests that where one encounters pleasures, one will be in the vicinity of experiences worthy of further reflection, experimentation, and reformulation" (p. xxxvii). Understanding more deeply the expressions, meanings and significance of pleasure and joy in Māori–Pākehā relations, might further direct our attention to fruitful relational possibilities. I am also interested in how we, Māori and Pākehā, *can and do* go on to co-create pleasure, joy and relational possibilities in spite of and even from troubling encounters. Occasionally, in this research, hope and beauty were also mentioned and it would be fruitful to know more about how working the hyphen can nourish hope and beauty, and what these notions can teach scholars and practitioners about a relational orientation and relational possibilities.

## **Last Words**

I hoped this study would enact the complex reciprocity that A. Jones and Jenkins (2008b) call for in Māori–Pākehā relations (an open but always conditional approach that is constantly negotiated), while acknowledging that confounding non-reciprocity that Levinas (1998a) insists on (that impossible demand of an infinite ethical responsibility to the Other that requires me to forget myself). Rather than offer an incentive for contributing to this research (which could diminish one's mana or usurp authority as a co-researcher who has authorial rights and responsibilities), I sought to value our relational enterprise through a meaningful exchange.

A reciprocity evolved through this exchange and was embodied in different ways. When I became aware that a line of enquiry was of particular interest to my co-researcher, I pursued it actively even when it appeared at first to be beyond the scope of my project. Inevitably I

made connections. I proposed to my co-researchers that the interview texts could become part of their whānau (family) archives. I suggested that they might wish to use their/our interview texts for their own writing or a collaborative composition. I left open the possibility of continuing to work together, perhaps to co-author a book of co-research conversations or co-produce longer narratives. Kevin wants to work on a legacy text and Sam, a spiritual memoir. I will do whatever I can to assist them simply because we are now forever connected, and my heart feels aroha for them. Bishop (1996) suggests, “There is a wairua (spirit) in story that binds the listener to the teller beyond any linkage created by the words on their own” (p. 25). I do not know what Bishop means exactly, but his words express something of what I feel in my relationships with my co-researchers *and* am reaching for. Our work together will not end with this thesis.

Our exchange co-produced other forms of reciprocity. When I am with my co-researchers, it is like being with my maternal grandmothers; I feel rejuvenated and want to be like them. I receive something I need *for* my life and I offer something. Our exchange is open-ended and complex. My offering is not the same as giving something *in return*, because some things are not easily *returned* in any form, if at all, especially the taonga (treasures) of stories or of mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledges) which carry their own wairua (spirit). Rather in this exchange, I learned from my co-researchers how to better embody the kind of “social ethicality” that Te Kawehau speaks of and that enables her and others in this project to work the hyphen productively. *Because of their generosity*, I was able to work with them to re-present some of their knowledge in this thesis, as composed conversations, so others could learn from their stories, philosophical insights and wisdom. Archibald again reminds me that “knowledge gains power as it is shared” (Haig-Brown & Archibald, 1996, p. 251). I have been doing this work for many years with Māori, Pacific Island and low-income peoples, groups and communities, and perhaps it is my particular little thing that I can offer the world.

I would like to say that my doctoral research has been front and centre over these past few years, and it has been but not always. Other seemingly unrelated Māori–Pākehā, Indigenous–non-Indigenous engagements, local and international, turned out to be and still are profoundly significant. Their problematics and possibilities claimed quite a bit (I mean, a huge amount) of my attention, not because they embodied the topic of my thesis, but because they offered me ways to live a life that is seeking to become more relationally

responsible, both ethically and politically. This life I am living *in* the work I am doing refused to stop while I did a PhD and I could not turn away. I live the topic of my thesis every day in a messy entangled kind of way.

“What will you do after the doctorate?” Te Kawehau asked. “Keep working with *them* *Māori fellas*,” I said. “Yeah, they’re more fun,” she replied, and we both laughed. In that fun and all the laughter, those slow nods and side glances, the bright eyes and warm gestures, that extraordinary generosity that feels like deeply touching kindness, I find so much wisdom, joy and beauty – a kind of holistic appreciation for life and for living together, and what that means, that makes so much sense against haunting experiences of suffering and grief. I find my life, the one I *am* living, that stretches me in every direction, and I love it, *completely*. I need all my relationships with my Indigenous mates, however those relationships are composed and defined, however cuddly or scratchy; each one is significant and unique. I need my Pākehā mates also, because their perseverance and resilience, their commitment and passion, their grace and humility, gives me hope for how I can be with my Indigenous colleagues and friends.

Finally, this research addresses the topic of Māori–Pākehā relations, and more broadly Indigene–settler relations. This topic is crucially important because these relations are situated in contested histories with troubled legacies that shape current macrolevel political arrangements and microlevel face-to-face engagements. It is also vitally interesting because, at a face-to-face level, particular relationships are singular and diverse, personal and political. Relational justice transforms relational problematics into face-to-face pedagogical meetings that intersect the ethical and the political. Scholars and practitioners seeking to productively work the hyphen in Māori–Pākehā relations are called to embody an ethical–political–ontological–pedagogical–spiritual orientation that 1) attends to power relations; 2) demonstrates an ethical response to and responsibility for the Other; 3) allows for human becoming and fosters qualities of relation that produce relational goodness; 4) learns in relation *from* the Other; and 5) cultivates a way of life, a manner of being, that creates possibilities for friendship. Situated in a shared and troubled history, Māori–Pākehā relations, like other Indigene–settler relations, are marked by complexity, ambiguity, contradiction and tension. But these problematics create the conditions for justice and provide openings for nonviolent relations. Relational justice, my research shows, requires

a meaningful exchange that is at once always already political, profoundly ethical, deeply human, powerfully pedagogical, and cultivates a way of life that, for some, is spiritual.

# Appendix A: Participant information sheet

## Project title:

Being just, doing just practice: the intersection of ethics and politics in Indigene–settler relations

## About the researcher and an invitation to work together

My name is Frances Hancock and I am undertaking doctoral studies in education at the University of Auckland. I am writing to invite you to participate in a research project that will be the basis of my doctoral studies.

I am an Irish Pākehā New Zealander who comes from a long line of justice-seeking women and men. I live in Māngere Bridge where my parents settled nearly 40 years ago. For over 25 years, through my professional work, I have combined interests in the Treaty of Waitangi, community storytelling, community development and social change with research and writing. I have mainly worked alongside Indigenous peoples and low-income communities. Over the past decade I have interviewed hundreds of people engaged in diverse community, philanthropic and educational projects aimed at social change benefitting mainly Māori and Pacific youth, families, their communities, and the nation. Through this work I have encountered many practitioners striving to make the world a better place through their justice-seeking efforts. Their words provide the inspiration for my doctoral study, which is situated in the University’s School of Māori Education, Te Puna Wānanga, where my two supervisors (Professor Alison Jones and Dr. Te Kawehau Hoskins) are located. Their contact details are below.

## Project aims and objectives

Learning from “exemplars of justice,” including you, my research aims to understand the notion of a “just practice” and develop educational narratives (including individual portraits of exemplars) to help educate and guide the next generation. The study will explore the particular characteristics, purposes, meanings, challenges and relevance of a just practice. To ground the study in Aotearoa New Zealand, the portraits will focus on pairs of Māori and Pākehā colleagues who have worked together over many years and can speak specifically to the ethical, political and practical challenges and responsibilities in Indigene–settler relations as experienced by them.

For the purposes of this project, the term “just practitioner” and “exemplars of justice” are used interchangeably and will refer to individuals who:

- Have dedicated their lives and professional work to social justice;
- Have developed a reputation among their peers for ethical and just practice;
- Are seen as exemplars of justice, exercising a critical stance and displaying such qualities as respect, honesty, courage, perseverance, generosity, optimism and hope;
- Are in the third chapter of their lives (aged 50-75 years) with many stories to tell and insights to offer; and,
- Negotiate the Indigene–settler relation in their work and lives.

The main research questions are:

- What is a just practice? And what does it mean to be a just practitioner? What kind of qualities, ethical practices and political commitments define a just practice? And a just practitioner?
- How do just practitioners go about doing justice in an unjust world? Looking through the eyes of just practitioners, what does seeking “to be just” and “do justice” look like, work like and feel like? With whom do just practitioners cast their lot? And why?
- How does one become *and* remain a just practitioner?
- How does just practice support Indigene–settler relations, in particular collaborative relationships, ethical responsibilities, Treaty-based practice, and political commitments? What does a just practice make possible?

I will use a case study and narrative enquiry approach combined with portraiture methods to create individual portraits. I will analyse the information generated in the research and discuss key themes and issues with exemplars. In addition to the doctoral thesis, I eventually hope to publish from the research including possibly a book of just practices, a collection of portraits or interviews, aimed at the next generation and interested others. Academic articles or a text for graduate students may be another way of sharing exemplar insights, stories and poetic wisdom.

### **Your participation**

I will conduct up to six interviews (face-to-face and/or by email or skype) with six “exemplars of justice”. The interviews will happen over six months and the duration of each interview will be around 90 minutes. Face-to-face and skyped interviews will be digitally recorded. At any time during these interviews you can ask me to turn off the recording device and to exclude particular information from the research. Taped interviews will either be transcribed by me or by a professional transcriber who will be required to sign a confidentiality form. I will ask you to review the transcripts to ensure accuracy. You will be able to make any changes you want, including deletions, additions and corrections. You will need to sign the attached consent form if you agree to participate.

### **Right to withdraw**

All participants have the right to withdraw from the research at any time, without giving a reason, and can withdraw information they have contributed up until 1 November 2015, when the data analysis begins.

### **Your information**

Only I (the researcher) or a professional transcriber will have access to your interview recordings. I will quote verbatim extracts from the interviews in my doctoral thesis, where relevant and appropriate, and also in conference presentations, seminars and publications. You will be identified with your research material. Being able to name the just practitioners contributing to the research is important for the educative purposes of the study and will add to its “mana”; alternatively it would be difficult if not impossible to ensure anonymity given that exemplars are chosen because of their reputations.

Your consent form will be stored separately from your interview recordings and transcripts. All consent forms will be kept securely in my supervisor's office the University of Auckland Epsom Campus for six years and then destroyed. Interview transcripts and my research notes will be kept in my locked office for a period of six years and then destroyed. Electronic data (word files and email exchanges) will be stored on my password protected computer for six years and then deleted. All recordings will be kept until data analysis is completed so transcripts can be checked for accuracy. I will then return your interview audio material to you or, if you prefer, it will be deleted.

I will advise you on how to access the completed thesis online and/or make available a hard copy for you to read. The final thesis will be submitted for assessment for the award of a PhD at the University of Auckland.

### **Contact details**

If you would like further information about the research please contact me on (09) 6345228 or 0210722696 or email me at [f.hancock@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:f.hancock@auckland.ac.nz). If you prefer, and at any time during the research, you can ask questions or raise concerns with my doctoral supervisors at the University of Auckland, Professor Alison Jones ([a.jones@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:a.jones@auckland.ac.nz)) or Dr Te Kawehau Hoskins ([tk.hoskins@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:tk.hoskins@auckland.ac.nz)).

You may also contact:

Dr Jenny Bol Jun Lee, Head of School,  
Te Puna Wānanga School of Māori Education,  
Faculty of Education, University of Auckland,  
Tel: +64 9 623 8899 ext. 48125  
[jenny.lee@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:jenny.lee@auckland.ac.nz).

*For any concerns regarding ethical issues you may contact:*

The Chair, University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee,  
University of Auckland, Research Office,  
Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142.  
Telephone: 09 373-7599 extn. 87830/83761;  
[humanethics@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:humanethics@auckland.ac.nz).

Thank you for taking the time to review this information and for considering the opportunity to take part in my doctoral research.

Heoi anō

Frances Hancock, researcher

**APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 1 December 2014 for three years. Reference Number 013381**



## Appendix B: Participant consent form

**This consent form will be held securely for six years and then destroyed.**

**Title of the research:** Being just, doing justice: the intersection of ethics and politics in Indigene–settler relations

**Researcher:** Frances Hancock

I have read the participant information sheet on the proposed research. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have them answered. I understand the aims and objectives of the research and how it will be carried out. I consent to participate and affirm that my participation is voluntary. I understand that I am free to withdraw from the research at any time without giving a reason and that I can request (up until the beginning of the analysis phase of the research, 1 November 2015) that my research material not be used in the research.

In addition, I also understand that:

- I will take part in up to six interviews (or about 8 hours in total) over a period of six months, through a combination of face-to-face meetings and email exchanges. Skype may also be used.
- Face-to-face and skyped interviews with me will be digitally recorded. At any time during these interviews I know I can ask the researcher to turn off the recording device and to exclude particular information in the research.
- The researcher will transcribe the taped interviews (or a professional transcriber who must sign a confidentiality agreement).
- I will review interview transcripts to ensure their accuracy. I know I can make any changes I want, including deletions, additions and corrections up until 1<sup>st</sup> November 2015.
- Only the researcher will have access to my audio material. Audio material from my interviews will be kept securely in the researcher's office until data analysis is completed so transcripts can be checked for accuracy. My audio material and transcripts will then be given to me for my personal records. If I prefer my audio material can be digitally destroyed.
- I will be named in the portrait and in any extracts used in the doctoral thesis, conference presentations, seminars and publications.
- If, at any time, I have any questions or concerns about the research, I can raise these with Frances Hancock (021 072 2696 or f.hancock@auckland.ac.nz) or with her supervisors at the University of Auckland, Professor Alison Jones (a.jones@auckland.ac.nz) or Dr. Te Kawehau Hoskins (tk.hoskins@auckland.ac.nz).

**I agree to participate in the research**

**Signed:**

**Name:**

**Date:**

**APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS  
ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 1 December 2014 for three years. Reference Number  
013381**

## References

- Archibald, J. (2008). *Indigenous storywork: Educating the heart, mind, body and spirit*. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.
- Aristotle. (1975). *The Nicomachean ethics* (H. G. Apostle, Trans.). Dordrecht, Holland: Reidel.
- Aristotle. (1995). *Selections* (T. Irwin & G. Fine, Trans.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Baker, S., Edwards, R., & Doidge, M. (2012). *How many qualitative interviews is enough?: Expert voices and early career reflections on sampling and cases in qualitative research. Discussion Paper*. Retrieved from [http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/2273/4/how\\_many\\_interviews.pdf](http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/2273/4/how_many_interviews.pdf)
- Barclay, K. (2005). Rethinking inclusion and biculturalism: Towards a more relational practice of democratic justice. In J. H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 118–139). Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Barlow, C. (1994). *Tikanga whakaaro: Key concepts in Māori culture*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Battiste, M. (2000). *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision*. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.
- Baxter, J. (2010). Case studies in qualitative research. In I. Hay (Ed.), *Qualitative methods in human geography* (3rd ed., pp. 81–98). Don Mills, Ontario, Canada: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, A. (2004). *Relating Māori and Pākehā: The politics of Indigenous and settler identities*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis), Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Bell, A. (2007). *Becoming Pākehā: Dominance and its costs*. Paper presented at the “Sweet As?”: Ethnic and Pākehā NZers talk identity and dominance in a colonised land, Newtown, Wellington. Retrieved from <http://sweetasconference.blogspot.co.nz/2007/05/becoming-pkeh-dominance-and-its-costs.html>

- Bell, A. (2008). Recognition or ethics? De/centering and the legacy of settler colonialism. *Cultural Studies*, 22(6), 850–869.
- Bell, A. (2014). *Relating Indigenous and settler identities: Beyond domination*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bell, A. (2017). Coexisting Indigenous and settler worlds: Ontological styles and possibilities. *The Journal of New Zealand Studies* 2017(24), 15–24.
- Bernasconi, R. (1999). The third party: Levinas on the intersection of the ethical and the political. *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*, 30(1), 76–87.
- Bhabha, H. K. (2004) *The location of culture* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bidois, V. (2013). A genealogy of cultural politics, identity and resistance: Reframing the Māori–Pākehā binary. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 9(2), 142–154.
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: Whakawhanaungatanga*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R. (2005). Freeing Ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: A kaupapa Māori approach. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 109–138). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bishop, R. (2012). Pretty difficult: Implementing kaupapa Māori theory in English-medium secondary schools. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 38–50.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999a). The space of points of view. In P. Bourdieu (Ed.), *The weight of the world: Social suffering in contemporary society* (P. Parkhurst Ferguson, Trans., pp. 3–5). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999b). To the reader. In P. Bourdieu (Ed.), *The weight of the world: Social suffering in contemporary society* (P. Parkhurst Ferguson, Trans., pp. 1–2). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999c). Understanding. In P. Bourdieu (Ed.), *The weight of the world: Social suffering in contemporary society* (P. Parkhurst Ferguson, Trans., pp. 607–626). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Boylorn, R. M., & Orbe, M. P. (2014). *Critical autoethnography: Intersecting cultural identities in everyday life*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

- Brewer, J. D. (2000). *Ethnography*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *InterView: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bruner, J. S. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Carter, P. (1992). *Living in a new country: History, travelling and language*. London, England: Faber and Faber.
- Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clandinin, D. J. (2007). *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Coles, R. (1989). *The call of stories: Teaching and the moral imagination*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Consedine, R., & Consedine, J. (2012). *Healing our history: The challenge of the Treaty of Waitangi* (3rd ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Crocket, K., Flanagan, P., Alford, Z., Allen, J., Baird, J., Bruce, A., ... & Swann, H. (2013). Supervision and culture: Meetings at threshold. *New Zealand Journal of Counselling*, 33(1), 68–86.
- Crocket, K., Flanagan, P., Swann, H., Swann, B., Soundy, T., Smith, B., ... & Alford, Z. (2015). Supervision as cultural partnership: Contributions to dialogue. *Ata: Journal of Psychotherapy Aotearoa New Zealand*, 19(1), 67–81.
- Cruikshank, J. (1998). *The social life of stories: Narrative and knowledge in the Yukon Territory*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Dam, L. (2018). Love and politics: Rethinking biculturalism and multiculturalism in Aotearoa–New Zealand. In Z. L. Rocha & M. Webber (Eds.), *Mana tangatarua: Mixed heritages, ethnic identity and biculturalism in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 135–150). Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Davis, L. (Ed.). (2010a). *Alliances: Re/envisioning Indigenous–non-Indigenous relationships*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

- Davis, L. (2010b). Introduction. In L. Davis (Ed.), *Alliances: Re/envisioning Indigenous–non-Indigenous relationships* (pp. 1–12). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Davis, L. (2010c). Linking theory and practice, Part 3. In L. Davis (Ed.), *Alliances: Re/envisioning Indigenous–non-Indigenous relationships* (pp. 211–212). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Davis, L., & Shpuniarsky, H. Y. (2010). The spirit of relationships: What we have learned about Indigenous–non-Indigenous alliances and coalitions. In L. Davis (Ed.), *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous–non-Indigenous relationships* (pp. 334–348). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Deloria, V., Jr. (1999). *For this land: Writings on religion in America*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Denzin, N. K. (2001). The reflexive interview and a performative social science. *Qualitative Research, 1*, 23–46.
- Denzin, N. K., & Giardina, M. D. (2007). *Ethical futures in qualitative research: Decolonizing the politics of knowledge*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., & Smith, L. T. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Durie, E. (2000, April). *Peace in customary terms*. Paper presented at the Just peace? Peace-making and peace-building for the new millennium, Massey University, Albany, Aotearoa/New Zealand.
- Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora: Māori health development*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (1997). Identity, access and Māori advancement. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Administration, 12*, 41–45.
- Ellis, C. (1997). Evocative autoethnography: Writing emotionally about our lives. In W. Tierney & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Representation and the text: Reframing the narrative voice* (pp. 115–139). Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Epston, D. (1999). Co-research: The making of an alternative knowledge. *Narrative therapy and community work: Conference collection* (Vol. 1, pp. 137–156). Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre.
- Epston, D., Rennie, G., & Napan, K. (2004). On becoming a just practitioner: Experimenting with the final paper of an undergraduate programme as a rite of passage. *Social Work Review*, *XVI*(4), 38–50.
- Ermine, W. (2007). The ethical space of engagement. *Indigenous Law Journal*, *6*(1), 193–204.
- Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: Reinventing Self and Other in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 70–82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Finn, J. L., & Jacobson, M. (2003). Just practice. *Journal of Social Work Education*, *39*(1), 57–78.
- Finn, J. L., & Jacobson, M. (2008). *Just practice: A social justice approach to social work* (2nd ed.). Peosta, IA: Eddie Bowers.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1997a). The ethics of the concern for self as a practice of freedom. In P. R. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics, subjectivity and truth: Essential works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984, Volume One* (pp. 281–301). New York, NY: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1997b). Friendship as a way of life. In P. R. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics, subjectivity and truth: Essential works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984, Volume One* (pp. 135–140). New York, NY: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1997c). On the genealogy of ethics: An overview of work in progress. In P. R. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics, subjectivity and truth: Essential works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984, Volume One* (pp. 253–280). New York, NY: The New Press.

- Foucault, M. (1997d). Sex, power, and the politics of identity. In P. R. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics, subjectivity and truth: Essential works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984, Volume One* (pp. 163–173). New York, NY: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (1997e). Technologies of the self. In P. R. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics, subjectivity and truth: Essential works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984, Volume One* (pp. 223–251). New York, NY: The New Press.
- Foucault, M. (2003). The subject and power. In P. Rabinow & N. Rose (Eds.), *The essential Foucault: Selections from essential works of Foucault, 1954–1984* (pp. 122–144). New York, NY: The New Press.
- Frank, A. (2004). *The renewal of generosity: Illness, medicine and how to live*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Frank, A. (2010). *Letting stories breathe: A socio-narratology*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Frankl, V. E. (1985). *Man's search for meaning*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gergen, K. J. (2009). *Relational being: Beyond self and community*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Giroux, H. (2005). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- gkisedtanamoogk., & Hancock, F. (1993). *Anoqcou: Ceremony is life itself*. Portland, ME: Astarte Shell Press.
- Goodall, H. L., Jr. (2000). *Writing the new ethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Grant, B. (2003). Mapping the pleasures and risks of supervision. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 24(2), 175–190.
- Grant, B. (2010). Challenging issues: Doctoral supervision in post-colonial sites. *Acta Academica Supplementum*, 1, 103–129.
- Greenwood, J. (2005). Journeying into the third space: A study of how theatre can be used to interpret the emergent space between cultures. *Youth Theatre Journal*, 19(1), 1–16.

- Hager, S. (2017). *Through the eastern door: When Native and White America sat down together*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Haig-Brown, C. (1992). Choosing border work. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 19(1), 96–115.
- Haig-Brown, C., & Archibald, J. (1996). Transforming First Nations research with respect and power. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 9(3), 245–267.
- Haig-Brown, C., & Nock, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Good intentions: Euro-Canadian and Aboriginal relations in colonial Canada*. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.
- Hancock, F. (2012). *He akoranga, he aratohu Māori and Pacific Education Initiative: Lessons to guide innovative philanthropic & social practice*. Auckland, New Zealand: ASB Community Trust.
- Hancock, F. (2013). *Nga maumaharatanga: Māori and Pacific Education Initiative: Our journey of forging philanthropic innovation together*. Auckland, New Zealand: ASB Community Trust.
- Hancock, F., (with Chapman, S., Milne, A., Usmar, M., Milne, K., Iorangi, K., & Timoteo, F.). (2015). *Otara: Where ancient and new technologies meet*. Otara, Auckland, New Zealand: HTYN Publishing.
- Hancock, F., & Epston, D. (2008). The craft and art of narrative inquiry in organizations. In D. Barry & H. Hansen (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of new approaches in management and organization* (pp. 485–502). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Head, L., & Mikaere, B. (1988). Was 19th century Māori society literate?. *Archifacts*, 2, 17–20.
- Hofmeyr, B. (2003). Self-created or other-invoked? Foucault and Levinas on how to become ethical. *Phronimon, Journal of the South African Society of Greek Philosophy and the Humanities*, 4(1), 40–61.
- Hofmeyr, B. (2010). From activity to radical passivity: Retracing ethical agency in Levinas. *MonoKL*, 8–9, 97–117.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1995). *The active interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Hoskins, T. K. (2010). *Māori and Levinas: Kanohi ki te kanohi for an ethical politics* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Hoskins, T. K. (2012). A fine risk: Ethics in Kaupapa Māori politics. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 85–99.
- Hoskins, T. K. (2017). Te ara whanaunga: Relations on the ground at Waitangi Tribunal hearings. In R. Bell, M. Kawharu, K. Taylor, M. Belgrave, & P. Meihana (Eds.), *The Treaty on the ground: Where we are headed, and why it matters* (pp. 133–148). Auckland, New Zealand: Massey University Press.
- Hoskins, T. K., & Jones, A. (Eds.). (2012). Introduction. He aha te Kaupapa? Critical conversations in Kaupapa Māori [Special issue]. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 3–9.
- Jones, A. (1999). The limits of cross-cultural dialogue: Pedagogy, desire and absolution in the classroom. *Educational Theory*, 49(3), 299–316.
- Jones, A. (2005). *Pedagogy of the gaps: Lessons on evidence, from the beach*. Paper presented at the The Herbison Lectures 1999–2004, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Jones, A. (with Jenkins, K.). (2008). Rethinking collaboration: Working the Indigene-colonizer hyphen. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies* (pp. 471–486). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jones, A. (2012). Dangerous liaisons: Pākehā, kaupapa Māori and educational research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 100–112.
- Jones, A., & Jenkins, K. (2008a). Indigenous discourse and “the material”: A post-interpretivist argument. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 1(2), 125–144.
- Jones, A., & Jenkins, K. (2008b). Invitation and refusal: A reading of the beginning of schooling in Aotearoa New Zealand. *History of Education*, 37(2), 187–206.
- Jones, A., & Jenkins, K. (2011). *Words between us/He Kōrero: First Māori-Pākehā conversations on paper*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.
- Jones, A., & Jenkins, K. (2017). *Tuaiti: A traveller in two worlds*. Wellington, New Zealand: Williams Books.

- Jones, C. (2016). *New Treaty, new tradition: Reconciling New Zealand and Māori law*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- King, M. (1985). *Being Pākehā: An encounter with New Zealand and the Māori renaissance*. Auckland, New Zealand: Hodder and Stoughton.
- King, M. (1999). *Being Pākehā now: Reflections and recollections of a white Native*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- King, M. (2011). *The silence beyond: Selected writings by Michael King*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Kovach, M. (2010). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Kuby, C. (2013). "Ok this is hard": Doing emotions in social justice dialogue. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 8(1), 29–42.
- Kuby, C. (2014). Understanding emotions as situated, embodied, and fissured: Thinking with theory to create an analytical tool. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 27(10), 1285–1311.
- Labonte, R. (2011). Reflections on stories and a story/dialogue method in health research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 14(2), 153–163.
- Land, C. (2011). *The politics of solidarity with Indigenous struggles in Southeast Australia* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Deakin University, Burwood, VIC, Australia.
- Lassiter, L. (2005). *The Chicago guide to collaborative ethnography*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Feminist research in education: Within/against*. Geelong, VIC, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Lawless, E. (1993). *Holy woman, wholly women: Sharing ministries through life stories and reciprocal ethnography*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lawrence-Lightfoot, S. (1999). *Respect: An exploration*. Reading, MA: Perseus Books.
- Lee, J. (2009). Decolonising Māori narratives: Pūrākau as a method. *MAI Review*, 2(3), 1–12.

- Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1986). The trace of the other. In M. C. Taylor (Ed.), *Deconstruction in context* (pp. 345–359). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Levinas, E. (1998a). *Otherwise than being or beyond essence* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1998b). Philosophy, justice and love (M. Smith & B. Harshav, Trans.) *Entre nous: Thinking-of-the-other* (pp. 103–121). London, England: Continuum.
- Lusted, D. (1986). Why pedagogy? *Screen*, 27(5), 2–16.
- MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After virtue: A study in moral theory* (3rd ed.). Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Mansvelt, J., & Berg, L. (2010). Writing qualitative geographies, constructing geographical knowledges. In I. Hay (Ed.), *Qualitative methods in human geography* (3rd ed., pp. 333–355). Don Mills, Ontario, Canada: Oxford University Press.
- Margaret, J. (2013). *Working as allies: Supporters of Indigenous justice reflect*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland Workers Educational Association.
- Marsden, M. (2003). *The woven university: Selected writings by Rev. Māori Marsden*. Otaki, New Zealand: The Estate of Rev. Māori Marsden.
- Martin-Booran Mirraboopa, K. L. (2003). Ways of knowing, being, doing: A theoretical framework and methods for Indigenous re-search and indigenist research. *Journal of Australian Studies*, 27(76), 203–214.
- Mattingly, C. (2010). *The paradox of hope: Journeys through a clinical borderland*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- McAllan, F. (2013). *Speaking-writing with: Aboriginal and settler interrelations*. Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Cambridge Scholars.
- McGloin, C. (2009). Considering the work of Martin Nakata’s “cultural interface”: A reflection on theory and practice by a non-Indigenous academic. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 38(1), 36–41.

- McIntosh, P. (1989). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. Retrieved from White privilege: <https://nationalseedproject.org/white-privilege-unpacking-the-invisible-knapsack>.
- MacKinlay, E. & Chalmers, G. (2104). Rememberances and relationships: Rethinking collaboration in ethnomusicology as ethical and decolonising practice. In K. Barney (Ed.), *Collaborative ethnomusicology: New approaches to music research between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians* (pp. 63–80). Melbourne, VIC, Australia: Lyrebird Press.
- Mead, H. M. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.
- Meredith, P. (1998). *Hybridity in the third space: Rethinking bicultural politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Paper presented at the Te Oru Rangahau Māori Research and Development Conference, Massey University, New Zealand.
- Mertens, D. M., Cram, F., & Chilisa, B. (Eds.). (2013). *Indigenous pathways into social research: Voices of a new generation*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Micciche, L. R. (2007). *Doing emotion: Rhetoric, writing, teaching*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Nakata, M. (2007a). The cultural interface. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 36(S1), 7–14.
- Nakata, M. (2007b). *Disciplining the savages, savaging the disciplines*. Canberra, Australia: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Nelson, H. L. (2001). *Damaged identities, narrative repair*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- New Zealand Māori Council v. Attorney-General (1987).
- Neveu, L. (2010). Beyond recognition and coexistence: Living together. In L. Davis (Ed.), *Alliances: Re/envisioning Indigenous–non-Indigenous relationships* (pp. 234–255). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Nunns, R. (2014). *Te ara puoro: a journey into the world of Māori music*. Nelson, New Zealand: Craig Potton Publishing.

- Oakley, A. (2010). The social science of biographical life-writing: Some methodological and ethical issues. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 13(5), 425–439.
- Orange, C. (1987). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington, New Zealand: Allen & Unwin/Port Nicholson Press.
- Patel, L. (2016). *Decolonizing educational research: From ownership to answerability*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pelias, R. J. (2007). Performative writing: The ethics of representation in form and body. In N. K. Denzin & M. D. Giardina (Eds.), *Ethical futures in qualitative research: Decolonizing the politics of knowledge* (pp. 181–196). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Pihama, L. (1993). No, I will not be a post. *Te Pua*, 2(1-2), 35–37.
- Polkinghorne, D. (1997). Reporting qualitative research as practice. In W. Tierney & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Representation and the text: Reframing the narrative voice* (pp. 3–22). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Pratt, M. L. (1992). *Imperial writing and transculturalism*. London, England: Routledge.
- Rabinow, P. (1997). Introduction: The history of systems of thought. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Ethics, subjectivity and truth: Essential works of Michel Foucault 1954–1984, Volume One* (pp. xi–xlii). New York, NY: The New Press.
- Riessman, C. K. (2008a). Narrative analysis. In L. S. Given (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopaedia of qualitative research methods* (Vol. 2, pp. 539–540). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Riessman, C. K. (2008b). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Royal, T. A. (2012). Politics and knowledge: Kaupapa Māori and matauranga Māori. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 30–37.
- Salmond, A. (2012). Ontological quarrels: Indigeneity, exclusion and citizenship in a relational world. *Anthropological Theory*, 12(2), 115–141.
- Salmond, A., & Stirling, A. M. (1976). *Amiria: The life story of a Māori woman*. Wellington, New Zealand: Reed.

- Sawicki, J. (1991). *Disciplining Foucault: Feminism, power, and the body*. Hove, England: Psychology Press.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Sennett, R. (2006). *The culture of the new capitalism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Simons, J. (Ed.). (2004). *Contemporary critical theorists: From Lacan to Said*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Slivka, K. (2015). My failure with an Ojibwe artist: Reflections on initial intercultural relationships. *The Journal of Social Theory in Art Education (Online)*, 35, 44–56.
- Smith, G. (1992). Research issues related to Māori education. In *The Issue of Research and Māori* [Monograph no. 9]. Auckland, New Zealand: Research Unit for Māori Education, The University of Auckland.
- Smith, G. (1997). *The development of kaupapa Māori: Theory and praxis* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). London, United Kingdom: Zed Books.
- Solnit, R. (2016). *Hope in the dark: Untold histories*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.
- Somerville, M. (2014). Creative collaborations in the contact zone. In K. Barney (Ed.), *Collaborative ethnomusicology: New approaches to music research between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians* (pp. 9–24). Melbourne, VIC, Australia: Lyrebird Press.
- Somerville, M., & Perkins, T. (2003). Border work in the contact zone: Thinking Indigenous–non-Indigenous collaboration spatially. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 24(3), 253–266.
- Spence, D. (1982). *Narrative truth and historical truth: Meaning and interpretation in psychoanalysis*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 435–454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Stake, R. (2010). *Qualitative research: Studying how things work*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2012). *NZ official yearbook 2012: New Zealand's prison population*. Retrieved from [http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse\\_for\\_stats/snapshots-of-nz/yearbook/society/crime/corrections.aspx](http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/snapshots-of-nz/yearbook/society/crime/corrections.aspx)
- Statistics New Zealand (2013a). *2013 Census QuickStats about Māngere Bridge*. Retrieved from [www.stats.govt.nz](http://www.stats.govt.nz)
- Statistics New Zealand. (2013b). *2013 Census QuickStats about Māori*. Retrieved from [www.stats.govt.nz](http://www.stats.govt.nz)
- Statistics New Zealand. (2017). *National ethnic population projections: 2013(base)–2038 (update)*. Retrieved from [www.stats.govt.nz](http://www.stats.govt.nz)
- Stewart, G. (2016). From both sides of the Indigenous–settler hyphen in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 48, 1–9.
- Swamp, J. (2010). Kanikonriio: Power of a good mind. In L. Davis (Ed.), *Alliances: Re/envisioning Indigenous–non-Indigenous relationships* (pp. 15–24). Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Tate, H. (2012). *He puna iti i te ao mārama: A little spring in the world of light*. Auckland, New Zealand: Libro International.
- Te Puni Kokiri. (2001). *He tirohanga o kawa ki te Tiriti o Waitangi: The principles of the Treaty of Waitangi as expressed by the Courts and the Waitangi Tribunal*. Wellington, New Zealand: Te Puni Kokiri. Retrieved from <http://www.tpk.govt.nz/publications/subject/default.asp#gov>
- Todd, S. (1997). *Learning desire: Perspectives on pedagogy, culture, and the unsaid*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Todd, S. (2003). *Learning from the other: Levinas, psychoanalysis, and ethical possibilities in education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Todd, S. (2009). *Toward an imperfect education: Facing humanity, rethinking cosmopolitanism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Todd, S. (2014). Between body and spirit: The liminality of pedagogical relationships. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 48(2), 231–245.

- Tolich, M. (2002). Pākehā “paralysis”: Cultural safety for those researching the general population of Aotearoa. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 19(December), 164–178.
- Waitere, H. (2008). Cultural leadership: Creating futures our ancestors can walk in with our children. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*, 23(2), 34–47.
- Webber, M. (2008). *Walking the space between: Identity and Māori/Pākehā*. Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER Press.
- Webster, J. P., Wiles, P., Civil, M., & Clark, S. (2005). Finding a good fit: Using MCC in a “Third Space”. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 44(3), 9–30.
- Weerasooriya, A. (2004). Emmanuel Levinas (1906–95). In J. Simons (Ed.), *Contemporary critical theorists: From Lacan to Said* (pp. 35–50). Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wevers, L. (2006). Being Pākehā: The politics of location. *Journal of New Zealand Studies*, 4(5), 1–9.
- White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Yukich, R., & Hoskins, T. K. (2011). Responsibility and the Other: Cross-cultural engagement in the narratives of three New Zealand school leaders. *Journal of Systemic Therapies*, 30(3), 57–72.