



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](#).

“Ko te mea nui, ko te aroha.”

**Theological Perspectives on
Māori Language and Cultural Regeneration
Policy and Practice
of the Anglican Church**

Wayne Rangi Nicholson

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,

The University of Auckland, 2009.

Abstract

For almost two hundred years the Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand has conducted mission and ministry through the medium of Māori language and culture. At the beginning of the twenty-first century Māori language and culture are endangered. Over the past forty years there have been regeneses efforts to revive and revitalise these cultural resources. This thesis critiques the current Māori language and cultural regeneses policy and practice of the Anglican Church through bicultural Treaty of Waitangi partnership and Māori theological lenses.

The written regeneses policy consists of five Standing Resolutions of the General Synod which is the main policymaking body of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia. Four of these Resolutions are bicultural and one is missional. This policy is placed within the contexts of Māori research, the history of Māori language and culture, the Anglican Church and the Treaty of Waitangi, Māori biblical and liturgical resources, recent examples of regeneses and the personal location of the thesis writer.

Twenty-five senior stakeholders are interviewed from the Church's three cultural strands: Tikanga Māori, Tikanga Pākehā and Tikanga Pasifika. A wide range of perspectives emerge from within these cultural groupings as they review past, present and future practices of each Standing Resolution.

Syntheses of this Anglican Church regeneses policy and practice are viewed through bicultural Treaty partnership and Māori theological lenses. The former focusses on economic, political and constitutional Treaty debates on partnership and biculturalism in the public square. The latter surveys the theological writings of twenty-three Māori theologians, giving rise to four major themes: Māori spirituality, ecclesiology, theological education, and language and cultural regeneses. As a result of viewing the Church's policy and practice through these lenses, a number of disturbing trends become apparent.

The thesis concludes by strongly advocating that Tikanga Māori alter its policy and practice in order to reverse these trends through bold, loving transformation. Eighteen important contexts for future Māori language and cultural ministry emerge. Nine major policy priorities for future regeneses development are outlined. Christ-like love is seen to be critical if the Church and Māori language and culture are to survive and flourish.

He Mihi: Greetings and Acknowledgements

He korōria ki te Atua i runga rawa,

He maunga ā rongō ki runga i te mata o te whenua,

He whakaaro pai ki ngā tāngata katoa.

Tēnā koutou katoa e ngā pononga a te Atua, e aku tuāhine, tuākana i roto i a te Karaiti.

Tēnei te mihi atu ki ngā tini aituā kua wehe atu i runga i te whakaponono, i te wehi ki tō tātou Matua nui i te rangi. Nāna i hōmai, nāna anō i tango atu. Kia whakapaingia te Atua aroha i ngā wā katoa. Ka āpiti hono tātai hono, te hunga wairua ki te hunga wairua, ka āpiti hono tātai hono, te hunga ora ki te hunga ora.

Kaati, he mihi poto ki te hunga tautoko i te kaupapa. Tēnā koutou e awhi nei, e manaaki i ahau. Kei te mihi, kei te tangi mō tō koutou aroha me tō koutou manawanui. Ka mihi ahau ki a koutou o Te Hāhi Mihinare ki Aotearoa ki Niu Tireni, ki ngā Moutere o te Moana Nui a Kiwa, Te Whare Wānanga o Hoani Tapu, te Kaikauwhau i te Rongopai, Te Whare Wānanga o Te Rau Kahikatea, Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa me Te Whare Wānanga o Tāmaki Makaurau. Nā koutou ahau i āwhina kia whai tuarā ai ahau ki roto i tēnei tuhingaroa. E kore e taea te kōrero ngā whakaaro e pupū ake mō tō koutou atawhai. Kaati ake, hei whakakapi i ēnei rārangi, kia tau tonu rā ngā manaakitanga a te Atua ki runga i a koutou katoa.

Glory to God on high,

Peace on earth,

Goodwill to all people.

First, I give thanks to God for the countless blessings which I have enjoyed on this doctoral journey. This thesis was conceived in faith, sustained in prayer and encouraged by the Word of God. With God's help I have been able to complete this research project. I pray that Māori language and cultural regenesi will glorify the Creator.

Second, I wish to thank the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia including the Presiding Bishops, Standing Committee of General Synod, and the twenty-five senior stakeholders who agreed to be interviewed. I am especially grateful to the late Bishop Whakahuihui Vercoe for his encouragement and support to embark on doctoral studies and to establish the Maori Language Planning Group. I also wish to thank Bishop Ngarahu Katene for allowing me the time and space to focus on this thesis. I acknowledge Te Hui Amorangi o Te Manawa o Te Wheke for allowing me, a southerner, to be a part of their diocese, and the Māori Language Planning Group, Te Rōpū Whakarauoratanga Reo, for their faith, friendship and perseverance over the last seven years.

Third, I have appreciated the opportunity to be a research student funded by generous scholarships from the St. John's College Trust Board. My thanks to Dr Jenny Plane Te Paa, in her role as Te Ahorangi, for accepting me as a student at Te Whare Wānanga o Te Rau Kahikatea. I have enjoyed fellowship with the staff and students of all three Anglican theological colleges at St. John's College and Trinity Methodist Theological College at the Meadowbank campus in Auckland. Also based at this campus is the John Kinder Theological Library, Te Puna Atuatanga. I am indebted to the librarians for their cheerful assistance: Judith Bright, Helen Greenwood, Jenny Harper, Eddie Sun, Mary Nuttall and Whina Te Whiu.

Fourth, I am grateful for the four years which I have spent at a Pākehā Anglican Church, St. Chad's in Meadowbank, Auckland. I express my warm thanks to the Reverend Dr Martin Bridge, his wife, the Reverend Valerie Bridge, and the parishioners for accepting my wife and me as part of the congregation. I also wish to thank Roger Williams and members of my home group for their supportive fellowship.

Fifth, I would also like to thank the Reverend Bruce Keeley, Co-Vicar of All Saints Anglican Church in Howick, for acting as my spiritual advisor.

Sixth, I want to express my gratitude to the University of Auckland. I was supported collegially by Professor Elaine Wainwright and Dr Allan Davidson and Dr Mary Caygill, Directors of Postgraduate Studies, as well as the staff and students of the School of Theology. I am deeply grateful to my supervisors, Dr Neil Darragh from the School of Theology and Dr Margie Hohepa from the School of Education, for their guidance, encouragement and assistance. I also enjoyed the gatherings of the PhD Reading Group of the School of

Theology who helped me to refine parts of my thesis. I thank the staff at the University's Student Learning Centre for their worthwhile postgraduate seminars.

Seventh, I express my warm thanks to Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga, based at the University of Auckland, for the four doctoral writing retreats that I attended at Hopuhopu and for the doctoral scholarship that I was awarded.

Eighth, I was really blessed to have a group who assisted me with the editing, proofreading and formatting of this thesis: Christine Sorensen, Margaret Stiles, Tim and Mel McKenzie, Brent Swann and Victor Mocaraka.

Ninth, I have also been encouraged by Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori, the Māori Language Commission, and the Raukawa Trust Board which is based in Tokoroa. It has been a privilege to act as a Māori language planning consultant to both organisations. I pray that the Creator will guide and strengthen the Commission and the Board in their pursuit of Māori language and cultural regeneration.

Finally, I also give thanks to God for my whānau, especially my parents Nick and Florence Nicholson, and my uncles and aunties including Bishop Hapai Winiata and the Reverend Hira Royal, who nurtured and supported the budding scholar and cleric. Last, but not least, I thank God for my wife, Ellen, and children, Alex and Arohanui. Without the support of my loving wife, who typed, cooked and prayed ceaselessly, and the forbearance of my children who often saw their father slouched over a desk during my years of study, this thesis would not have been completed.

I am conscious of the fact that so many people have contributed to the production of this piece of research writing. May God bless you all. If I have not specifically acknowledged you by name, please forgive me and accept my apologies.

“Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brothers and sisters to dwell together in unity!”

(Psalm 133:1)

Kia ora anō tātou katoa.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
He Mihi: Greetings and Acknowledgements.....	iii
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
1.1. <i>Mission and Ministry Through Māori Language and Cultural Regenesi</i> s	1
1.2. <i>Thesis Question and Content</i>	2
1.3. <i>Theological Research Methods</i>	2
1.4. <i>Māori Research</i>	4
1.5. <i>History of the Māori Language</i>	7
1.6. <i>The Anglican Church and the Treaty of Waitangi</i>	9
1.7. <i>Anglican Māori Biblical and Liturgical Resources</i>	11
1.8. <i>Recent Examples of Regenesi</i> s	13
1.8.1 <i>Government Māori Language Regenesi</i> s Strategies	14
1.8.2 <i>Tribal Case Study</i>	15
1.8.3 <i>Māori Anglican Church Case Study</i>	18
1.9. <i>Personal Location</i>	20
1.10. <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	21
Chapter 2. Anglican Regenesi s Policies in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia	23
2.1. <i>Early History of Anglican Policymaking</i>	23
2.2. <i>Bi-cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi</i>	24
2.2.1 <i>Ordination Training</i>	25
2.2.2 <i>Use of the Māori Language</i>	26
2.2.3 <i>Kōhanga Reo</i>	27
2.2.4 <i>Māori Language Programmes</i>	27
2.2.5 <i>Principles of Mission</i>	29
2.3. <i>Anglican Church Constitution 1992</i>	30
2.3.1 <i>Three Cultural Strand Church</i>	30
2.3.2 <i>Recognition of Māori and English Languages</i>	31
2.3.3 <i>Partnership and Bicultural Development</i>	32

2.3.4 Anglican Communion.....	33
2.3.5 Further Provisions	33
2.4. Anglican Church Canon Law.....	34
2.5. Concluding Remarks	34
Chapter 3. Anglican Māori Responses to Regenesi s Policies	36
3.1. Ordination Training.....	36
3.1.1 Question One: Knowledge of Student Training	36
3.1.2 Question Two: Extent of Training.....	37
3.1.3 Question Three: Future Training.....	39
3.2. Use of Māori Language.....	40
3.2.1 Question One: Amount of Māori Words Used	40
3.2.2 Question Two: Substitution and Correction of Māori Words.....	41
3.2.3 Question Three: Future Implementation.....	42
3.3. Kōhanga Reo	42
3.3.1 Question One: Extent of Implementation.....	42
3.3.2 Question Two: Involvement of English Speakers.....	43
3.3.3 Question Three: Future Implementation.....	43
3.4. Māori Language Programmes	44
3.4.1 Question One: Extent of Māori Language Teaching	44
3.4.2 Question Two: Extent of Teaching on the Treaty and Marae.....	45
3.4.3 Question Three: Future Implementation.....	45
3.5. Principles of Mission.....	46
3.5.1 Mission Principle One: Evangelism.....	46
3.5.2 Mission Principle Two: Teaching, Baptism and Nurturing	47
3.5.3 Mission Principle Three: Loving Service.....	47
3.5.4 Mission Principle Four: Transforming Unjust Structures.....	48
3.5.5 Mission Principle Five: Safeguarding and Renewing Creation	48
3.6. Additional Comments	49
3.7. Concluding Remarks	49
Chapter 4. Anglican Pākehā Responses to Regenesi s Policies	51
4.1. Ordination Training.....	51

4.1.1 Question One: Knowledge of Student Training	51
4.1.2 Question Two: Extent of Training	52
4.1.3 Question Three: Future Training.....	53
4.2. Use of Māori Language.....	53
4.2.1 Question One: Amount of Māori Words Used	54
4.2.2 Question Two: Substitution and Correction of Māori Words	54
4.2.3 Question Three: Future Implementation.....	55
4.3. Kōhanga Reo	55
4.3.1 Question One: Extent of Implementation.....	56
4.3.2 Question Two: Involvement of English Speakers.....	56
4.3.3 Question Three: Future Implementation.....	56
4.4. Māori Language Programmes	56
4.4.1 Question One: Extent of Māori Language Teaching	57
4.4.2 Question Two: Extent of Teaching on the Treaty and Marae	57
4.4.3 Question Three: Future Implementation.....	58
4.5. Principles of Mission.....	58
4.5.1 Mission Principle One: Evangelism.....	58
4.5.2 Mission Principle Two: Teaching, Baptism and Nurturing	59
4.5.3 Mission Principle Three: Loving Service.....	59
4.5.4 Mission Principle Four: Transforming Unjust structures	59
4.5.5 Mission Principle Five: Safeguarding and Renewing Creation	60
4.6. Additional Comments	60
4.7. Concluding Remarks	62
Chapter 5. Anglican Pacific Islander Responses to Regenesi s Policies.....	63
5.1. Ordination Training	63
5.1.1 Question One: Knowledge of Student Training	63
5.1.2 Question Two: Extent of Training	64
5.1.3 Question Three: Future Training.....	64
5.2. Use of Māori Language.....	65
5.2.1 Question One: Amount of Māori Words Used	65
5.2.2 Question Two: Substitution and Correction of Māori Words	66
5.2.3 Question Three: Future Implementation.....	66

5.3. <i>Kōhanga Reo</i>	67
5.3.1 <i>Question One: Extent of Implementation</i>	67
5.3.2 <i>Question Two: Involvement of English Speakers</i>	67
5.3.3 <i>Question Three: Future Implementation</i>	68
5.4. <i>Māori Language Programmes</i>	68
5.4.1 <i>Question One: Extent of Māori Language Teaching</i>	68
5.4.2 <i>Question Two: Extent of Teaching on the Treaty and Marae</i>	69
5.4.3 <i>Question Three: Future Implementation</i>	69
5.5. <i>Principles of Mission</i>	70
5.6. <i>Additional Remarks</i>	70
5.7. <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	71
Chapter 6. Partnership and Biculturalism in the Public Square	72
6.1. <i>Partnership</i>	73
6.1.1 <i>Centrality of the Treaty</i>	73
6.1.2 <i>Transparent Partnership</i>	77
6.1.3 <i>Authentic Partnership</i>	81
6.1.4 <i>Equal and Equitable Partnership</i>	86
6.1.5 <i>Incremental Pragmatism or Radical Innovation</i>	89
6.2. <i>Biculturalism</i>	92
6.2.1 <i>Centrality of the Treaty</i>	92
6.2.2 <i>Symbolic Biculturalism</i>	96
6.2.3 <i>Resource-Based Biculturalism</i>	97
6.2.4 <i>Biculturalism and Multiculturalism</i>	102
6.3. <i>Future Partnership and Biculturalism</i>	105
6.4. <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	110
Chapter 7. Contemporary Māori Christian Theologies	112
7.1. <i>Māori Spirituality</i>	113
7.1.1 <i>Māori Marsden</i>	113
7.1.2 <i>Te Kitohi Pikaahu</i>	114
7.1.3 <i>Henare Tate</i>	115
7.1.4 <i>Manuka Henare</i>	117

7.1.5 Wiremu Kaa.....	118
7.1.6 Bill Tuhiwai.....	118
7.1.7 Whakahuihui Vercoe	119
7.1.8 Te Waaka Melbourne	119
7.1.9 Jack Papuni.....	121
7.1.10 Tui Cadigan.....	123
7.1.11 Tiki Raumati.....	126
7.1.12 Eru Potaka-Dewes.....	126
7.1.13 Turi Hollis	127
7.1.14 Moeawa Callaghan	128
7.1.15 Donald Tamihere.....	129
7.1.16 Wayne Te Kaawa.....	130
7.1.17 Summary.....	131
7.2. Māori Ecclesiology	131
7.2.1 Hone Kaa.....	132
7.2.2 Jenny Plane Te Paa.....	133
7.2.3 Manuka Henare.....	136
7.2.4 Moeawa Callaghan	136
7.2.5 Robert Kereopa	137
7.2.6 Rangi Nicholson.....	138
7.2.7 Tui Cadigan.....	138
7.2.8 Wayne Te Kaawa.....	140
7.2.9 Summary.....	141
7.3. Māori Theological Education	141
7.3.1 Jenny Plane Te Paa.....	142
7.3.2 Robert McKay	146
7.3.3 Summary.....	148
7.4. Māori Language and Cultural Regenesis	148
7.4.1 Māori Marsden.....	148
7.4.2 Rangi Nicholson.....	149
7.4.3 Muru Walters.....	150
7.4.4 Peter Wensor	151

7.4.5 Jenny Plane Te Paa.....	151
7.4.6 Tui Cadigan.....	153
7.4.7 Perspectives of Other Māori Theologians	154
7.4.8 Summary.....	154
7.5. Concluding Remarks	155
Chapter 8. Synthesis	157
8.1. Synthesis of Māori Language and Cultural Policy and Practice	157
8.1.1 Ordination Training.....	158
8.1.2 Use of the Māori Language.....	159
8.1.3 Kōhanga Reo.....	160
8.1.4 Māori Language Programmes	161
8.1.5 Principles of Mission.....	163
8.1.6 Emergent Trends	164
8.2. Synthesis of Partnership and Biculturalism in the Public Square	165
8.2.1 Partnership.....	165
8.2.2 Biculturalism.....	167
8.2.3 Future Partnership and Biculturalism.....	169
8.3. Regenesi Policy and Practice Through the Lens of Partnership and Biculturalism. 170	
8.3.1 Ordination Training.....	171
8.3.2 Use of the Māori Language.....	173
8.3.3 Kōhanga Reo.....	175
8.3.4 Māori Language Programmes	177
8.3.5 Principles of Mission.....	178
8.3.6 Emergent Trends	180
8.4. Synthesis of Contemporary Māori Theologies	184
8.4.1 Māori Spirituality.....	184
8.4.2 Māori Ecclesiology	185
8.4.3 Māori Theological Education	187
8.4.4 Māori Language and Cultural Regenesi	188
8.5. Regenesi Policy and Practice through Māori Theological Lenses	189
8.5.1 Ordination Training.....	189
8.5.2 Use of the Māori Language.....	193

8.5.3 <i>Kōhanga Reo</i>	194
8.5.4 <i>Māori Language Programmes</i>	196
8.5.5 <i>Principles of Mission</i>	198
8.5.6 <i>Emergent Trends</i>	200
8.6. <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	204
Chapter 9. Conclusion	205
9.1. <i>Maintaining or Altering Current Regenesi s Policy and Practice</i>	205
9.2. <i>Future Māori Language and Cultural Regenesi s Mission in the Anglican Church</i> ...	207
9.3. <i>Future Māori Language and Cultural Regenesi s Ministry Contexts</i>	208
9.3.1 <i>Priority Area One: Archives and History</i>	208
9.3.2 <i>Priority Area Two: Theological Education and Ministry Formation</i>	209
9.3.3 <i>Priority Area Three: Revision and Development of Key Liturgical Texts</i>	209
9.3.4 <i>Priority Area Four: Research, Policies and Monitoring</i>	210
9.3.5 <i>Priority Area Five: Publicity and Promotion</i>	211
9.3.6 <i>Priority Area Six: Community Development</i>	211
9.3.7 <i>Priority Area Seven: Resource Development</i>	212
9.3.8 <i>Priority Area Eight: Partnership</i>	212
9.3.9 <i>Priority Area Nine: Bicultural Development</i>	213
9.4. <i>Mihinare Centre for Māori Language Regenesi s</i>	214
9.5. <i>Concluding Remarks</i>	214
Appendix 1 Questionnaire	216
Appendix 2 Glossary	219
Reference List	224

Chapter 1. Introduction

Māori language and culture are endangered in Aotearoa New Zealand at the beginning of the twenty-first century (Nicholson, 2000, p. 7).¹ According to the Māori Language Commission, *Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori*, only 9% of Māori adults speak their language, or *te reo Māori*, very well (*Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Maori*, 2008b, p. 8). In addition to this low level of fluency for Māori adults, there are only 4% of New Zealanders overall who can speak Māori. The New Zealand Council for Educational Research, *Te Rūnanga o Aotearoa mō Te Rangahau i te Mātauranga* and the Ministry of Māori Development, *Te Puni Kōkiri*, undertook Māori language surveys in the 1970s and 1990s which showed that the church was a major Māori speaking context (Nicholson, 2000, p. 8). In this first chapter I introduce the central concern of this thesis which is the Anglican Church's mission and ministry delivered through Māori language and cultural regensis. I then outline the research question, the content and the methods of the thesis which I place within a framework of Māori research. I also locate this thesis within the context of the Anglican Church and its relationship with the Treaty of Waitangi, and the production of biblical and liturgical resources. In addition, I give three concrete examples of recent attempts at Māori language regensis: by the Aotearoa New Zealand government, by the Raukawa Trust Board and within the Anglican Church. I conclude with a statement of my own personal location within this field of research.

1.1. Mission and Ministry Through Māori Language and Cultural Regensis

The Māori Anglican Church, *Te Hāhi Mihinare*, has a rich tradition of conducting its mission and ministry through the medium of the Māori language and culture for over almost two hundred years. "Since 1814, when the gospel was first preached in Aotearoa New Zealand², the Anglican Church has been involved in processes of implicit and explicit Māori language and culture policymaking" (Nicholson, 2009, p. 37). Māori language and cultural regensis

¹ Macrons have been used in this thesis to indicate vowel length in most Māori language words. The only exceptions are contemporary personal names which have been written as they appear in publications.

² Aotearoa is the Māori name for New Zealand. In this thesis I have used Aotearoa New Zealand to signify the bicultural beginnings of this nation.

have occurred through Māori language biblical and liturgical resources, church services, periodicals, synods and church board meetings. Other examples include either using Māori as the medium of instruction or, by teaching Māori language as a subject in Māori Anglican Church schools and tertiary theological training institutions (p.38). Nevertheless, despite these examples, Māori language and culture is still endangered in the twenty-first century. It will be argued later in this thesis that both Anglican Church mission and ministry will need to address this situation and progress regensis.

1.2. Thesis Question and Content

This thesis answers the major research question:

Should current Anglican Church policy and practice concerning Māori language and cultural regensis be maintained or altered in the light of contemporary Treaty of Waitangi debates in the public square and Māori Christian theologies?

Chapters Two, Three, Four and Five investigate the current policy and practice concerning the Māori language and cultural regensis of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia. Chapter Six surveys contemporary political, economic and constitutional debates in the public square regarding notions of Treaty of Waitangi partnership and biculturalism. Chapter Seven reviews contemporary Māori Christian theologies. Chapter Eight synthesises and critiques the Anglican Church's regensis policy and practice through the lenses of bicultural Treaty partnership and Māori theology. Chapter Nine discusses the implications of the research findings for future regensis mission and ministry.

1.3. Theological Research Methods

I have used a range of theological research methods in this thesis. The first method focussed on analysing the current written regensis policies of the Anglican Church. These consisted of Standing Resolutions of General Synod, the Anglican Church's major decision-making body, which meets biennially. Four of these Resolutions, which were bicultural, were adopted in 1986. Another Resolution that affirmed the worldwide Anglican Church's five-fold mission was adopted in 1994. These five Standing Resolutions are discussed later in this chapter.

The second theological research method involved the interviewing of twenty-five informants who identified themselves as Anglicans across three cultural groupings: eleven Māori, eleven

Introduction

Pākehā and three Pacific Islanders³. These cultural groupings are commonly known in the Anglican Church by their Māori names: Tikanga Māori, Tikanga Pākehā and Tikanga Pasifika. The majority of these interviewees were members of the General Synod Standing Committee in 2005. I also included several other Anglicans who were former Committee members. I decided to interview all of these senior decision makers because I was reviewing Standing Resolutions adopted by General Synod. These decisionmakers were also very familiar with the contexts of their respective Tikanga and had some familiarity with the Church overall. I sought ethics approval for the interviews from the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee and this was granted in May 2005.

I travelled extensively throughout Aotearoa New Zealand to audiotape the responses of the twenty-five informants who included bishops, clergy and laity. In the interviews I facilitated the review of current regenesi s policy and practice by the interviewees. I also elicited comments on future developments concerning the Standing Resolutions. At the time of the interview I assured the interviewees verbally, and in my participant information sheet, that the information they were providing would be confidential and locked securely in my study. In addition, I assured them that their names would not be used in the thesis other than in a general acknowledgement. In an effort to maintain confidentiality, I did not quote any of the interviewees directly. Interviews were recorded using a digital voice recorder. While I was recording, I took extensive notes. Later I checked my notes and either corrected or added to them as I listened to the recordings. I also sent a copy of his or her own recording to each participant for personal and whānau use. For one participant I relied entirely on my extensive notes.

I discovered that there was a wide range of perspectives on each aspect of regenesi s policy which was discussed. Nevertheless, as I analysed the interview data, I initially searched for common views shared by the informants. I have also acknowledged the different viewpoints that emerged from within each Tikanga. I plan to make this thesis accessible to the participating interviewees by sending copies to the main offices of the Māori, Pākehā and Pacific Islander Anglican Church as well as to the John Kinder Theological Library based at

³ In this thesis, except for chapter six, the term *Pākehā* refers to all Anglicans who are not Māori or Pacific Islanders.

St John's College in Auckland.⁴ I also plan to speak at a number of church meetings and hui to share the research findings and to discuss their implications for future regensis development.

The third theological research method entailed consulting a range of secondary sources including books, journal articles, conference proceedings and unpublished papers. I surveyed Māori and non- Māori perspectives on concepts of Treaty partnership and biculturalism in the public square and the writings of twenty-three contemporary Māori Christian theologians. In this thesis *public square* broadly refers to those spaces outside the grounds of the church where public discussions take place.

The fourth theological research method necessitated the construction of a synthesis of the Church's regensis policy and practice data and then viewing and critiquing this data through two very useful lenses, namely, bicultural Treaty partnership and Māori theological perspectives. Given the Treaty obligations and gospel responsibilities of the Anglican Church, it proved to be highly appropriate to do this.

The fifth theological method required exploring the implications of the research findings for future regensis mission and ministry. I have recommended nine major policy priorities and a mechanism to assist with their implementation.

1.4. Māori Research

As a Māori researcher, I wish to locate this thesis within a framework of Māori research. I acknowledge, however, that there exists a diversity of Māori perspectives regarding research. "There is no one Māori reality. . ." (M. Durie, 1998, p. 92). Chris Cunningham, a Māori researcher, makes a useful distinction between research which holds no specific issues or interest for Māori, and research which involves Māori and Māori-centred research (Cunningham, 1998, pp. 390-392). This thesis initially falls within the category of involving Māori as participants, researchers and subjects. It also involves Māori data in terms of regensis policy and practice. In addition, I consulted Māori experts and drew upon their documented knowledge. However, this thesis not only involves Māori but is also Māori-

⁴ St John's College is more formally known as the College of St John the Evangelist, Te Whare Wānanga o Hoani Tapu te Kaikauwhau ki te Rongopai. This institution provides theological education and ministry formation for the Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand, Polynesia and the world.

Introduction

centred in that Māori, Pākehā and Pacific Islander data is collected in a Māori way and analysed through a Māori lens to produce Māori knowledge.

An important aspect of data collection for this thesis was the twenty-five interviews. Two Māori researchers, Linda Smith and Fiona Cram, have provided a useful framework for defining appropriate Māori researcher conduct (Smith, 2006b, p. 12). Interviewing in a Māori way meant showing compassion or aroha to each informant whether that person was Māori, Pākehā, or Pacific Islander. Respecting each person included allowing him or her to decide on the appropriate place for the interview and to contribute to how the interview process might be conducted. I preferred face to face interviews because it provided me with the opportunity to observe and listen to the interviewee at the initial encounter. I was then able to proceed successfully with the interview to ensure that both the informant and I were affirmed and valued. Clearly I needed to proceed cautiously. I did not wish to insult any person or hurt their feelings or trample on their dignity. It was crucial to be humble and not arrogant. It was necessary to be both politically and culturally sensitive.

Being politically and culturally sensitive also involved reflecting on my status as an insider or outsider within each Tikanga context. Clearly, as a Māori researcher, I was an outsider in terms of interviewing Tikanga Pākehā and Tikanga Pasifika informants but as an Anglican I was an insider. In the former situation I needed to be respectful as mentioned above.

However, in the latter I belonged to the church family or whānau and was able to gain easy access to these interviewees. The downside of being an insider was that these participants could be tempted to give me the responses which they thought I might like to hear or which might be politically acceptable in a three Tikanga church. The overwhelming impression I gained from these interviews was the diversity of perspectives and the high level of honesty. The same impression was true for the Māori informants. Here also I was both an insider and an outsider. I was able to interact well with each Māori interviewee because I knew most of them personally. There was the potential that, as they knew of my commitment to regensis over a long period of time, they could also be tempted to produce politically acceptable responses. I was an outsider in the sense that I was not very familiar with their individual Church contexts. In many cases I also did not have the same level of experience or I was not a product of the same generation. A Māori researcher, Russell Bishop, acknowledges the strengths and weaknesses of being an insider or an outsider. He also questions whether such a distinction is useful and whether what is more important is “a discursive repositioning of all researchers into those positions that operationalise self-determination for indigenous peoples”

Introduction

(Bishop, 2005, p. 113). In other words, the main aim of researchers should be to support the aspirations of Māori concerning sovereign rights to self-determination whether they are insiders or outsiders.

Successful interviewing is very much a collaborative exercise, not only at the time of the recording but also after the interview has been concluded. I plan to continue to develop my relationship with each of these interviewees after I have completed my current doctoral research work. Furthermore, I will be open to further discussions regarding the implications of the research findings for future regensis development including the possibility of collaborative ventures.

Māori ways of conducting research can also be described as holistic (Nicholson, 2000, p. 117). Another Māori researcher, Mason Durie, has developed a four sided model which focusses on the spiritual, mental, physical and extended family aspects of Māori research (M. Durie, 1995, p. 70). In my master's thesis I adopted Durie's model to develop a Māori analytical tool which emphasised the spiritual, mental, physical and social dimensions of interviews. Smith and Cram's framework, referred to earlier, does not appear to state explicitly the holistic aspects of data collection, especially spirituality. Not only did I need to be politically and culturally sensitive, as advocated by Smith and Cram, but I also needed to be aware of the state of my own spirituality and that of the informant. In almost all cases the interviewee and I prayed in either Māori or English at the beginning or end of the interview. Aspects of the participants' spiritual development and where this intersected with the Anglican Church were often the subject of informal discussion before the tape recording began. Whether I was interviewing Anglican Māori, Pākehā or Pacific Islanders, I acknowledged, implicitly or explicitly, the importance of the spiritual dimension to Māori.

After collecting the data, I also analysed it from the viewpoint of a Māori theological framework. Later in the thesis I will focus on a review of contemporary Māori theology which will include Māori spirituality. This will contribute to the development of a Māori theological lens through which the regensis policy and practice data will be viewed and critiqued. Not only was it important in this research to acknowledge Māori protocols but it was also critical to undertake analysis by recognising Māori cultural and spiritual values. Such analysis confirms the high level of legitimacy of Māori culture and spirituality in the eyes of Māori communities. The importance of Māori language and culture is taken for granted (Smith, 1999, p. 185).

Underpinning the Māori research issues which I have discussed above is an approach known as Kaupapa Māori research which was developed and informed by the work of Māori researchers such as Linda Smith, Russell Bishop and others. This research

presupposes positions that are committed to a critical analysis of the existing unequal power relations within the wider New Zealand society that were created with the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, those structures that work to oppress the Māori people (Bishop, 2005, p. 114).

In other words, it aims to put self-determination or tino rangatiratanga into operation and therefore to benefit all the research participants. It also makes explicit and recognises Māori research aspirations including theories, methodologies and practices. In addition, Kaupapa Māori analysis must not only benefit Māori in principle but also in practice. Notwithstanding that this is an important Māori approach to research, I began this doctoral thesis focussed on the major research question. It was only by firstly answering this question that I was able to explore the implications of the research findings for the Anglican Church. At the conclusion of this thesis I canvass a range of policy priorities which have the potential to benefit both Māori and the other cultural groupings.

The aim of this thesis is to critique the Anglican Church's current regensis policy and practice. Later in this chapter I will detail how the context of the 1980s influenced these developments. However, to provide a general background to the Church's regensis activities, I now focus on a history of the Māori language.

1.5. History of the Māori Language

The Māori language has a colourful history. It can be classified as an *Austronesian language*. Therefore it is related to more than five hundred Asian and Pacific languages (Benton, 1991, p. 1). Since the original migrants came to Aotearoa New Zealand from different parts of eastern Polynesia, it is possible that diverse dialects were spoken. "While there were some distinctions in pronunciation and words, Māori dialects were in general mutually understandable from one end of the country to the other" (Nicholson, 2000, p. 7). A rich oral tradition, which included storytelling, poetry and oratory, gradually developed over the centuries.

It is clear that before the arrival of European settlers in the early nineteenth century almost all Māori were monolingual speakers of the Māori language. Māori chiefs and representatives of the British Crown signed the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 which guaranteed in Article II the

protection of the Māori language (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, pp. 59-60). However, seven years after the Treaty was signed, Governor Grey, under the 1847 Education Ordinance, directed that English be the medium of instruction (Walker, 2004, p. 146). Therefore schooling occurred largely through the medium of the English language. Throughout the rest of the nineteenth century and up to about World War II, the Māori language was spoken in most homes and marae in rural settlements. At the turn of the twentieth century, almost all Māori children beginning their education at a primary school spoke Māori. This had slumped to twenty-six per cent by 1960 (p. 147). The policy of government educational authorities to teach English to Māori pupils was strongly enforced, “sometimes through the physical punishment of Māori children” (Te Puni Kokiri & Te Taura Whiri i Te Reo Māori, 2003, p. 11). Many Māori also believed that the English language was crucial for social and economic advancement.

Greatly increased Māori urban migration after 1945 accelerated the shift from Māori to English. The government policy of pepper-potting state houses throughout cities did not assist the establishment of Māori speaking communities. Before the mid 1970s most Māori living in urban areas found themselves in English language educational, employment and media environments. “By the 1970s, the Māori language played only a marginal role in the lives of Māori children, and adults used it primarily on the marae and for religious activities” (p. 11).

The vitally important process of transmitting the Māori language from parents to children had been severely weakened by urbanisation. Young urban Māori, feeling “culturally disadvantaged and cheated by a monocultural education system,” petitioned the government in 1972 seeking the teaching of the Māori language in primary and secondary schools (Walker, 2004, pp. 210-211). This petition, together with the Waitangi Tribunal 1986 findings on the Māori language, served as a catalyst for a wide range of interventions by the Aotearoa New Zealand government including the 1987 Māori Language Act which acknowledged the Māori language as an official language of Aotearoa New Zealand and established the Māori Language Commission (Te Puni Kokiri & Te Taura Whiri i Te Reo Māori, 2003, p. 13). The establishment of Māori language medium preschools or *kōhanga reo* in the early 1980s was also an important development (Walker, 2004, p. 238). This was followed by the setting up of Māori language medium primary and secondary schools or *kura kaupapa* and *whare kura*. In 2008 over twenty-five thousand Māori students were involved in Māori-medium learning at such schools (*Maori Medium Education*, 2008, p. 1).

In the mid 1980s Māori attention turned towards broadcasting and especially to the birth of Māori language radio and television. “The gains that Māori made in broadcasting were not achieved without a struggle” (Walker, 2004, p. 369). In 2008 there were over twenty Māori language radio stations (Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Maori, 2008b, p. 10). In 2004 a bilingual Māori Television channel, Whakaata Māori, was established after an initial attempt by Aotearoa Television Network in 1997. The Māori language television channel, Te Reo, began broadcasting in 2008 with three hours each evening seven days a week (Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Maori, 2008a, p. 16).

Government educational policies, low social status, urbanisation, lack of intergenerational transmission and monolingual media contributed to the demise of Māori language to the extent that it is now endangered. Although Māori and Pākehā together with the government have achieved a great deal to reverse this situation, nevertheless, much more progress will need to occur to ensure that effective regeneration takes place. The Anglican Church has played its role over the last three decades to assist revival and revitalisation including recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi and the emergence of its current regeneration policies.

1.6. The Anglican Church and the Treaty of Waitangi

Working alongside representatives of the British Crown, missionaries of the Church Missionary Society (CMS), an Anglican missionary organisation active in developing the Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand, translated into Māori, facilitated, promoted and signed the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 (Davidson, 1997, pp. 25-26). These missionaries played a crucial role in persuading Māori chiefs to sign the Treaty. Many of these Māori saw the Treaty as a biblical covenant (Orange, 1987, p. 57). For over one hundred years the Settler Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand largely chose the path of colonisation and considerably downplayed its Treaty obligations to Māori language and culture. Since the mid 1980s there has been a movement by the Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand to recognise past injustices as a result of colonisation, and the guiding role of the Treaty of Waitangi as a reconciliation instrument. In 1984 the General Synod of the Anglican Church established a Bi-cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi. The Commission published its report in 1986 (Bi-cultural Commission, 1986). Appended to this Report were eighteen recommendations (pp. 26-28). These included several on Māori language, parts of which subsequently became four Standing Resolutions of General Synod in 1986. These bicultural

Introduction

Standing Resolutions, which today are still the Church's current policies concerning Māori language and cultural regensis, are examined more fully in the next chapter.

Anglican Church regensis policies need to be viewed contextually in terms of significant events which occurred before their adoption. The Waitangi Tribunal, a New Zealand government body, heard the claim on the Māori language in 1985. The hearings focussed on whether the Māori language should be recognised as an official language in Aotearoa New Zealand (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 11). The Tribunal wrote in its report that "the Crown has failed to protect the Māori language as required by Article II of the Treaty" (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, pp. 59-60). Moreover, the Tribunal questioned "whether the principles and broad objectives of the Treaty can ever be achieved if there is not a recognised place for the language of one of the partners to the Treaty" (p. 27).⁵ A member of the Church's Bicultural Commission, Professor Whatarangi Winiata, also made submissions to the Waitangi Tribunal. This Tribunal would have influenced the recommendations of the Commission. Also the regensis work of the Anglican Church no doubt impacted on the Tribunal since two of its three members were prominent lay members of the Māori Anglican Church (Beatson, 2002, pp. 94-95).

Another major event in the early 1980s was the rapid development of the kōhanga reo movement which promoted Māori language medium pre-school education. This movement influenced the recommendations of the Bi-cultural Commission and the Waitangi Tribunal. These two bodies wished to support the fledgling movement which had increased its number of centres to 416 with over 6000 children before both of their reports had appeared in 1986 (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 17).

As a result of the Bicultural Commission's report, the General Synod undertook major constitutional changes in 1992 in the Anglican Church. The Commission produced a new bilingual Constitution as an acknowledgement of the wrongs of the past and as an attempt at reconciliation between Māori and Pākehā in terms of Treaty partnership and bicultural development. The new Constitution set in place a three cultural strand Church consisting of Tikanga Māori, Tikanga Pākehā and Tikanga Pasifika. The Church's official name became the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia, Te Hāhi Mihinare ki Aotearoa, ki Niu Tirenī, ki Ngā Moutere o te Moana Nui a Kiwa.

⁵ See earlier reference to the Waitangi Tribunal on p.8.

In 1988 and 1994 the General Synod also adopted the broad mission statement of the Anglican Consultative Council, a world wide organisation of Anglican representatives. This statement is referred to in this thesis as the five-fold mission statement. The first principle is evangelism; the second, teaching, baptism and nurture; the third, loving service; the fourth, transforming unjust structures; and the fifth, safeguarding and renewing creation. This Standing Resolution is reviewed in Chapter Two in terms of Māori language and cultural regensis mission.

It would be wrong to give the impression that the Anglican Church has only relatively recently developed its policies regarding Māori language and culture. From the early nineteenth century the Church's missionaries were challenged to make decisions about how to undertake mission and ministry through the medium of Māori language and culture. The production of Bibles, prayer books and hymnals became an early major priority to assist with the spread of the gospel.

1.7. Anglican Māori Biblical and Liturgical Resources

The Māori Anglican Church has a strong Māori language printing and publishing history (Nicholson, 2000, p. 144). It was CMS missionaries who translated the Bible into the Māori language. The first attempts at printing parts of the Bible were produced in 1827 (Davidson, 1997, p. 11). The New Testament in Māori was first printed in 1835-1836 (Lineham, 1996, pp. 13-14). The whole of the Bible was first published in 1868 (p. 141). Over the rest of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries there were new revisions and editions of the Bible. The last major revision began in 1946 when Māori representatives of the Anglican, Presbyterian and Methodist Churches gathered to produce a new edition which became available in 1952 (p. 153). In December 2008 the Bible Society in New Zealand launched a re-formatted version of the 1952 edition. "Its presentation has been enhanced in several ways for the modern Māori language reader: macrons have been added to indicate vowel length; speech marks have been added and punctuation carefully revised. Paragraphing has been introduced and paragraph headings added" ("Introduction," 2008, p. iii-iv). On 6 March 2009 the Bible Society called a meeting of Māori representatives of the churches to discuss a new translation in Māori with a projected target readership of youth or young married couples since about 74% of the Māori population is under the age of 40 (Statistics New Zealand, 2008, p. 117). As an Anglican Māori, I attended this meeting and was elected as a member of the Steering Committee.

Te Rāwiri is the name commonly used by Anglican Māori for the Māori language version of the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662). CMS missionaries first published this small text in 1839. Its full Māori title describes its contents, namely, that it is a book of prayers and guidelines of the Anglican Church for sacramental ministry and other liturgies. It also “contains the Songs of David encapsulated in the Psalms” (Plane Te Paa, 2006, p. 343). *Te Rāwiri* can be literally translated to refer to David. Nineteenth century Māori related well to these Psalms with their wide range of emotional responses to life’s challenges as they adapted to both the painful and joyful aspects of colonisation. “They inspired, encouraged, and reassured Māori to remain faithful to God in spite of the hardships they faced” (p. 344). In addition to the Psalms, there were also prayers and hymns suitable for all situations as well as calendars and readings. Today many Anglican Māori still use parts of *Te Rāwiri*, especially the morning and evening prayers.

The hymnody in *Te Rāwiri* is a collection of hymns for a range of liturgical occasions such as Lent, Eucharist, Pentecost and the birth of Christ. Each hymn is prefaced by a short Māori language biblical reference with the exact chapter and verse upon which the hymn is based. No English language translation for this reference and the hymn are provided. In other words, this is not a bilingual text. Another collection of Māori language hymns was published in 1983 by the late Archdeacon Sir Kingi Ihaka. The title of this collection was *Hīmene: Waiata tapu, Etahi inoi, Te Inoi a te Ariki, Te Whakapono o Naihia me ngā Apōtoro, Etahi Waiata a Rāwiri* (Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa, 1983).⁶ Its subtitle referred also to prayers, the Nicene and Apostles’ Creeds and some Psalms as being part of its contents. The print size in this text is larger and easier to read than *Te Rāwiri*. However, this more modern hymnody does not contain any biblical references. In addition to the one hundred and eighty-seven hymns in *Te Rāwiri*, *Hīmene* contains twenty-two new hymns including eleven composed by Ihaka himself. There are no English language translations of these hymns. *Hīmene* was published by the Māori Anglican Church before the bicultural Standing Resolutions were adopted by General Synod in 1986.

⁶ This book is referred to in this thesis by its short Māori name, *Hīmene*.

It took twenty-five years of concerted effort by a Prayer Book Commission to produce *A New Zealand Prayer Book, He Karakia Mihinare o Aotearoa* in 1989 (Church of the Province of New Zealand, 1989).⁷

One of the features of the new Prayer Book which appealed greatly to urban Māori (many of whom were non-native-speaking but part of a growing urban renaissance movement committed to Māori language revival) was the extensive use of Māori language in many of the orders of service (Plane Te Paa, 2006, p. 344).

In one eucharistic liturgy the Māori language translation uses poetic forms which are evident in formal Māori oratory (p. 345). In addition to a range of mostly English language liturgies for all occasions, there were innovative bilingual and bicultural orders of service including Prayers in a House after Death and the Unveiling of a Memorial (Church of the Province of New Zealand, 1989, pp. 871-875, 881-884). It also contains the church calendar, Psalms for worship, sentences, prayers and readings for the church year, a catechism and a table to regulate observances. In the Introduction there is an acknowledgement that this text is “a deliberate attempt to allow a multitude of voices to speak” (p. x).

1.8. Recent Examples of Regensis

Having located this thesis within the context of the Anglican Church and the Treaty of Waitangi, I now turn to review three concrete examples of recent attempts at Māori language and cultural regensis. These examples may assist the Anglican Church with its future regensis mission and ministry. I have chosen to begin with an investigation of the regensis strategies of the New Zealand government. No other organisation, including the Church, has been as active in its visioning, planning and policymaking. The government has spent millions of dollars over the last thirty years in its efforts to support regensis. The second example is the Raukawa Trust Board which provides a tribal case study. The Board’s Māori language strategy, funded by the government, is a very good model which the Anglican Church may decide to emulate. The third example comes from within the Anglican Church itself. This case study surveys the pioneering regensis work of a planning group which was set up in one of the Māori dioceses in 2003. Again the Anglican Māori Church as a whole may find this innovative model helpful.

⁷ This book is referred to in this thesis by its common English title, *A New Zealand Prayer Book*.

1.8.1 Government Māori Language Regeneration Strategies

In 2003 the Aotearoa New Zealand government announced a vision for the future of the Māori language as part of its twenty-five year strategy:

By 2028, the Māori language will be widely spoken by Māori. In particular, the Māori language will be in common use within Māori whānau, homes and communities. All New Zealanders will appreciate the value of the Māori language to New Zealand society (Te Puni Kokiri & Te Taura Whiri i Te Reo Māori, 2003, p. 5).

Underpinning this vision are a number of critical factors. First, the Treaty of Waitangi guaranteed the Māori language as a treasure or taonga to Māori. Second, regeneration will be led by Māori. Third, there is a range of Māori language use contexts. Fourth, the family or whānau has a crucial role to play in the transmission of the Māori language. Fifth, the goodwill and support of all New Zealanders is important. Sixth, it is vital that Māori language development occurs over the next twenty-five years. Seventh, there are five interconnected goals to assist the realisation of the vision, namely, strengthening Māori language skills, usage, educational opportunities, community leadership and recognition (p. 7).

The Māori Language Commission has reviewed the first five years of the twenty-five year strategy after consultation with government agencies and Māori (Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori, 2008b, p. 7). It has decided on five priority areas for 2008-2013 which it has named Setting the Direction (p. 14). Priority Area One is intergenerational transmission in the home. Māori language development strategies for communities and homes will be progressed. Whānau language mentors will be supported. Promotional activities will be refocused on the home and community. Free Māori language resources for the home will be produced. Māori language broadcasting will encourage intergenerational transmission (Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori, 2008a, p. 22).

Priority Area Two focusses on community language development. Strategies will be advanced to develop community Māori language hubs to support programmes and services at the community level and to engage with central and local government agencies. They will also promote use of tribal dialects and to support Māori language usage on marae, in homes and communities. Other aspects involve promoting language use within homes and communities and the funding of community based Māori language initiatives (p. 23).

Priority Area Three gives attention to national leadership of Māori language development and innovation. The Commission plans to continue to work with Māori communities to ensure

their needs and aspirations are being met, and to work with government agencies to develop guidance and standards, infrastructure, capacity, research, planning and implementation (p. 24).

Priority Area Four concentrates on enhanced frameworks and systems for Māori language development. The aim is to extend Māori language use in a range of situations through a more coordinated information technology approach. This will involve “the development of a national repository of Māori words and phrases, including their linguistic attributes and other lexical information ...” (p. 25). It is planned to establish a group of Māori language experts concerning the development of new vocabulary. It is also planned that the Commission will act as the authority on standards and quality assurance. Such services will be made available through information technology systems.

Priority Area Five looks at workforce development revolving around Māori language professions and their critical issues and solutions including training, resources and qualifications for Māori interpreters and translators. The Commission considers personal and professional development for Māori language professionals to be a major issue which needs to be addressed. The Commission also wishes to work towards “the development of a National Māori Language Professions Workforce Development Plan” as well as to organise more effectively proficiency examinations (p. 25).

The Crown, as a signatory to the Treaty of Waitangi, has responsibilities to ensure that the future of the Māori language is guaranteed. In 2003 the government signalled its intention to commit to a twenty-five year vision and a range of regeneration strategies. Clearly the Crown is to be commended for this development work. Yet under the Treaty the tribal partners also have responsibilities in terms of leadership and partnership with the government. I would now like to focus on an outstanding example of such leadership and partnership offered by one tribal group, namely, the Raukawa Trust Board.

1.8.2 Tribal Case Study

In 2006 and 2009 the Māori Language Commission awarded the Raukawa Trust Board, a tribal authority, not only the Community Award but also the Supreme Award for that year. The regeneration work of the Board is an excellent model of Māori language and cultural regeneration which the Anglican Church may wish to investigate. It shows that careful and

systematic visioning, planning and policymaking has the potential to contribute significantly to successful regeneration.

In 2005 the Raukawa Trust Board, which is based in the township of Tokoroa in the central North Island, initiated its regeneration project under the New Zealand government's Community Based Language Initiatives (CBLI) programme. Administered by the Ministry of Education, tribal or iwi partners of the government are offered the opportunity to undertake major Māori language planning in their respective communities. Underpinning this development are five forms of language planning. First, acquisition planning focusses on how knowledge of Māori language is acquired. It also gives attention to who it is that acquires the language and their level of competency. Second, usage planning concentrates on who it is that speaks the Māori language, in what contexts and, on what topics. Third, critical awareness planning recognises that the Māori language is endangered, how this has occurred, what the situation is today and how regeneration might take place in the future. Fourth, status planning gives attention to the level of mana accorded to the Māori language in a range of local and national contexts. Fifth, corpus planning addresses questions concerning what Māori language is actually being spoken or written as well as quality, dialects and new vocabulary ("What does te reo Māori mean to you?," 2005).

Strategies for the regeneration of Raukawa language and culture were the main focus of the Trust Board's project. After completing research on Māori language regeneration and extensive consultation with tribal members, in July 2006 the Board launched its strategic plan in a booklet entitled *Whakareia te kakara o te hinu Raukawa: Te Rautaki Reo a Raukawa, The Raukawa Reo Strategy*. The strategy was very well received by the Māori Language Commission and the Māori Development Corporation (Te Pana, 2006).

This strategy has been developed from the aroha, passion and desires of the many, whose determination and strength for te reo is motivated by the whakaaro of a better future for our tamariki and mokopuna. This strategy also reflects the dreams and aspirations of our many loved ones who have sadly passed on (Raukawa Trust Board, 2006, p. 2).

Between August 2005 and May 2006 the feedback received from elders, families and teachers was that the Māori language was not valued by the majority of Māori and Pākehā who were surveyed within the Raukawa tribal boundaries. "Many have had no aroha for te reo and many have had no real desire to see it revived" (p. 5). In their opinion it is government monies which are keeping the Māori language alive.

Introduction

Major problems facing Raukawa are the lack of intergenerational transmission, the level of complacency, the small number of native speakers, the inadequate numbers of speakers on marae and the basic knowledge of students. Only four percent of those surveyed predominantly speak the Māori language. About a third were learning the language. Survival of the Māori language is also linked to the survival of the Māori culture and Māori themselves. It is also connected to tribal identity, history, genealogy and arts (p. 6). The strategy has been designed not only for Raukawa but also for any person living within their tribal boundaries who has, or will have, an interest in the Māori language. In addition, agencies with obligations or relationships with Raukawa are also included (p. 7).

The Raukawa Trust Board has declared its vision for the Māori language. In the short term, after the first five years it plans to have established a solid platform for the future development of the Māori language. Its medium term goal is that by the year 2030 Māori language will be used much more by a greater number of Raukawa especially in the home and communities (p. 8). The Trust Board envisages that the whole regensis process will take over 150 years in the long term. Underpinning the strategy are eight Māori values and principles: spirituality or wairuatanga, relationships or whanaungatanga, chieftainship and self determination or rangatiratanga, caring or manaakitanga, guardianship or kaitiakitanga, being accomplished and skilled or pūkenga, land as sustenance or ūkaipō and strength through unity or kotahitanga (pp. 9-10).

The strategy essentially has a two-pronged approach. The first focus is building a solid foundation to strengthen the Māori language through strategic alliances with the main stakeholders, leadership development and promotion (pp. 15-16). The second is strengthening and supporting the continual development of Māori language and cultural knowledge through its recovery, collection, storage, access, development, tribal identity and monitoring (pp. 17-19). The twenty-five year plan, which has been divided into three stages of recovery, stabilising and enhancing, will set the platform for 150 years of development leading to full regensis (p. 24). A multi-layered approach has included the development of strategies not only at the tribal level but also for marae and homes. Each year the Trust Board has held a successful awards evening to celebrate the regensis achievements of community groups, marae, educational institutions, media, government bodies and individuals. The Board has appointed three staff members to manage all these regensis processes. These staff members are assisted by an Advisory Group composed of mainly tribal members.

The Raukawa case study provides an exceptional example of what can be achieved at the tribal level. The Trust Board through its vision and strategies has empowered and encouraged its members and supporters to take regensis processes seriously. There is a high level of transparency present in its acknowledgement of the difficulties that it faces. The Board has also underpinned its strategies with important Māori values and principles. Now I wish to give attention to the third recent example of regensis which is provided by the Anglican Church, a non-governmental organisation.

1.8.3 Māori Anglican Church Case Study

Te Hui Amorangi o Te Manawa o Te Wheke is a diocese of the Māori Anglican Church based in Rotorua. At its annual meeting in 2003, Te Hui Amorangi decided to establish a Māori Language Planning Group, to prepare a brief report on a future plan for Māori language and culture.⁸ At an early meeting the Group agreed that Māori language and culture was a critical component for mission and ministry. An urgent initial priority that emerged was the audiotaping and videotaping of the experiences of a dwindling number of Māori speaking Anglican Māori elders. In 2006 a project team was set up and sixteen native speaker elders were recorded on audiotapes and almost all on videotapes.

Crucial for future reo regensis mission and ministry, it is planned to use all these audio and videotapes for teaching and use in homes, classrooms and where karakia and to record the tribal dialects or te mita o te reo of the different iwi. The recordings will also promote Te Hui Amorangi and its work to revive and revitalise an endangered language – a taonga and a God given gift of creation (*Hui Amorangi ki Te Manawa o Te Wheke*, 2008, p. 67).

The native speaker interviewers assisted with the design of the interview questionnaires. They also completed the abstracting of their own interviews. Abstracting is the process involved in the preparation of lists of topics covered in the interviews to enable quick direct access to specific information on the tapes.

The Planning Group also convened a two day hui or gathering in 2008 for about twelve native speaker elders in Rotorua. Video and audio recordings were made of their informal discussions in Māori on regensis mission and ministry. These elders recommended that the Hui Amorangi make explicit “the importance of te reo in the five-fold mission statement of the Anglican Church” (*Hui Amorangi ki Te Manawa o Te Wheke*, 2008, p. 66).

⁸ The Māori Language Planning Group was later known as the Reo Regensis Planning Group or Te Rōpū Whakaruaratanga Reo.

Introduction

Early in 2009 the Bible Society of New Zealand called a meeting of Māori church representatives and staff to discuss the proposal for a new Māori language translation of *Te Paipera Tapu*, the Māori Bible. This would be aimed at youth or young married couples. The 1946 Revision Committee last revised this Bible and then published it in 1952. Another proposal that emerged at the meeting was a literal English translation of this revision to value and honour the work of the Committee.

A Psalms Translation Wānanga or workshop was organised by the Planning Group in Rotorua in April 2009. The main purpose of this workshop was to experiment with various ways of producing singable translations of three Psalms in the Māori language. It was an opportunity for elderly native speakers to contribute towards these fresh translations. Translators, composers, songwriters, musicians and singers attended this gathering. Two Pacific Island translation groups from Pukapuka in the Cook Islands and Tokelau also participated. An international Translation Consultant from Wycliffe Bible Translators, a Translation consultant from the United Bible Societies and two advisors with the Pukapuka Bible Translation Project held teaching sessions on translation skills. On the final evening each of the cultural groups sang one or more of the newly translated Psalms in front of an audience that included local community members and representatives of the sponsoring bodies: Wycliffe Bible Translators New Zealand and the Bible Society in New Zealand. Many of the attendees indicated that they would be happy to attend further translation workshops in the future.

The major future projects, which the Group is planning to undertake, involve also the dwindling number of native speaking elders. In July 2007 two worship centres of the Hui Amorangi held special Māori language church services during Māori Language Week, Te Wiki o te Reo Māori. The Group videotaped native speaker elders at one of these services. There are plans to hold more such services in 2009 where Māori language medium and mainstream educational institutions will be invited to attend. Another project is a Māori language total immersion experience for elders and advanced second language learners in which they stay together in a cluster of three or four houses. This would be an opportunity for intergenerational transmission. The Group would audiotape and videotape the native speakers speaking formal or informal Māori language in these contexts. Yet another future project is a gathering for Anglican Māori language teachers who are working in educational institutions. “The main purpose of this hui would be to explore how the Hui Amorangi might be able to support their work as part of its reo regeneration mission and ministry” (*Hui Amorangi ki Te*

Manawa o Te Wheke, 2009, p. 59). A further project to which the Planning Group has given priority is Māori language theological education. It is planned for 2010 to hold three two day Māori language medium theological education seminars for native speakers and advanced language learners. These seminars will provide an opportunity for elderly Māori speaking theological educators to teach about the latest developments in their particular field. The aim is also to audiotape and videotape these teaching classes. The Planning Group has a list of twelve possible projects but have focussed on giving priority to those outlined above due to limited human and financial resources and the dwindling number of Anglican Māori speaking elders.

Each of the three organisations that I have surveyed has attempted to develop strategic plans to ensure a better future for Māori language and culture. The government, as part of its Treaty obligations, has launched a bold twenty-five year vision and accompanying strategies. I examined the work of one tribe that is attempting to follow this example. In contrast, a section of the Māori Anglican Church has chosen a different path by focussing on a number of urgent projects before undertaking more explicit visioning processes. Transparency has already emerged as a significant factor in regensis development work. Therefore, I need also to now clarify my own background, including involvement in each of these three models.

1.9. Personal Location

I have been committed to Māori language and cultural regensis for about thirty-five years and regensis as a tool for mission and ministry for about twenty years including the development of government regensis strategies and the two case studies which have just been reviewed. However, in writing this section, I wish to recognise a Māori proverb: “Ehara mā te kumara e kōrero te reka” which can be loosely translated as: “it is not the job of the kumara to speak of its sweetness.” “In traditional Māori society humility was considered a virtue” (Nicholson, 2000, p. 104).

I was born in Levin, a town about one hundred kilometres to the north of the capital, Wellington. My tribal links are Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Toa, Ngāi Tahu and Ngāti Kahungunu. My family migrated to Christchurch in the late 1950s where I attended English language medium primary and secondary schools. English was also the language of our home. My interest in Māori language regensis developed as a result of my Māori language and sociolinguistic studies at Victoria University of Wellington as well as my membership of Te

Reo Māori Society, a student Māori language organisation. I was very involved with the petition to Parliament in 1972 calling for Māori language to be offered as a subject in primary and secondary schools (Te Rito, 2008, pp. 1-2). I was also closely connected with the petition to Parliament in 1977 calling for the establishment of a Māori Language Television Production Unit. I graduated from Victoria with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Māori and Linguistics and a postgraduate diploma in teaching English as a second language.

Teaching, administration, consultancy and ministry have been my principal professional occupations. I graduated from Auckland Secondary Teachers' College and have taught at high schools, polytechnics and universities over the last thirty years. I was Director of Māori Language Studies at Te Wānanga o Raukawa, one of the three major Māori tertiary institutions in Aotearoa New Zealand. I was also Director of Māori Language Development at the Māori Anglican Church's tertiary theological training establishment, Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa.

My sociolinguistics master's thesis focussed on Māori language planning in the Māori Anglican Church. I have been a Māori language planning consultant to the Māori Language Commission and the Ministry of Education's CBLI programme as well as the Raukawa Trust Board. I am also Co-coordinator of the Māori Language Planning Group of the Hui Amorangi o Te Manawa o Te Wheke. All of these organisations have been mentioned earlier in this chapter.

Finally, I have been closely associated with the Anglican Church for almost thirty years. I am an ordained clergyperson in the Māori Anglican Church. I gained my undergraduate qualifications in theology from Melbourne College of Divinity while I was based as a student at Te Whare Wānanga o Te Rau Kahikatea, the Māori Anglican theological college at St. John's College in Meadowbank, Auckland.

1.10. Concluding Remarks

At the beginning of the twenty-first century Māori language and culture are endangered in Aotearoa New Zealand. Over almost two hundred years the Māori Anglican Church has undertaken its mission and ministry through the medium of Māori language and culture. The research question asks whether current Church regeneration policy and practice should be maintained or altered in the light of contemporary Treaty of Waitangi debates and Māori theologies. The research that produced this thesis examined those policies and practices, and

Introduction

surveyed contemporary public debates as well as Māori theological writings. The possibilities and difficulties of Māori language regeneration have also been illustrated by three examples of regeneration. On this basis, I turn now in Chapter Two to the more detailed examination of the Anglican Church's Māori language and cultural policies.

Chapter 2. Anglican Regenesi Policies in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia

For almost two hundred years the Anglican Church has adopted implicit and explicit Māori language and cultural policies. In 1986 the Church's Bi-Cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi held high hopes that the four bicultural Standing Resolutions would represent the embodiment of the Treaty in the institutions and life of the Church. Furthermore, as it was widely known that the Māori language and culture were endangered, then regenesi became a critical issue for the Commission. The purpose of this chapter is to clarify the status of the Church's regenesi policies. First, I review briefly the development of Māori language and cultural policies which were initially advocated by CMS missionaries and Māori and then by the Anglican Church of the Province of New Zealand. Second, I examine five Standing Resolutions of the General Synod in the context of the recommendations of the Bi-cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi and the findings of the government's Waitangi Tribunal in 1986. Third, I explore the implications of the 1992 Constitution and canon law in order to ascertain the current state of these written policies within the Anglican Church.

2.1. Early History of Anglican Policymaking

Since 1814, when the gospel was first preached in Aotearoa New Zealand, the Anglican Church has been involved in processes of implicit and explicit Māori language and cultural policymaking. In the early nineteenth century CMS missionaries made a series of policy decisions concerning the introduction of Māori print literacy. "Selected texts were published by CMS missionaries as part of wider strategies to convert Māori to Christianity" (Nicholson, 2000, p. 97). In Chapter One I briefly reviewed this publishing tradition in terms of *Te Paipera Tapu*, *Te Rāwiri*, *Hīmene* and *A New Zealand Prayer Book*. In the early twentieth century most Māori living in rural settlements were Māori language speakers. For over thirty years, mostly in the early 1900s, the Anglican Church published Māori language periodicals, such as *He Kupu Whakamārama* and *Te Pīpīwharauoa*, to keep these Māori informed of significant religious and secular issues (pp. 51-52). These matters were also canvassed at Māori language church conferences held from 1861 until World War I. "A conscious policy was adopted to conduct business in the Māori language to ensure that Māori clergy and laity were part of decision-making processes" (p. 97). In the early twentieth century the Young

Māori Party, which was comprised of former students of the Anglican boarding secondary school, Te Aute College, decided to hold its conferences in the Māori language in order to reach a wider Māori audience (p. 78). Yet ironically Māori Colleges, such as Te Aute, were instrumental in banning Māori language or limiting its use until explicit policies were adopted to introduce the language as a separate subject in the 1930s.

The Māori Anglican theological institution, Te Rau Kahikatea, established in 1883, initially used Māori as the medium of instruction, but by 1907 was also teaching partly in English (p. 71). The Church closed this institution in the early 1920s and Māori students then enrolled at the largely monolingual St. John's College. In 1970 the General Synod of the Anglican Church agreed "that studies in Māori Language [sic] and culture be required in the training of all ordinands" (Davidson, 1993, p. 229). The next year the Reverend John Tamahori was appointed at St. John's to teach the Māori language (p. 230). I now turn to the Bi-cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi which was responsible for writing the Anglican Church's regenesi s policies.

2.2. Bi-cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi

In 1984 General Synod set up a Bi-cultural Commission of the Anglican Church on the Treaty of Waitangi with the following terms of reference:

- to study The Treaty of Waitangi and to consider whether any principles of partnership and bi-cultural development are implied and the nature of any such principles that may serve as indicators for future growth and development;
- to consult with Māori and non-Māori people thereon at such marae and other venues as may be appropriate;
- to advise General Synod on any ways and means to embody the principles of the Treaty in the legislation, institutions and general life of the Church of the Province of New Zealand (Bi-cultural Commission, 1986, p. 14).

The report of the Commission was published in 1986. Eighteen recommendations were appended (pp. 26-28). These included several on Māori language, parts of which subsequently became four bicultural Standing Resolutions of General Synod in 1986. In what follows, consideration is given to these four selected Resolutions, along with consideration of an important fifth Resolution on mission within the Church. For the purposes of clarity and brevity in this thesis the title of two of these five Standing Resolutions has been modified and is different to that on the Church's list of Standing Resolutions.

2.2.1 Ordination Training

The first of these bicultural Resolutions focussed on the inclusion of Māori language and culture in ordination training programmes:

That training for ordination requires Māori language and cultural studies of sufficient rigour, intensity and depth to ensure that candidates for ordination have the capacity to conduct fluently all of the important tikanga karakia in Māori, and to be able to perform ably on Marae and in other Māori settings. [1986], (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 6).

It is important to have a clear understanding of the policy and practice that existed before the adoption of the new Constitution in 1992. In the 1986 Report this recommendation was preceded by an acknowledgement that most Anglican clergy lacked knowledge of Māori language and culture and were unable to conduct ministry in a Māori setting. It also recognised that there was a dearth of appropriate training opportunities, or where these were available, they were not used by clergy or those in training. “Incompetence, inadequacy or lack of interest in the Māori language and culture can render the ministry of an ordained person among Māori people ineffectual” (Bi-cultural Commission, 1986, p. 26). It was also the Commission’s view that such a priest, namely, one who is unable to minister to Māori in their language and culture is ill-equipped to become a bishop. Furthermore, the Commission asserted that when “clergy disregard or imply disrespect for the Māori language and culture they deny the obligations of the Church under the Treaty and their responsibilities to God” (Bi-cultural Commission, 1986, p. 26). The Standing Resolution on ordination training was clearly aimed at Māori and Pākehā ordinands. However, the original recommendations also referred to those who were already ordained and special arrangements were sought for these clergy as well as ordinands to study Māori language and culture. The Board of Governors of St. John’s College and the Provincial Board of Ministry¹ were also requested to design appropriate training programmes and report back to the next session of General Synod. It is true that since 1987 all Māori and Pākehā ordinands at St. John’s College have been expected to enrol in Māori language and cross-cultural courses (Davidson, 1993, p. 303).

After these constitutional changes each Tikanga assumed a level of greater responsibility for organising its own affairs including language. Essentially, it was left to each Tikanga to

¹ The Anglican Church worldwide is divided into provinces. When the terms ‘province’ or ‘provincial’ are used in this thesis, it is in regard to its Anglican usage. The Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia is a province.

decide how they would define the word *sufficient* in terms of the rigour, intensity and depth of training in Māori language and cultural studies. Technically this Standing Resolution is still in operation and applies to ordinands of all three Tikanga or cultural strands including Tikanga Pasifika or the Diocese of Polynesia. While St. John's College is still an important provincial site for theological education, a considerable amount of theological training now takes place outside St. John's at other Anglican ministry and theological training institutions within each Tikanga. There do not appear, however, to have been any monitoring mechanisms put in place to ensure that the intent of the Standing Resolution was achieved at any of these institutions. There has also not been any subsequent assessment of clergy, Māori or Pākehā, concerning their ability to conduct all the major services in Māori on the marae and elsewhere. According to anecdotal evidence, it is now largely Māori clergy who conduct Māori language services. Clergy from the other two Tikanga have few, if any, opportunities to use Māori language in their church settings or elsewhere.

2.2.2 Use of the Māori Language

The second bicultural Standing Resolution, which was approved in 1986 by General Synod, centred on the use of the Māori language:

That this General Synod, being of the view that the selective use of Māori words in spoken and written English enriches the English language and enhances communication, and gives New Zealand English a distinctive character, and wishing to acknowledge the koha to the Māori language of English words and expressions:

1. supports the use by English speakers of Māori words in everyday speech and writing, in formal documents, and in liturgical revisions when those words convey a better meaning;
2. encourages Māori speakers to suggest the substitution of Māori words which may give a better meaning, and to correct English speakers' misuse of Māori words. [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 6).

This recommendation, which did not appear to involve any training or financial expenditure, was adopted in its totality by General Synod. The first section of this resolution paved the way for the use of Māori words in the English language version of the Constitution.

Examples of such words in this text included: *Te Hāhi Mihinare* (Missionary Church or Anglican Church), *tikanga Māori*, where tikanga is spelt with a small "t" to mean Māori culture, (and later, *Tikanga Māori* with a capital "T" to mean one of the three cultural strands of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia) and *Te Hīnota Whānui* which is the Māori translation of General Synod.

The second section allowed for church members from whichever Tikanga to seek advice on the appropriate use of Māori words in an English language context. Furthermore, it also empowered Māori speakers to correct the misuse of Māori words. It is not evident from the Report of the Commission whether the intention here was also to encourage the correction of any mispronunciation of Māori words, especially personal and place names.

2.2.3 Kōhanga Reo

Kōhanga reo, or Māori language pre-schools, were the focus of the third bicultural Standing Resolution adopted in 1986:

That congregations and trustees of premises and plant throughout New Zealand be encouraged to make their facilities available to assist Kōhanga Reo and the adult language programmes, and that English speaking parents be encouraged to consider the advantages of involving themselves and their children in Kōhanga Reo. [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 6).

At one of the hearings of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1985 a good deal of attention was focussed on the development of the kōhanga reo movement which began with one pre-school in 1982 and after three years had rapidly grown to 416.

The parents take an active part in the running of these centres and they pay fees for each child attending. The cost differs from place to place but \$25 per child per week was said to be a common charge. This is a significant sum of money for Māori families especially when it is certain that many are not well-to-do members of the higher income group in society. (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 17).

At the time that the recommendation concerning the kōhanga reo was drafted, the huge expansion of these pre-schools was seen as being very important for the future of the Māori language. The Government had not yet begun to fund the movement in a substantial manner. Financial resources, including access to buildings, were very limited. Again, there appears to have been no effort made by General Synod to monitor how many congregations and trustees of premises and plant throughout the country did make their facilities available. Likewise, it is unclear how many Anglican English speaking parents and children were encouraged to take part in kōhanga reo and how many, in fact, did so.

2.2.4 Māori Language Programmes

The fourth bicultural Standing Resolution concerns Māori language programmes in educational bodies associated with this church:

1. That in view of the equal right of both Māori and Pākehā people to enjoy and express their own language and culture this General Synod recommends that all educational bodies associated with the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia accept the study of Māori language as an integral part of their teaching programmes.

2. That all educational bodies associated with the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia be urged to include in their teaching programmes at appropriate levels:

(i) an understanding of the principles of partnership and bi-cultural development and of various words and expressions as reported on by the General Synod Bi-Cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi;

(ii) an understanding of marae kawa. [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 7).

The first half of section one of this Standing Resolution explicitly states the “equal right of both Māori and Pākehā people to enjoy and express their own language and culture.” The Waitangi Tribunal’s concluding sentences before their recommendations also discuss fairness and equality: “What the claimants seek in this case is fairness and equality of opportunity. We think that no fair-minded New Zealand would deny them what they ask for” (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 60). It would appear that General Synod decided to focus, initially at least, on educational bodies associated with the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia and to recommend that such bodies accept the study of Māori language as an integral part of their curricula.

Interestingly, the second part of the Standing Resolution urges, rather than recommends, that these educational bodies include in their teaching programmes an understanding of the principles of partnership and bi-cultural development as well as various words and expressions used by the Commission in its report. Effectively, what this Resolution is strongly recommending is that Anglican staff and students study the Commission’s Report. Given the use of the word “urge,” this second half of the Resolution could be interpreted as a plea for schools, at the very least, to become acquainted with the thinking and work of the Commission. Likewise, this would appear to be the case with an understanding of marae kawa.

This Standing Resolution is a combination of two recommendations by the Commission. The second half of the first recommendation was not included in the Standing Resolution, namely, that “this General Synod recommends to the Minister of Education that the study of Māori language and culture be an integral part of the teaching programme of all schools” (Bi-cultural Commission, 1986, p. 27). It is not obvious why this section of the original recommendation was not subsequently approved by General Synod. While the word

compulsory was not used, the intention of this recommendation was to make Māori language and culture more than an option at pre-schools, primary and secondary schools. It could be surmised that this recommendation was later dropped as part of a compromise or that it was unacceptable to some members of General Synod.

Yet again, there appears to have been no thought or discussion given as to how this Standing Resolution might be monitored. The recommendations embodied in the Resolution were, no doubt, expected to be seriously considered by Anglican educational bodies, but it is far from clear how many actually did so and how many incorporated either Māori language and culture or the work of the Commission and marae kawa into their teaching programmes.

It is clear from all four Standing Resolutions that it was the aspiration of the Commission to place the Treaty of Waitangi near the centre of the Church's mission and ministry. It was also their hope that the Church would support Māori language and cultural regenesi not only because of Treaty obligations but also because of gospel responsibilities. "When clergy disregard or imply disrespect for the Māori language and culture they deny the obligations of the Church under the Treaty and their responsibilities to God" (Bi-cultural Commission, 1986, p. 26). Māori language was one of the most debated issues before the Commission (Beatson, 2000, p. 20). About 25% of the submissions received by the Commission referred to the Māori language (p. 22).

2.2.5 Principles of Mission

While these four bicultural Standing Resolutions concerning Māori language and culture clearly arose in 1986 as a result of the Bi-cultural Commission's report, there is another Standing Resolution which impacts on Māori language and cultural regenesi. This focusses on the endorsement by General Synod of the mission principles of the Anglican Church worldwide as stated by the international Anglican Consultative Council's (ACC 6 and ACC 8) resolutions:

- (i) To proclaim the good news of the Kingdom;
- (ii) To teach, baptise and nurture the new believers;
- (iii) To respond to human needs by loving service;
- (iv) To seek to transform unjust structures of society;
- (v) To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth [1988, 1994]. (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 15).

Each of these principles was not known, in the above forms, at the time that the Bi-cultural Commission's report was produced. Yet, as explicit policy, each principle potentially has a regeneration dimension. Clearly evangelism, teaching, baptism and nurturing can take place through the medium of Māori language and culture as can loving service or pastoral care. Likewise, the call to change unjust structures would appear to underpin the four Resolutions already discussed. It also undergirds the Commission's recommendation regarding broadcasting which was not, however, adopted as a Standing Resolution (Bi-cultural Commission, 1986, p. 28). The fifth mission, which is aimed at the natural environment, also could be applied to Māori language and culture as an endangered part of creation.

This fifth Standing Resolution, mission principles implementing the position of the worldwide Anglican Church, can be viewed in the context of the four bicultural Standing Resolutions of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia. Ordination training, use of Māori language, kōhanga reo and Māori language programmes can be linked to each of these mission principles. The five-fold mission of the Anglican Church has the potential to be delivered through the medium of Māori language and cultural regeneration. I now focus on the new constitutional arrangements and their impact on these Resolutions.

2.3. Anglican Church Constitution 1992

General Synod first adopted Te Pouhere, the Constitution of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia, in 1990 and then confirmed it in 1992. The Constitution addresses the establishment of a three cultural strand Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia. It gives also recognition to both English and Māori languages. Furthermore, it affirms a bicultural Treaty partnership and the relationship with the international Anglican community. Finally, in the section entitled "Further Provisions," it describes the written liturgical and biblical resources of the Church as well as the status of the Māori and English versions of the Constitution.

2.3.1 Three Cultural Strand Church

Culture is explicitly mentioned in clause 4 of the Preamble. In establishing the Church's context, this clause recognises that:

. . . in striving to express the perfect oneness prayed for by Christ, and affirming the transforming power of the Gospel,
(a) advances its mission,

(b) safeguards and develops its doctrine and
(c) orders its affairs,
within the different cultures of the peoples it seeks to serve and bring into the
fullness of Christ... (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia,
1990, p. 4).

Essentially, this clause outlines the need for a three cultural strand church within a unified Anglican Province. It also affirms that the gospel involves change. While this section of the Constitution allows Tikanga Māori to progress its mission, theology and processes within the context of its own language and culture, this is also true for Tikanga Pākehā and Tikanga Pasifika. Ultimately each cultural group is able to decide how much Māori language and culture it will incorporate into its Tikanga. It could be argued that the four bicultural Standing Resolutions have remained for almost twenty years only because they are largely recommendations and allow each Tikanga to make its own decisions in terms of its cultural parameters.

2.3.2 Recognition of Māori and English Languages

Formal recognition of the Māori and English languages is first made in the early part of the Constitution, namely, clause 5 of the Preamble, which covers the history of the founding of the Anglican Church in this country:

this Church has developed in New Zealand from its beginnings when Ruatara introduced Samuel Marsden to his people at Oihi in the Bay of Islands in 1814, first in expanding missionary activity as Te Hāhi Mihinare in the medium of the Māori language and in the context of tikanga Māori, initially under the guidance of the Church Missionary Society, and secondly after the arrival of George Augustus Selwyn in 1842 as a Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland spreading amongst the settlers in the medium of the English language and in the context of their heritage and customs and being known as the Church of England, so leading to a development along two pathways which found expression within tikanga Māori and tikanga Pākehā... (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 1990, p. 6).

Here tikanga Māori and Pākehā refer to two cultures which have been present in the Anglican Church since the arrival of Anglican missionaries in the early nineteenth century. However, in clause 8 there is mention of the first Constitution of 1857 as one which Māori were not involved in drafting or adopting and which excluded tikanga Māori (p. 8).

2.3.3 Partnership and Bicultural Development

In clause 6 of the Preamble there is an acknowledgement of the Treaty of Waitangi which was signed by Māori and Pākehā in 1840. This became the foundation for future government and settlement in Aotearoa New Zealand. The Church asserts that the “Treaty implies partnership between Māori and settlers and bicultural development within one nation” (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 1990, p. 6). The principles of partnership and bicultural development are said, in clause 12, to require the Anglican Church to:

- (a) organise its affairs within each of the tikanga (social organisations, language, laws, principles and procedure) of each partner;
- (b) be diligent in prescribing and in keeping open all avenues leading to the common ground;
- (c) maintain the right of every person to choose any particular cultural expression of the faith... (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 1990, p. 10).

Here tikanga in (a) again means culture, and language is included within this overarching term. All three Tikanga are expected to organise their business within each of their cultures. It is then the task of the three cultural groupings to decide which languages will be involved in the conduct of this business. For Tikanga Māori it is clear that Māori language and culture is an integral part of the way that its affairs are organised. Given the discussions above concerning the Standing Resolutions, it was recommended in 1986 that Tikanga Pākehā and Tikanga Pasifika take various actions regarding Māori language and culture. However, these two Tikanga will decide the nature of those actions. Yet while there is recognition of cultural diversity, there is also an expectation in (b) that the overall Church will lay down ways to work together “in keeping open all avenues leading to the common ground” (p. 10). It is possible that, in order to support the principles of partnership and bicultural development, all three Tikanga could decide that they support Māori language and cultural regenesi s. This could potentially be seen as an example of a common ground.

In (c) the right of each individual to choose how they express their faith culturally is set out. Liturgical expression in the context of church services conducted by each Tikanga seems an obvious implication. However, it is possible to express faith culturally in other situations such as General Synod or inter-Tikanga forums. Technically, each person, whatever their Tikanga, has been empowered to choose the language and culture for expressing his or her faith. While diglot liturgies go some distance towards achieving this, in settings which include either one,

two or all three Tikanga, there may be a need in the future to have translation services supported by sophisticated technology to put this section of the Constitution more fully into effect. It is interesting to note that according to Standing Order 25 of General Synod: “Every Member when speaking shall stand and address the President, and may speak in any of the languages used in Aotearoa, New Zealand or the Diocese of Polynesia” (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2000, p. 7). There are not, as yet, any provisions for translation services. Effectively, at this point in time English is the de facto language of most common life meetings including General Synod.

Clause 13 of the Preamble outlines the process whereby the Constitution was amended and revised so that the principles of partnership between Māori and Pākehā and bicultural development would be implemented and entrenched. It was in 1990 that Te Rūnanga o Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa (the Diocese of Aotearoa Council) met with the General Synod, entered into a covenant with one another and agreed to the constitutional reforms mentioned above (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 1990, p. 10).

2.3.4 Anglican Communion

The final clause of the Preamble (18) has been included here because of the international links with other Anglicans, especially those who belong to the Anglican Indigenous Network, which currently consists of Native Americans, Native Hawaiians, Native Canadians, Aboriginal Australians, Torres Strait Islanders and Māori. This organisation attempts to meet biennially to discuss matters of common interest and concern. Given that most indigenous languages and cultures are endangered, this clause has been included in this survey of explicit policymaking. Clause 18 recognises that:

... this Church is part of and belongs to the Anglican Communion, which is a fellowship of duly constituted Dioceses, Provinces or Regional Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury, sharing with one another their life and mission in the spirit of mutual responsibility and interdependence... (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 1990, p. 14).

2.3.5 Further Provisions

In clause 1 of Part B of the Further Provisions of the Constitution, *Te Rāwiri* and *A New Zealand Prayer Book* are described as written resources where the “Doctrine and Sacraments of Christ as the Lord has commanded in Holy Scripture” are explained (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 1990, p. 22). Clause 3 of the same Part states that

General Synod has no power to alter the Māori Bible, *Te Paipera Tapu*, but it may order or permit the use of other versions of this book for public worship (p. 24). Finally, clause 5 of Part G states, “In applying this Constitution the Māori and English texts shall be considered together” (p. 70). Technically, it could be possible to conduct a debate on the Constitution of General Synod entirely in Māori. The likelihood, however, of this happening in the short to medium term seems remote unless translation services are provided.

2.4. Anglican Church Canon Law

I now turn briefly to the canon law of the Anglican Church. Canon V of Title G focusses on scriptural translations. Clause 3 of this Canon confirms *Te Paipera Tapu*, which was published in 1952 by the Bible Society in New Zealand, as appropriate for use in public worship (2002, p. 9). This became part of Canon V in 1986. In Canon X, which relates to the Church’s Formularies, a “translation into the Māori language shall not be published or used unless it has been approved by Te Pīhopa o Aotearoa after consultation with Te Rūnanga Whāiti” (2002, p. 12). Here Te Pīhopa refers to the Bishop of Aotearoa and Te Rūnanga Whāiti to the Standing Committee of the Bishopric.

2.5. Concluding Remarks

It is evident from these documents that, since 1985 the issue of Māori and their language and culture in the Anglican Church has been placed within the framework of partnership and bicultural development as envisaged in the Treaty of Waitangi. The current situation concerning Māori language and cultural regeneration policies within the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia could be described as fluid and dynamic, in that each of the three Tikanga under the 1992 Constitution is responsible for organising their affairs within their own cultural parameters. While Māori language and culture is affirmed and valued in the Constitution, as are the other languages and cultures, it is for each Tikanga to decide, given limited human, cultural and financial resources, how much importance to attach to them. The four bicultural Standing Resolutions of General Synod concerned with Māori language and culture have de facto been subsumed by the 1992 Constitution.

The General Synod has not monitored these Standing Resolutions for over almost twenty years. All three Tikanga had not considered it a priority to review these policies before their representatives took part in the interviews conducted as part of this research in 2005. This is not altogether surprising given that the main emphasis since the adoption of the new

Constitution has been the consolidation of each Tikanga's processes and procedures in terms of mission and ministry. In the next chapter I focus on how Tikanga Māori have perceived these Standing Resolutions and their implementation since 1986.

Chapter 3. Anglican Māori Responses to Regenesis Policies

In Chapter Two I outlined the written policies regarding Māori language and cultural regenesis in the Anglican Church. In order to gain an understanding of how these policies were implemented, in 2005 I interviewed eleven Tikanga Māori informants. All six, then-current Standing Committee members of the General Synod from Tikanga Māori, agreed to take part. It was important for the credibility of the research that there were representatives from across the five Anglican Māori episcopal units. It was also helpful that there was a balance of four bishops, four clergy and three laity. Four of the interviewees were members of General Synod when it voted for the bicultural Standing Resolutions. The majority of the participants were also aged over sixty years and only one was under forty. This is significant given that almost 74% of Māori are under the age of forty (Statistics New Zealand, 2008, p. 117). Not only was there a lack of spread in terms of ages, it was also not possible to achieve an even number of males and females since only two of the eleven were women. There were fewer younger people and women who had been elected to the Standing Committee of General Synod. I now begin to appraise the responses of these senior Anglican Māori decision makers who reviewed the implementation of the five Standing Resolutions. Those interviewed answered three critical questions for each Standing Resolution. Questions on the Anglican five-fold mission statement concentrated only on links between Māori language and culture and each of the mission principles.¹

3.1. Ordination Training

That training for ordination requires Māori language and cultural studies of sufficient rigour, intensity and depth to ensure that candidates for ordination have the capacity to conduct fluently all of the important tikanga karakia in Māori, and to be able to perform ably on Marae and in other Māori settings. [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 6).

3.1.1 Question One: Knowledge of Student Training

Knowledge of ordinands' training varied among interviewees. In the minds of many interviewees a clear distinction emerged between those students who attended St. John's

¹ See Appendix 1 for a copy of the full questionnaire.

College and those who were non-stipendiary clergy or *minita-ā-iwi* possibly trained at Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa, the Māori Anglican tertiary institution. Several informants commented on the initial focus of the Resolution on the training programme at St. John's. Since 1992 all Māori theological students had been expected to undertake Māori language and culture courses. However, according to one informant, in the 1980s and 1990s a high percentage of *minita-ā-iwi* or non-stipendiary Māori clergy already had a level of fluency in liturgical Māori. A graduate of St. John's maintained that his real training began in the field while being coached by senior priests. One person was concerned about the possible low level of Māori cultural knowledge of the future generations of Māori clergy.

Little was known of Tikanga Pākehā and Tikanga Pasifika training or indeed their commitment to Māori language training for ordinands. As for Pākehā students of St. John's, one informant was aware that their participation was dependent on the Dean of St. John's and later the Dean of the Pākehā theological college – the College of the Southern Cross. Not all Pākehā students studied Māori language and culture. The few Pākehā who were reasonably fluent had received their training through their mission work among Māori in the field. Overall, little was known of Māori language programmes in Pākehā dioceses. One exception was those Pākehā from two dioceses who had attended courses at Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa which had been designed primarily for Māori students. According to one informant, Tikanga Pasifika students at St. John's have not been required to undertake such training.

3.1.2 Question Two: Extent of Training

The second question aimed at gauging the extent of regensis training. In other words, how rigorous, intense and deep were the Māori language and cultural studies undertaken by ordinands in efforts made to prepare them to lead Māori language church services on the marae and elsewhere. The extent of Māori language and cultural training for Tikanga Māori varied depending on the educational institution. Only two informants believed that the Māori language courses offered at St. John's College were meeting the requirements of the Resolution on ordination training in terms of rigour, intensity and depth. Several informants, who did know about the situation at St John's, disagreed with this perspective. The introductory nature of the courses as well as the lack of practical experience had meant that students were not well prepared to lead Māori language services on the marae and elsewhere.

Concerns were expressed as to whether students at St. John's were well-placed to use the Māori language beyond the classroom. Learners needed encouragement to use what they had learnt. In contrast to St John's, Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa courses in Māori language and culture were acknowledged by four informants as providing a good level of rigour, depth and intensity. Despite these ratings, another informant had discerned an increase in the confidence of both Māori and Pākehā ordinands as a result of attending courses. He had become particularly aware that the overall enthusiasm of Māori to learn their language had lifted.

The extent of training for Anglican Pākehā varied depending on the Pākehā diocese. For one interviewee it was unrealistic to expect Pākehā students, who had only completed introductory courses, to emerge as fluent speakers. For another it is clear that Māori language studies for Pākehā had been marginalised in terms of the theological degree. Nevertheless, Pākehā goodwill was seen to be critical and some Pākehā bishops had provided leadership by improving their competency in formal language.

According to several informants the full extent of the training originally envisaged had not yet been fully realised. Three informants felt that the level of rigour, depth and intensity required could only be achieved through a total immersion delivery system which stressed practical performance. One of these interviewees claimed that such a total immersion course should be held for a period of two years although sections of the Church would find this difficult to accept. In his opinion, only a very minor part of this somewhat idealistic Resolution had been put into effect to date. Reasons offered for this situation were the importance given by Tikanga Pākehā to other areas of the theological curriculum and the lack of foresight and theological wisdom shown by Tikanga Māori native speakers regarding the next generations whose knowledge of Māori language was limited. A major impediment for another informant had been the scarcity of well-trained Māori language teachers. Another informant noted the lack of explicit theological underpinning of the learning of the Māori language by Tikanga Māori and Tikanga Pākehā.

Most of the attention was focussed on Māori and Pākehā ordinands. The participation of Tikanga Pasifika received very little attention. Only one informant acknowledged that this Tikanga would have little difficulty in learning Māori because of its similarity with Polynesian languages.

3.1.3 Question Three: Future Training

I asked interviewees whether the Standing Resolution on Māori language and cultural training should be retained or changed. Most informants were in favour of retaining this Resolution although for different reasons. Several informants believed that each new generation needs to be reminded about partnership and two cultures, or bicultural development, under the Treaty of Waitangi. Māori language and culture are seen as the gift of the Māori to the Anglican Church. According to one informant, the Resolution is a test of aroha involving trust, respect and compassion. Such trust, respect and compassion mean that in faith people and their cultures are accepted as well as the fact that everyone has cultural needs. For him some Pākehā parishes have accepted this gift; others have rejected it. Indeed another informant has a vision of Pākehā sufficiently conversant with Māori language and culture that they are able to minister cross-culturally. Yet another interviewee perceives the Resolution as a part of a sacred covenant which will enhance considerably communication between true partners. Another informant cautions that it should not be necessary for the Māori partner to either entice or encourage Pākehā to move beyond their comfort zones. One informant is critical of Pākehā leadership for not taking seriously the wishes of their own Tikanga members in terms of adopting aspects of Māori culture such as the blessing of land and buildings or the burying of placenta. However, one interviewee noted the increasing number of Pākehā clergy who are using Māori language with confidence.

Some informants mentioned the importance of monitoring the implementation of this Standing Resolution. It was acknowledged that that the Church had not pursued this Resolution well. The need to keep the Resolution at the forefront of General Synod meetings was suggested, although how this might happen in practical terms was not explored. Yet another informant cautioned that any review of this implementation should be characterised by genuine enquiry rather than confrontation. It was also recommended that the geographical extent of the Resolution should be broadened to include any place where Māori gather. Another informant was concerned that Māori leadership is too complacent about the present state of Māori language and culture as well as about their future. This interviewee believes that the precarious state of regensis reflects the state of the Church. He warns that if the Church does not take regensis seriously, it risks becoming marginalised by Māori communities as Māori speaking elders disappear with their precious cultural knowledge. According to this interviewee the Church needed to be fully committed to regensis. Another participant acknowledged the importance of liturgy in church services as a way of pursuing

such regenesi. The dream of one informant was that speaking Māori will eventually become much more accepted.

3.2. Use of Māori Language

That this General Synod, being of the view that the selective use of Māori words in spoken and written English enriches the English language and enhances communication, and gives New Zealand English a distinctive character, and wishing to acknowledge the koha to the Māori language of English words and expressions:

1. supports the use by English speakers of Māori words in everyday speech and writing, in formal documents, and in liturgical revisions when those words convey a better meaning;
2. encourages Māori speakers to suggest the substitution of Māori words which may give a better meaning and to correct English speakers' misuse of Māori words. [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 6).

3.2.1 Question One: Amount of Māori Words Used

The amount of Māori language used over the last twenty years by English speakers in everyday speech and writing, in formal documents and in liturgical revisions, was the subject of reflection by informants. Most interviewees agree that over the last twenty years there has been an increase in the amount of Māori language in everyday speech. There was considerable disagreement, however, as to the extent of that increase. Some informants drew distinctions between Māori and Pākehā English speakers and younger and older New Zealanders. It would appear that Māori English speakers and younger New Zealanders are more likely to be motivated and competent. Two informants raised the confidence factor. Another focussed on capacity and will as critical inhibitors, especially for Pākehā. A further distinction was also made between the wider and Church communities. Several referred to limited parts of the Anglican Church, mostly at the provincial level, such as General Synod and Te Kotahitanga, the Church's ministry education body, as places where there has been an increase in the use of Māori language. English words in Māori sentences were briefly the subject of comment for two informants who raised issues including the appropriateness of these English words as well as translations.

Writing in Māori was hardly mentioned in terms of either personal or Church letters. As for formal documents, one informant mentioned the charter and profile of Te Whare Wānanga and another talked about the Church's Constitution as examples. Two others felt that there had been a negligible increase in Māori language writing.

Several informants referred to *A New Zealand Prayer Book* (1989) as an exemplar in terms of the increase in Māori language in a liturgical setting. However, one informant felt that the influence of this text had “levelled out” and another maintained that liturgical revisions are not annual events and that scholarship in this area should have been encouraged. Despite these reservations, one informant boldly asserted that most Anglicans are now able to say the Lord’s Prayer in Māori. References were also made to Joan Metge’s (2005) book designed to encourage Pākehā congregations to use Māori language in their church services, and the sections of the Lectionary which had been translated into Māori.

In addition to the above feedback, one informant believed that many Anglicans are afraid to speak Māori. He sees this Resolution as the soft option when compared to the first Resolution. While there seems overall to have been an increase in the amount of Māori spoken by both Māori and Pākehā, one interviewee believes that there is both a shortage of good teachers and effective monitoring of programmes.

3.2.2 Question Two: Substitution and Correction of Māori Words

The substitution of Māori words and the correction of English speakers’ misuse of Māori words since 1986 are the foci of this question. In terms of the substitution of Māori words most informants contended that very little had taken place. Although there were several notable exceptions, such as the names Tikanga and Te Kotahitanga, such substitutions tended to occur at the provincial level in forums like General Synod. One informant also supported substitutions in the context of a Māori congregation when these conveyed a better meaning. Another informant claimed that, while some substitution had taken place, here was yet another situation where Māori had to lobby other sections of the Church. A different perspective offered by an informant was the substitution of new vocabulary unfamiliar to some native speakers.

The issue of correcting English speakers’ misuse of Māori words drew a diverse range of responses. Some acknowledged that such corrections did take place to varying degrees. Others claimed that it was minimal if it did occur. There was concern expressed by several interviewees that if correction did happen that it should be gentle. In three cases it was asserted that it did not transpire at all. Diametrically opposed to this position is the situation cited by one informant that elders acted as “Māori language police” by being critical of Māori clergy.

3.2.3 Question Three: Future Implementation

The future implementation of the Resolution on Māori language use was discussed with informants. Several interviewees wished to retain this Standing Resolution. In one case it was for future generations. In another it was to ensure priority is given in the Church to Māori language. They acknowledged the intention behind it including better pronunciation of Māori language. Two participants supported it with the proviso that it encouraged Anglicans to use Māori words. However, some felt much less commitment: one believed that substituting and correcting were already taking place and the other preferred to give far more weight to the first Resolution on ordination training. One informant believed that General Synod needed to distinguish Resolutions which are a high priority for the Church in order to ensure their implementation. Yet another mentioned the importance of monitoring implementation. The contemporary three Tikanga context of the Anglican Church meant that there was a need to find opportunities to come together. There was also a need to explore educational training for Pākehā delivered by appropriate secular institutions.

3.3. Kōhanga Reo

That congregations and trustees of premises and plant throughout New Zealand be encouraged to make their facilities available to assist Kōhanga Reo and the adult language programmes, and that English speaking parents be encouraged to consider the advantages of involving themselves and their children in Kōhanga Reo. [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 6).

3.3.1 Question One: Extent of Implementation

This question investigated the extent to which congregations or trustees of premises and plant had made their facilities available to assist kōhanga reo and adult Māori language programmes. Almost all the informants either believed that there were no instances or knew of only one case where the Church had made its building and property available for Māori language purposes. Only one informant confidently asserted that it had happened more than rarely. Where it had occurred, it was largely on a Tikanga Māori site. Only two situations were known that involved the Anglican Pākehā Church. An interviewee maintained that the unavailability of facilities had not, however, caused a setback to the study of the Māori language courses. Facilities at other institutions had been accessed. One example was mentioned of a kōhanga reo, built on Māori church land, which continues to operate today as part of the Church's mission response to Māori language and culture. Indeed one informant

believes that, despite the fact most kōhanga reo are not located on church properties, the Māori Anglican Church has made a huge contribution in terms of human resources. Many of its members have either enrolled their children or have worked there.

3.3.2 Question Two: Involvement of English Speakers

In this question informants were asked whether they knew of any English speaking parents who were encouraged to and did involve themselves and their children in kōhanga reo. Several interviewees were aware of numerous Māori parents, whose first language was English and who had become involved in kōhanga reo. The overall view of those few who did comment about Pākehā was that it was a relatively rare phenomenon to see any such involvement. One informant noted that some “old Pākehā” had encouraged their children to learn Māori. Another informant felt that many Pākehā did not value Māori language.

3.3.3 Question Three: Future Implementation

Informants were then requested to review the future implementation of this Resolution which aimed to assist kōhanga reo and encourage English speakers to become involved with these Māori language pre-schools. A diverse range of responses emerged. There was some support for retaining this Resolution. One informant felt that the Church’s theology was being challenged by the issues raised. Indeed another informant strongly asserted that it was important to retain the Resolution as a sign that the Church recognises the serious role of kōhanga reo. He was also aware of the potential for further use of Church properties. There were two informants who were keen to retain the section of the Resolution which supported adult Māori language programmes. Despite this advocacy for retention, there were several who were in favour of deleting it. One felt that, if it was expunged, there would be little ground lost. Another agreed that the kōhanga reo movement had progressed considerably over the last twenty years to the extent that deletion would probably not cause difficulties. Yet another maintained that the Resolution built up barriers which separated races and so it should be deleted. One of the informants claimed that either the Resolution should be strengthened or deleted. Another felt that she was not able to comment due to her lack of knowledge of the kōhanga reo situation.

3.4. Māori Language Programmes

1. That in view of the equal right of both Māori and Pākehā people to enjoy and express their own language and culture this General Synod recommends that all educational bodies associated with the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia accept the study of Māori language as an integral part of their teaching programmes.
2. That all educational bodies associated with the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia be urged to include in their teaching programmes at appropriate levels:
 - (i) an understanding of the principles of partnership and bi-cultural development and of various words and expressions as reported on by the General Synod Bi-Cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi;
 - (ii) an understanding of marae kawa. [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 7).

3.4.1 Question One: Extent of Māori Language Teaching

Informants were requested to comment on how widespread across the three Tikanga is the study of Māori language as an integral part of teaching programmes at Anglican pre-schools, primary schools, secondary schools and theological colleges. The majority of informants were unable to comment about the study of Māori language and culture at Tikanga Pākehā educational institutions. But one informant acknowledged the courses that existed at some Anglican Pākehā schools because of the presence of Māori and Pacific Island students. He also asserted that Māori language was not included across the curriculum at such schools due to a perceived lack of relevance. Another informant described the teaching programmes as uneven and minimalist – the latter label also being attached to tertiary institutions which cater for Pākehā students. The term “tokenistic” was also employed by two other informants. Another informant maintained that Pākehā schools should be teaching Māori language and culture, although this would involve the development of appropriate courses with the assistance of Māori educators.

There was a far greater knowledge of what was being offered in Anglican Māori educational institutions from pre-school to tertiary level. Two informants, however, raised the issue of quality teachers. Another was concerned about quality learning of language. Little explicit mention was made of Pasifika except for three informants who were either less concerned about their participation than that of Pākehā or who wondered aloud about Pasifika languages.

3.4.2 Question Two: Extent of Teaching on the Treaty and Marae

This question is focussed on how widespread the teaching is of the principles of partnership and bi-cultural development, various words and expressions as reported on by the General Synod Bi-cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi, and marae protocol or kawa. Generally those informants who could respond to this question were unable to quantify the amount of teaching concerning the principles of partnership and bi-cultural development or various words and expressions as reported on by the General Synod Bi-cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi. However, several were able to confirm that Tikanga Māori institutions had such teaching as an integral part of the curriculum. While a number of informants, either implicitly or explicitly, affirmed the importance of such teaching programmes, two informants expressed concern that it was one thing to teach the principles, but something else to put them into practice. Another noted that educational bodies are not required to include these issues in their teaching programmes but rather are urged to do so. One person thought that St. John's College is implementing this Resolution while another was critical of its lack of effort. Another was uncertain about whether political matters should be taught at high schools.

Only a couple of informants were able to specifically discuss what is currently happening in Pākehā dioceses. It was suggested in one case that re-education was necessary or in another that teaching on biculturalism was as widespread as could be expected in some situations. At the parish level two informants claimed that there was a need to educate congregations. One informant pointed out that it was difficult to talk about partnership when there is the current separation of Tikanga especially at the parish or pastorate levels.

Overall, most informants believed that Anglicans had received an understanding of marae protocol through the teaching programmes of their educational bodies. One informant questioned the amount of understanding that was desirable. Another linked marae protocol to the issue of oppressing women. Yet another noted that marae protocol had been added on to the end of the Resolution.

3.4.3 Question Three: Future Implementation

Informants were given an opportunity to comment on future implementation of this Resolution. The majority of informants were in favour of retaining this Resolution. A number commented that progress had been made but that there was still work to be done in these

areas of consciousness-raising. Several argued that there was a need to revise the Resolution to ensure either cognisance being taken of the three Tikanga church context or the availability of new resources. One informant maintained that it was necessary to organise a gathering for all three Tikanga to reflect on the journey so far. Yet another felt there was no need to have a section on marae protocol.

3.5. Principles of Mission

In 1988 and 1994 the General Synod adopted another Standing Resolution which focussed on the mission principles of the Anglican Church. I now examine, in terms of Māori language and cultural regenesis, this five-fold mission statement of the worldwide Anglican Church as set out below:

- (i) To proclaim the good news of the Kingdom;
- (ii) To teach, baptise and nurture the new believers;
- (iii) To respond to human needs by loving service;
- (iv) To seek to transform unjust structures of society;
- (v) To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth [1988, 1994]. (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 15).

3.5.1 Mission Principle One: Evangelism

Initially I asked each informant about the connections between regenesis and proclamation of the good news of the Kingdom. For the purposes of the questionnaire I interpreted this proclamation to mean evangelism. There was a diverse range of responses. Several informants focussed on proclaiming the good news in Māori contexts such as the family or tribe or marae. Two informants questioned the nature of the good news. One defined good news in terms of Pākehā support for the teaching of Māori language and culture and for assisting with its regenesis. Another wondered whether the good news was secondary to Māori political aspirations or Pākehā disregard for Māori concerns. Two informants also questioned the relevance of Māori language and culture for evangelism in the contemporary context. One even went to the extent of questioning what is more important – hearing the Māori language or the good news in a language understood by the hearer. Most, however, did not see evangelism in the Māori context as posing this kind of dichotomy. One interviewee acknowledged that Māori language and culture was only part of the discipleship process. However, the majority either implicitly or explicitly stated the importance of Māori hearing the gospel in their own language. One informant expressed considerable disquiet about the

lack of quality preaching in Tikanga Māori and the subsequent need for theological education. Indeed another informant asserted that it is crucial for the Māori Anglican Church to reappraise itself to proclaim the good news in innovative and exciting ways.

3.5.2 Mission Principle Two: Teaching, Baptism and Nurturing

The links between Māori language and culture and the teaching, baptism and nurture of new believers are the focus of the second mission principle. Three interviewees raised questions about how effective the Anglican Māori Church is in terms of teaching and nurture, especially when there is a lack of knowledge of Māori language and culture. Another informant discussed the issue of Tikanga Pākehā valuing Māori language through teaching, baptism and nurture. Yet another perspective offered by an interviewee was the possibility of teaching and nurture at Māori language-medium educational institutions such as kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa. He confessed that the Church probably did not know how to do this. As for baptism, one informant also questioned the success of the Church's processes while another discussed the high level of Māori language used during the baptism liturgy.

3.5.3 Mission Principle Three: Loving Service

The connection between Māori language and culture and loving service or pastoral care is the main concern of the third mission principle. Again there was a range of responses from Māori informants. Four interviewees critiqued notions of love or aroha. One felt that the Māori cultural concepts of aroha were limited largely to those within the same family, subtribe, or tribe. He compared this with Christian principles which appeared to be more embracing. Another informant encouraged the union of both Māori and Christian principles. One informant went a step further to assert the importance of putting aroha into practice. In other words, trust can be built up when action matches the rhetoric. Yet another informant referred to ways that Tikanga Pākehā could respond generously to the needs of Māori. However, two informants mentioned Tikanga Pākehā social services: one gave credit to these organisations but raised the question of whether the concerns of women and children were being met; another claimed that Māori Anglicans lacked the resources of these Pākehā organisations. Two informants also canvassed situations where pastoral care had been provided through the medium of the Māori language and culture at local, regional and international levels.

3.5.4 Mission Principle Four: Transforming Unjust Structures

Transforming unjust structures of society is the focal point of this mission principle. There was yet again a diverse range of responses. Several informants referred to the injustices of the past concerning Māori language and culture. One challenged Tikanga Pākehā to assist the transformation process. Another referred to partnership and bicultural development under the Treaty of Waitangi. Yet another felt that, in spite of these Standing Resolutions, Māori language would remain marginalised because Tikanga Pākehā was opposed to it. Although an informant claimed that the process of changing unjust structures has continued since colonial times, Māori language was seen by another as assisting reconciliation processes. Two informants mentioned the Hīkoi of Hope, the national march to Parliament in 1998 which was organised by the Anglican Church in order to address issues around poverty. One talked about the use of haka on the Hīkoi and the other the transitory nature of the march in terms of social justice.

A major focus of some informants was transformation within Tikanga Māori. One informant perceived Māori language and culture as a kind of panacea for Māori institutions which leads to changes of perception by Māori in terms of how they see the world and their relationship with one another and others. Such changes had been assisted by Christian viewpoints which were healthier than the traditional concept of utu. There was generally support for Tikanga Māori to give priority to this mission statement. However, one person questioned whether the Anglican Māori Church was well placed to make the links between social justice and ministry. Others made connections with young urban Māori and those Māori outside the Church who were knowledgeable and committed. One interviewee cautioned that there is a need for the Church to put biblical precepts into practice to ensure that it is clear about the good news.

3.5.5 Mission Principle Five: Safeguarding and Renewing Creation

I now examine the responses of the informants concerning the association between Māori language and culture and safeguarding the integrity of creation and sustaining and renewing the life of the earth. Most interviewees asserted that it was important to protect the environment. Links were also made with Māori language and culture in terms of storytelling, including the Māori creation story, genealogy and prayers. The concept of guardianship or kaitiakitanga was also mentioned explicitly or implicitly by several informants. Some made

connections with such a concept within the context of the Church. One claimed that the Church needs to understand its role in creation, while another maintained that it is necessary for the Church to build upon Māori traditions by sharing the gospel understandings of the Creator. Other informants went beyond understanding to focus on the practical witness of the Church as it attempts to conserve the environment. It is interesting to note that while there was implicit discussion of the Māori language, only two informants referred directly to the language as part of creation. One challenged Tikanga Pākehā to learn Māori language as part of safeguarding the integrity of creation that exists for Māori. Such a witness is critical if young Māori are to give credence to the gospel imperative in terms of caring for creation.

3.6. Additional Comments

Several informants made additional comments towards the end of their interviews. I have decided to include these remarks as they also contribute to a better understanding of Tikanga Māori thinking. One interviewee asserted that the Church needs to undertake long term planning. He referred to a tribe and their twenty-five year development plan. He considers that the long-term survival of Māori is the responsibility of the whole Anglican Church which could make financial provision to advance Tikanga Māori. For him being Māori means language and culture. He was encouraged that the Pākehā side of the Church had adopted the Standing Resolutions of General Synod including those on Māori language and culture. Nevertheless, he questioned the level of seriousness regarding Standing Resolutions which tend to be seen as guides. If Tikanga Pākehā wished to be serious, then these Resolutions would be incorporated into their Canons at the Diocesan level. However, he maintains that the Church is moving away from Canons towards principles on how to conduct the Church's business. Another informant thinks that it is very important to have such Resolutions. He claims, however, that such Resolutions are useless if they only stay inside the Synod manual. They need to be discussed openly and taken seriously by leaders within the Church. He argues that if the whole Church is not prepared to do this, then Tikanga Māori will need to do it. For ministry, he claims, language needs to be taken seriously, including lifting the level of acquisition to fluent or near fluent.

3.7. Concluding Remarks

Most Anglican Māori interviewees supported Māori language and cultural regensis. A diverse range of perspectives emerged about Anglican Church policies and practice. A lack of

transparency on the part of the Church regarding implementation meant that some were unable to comment authoritatively on developments across all three Tikanga. For a number of informants the lack of monitoring concerning these policies was a major issue. Different viewpoints on what constitutes effective practice meant that discerning common ground proved to be challenging. Nevertheless, it is clear that many interviewees give priority to learning and teaching Māori language and culture but recognise the lack of suitably trained and experienced teachers and, in some cases, appropriate course delivery. It is clear that in the eyes of most informants regeneration is also part of the Church's mission and ministry. Hearing the gospel in the Māori language is still important for the majority of the interviewees. A number of participants raised concerns about how well the Anglican Church is placed to undertake such work. Nonetheless, transformation emerged as a critical focus for Tikanga Māori. Several informants also believed that Tikanga Pākehā needed to be challenged to make a significant regeneration contribution to meet their Treaty obligations and gospel responsibilities. In Chapter Eight there will be a synthesis of these perspectives alongside those of the other two Tikanga. I now wish to turn to appraising the responses of Tikanga Pākehā interviewees.

Chapter 4. Anglican Pākehā Responses to Regeneration Policies

In Chapter Three Anglican Māori reviewed the Māori language and cultural regeneration policy and practice of the Anglican Church. To gain insights into how this policy was put into action in Pākehā Anglican Churches, I interviewed eleven informants from Tikanga Pākehā in 2005. I focussed on their perspectives regarding the five Standing Resolutions. All the then-current Pākehā Standing Committee members of General Synod, except one, participated. The one person, who was unavailable, was replaced by another representative in a similar position in the same diocese. As with Tikanga Māori, it was important to have representation across all the dioceses. There was also a reasonable balance of three bishops, five clergy and three laypersons. Five of the interviewees, however, had been part of the General Synod in 1986 when the Resolutions were adopted. Most were aged sixty years or more and only one was under forty. It was not only impossible to get a good spread in terms of ages but there was also a gender imbalance with three women and eight men. I now begin to assess the responses of these Pākehā informants who evaluated the five Standing Resolutions and their subsequent implementation over the previous two decades. I asked these participants the same set of questions as for the other two Tikanga.

4.1. Ordination Training

That training for ordination requires Māori language and cultural studies of sufficient rigour, intensity and depth to ensure that candidates for ordination have the capacity to conduct fluently all of the important tikanga karakia in Māori, and to be able to perform ably on Marae and in other Māori settings. [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 6).

4.1.1 Question One: Knowledge of Student Training

I asked informants in the first question whether they knew of any people who have studied Māori language and culture as part of their ordination training programme. It would appear that most Pākehā interviewees were aware that those who had attended St. John's College since the late 1980s had received ordination training which included Māori language and culture. By implication, local diocesan training programmes appeared to be non-existent at worst or minimal at best for these informants. Only one person explicitly challenged the perspective of a number of Pākehā dioceses that they are not now obliged to undertake this

kind of training. The new constitutional arrangements had led these dioceses to this position. For this interviewee the Hīkoi of Hope in 1998 had served as a catalyst for two Pākehā parishes to conduct weekly eucharist services in Māori.

4.1.2 Question Two: Extent of Training

The next question attempted to elicit Pākehā responses on how rigorous, intense and deep the studies had been, especially in terms of ordinands and clergy being able to conduct Māori language church services on the marae and elsewhere. The intention of this Standing Resolution had been to attain a reasonably high standard of Māori language and culture. But the reality over almost two decades since the adoption of this Resolution by General Synod had been that few Pākehā clergy had reached the expected level. The new Constitution had effectively dampened the regensis commitment of a number of Pākehā ordinands and clergy. Māori language had ceased to maintain the same mission and ministry profile which it had enjoyed prior to 1992 in the life of Pākehā dioceses. But it is necessary to note that the range of Pākehā experience differed depending on whether the ordinands attended St. John's College or were exposed to regional diocesan training. It became evident in the course of the interviews that those who had attended St. John's in the late 1980s and 1990s displayed more confidence and competence than previous students. Although it is clear that some good training occurred at the College, it is also apparent that such courses were essentially introductory and that there is a need for further training. If an ordinand attended regional diocesan training, this varied considerably from a fairly minimalist approach to one which expected trainees to have at least a basic knowledge. The diversity of diocesan approaches had been attributed by some informants to the lack of Māori who attended Tikanga Pākehā services. Implicit in this perspective was the notion that it was not perhaps worthwhile for ordinands to invest much time in learning Māori because their chances of actually using the language would be very limited.

Being able to operate effectively as a clergyperson on the marae appears to have been attained by very few Pākehā clergy. One informant estimated that about one quarter of Pākehā clergy, however, would still be interested in pursuing training in Māori language. Interestingly, he did not specify to what level. The point was also made that knowledge of Māori language did not always equate with a person's knowledge of Māori culture. Overall, it would appear that the Māori language and cultural studies undertaken by Tikanga Pākehā ordinands since 1986 have not been of sufficient rigour, intensity and depth to ensure that

candidates are able to conduct all the important services in Māori on the marae and in other Māori contexts. There is also now a strong feeling among some Pākehā Anglicans about whether such knowledge is even appropriate given the new constitutional situation since 1992.

4.1.3 Question Three: Future Training

In the third question I elicited from the informants their comments concerning future training programmes in Māori language and culture. Overall, it would appear that all the Tikanga Pākehā informants to varying degrees were in favour of retaining the main thrust of the Resolution regarding the training of ordinands in Māori language and culture. Several were also in favour of unpacking this Resolution in terms of designing guidelines for ministry training, which ministry educators would be expected to follow at both St. John's College and at the diocesan level. A distinction existed also between the training required for those who are undertaking theological training at St. John's for a life-long vocation and those who will take up the role of a part-time non-stipendiary clergyperson. It may be necessary for past graduates from St. John's to return to the College for refresher courses, especially those that work in regions with a high Māori population. It may also be necessary to reword the Resolution to be more nuanced so as to acknowledge diverse Pākehā contexts. In many Pākehā situations the reality is that there are few opportunities to use Māori language and culture. The level of fluency envisaged by the Resolution may need to be dependent on the context. It may also be important to acknowledge that the process of regeneration is a lengthy one.

4.2. Use of Māori Language

That this General Synod, being of the view that the selective use of Māori words in spoken and written English enriches the English language and enhances communication, and gives New Zealand English a distinctive character, and wishing to acknowledge the koha to the Māori language of English words and expressions:

1. supports the use by English speakers of Māori words in everyday speech and writing, in formal documents, and in liturgical revisions when those words convey a better meaning;
2. encourages Māori speakers to suggest the substitution of Māori words which may give a better meaning and to correct English speakers' misuse of Māori words. [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 6).

4.2.1 Question One: Amount of Māori Words Used

In the first question I asked informants to comment on how much Māori language has been used over the last twenty years by English speakers in everyday speech and writing, in formal documents, and in liturgical revisions. Most interviewees agreed that there had been an increase in the use of Māori by English speakers in formal and informal settings over the last twenty years. Among Tikanga Pākehā clergy and lay people there appeared to be considerable diversity about the extent to which this usage occurred. A number of informants referred to the subtlety of the processes which had led to the increase of Māori words. Again most felt that this increase was a reflection of the acceptability of Māori language by many Pākehā. A symbol of this was the singing of the national anthem in both Māori and English. One informant sounded a word of caution that it was outside canonical church law to use language which was not understood. A concern is the fact that migrants living in this country would not understand Māori language. Another perceived danger of the increased usage was the pidginisation of Māori. The need for awareness and sensitivity to a range of attitudes emerged. While everyday speech and writing appears to have increased, this is not the case for formal documents. It is interesting to note that no informants referred to the use of Māori in the new Constitution.

Liturgical usage clearly depended on context. One informant stated the need for careful processes if Māori is introduced into church services. A number of texts had been published such as *A New Zealand Prayer Book* (Church of the Province of New Zealand, 1989) and *Tui Tui Tuia* (Metge, 2005) which encouraged such usage. Overall, the impression gained is that not much Māori is being used in Tikanga Pākehā services with some notable exceptions. One informant cautiously requested more training to enable more Māori to be used. Another alluded to the slowness of the process of the inclusion of more Māori. Attitudes of Pākehā varied towards the inclusion of Māori language. At one end of the spectrum they were very supportive but, at the other, suspicious and wary.

4.2.2 Question Two: Substitution and Correction of Māori Words

The second question focussed on to what extent, over the previous twenty years, Māori speakers had suggested the substitution of Māori words or corrected English speakers' misuse of Māori words. It appears from the responses of the Pākehā informants that there were few instances of Māori speakers suggesting the substitution of Māori words. One informant

believed that any suggestions, if sensitively handled and not pushed too hard, would win the support of Pākehā. Another interviewee was aware of discussions around critical Māori terms such as *tinu rangatiratanga* and *kaitiakitanga* which had influenced Pākehā thinking. For a number of informants the question of correcting English speakers was also sensitive. One person suggested that the use of the word “coach” might be considered. Not a great deal of explicit correcting appeared to take place outside St. John’s College. A couple of informants had been corrected less than sensitively at public meetings which risked loss of support. An informant did comment, however, on the level of courtesy extended by Māori. But much correction seemed to take place with Pākehā hearers listening to the pronunciation of Māori words and then making the necessary changes.

4.2.3 Question Three: Future Implementation

I then asked informants a question about the future implementation of this Standing Resolution and whether it should be maintained in its current form, changed, or, deleted. Almost all the informants were in favour of retaining the Resolution. There were, however, some suggested changes which included promoting the idea of assisting rather than correcting, and removing the notion of enriching English. A diversity of Pākehā feelings emerged with concerns to maintain rigorous Māori language standards at one end of the spectrum to resisting an offensive and off-putting crusade at the other. There needed also to be a clearer stance by the Church regarding the appropriateness of Pākehā learning Māori and the desirability of walking together on this journey. Such a journey, one informant asserted, needed to be related to the core business of proclaiming the gospel. Encouraging and commending the learning of Māori by Pākehā, especially at secondary schools, was considered a more positive way forward by several informants. One interviewee considered that actually processing, engaging with and owning the Resolution was an antidote to uttering platitudes or tokenism. Again there was mention that such processes for regeneration would take some time.

4.3. Kōhanga Reo

That congregations and trustees of premises and plant throughout New Zealand be encouraged to make their facilities available to assist Kōhanga Reo and the adult language programmes, and that English speaking parents be encouraged to consider the advantages of involving themselves and their children in Kōhanga Reo. [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 6).

4.3.1 Question One: Extent of Implementation

In the first question I asked the informants whether they knew of any congregations or trustees of premises and plant who had made their facilities available for assisting kōhanga reo and adult Māori language programmes. The majority of interviewees were unaware of kōhanga reo and Māori language adult classes being situated on Tikanga Pākehā premises. Three participants, however, believed that there were a number but were only able to cite a couple of examples. Two informants claimed that Māori preferred marae as pre-school venues rather than churches.

4.3.2 Question Two: Involvement of English Speakers

The second question focussed on the latter part of the Resolution, namely, whether the informant knew of any English speaking parents who were encouraged and did involve themselves and their children in kōhanga reo. It would appear that about a half of the informants were aware of some Pākehā families who had sent their children to kōhanga reo or who had members as learners of Māori. However, such instances were not common and it could be debated whether they were encouraged as a result of this Resolution or anything said and done by the Anglican Church. The reasons given by two interviewees for Pākehā not sending their children to kōhanga reo were a scarcity of Māori cultural resources, and the low social status of Māori language and culture. It seems, however, that younger Pākehā are more likely to be supportive.

4.3.3 Question Three: Future Implementation

This leads on to the third question regarding the future implementation of this Resolution. It seems that a large number of informants have major reservations. Furthermore, several have suggested that this Resolution is unrealistic and maintain that there is a need to review it. A couple of interviewees wondered whether the Church may be able to facilitate new developments in Māori education and bicultural development. One focussed on the primary importance of relationships between the two Tikanga. Two, however, believed that the Resolution should remain in its current state.

4.4. Māori Language Programmes

1. That in view of the equal right of both Māori and Pākehā people to enjoy and express their own language and culture this General Synod recommends that all

educational bodies associated with the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia accept the study of Māori language as an integral part of their teaching programmes.

2. That all educational bodies associated with the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia be urged to include in their teaching programmes at appropriate levels:

- (i) an understanding of the principles of partnership and bi-cultural development and of various words and expressions as reported on by the General Synod Bi-Cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi;
- (ii) an understanding of marae kawa. [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 7).

4.4.1 Question One: Extent of Māori Language Teaching

In the first question informants gave their responses on how widespread across the three Tikanga is the study of Māori language, as an integral part of teaching programmes, at Anglican pre-schools, primary schools, secondary schools and theological colleges. Most of the informants focussed on Church secondary schools which appear to vary in their attitudes and programmes concerning Māori language and culture. Over the last twenty years the response of these institutions could be described as minimal. Indeed one interviewee suspects that most church schools do not include Māori language as an integral part of their teaching programmes. Many parents send their children to these schools out of concern that such an education will increase their children's opportunities in the job market. One informant spoke very frankly in that she expounded the best scenario was apathy and the worst was hostility. Even diocesan training seemed to be minimalistic in that Māori language competed with the other demands of clergy training. According to this person, it may be wise to appreciate that given such a climate, any notion of obligation or compulsion would not be well received.

4.4.2 Question Two: Extent of Teaching on the Treaty and Marae

The second question centred on how widespread is the teaching of the principles of partnership and bi-cultural development, various words and expressions as reported on by the General Synod Bi-cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi, and then marae protocol or kawa. Again it would appear that there are a diverse range of church school responses to this Standing Resolution. However, as with the Māori language issue, these could also be characterised as minimal. It would seem that few Tikanga Pākehā schools discuss, teach or action the principles of partnership and bicultural development. One interviewee believed that Pākehā do not understand the Treaty of Waitangi. He acknowledged the importance of knowing the history of Aotearoa New Zealand. According to one informant, the concept of

veto is particularly alien. Yet implicitly and explicitly there appears to be a desire among some informants to teach about the Treaty in schools and in diocesan clergy training programmes. A majority of the participants perceived the teaching of marae protocol to be useful. There appeared to be a good deal of support for visits to marae by church educational institutions.

4.4.3 Question Three: Future Implementation

The third question deals with the issue of the future implementation of this Standing Resolution. It is clear that a large number of the informants are in favour of retaining this Resolution albeit in a changed form. Again there is a diverse range of perspectives from Tikanga Pākehā regarding its current effectiveness. Some informants are very familiar with the intent of the Resolution and believe that we need to be further along the track in practical terms. They acknowledge, however, that others are still struggling theologically. A couple of informants felt that “lip service” was being paid and that at the parish level there is little actual implementation. One interviewee found this Resolution difficult to accept because it had little currency at the parish level. For others, such implementation will occur over the next few decades. Only one informant mentioned marae protocol. He is uncertain about the value of teaching it. Most had already expressed support for marae protocol teaching in the previous section.

4.5. Principles of Mission

In 1988 and 1994 there was another Standing Resolution adopted by General Synod which potentially had a Māori language and cultural dimension. Let us now turn to the five fold mission statement of the Anglican Church:

- (i) To proclaim the good news of the Kingdom;
- (ii) To teach, baptise and nurture the new believers;
- (iii) To respond to human needs by loving service;
- (iv) To seek to transform unjust structures of society;
- (v) To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth. [1988, 1994] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 15).

4.5.1 Mission Principle One: Evangelism

I asked informants what links exist in Tikanga Pākehā between Māori language and culture and evangelism. About a half of the informants were able to make links between their

Tikanga and Māori language and culture in terms of proclaiming the gospel. Three interviewees said that it was contextually and theologically appropriate to make such links. Several, however, experienced real difficulty in making these links. Indeed one claimed that Pākehā congregations could not be expected to use Māori language and culture. Another asserted that the gospel is best preached in the familiar language of the hearers.

4.5.2 Mission Principle Two: Teaching, Baptism and Nurturing

The second mission principle focusses on the links between Māori language and culture and the teaching, baptism and nurture of new believers. Most informants had nothing significant to contribute beyond their initial responses to the first question. Two referred to *A New Zealand Prayer Book* (1989) as a resource. Yet two believed that there was a need to develop further resources for both Tikanga. What was critical for one informant was that if people understood Māori, then they should be taught, baptised and nurtured in that language.

4.5.3 Mission Principle Three: Loving Service

The intention of this section was to explore the links between Māori language and culture and loving service or pastoral care. Several informants focussed on the role of Pākehā social service agencies in the process of Māori language regensis. Indeed, one informant made an explicit connection with the gospel imperative of love by declaring support for regensis an act of loving service. Another informant linked language and culture together with the human need for cultural identity. Yet another person believed that Pākehā Anglicans had a responsibility to create an environment for regensis to occur. It is, however, one thing to have a relationship with the Māori language, and another to actually have a relationship with Māori themselves. In other words, if an individual does not love his or her neighbour, then it will be problematic to love the language and culture of that neighbour as much as loving one's own language and culture. There is clearly here a connection with Christ's commandment for a number of Pākehā informants. Three interviewees had no comment to make on this topic.

4.5.4 Mission Principle Four: Transforming Unjust structures

The fourth mission principle focusses on transforming unjust structures of society. There is clearly a range of Pākehā thinking and feeling about changing such structures. There is a call for transformation but also a need for Māori to convince Pākehā. If changes are needed, one

informant would like more deliberative, constructive, planning processes. Two interviewees referred to the Hīkoi of Hope as an effective way of encouraging transformation.¹ According to one participant, if real partnership and bicultural development is to take place, then the whole Church will need to agree that unjust structures exist. Another informant argued that the three Tikanga church is a just structure which enables dignity for all stakeholders.

4.5.5 Mission Principle Five: Safeguarding and Renewing Creation

I now turn to review the links between Māori language and culture, and safeguarding the integrity of creation and sustaining and renewing the life of the earth. Several informants gave recognition to the traditional links of Māori with the environment. However, two interviewees also maintained that for some Pākehā it is difficult to support Māori language and culture given the constitutional changes in 1992 which give each Tikanga considerable autonomy in terms of deciding priorities. It would also appear that Pākehā politicians no longer perceive Māori as the natural guardians of the environment. One participant creatively interprets this mission statement to include linguistic pluralism and cultural identity as part of God's creation. Another interviewee acknowledges that Māori have a role as first people of the land or tangata whenua but he maintains that the land also feeds the spirit of the Pākehā. Three participants had nothing to say regarding this mission principle. (Two of these were also those who did not comment on Mission Principle Three).

4.6. Additional Comments

As with the Tikanga Māori interviews, some informants made a further contribution near the end of the interview after the questions had concluded. One informant asserted that the Welsh context is a good one to view. He is aware that children who have learnt the Welsh language at school are now taking it back to their homes. He also conceded that the Irish situation is quite different but worthwhile investigating. In his opinion, the Anglican Church in Canada is the closest to the Aotearoa New Zealand situation. However, he did not give any reasons. Another interviewee believes that the regensis policies of the church are the correct policies. It is his conviction that people in the middle ground are not opposed to Māori language and culture issues but just have not heard about it. "Consciousness raising is a very important

¹ The Hīkoi of Hope in 1998 was a national protest march throughout Aotearoa New Zealand to the capital city, Wellington, to seek government action to address poverty, job creation, affordable housing, a trustworthy health system and accessible education.

part.” In addition, he thinks that there is the danger of inter-Tikanga preoccupations hindering the mission of the church. It is his opinion that it is vital to seek the common ground and to work together to operationalise the mission statements through common projects. There is a need for leadership which will facilitate these processes. He poses important questions: should the initial focus of the Church be on changing people’s attitudes so that after a while, once the attitudes have changed, right actions will follow? Or should the Church legislate right actions and once people act in right ways, their attitudes will change? He argues for the latter. For this interviewee, rather than wait for a change of attitude, it is necessary first to take action. Then the attitude of unity will follow.

Another participant valued having her attention brought to the Standing Resolutions. She contends that they would have been a good starting point for the work of General Synod’s Partnership Commission. She also raised the issue of monitoring these Resolutions to check progress. In her view it may be good for the whole Church to have these brought back for attention.

A further informant argued that it will be critical over the next ten to twenty years to observe how Māori values are recognised and incorporated into Church and national life. “As soon as you incorporate some things within Pākehā tradition, you will be subject to the normal processes of Pākehā change.” This argument has been advanced as a reason for not bringing the Treaty of Waitangi into the law. He looks forward to both separate cultures being adequately represented in a common culture which will be less monocultural and less based on a democratic system insensitive to cultural differences.

Yet another interviewee believes that migration may be helpful. “I would not be surprised if those with the least time in New Zealand may be more open than those who have been here six generations not twenty-six.” It is her theory that much Māori spirituality arises from Church Missionary Society spirituality which has been jettisoned by Tikanga Pākehā who do not want to know their history. There is a need to acknowledge cultural roots. She told a story concerning a redneck Pākehā who was part of a travelling party from Aotearoa New Zealand. While he refused to wear his hat with Aotearoa on it, he was still happy to sing *Pōkarekare ana* which is part of his cultural identity. Some Pākehā have adopted aspects of Māori culture, without acknowledging them, such as taking the deceased home or having a memorial service for the ashes of their loved ones.

4.7. Concluding Remarks

As with Tikanga Māori, there was a diverse range of perspectives on the issues that were discussed. Most Anglican Pākehā, nevertheless, appear to be in favour of these Standing Resolutions. The one exception is the Standing Resolution on kōhanga reo which should be reviewed in the light of changing educational and cultural contexts. Few Anglican Pākehā seem to have reached the level of Māori language and cultural knowledge originally envisaged by the Bi-cultural Commission in 1986. Tikanga Pākehā appear to be less motivated to increase this knowledge because the opportunities to minister to Māori have reduced considerably since the 1992 constitutional changes. It is, therefore, not surprising that the use of Māori language is generally very limited in liturgical settings despite a perceived increase in everyday situations. According to the interviewees, Anglican Pākehā educational institutions have responded minimally to the Resolution on the inclusion of Māori language courses and Treaty education in their curricula. Many informants also had difficulty making a connection between regenesis and the mission principles of the Church. The exception was meeting Māori needs in their social service agencies. Again, in Chapter Eight, there will be a fuller synthesis of these viewpoints alongside those of the other two Tikanga. I would now like to focus on the responses of the third cultural grouping, namely, Anglican Pacific Islanders.

Chapter 5. Anglican Pacific Islander Responses to Regeneration Policies

Anglican Pākehā, in chapter four, evaluated Māori language and cultural regeneration policy and practice. In order to gain an understanding of the viewpoints of the third major cultural grouping, I interviewed three Tikanga Pasifika informants. Two of these three interviewees were current members of the Standing Committee of General Synod. Two were aged over sixty years. Two were male bishops and one was a female layperson. Due to the low number of interviewees and the fact that most Standing Committee members are over the age of fifty, it was not possible to achieve a spread of ages. Tikanga Pasifika recognised that the low number was the result of practical considerations. Due to financial constraints it was only possible to interview in Auckland. This Tikanga felt that the number was sufficient to represent its outlook. While there was some commonality in the views expressed, there was also evidence of considerable diversity in their perspectives. I now begin to appraise the responses of these participants who reviewed the implementation of the five Standing Resolutions. I asked the same set of questions as I did for the other two Tikanga.

5.1. Ordination Training

That training for ordination requires Māori language and cultural studies of sufficient rigour, intensity and depth to ensure that candidates for ordination have the capacity to conduct fluently all of the important tikanga karakia in Māori, and to be able to perform ably on Marae and in other Māori settings [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 6).

5.1.1 Question One: Knowledge of Student Training

It was pointed out by one informant that past and present ordinands from Tikanga Pasifika were not required to study the Māori language as part of their ordination training. It was acknowledged by another informant that the context of these Standing Resolutions was important. In 1986 when these Resolutions were adopted, the Church was working towards changing the Constitution and at that time there was an expectation that those training for ministry needed to be able to study Māori language and culture. Yet another informant described what he saw happening as an outsider. He had witnessed a shift in emphasis in theological education from totally focussing on training full-time professional clergy to

including those working already in the field. Marae-based studies had been a revolutionary step. It was an attempt to move beyond the seminary to where the people were located. It was, according to this informant, an expression of public theology which changed who might receive theological education.

5.1.2 Question Two: Extent of Training

In response to the question concerning an assessment of rigour, intensity and depth of the Māori language studies, one informant said it was wishful and hopeful that priests in the Anglican Church would become, not just familiar with, but have a real understanding of the use of the language. To some extent it was “pie in the sky.” However, if there were enough people of goodwill in the church, these things could happen. In 1986 this was the vision, the dream and the hope. It has yet to be achieved in the eyes of this informant. Yet in the late 1980s the church was working towards finalising the new prayer book which included the Māori language. It was part of an attempt to indigenise the Anglican Church.

Another informant felt that the Māori language had been marginalised but as the language of the tangata whenua it was needed to complete marae worship. From a visitor’s perspective, this person defines rigour as allowing Māori language to take its rightful place. It is part of a holistic dimension embracing compassion in Anglican worship through the mana of the language. Indeed this informant believes that the mana of the language was always there. But it was the paternalistic Church that did not honour the Treaty of Waitangi.

The third informant questioned why the intention behind the Standing Resolution had not been carried out to the extent originally envisaged. This individual understands why it is not being carried out in Polynesia if priests do not come and live here. It was conceded, however, that “priests do move around.”

5.1.3 Question Three: Future Training

In discussing the future of such training programmes in Māori language and culture, one informant confessed that it was the first time the Standing Resolution had been encountered. All three informants acknowledged that the Standing Resolution was adopted before the birth of the three Tikanga church. One recognised that it emerged from a different climate. Although part of the vision had yet to be achieved, he endorsed the view expressed above that if an Anglican lives in Aotearoa New Zealand, then he or she needed to be a participant in the

vision. While he feels that there is also a need to be conscious of the various Pacific Island languages, Māori language ought to take precedence in this country. It was admitted that Tikanga Pākehā do not get upset if the Māori language is spoken. In fact he believed the scriptures encourage the view that the respect given to others will be returned. He is in favour of retaining the Standing Resolution.

The third informant had a quite different view: that the framework of 1986 is inadequate for today in that the Church has moved forward. The new spirit of partnership has removed divisions. In this informant's opinion, a new resolution is now required in terms of relating to education and future Māori language and cultural programmes.

5.2. Use of Māori Language

That this General Synod, being of the view that the selective use of Māori words in spoken and written English enriches the English language and enhances communication, and gives New Zealand English a distinctive character, and wishing to acknowledge the koha to the Māori language of English words and expressions:

1. supports the use by English speakers of Māori words in everyday speech and writing, in formal documents, and in liturgical revisions when those words convey a better meaning;
2. encourages Māori speakers to suggest the substitution of Māori words which may give a better meaning and to correct English speakers' misuse of Māori words. [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 6).

5.2.1 Question One: Amount of Māori Words Used

Assessing the amount of Māori language used over the last twenty years by English speakers in everyday speech and writing, in formal documents and liturgical revisions, one informant asserted that he had not detected an increase. Some Māori needed to explain Māori words at various meetings; for example, Te Kotahitanga, which is the provincial educational body. According to this interviewee, Pākehā will only use familiar words, although there are some who are quite knowledgeable. The issue of tribal dialectal differences was also raised as a matter that needs to be considered, although it was conceded that these differences can be compared to the English language dialects spoken by the English and the Scottish. In other words, there is a considerable amount of common language which is understood by all tribes.

Another participant admitted that the whole question was linked to identity. In the Pacific and elsewhere, when New Zealanders are asked to sing a song or perform an item, they struggle

with a Māori song or haka. It was an expression of the fact that Māori language is accepted as part of national identity. In terms of everyday speech there is little beyond greetings.

However, in Anglican Church services the language has become an integral part of the identity of the three Tikanga church at the level of ritual. Pākehā have realised that the Māori language is part of who they are. This informant claimed that there is much to be proud of in the Church. In the past Pākehā assumed that Māori and Polynesians did all the catching up. But now there is a need for everyone to catch up. While there has been progress at the level of General Synod and its Standing Committee as well as common life bodies, there is still much more work to be done. The third informant also conceded that while *A New Zealand Prayer Book* (1989) can mean some use of Māori, it is not an everyday language.

5.2.2 Question Two: Substitution and Correction of Māori Words

Only one informant claimed that there had been a huge amount of substitution of Māori words while the other two were not aware of any such substitutions. The first informant believes that Māori concepts have become key ideas in terms of understanding the Anglican Church. Such concepts and their practical working-out have shaped the church and its theology. Examples quoted included the words *Tikanga*, *Te Kotahitanga* and *hui*.

The issue of Māori speakers correcting English speakers' misuse of Māori words elicited different responses from each interviewee. One maintained that it had not happened. Another said that only Māori with strong personalities had corrected speakers but it was important that the person corrected did not lose face. The last informant cited an instance where Pākehā had brought their own understanding to a Māori term. This had necessitated a Māori leader delaying discussion on the term until a later meeting which enabled time for clarification.

5.2.3 Question Three: Future Implementation

One informant requested that the Resolution be retained in its present form as a source of encouragement. Another informant suggested that it could be better phrased. There was a need to move beyond the language of lawyers. The third informant, while acknowledging that this Resolution has been instrumental in helping to bring the Church to its current situation, believes that there is a real need to replace it with a new Resolution. Such a Resolution could better reflect the notion of partnership in a mutual sharing of English and Māori – a weaving together of both languages. In this way an Aotearoa New Zealand distinctive identity could emerge which draws upon this linguistic richness.

5.3. Kōhanga Reo

That congregations and trustees of premises and plant throughout New Zealand be encouraged to make their facilities available to assist Kōhanga Reo and the adult language programmes, and that English speaking parents be encouraged to consider the advantages of involving themselves and their children in Kōhanga Reo. [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 6).

5.3.1 Question One: Extent of Implementation

Two informants did not know of any congregations or trustees of premises and plant who had made their facilities available to assist Kōhanga Reo and adult Māori language programmes. But one of these did comment that Pākehā need to understand how Māori and Polynesians train their people. He explained that children in these cultures are told to listen and relate. Traditional upbringing did not focus on reading or simply head knowledge. Elders taught songs and movement to the young to convey stories over generations. That was how education and training took place.

Another informant had heard over the years of General Synod instances of dioceses that had made their facilities available. In this person's opinion the mission of God is naïve if it is monocultural. Partnership, which expresses cultural richness, enables the voices to be heard.

5.3.2 Question Two: Involvement of English Speakers

While the informants were not aware of any English speaking parents who had been encouraged and who had involved themselves and their children in kōhanga reo, one of them was able to speak of Pākehā children who had been brought up in the Pacific Islands who had been very enriched culturally by the experience. In contrast, this interviewee stated that in this country there are still a lot of Pākehā who do not want to have any contact with Māori. It was a matter of trust and patience. There was also a need to be careful not to accuse Pākehā of coveting the resources since it was through their sheer hard work that much of the resource had accumulated. However, asking the question whether they would be willing to share resources was more appropriate.

The third informant wished to acknowledge that the commitment to the Māori language pre-school system was one of the most powerful developments in Aotearoa New Zealand. For this interviewee, it was a reflection of the hearts of the parents. It was also an opportunity for the parents to learn. It is a vision to be marvelled at and celebrated. He was speaking out of

his experience from the Pacific Islands where pre-schools existed to expose children to English.

5.3.3 Question Three: Future Implementation

One of the informants was in favour of retaining the Standing Resolution in its current form for the reason that people who live in this country should be encouraged to make an effort. In a three Tikanga church this included Pacific Islanders living in Aotearoa New Zealand. Another informant, however, felt that Māori leaders were the best people to review this Resolution. The third informant read the wrong resolution and so did not specifically comment on the future implementation of this Resolution.

5.4. Māori Language Programmes

1. That in view of the equal right of both Māori and Pākehā people to enjoy and express their own language and culture this General Synod recommends that all educational bodies associated with the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia accept the study of Māori language as an integral part of their teaching programmes.
2. That all educational bodies associated with the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia be urged to include in their teaching programmes at appropriate levels:
 - (i) an understanding of the principles of partnership and bi-cultural development and of various words and expressions as reported on by the General Synod Bi-Cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi;
 - (ii) an understanding of marae kawa. [1986] (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 7).

5.4.1 Question One: Extent of Māori Language Teaching

The first informant was very much in favour of Anglican schools in Aotearoa New Zealand teaching the Māori language. It was not seen to be appropriate for schools in Fiji, Tonga and Samoa. A second interviewee also supported this Standing Resolution. One of the things that had made this individual proud of the Church is that the Church has promoted the Māori language. An example had been the Māori language included in *A New Zealand Prayer Book*. It has not been ignored. According to this person, there is a wider acceptance of Māori language by the community. Teaching needs to begin from the kindergarten. The third informant contended that leadership is the critical factor. In some Pākehā dioceses there is a vision and a commitment. Not everyone in Anglican secondary schools and theological colleges has yet fully understood the Constitution.

5.4.2 Question Two: Extent of Teaching on the Treaty and Marae

One informant maintained that the teaching of the principles of partnership and bi-cultural development needed to begin when children are young and involved in primary school and youth programmes. It was felt that the priests are the key people. If it is a requirement of the Church, then it will be more effectively implemented by clergy. Another informant also agreed that such teaching needed to take place. From this interviewee's viewpoint, the Treaty of Waitangi meant a lot to some Māori and Pākehā. Others were not part of it but learning to be part of it. The bicultural journey in Aotearoa New Zealand is important. The Constitution, however, has added another partner. The church in this Province is unique in the Anglican Communion. However, the Church is still learning what it means to be a three Tikanga church.

The third interviewee believes that this section of the Resolution needed to be explored further. This person asked two major questions: Who is teaching the principles of partnership? Can someone name a resource in Aotearoa New Zealand that concentrates on this? Often any progress is due to an individual's commitment. It was claimed that Tikanga Māori leadership had requested the space for Māori to discover their identity. It was also asserted that Pākehā want to do something but do not know how to do it. On the other hand, there are Māori who ask: Is it our task to do this? What is it that Pākehā wish to be taught? It is important to ask honest questions and to receive honest answers. In terms of partnership there is a need also to check whether the other Tikanga are ready to move.

Each informant also reviewed the teaching of marae protocol or kawa. Two informants made explicit statements which expressed that such knowledge is very important. One of these interviewees professed that this kind of cultural knowledge is crucial in the Diocese of Polynesia. The other interviewee requested that a general introduction on marae kawa be written down so that various protocols are observed. This participant recounted an experience of women from a particular section of the Church, who were dressed in slacks and sat on the front seat at a marae welcome. This was a breach of protocol due to a lack of awareness.

5.4.3 Question Three: Future Implementation

One informant was keen to keep the Resolution as it is but for the Church to make every effort to put it into action. Alongside this comment was a warning that it will not be easy at the beginning. Another informant believed that the Resolution needed to be broadened to

promote more fully the three Tikanga church. The third interviewee also warned that there is nothing that can be imposed on any of the partners.

5.5. Principles of Mission

- (i) To proclaim the good news of the Kingdom;
- (ii) To teach, baptise and nurture the new believers;
- (iii) To respond to human needs by loving service;
- (iv) To seek to transform unjust structures of society;
- (v) To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth [1988, 1994]. (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2007, p. 15).

In exploring any links between Tikanga Pasifika and Māori language in terms of evangelism, one informant referred to *A New Zealand Prayer Book* (1989). Otherwise, two of the informants were unable to find connections with evangelism, teaching, baptism, nurture, loving service, changing unjust structures or safeguarding creation in terms of regeneration and Tikanga Pasifika mission. One of these informants also suggested that the Resolution needed to be translated into Māori, into concepts that are believable. The third informant believed that evangelism involves acknowledging the importance of the indigenous language and culture. Teaching, baptism and nurture rely on communication in the language of the people. Pastoral care is considered to be contextual. This participant contends that transformation is a gift from God that challenges Christians. Furthermore, according to this individual, Māori and Polynesians have a similar respect for creation and its links with humanity.

5.6. Additional Remarks

One of these informants made further comments towards the end of the interview. In this person's opinion, most of these Standing Resolutions were formulated at a time when there was a great deal of emotion. Today Māori are speaking in their own right and not through a Pākehā diocesan bishop. Māori now have a number of new aspirations. This informant believes that the wording of these Resolutions needs to be re-examined to check that this policy is still applicable and whether it needs to be changed. Suggestions were made concerning several prominent Māori laypersons and clergy whom the interviewee thought ought to be interviewed.

5.7. Concluding Remarks

Like the other two Tikanga, there were diverse viewpoints on the issues that were reviewed. When the Anglican Church adopted the five Standing Resolutions, Tikanga Pasifika did not have churches in Aotearoa New Zealand. There were mixed responses to the notion of retaining these Resolutions. These interviewees generally saw themselves as outsiders but well-placed to comment on the growing partnership between Tikanga Māori and Tikanga Pākehā. Any redrafting of current policy would need to be undertaken bearing this partnership in mind. The new constitutional situation also impacted on policymaking as each Tikanga was now empowered to make its own decisions in its own time. The Pacific Islander Anglican Church had not expected its ordinands or clergy to study Māori language and culture. However, two of the participants intimated that the visionary thinking included in the Resolutions needed to be realised by all Anglicans in Aotearoa New Zealand, including Pacific Islanders. There was also support for teaching Māori language and culture as well as aspects of the Treaty in Anglican schools but not in the Pacific Islands. As for mission, there appeared to be some difficulty in relating Tikanga Pasifika as a whole to the five principles in terms of regeneration but recognition that such regeneration is crucial for Anglican Māori mission. One interviewee did, however, affirm the common understanding of creation shared with Māori. In Chapter Eight I will give a fuller synthesis of the perspectives of all three Tikanga. Having reviewed current policy and practice, I now move beyond the church doors to the mission field to investigate bicultural Treaty partnership in the public square. This will provide one of two helpful lenses through which to view and analyse the data that has just been examined.

Chapter 6. Partnership and Biculturalism in the Public Square

Bicultural partnership between Māori and the Crown is highly varied, highly contextual and highly contested in Aotearoa New Zealand. At the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 tribal chiefs clearly were prepared to share their political and economic power with the British Crown.¹ Without the involvement of reputable Anglican and other missionaries, it would have been unlikely that the Treaty would have gained any real traction among Māori. Within thirty years of the signing the balance of power had shifted to the rapidly increased number of Pākehā immigrants who advanced the development of a Pākehā settler state and the cause of colonisation. Colonial governments, the judiciary and other key stakeholders, such as the Anglican Church, consigned the Treaty relationship and its obligations to the position of historic artefact. Since the mid 1970s the Anglican Church and the Crown have belatedly recognised that injustices have occurred as a result of such a position.

Alongside the Crown, it was the Anglican Church, in its search for justice, peace and reconciliation in the mid 1980s, that contributed to the recovery of the concepts of partnership, biculturalism and bicultural development. In this chapter I venture beyond the church doors into the public square to examine the political, economic and constitutional debates on Treaty partnership and the widely used term *biculturalism*. Partnership and biculturalism are critical indicators of the seriousness with which each partner views the Treaty. One of the fundamental debates is whether the Treaty ought to be central to the policy and practice of the Crown in Aotearoa New Zealand. Major debates around partnership largely focus on the levels of transparency, authenticity, equality and equity required to meet Treaty obligations and whether transformation ought to be incrementally pragmatic or radically innovative. Major debates around biculturalism, on the other hand, concentrate on whether biculturalism ought to be not only symbolic but also resource-based and whether biculturalism is the precursor to multiculturalism. Yet another debate is centred on the possible future shape of Treaty partnership and biculturalism. The proposed new written constitution for Aotearoa New Zealand, the foreshore and seabed controversy, and the

¹ It was, of course, the Māori version of the Treaty, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, which was signed by the overwhelming number of these chiefs. Some commentators use “Te Tiriti o Waitangi” to signal this situation. In this thesis Treaty of Waitangi and Te Tiriti o Waitangi are used interchangeably.

viewpoints of a former National Party leader, Dr Don Brash, regarding Treaty partnership as well as neoliberal globalisation issues, have significantly contributed to increased public debates. As a result of these debates, heightened tensions and a straining of relationships between Māori and the Crown have occurred.

The Anglican Church has given a central position to the Treaty in its Constitution and policymaking. Given the Church's Treaty obligations, it is pertinent to examine contemporary debates on bicultural Treaty partnership. The public square, where these debates are taking place, is the Church's major mission field. The ministry work of the Church is contextual. If the Church is serious about regensis mission and ministry, then it cannot ignore contemporary Treaty debates. It needs to undertake its regensis processes mindful and respectful of such debates. It is for all these reasons that I have chosen to draw upon the following investigation and analysis of these debates to construct an important Treaty lens through which to view the Anglican Church's regensis policy and practice.

To underscore the diverse cultural backgrounds of the various commentators, I mention their ethnic identities. The term *Pākehā* in this chapter broadly refers to all New Zealanders of British or European descent. However, occasionally the identity of the commentator is referred to in terms of the person's country of origin when this person is not Pākehā. To support the contention that most of the public debates are occurring between cultural elites, I also mention their occupations.

6.1. Partnership

6.1.1 Centrality of the Treaty

In 1984 the Bi-cultural Commission of the Anglican Church on the Treaty of Waitangi circulated a discussion paper regarding the Treaty of Waitangi among members of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand. In the Commission's discussion paper, there is a brief section about the principle of partnership which was intended to stimulate reflection and submissions. The Commission tentatively advocated that partnership is an on-going process whereby the government legislates in the interests of the majority while, on the other hand, acknowledging the significant place of Māori as a result of the Treaty. While Article One cedes governorship or *kāwanatanga*, Article Three, in exchange, guarantees protection and the rights and privileges of being a British subject. It is Article Two which confirms the

position of Māori in terms of full chieftainship or tino rangatiratanga regarding lands, villages and possessions (Bi-cultural Commission, 1986, pp. 18-19).² In brief, the Commission believed that the Treaty recognised and established the principle of partnership despite a level of tension in the varying roles of both partners. The initial perspectives on this principle were well received by the majority of those who made submissions and were subsequently confirmed in the Commission's Report in 1986. Furthermore, partnership was defined as involving "co-operation and interdependence between distinct cultural or ethnic groups within one nation" in "a spirit of mutual respect and responsibility" (p. 25). The Anglican Church incorporated these principles into its new Constitution (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 1990, pp. 6, 10). Clearly the Commission, as well as the majority of the Church's General Synod which adopted the Constitution, regarded the Treaty as central to the mission and ministry of the Church.

Just as there was a good deal of discussion and debate surrounding the centrality of the Treaty and the principle of partnership in Anglican Church forums, the same has occurred in the Waitangi Tribunal, the courts, Parliament and the wider community. I begin by drawing upon the work of Janine Hayward, a Pākehā academic, concerning the Waitangi Tribunal. The Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 established the Waitangi Tribunal and a decade later its jurisdiction was extended to include claims

... by any Māori or group of Māori prejudicially affected, or likely to be prejudicially affected, by any ordinance, regulation, policy, practice, or action (done or omitted) by or on behalf of the Crown since 6 February 1840 which is *inconsistent with the principles of the Treaty* (Hayward, 2004, p. 29).

Over more than thirty years the Waitangi Tribunal has focussed on the Treaty in its deliberations on claims. As a result, a number of principles have emerged including the principle of partnership. Alongside the Tribunal's reports successive governments have passed legislation such as the Environment Act 1986 and the Resource Management Act 1991, where weight is expected to be given to these Treaty principles by government departments and agencies. While the Tribunal initially explored the Treaty text and possible principles in its early claims, it was the State-owned Enterprises (SOE) Act 1986 which acted as a catalyst for major advances in thinking concerning these principles (p. 31). In this Act the government included a section which declared that "Nothing in this Act shall permit the

² A diverse range of perspectives exist concerning the meaning of tino rangatiratanga.

Crown to act in a manner that is inconsistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi” (p. 32).

The Court of Appeal in 1987, in a case known as the *New Zealand Māori Council v Attorney-General*, declared in its judgement that the Treaty confirmed the notion of

partnership between Pākehā and Māori requiring each to act towards the other reasonably and with the utmost good faith. The relationship between the Treaty partners creates responsibilities analogous to fiduciary duties. The duty of the Crown is not merely passive but extends to active protection of Māori people in their use of their lands and waters to the fullest extent practicable (Hayward, 2004, p. 32).

The Waitangi Tribunal drew upon these judgements in its own findings in claims such as the Allocation of Radio Frequencies Report in 1990, and the Ngāi Tahu Report in 1991. In the Electoral Option Report in 1994 the Crown’s role was defined to the extent that it is reasonable considering the context. The fiduciary nature of its responsibilities was made more explicit in the Te Maunga Railways Land Report in 1994:

A fiduciary relationship is founded on trust and confidence in another, when one side is in a position of power or domination or influence over the other... Because the Crown is in the powerful position as the government in this partnership, the Crown has a fiduciary obligation to protect Māori interests (Hayward, 2004, p. 36).

The partnership principle also figured in later claims. Te Whānau o Waipareira Report in 1998 declared that the role of partnership is to assist the Crown to discern the level of Māori self-determination in the management of Māori issues and, more specifically, the nature of its relationship with Māori in the pursuit of resolutions to such issues (p. 34).

In the 1990s the Tribunal made an important connection between partnership and consultation by the Crown. Indeed in the Radio Spectrum Management and Development Final Report in 1999 it was the Tribunal’s view that the Crown was obliged to consult Māori “as fully as practicable” (p. 38). The Tribunal also acknowledged where the Crown had met its obligations to consult such as in the Kiwifruit Marketing Report in 1995. It is the Tribunal which has recommended to the government the degree to which importance should be attached to the Treaty. Successive governments, with their own political agendas regarding the centrality of the Treaty, have made their decisions about the nature of partnership. Nevertheless, Hayward believes that the principle of partnership is now “well entrenched and widely accepted” (p. 40). Māori professor Mason Durie also asserts that the Treaty applies to all Crown developments whether they are “economic, environmental, cultural and social” (M.

Durie, 2003, p. 262). Durie observes that “At the heart of the Treaty is the promise of a mutually beneficial relationship between Māori and the Crown – a partnership” (p. 265). Such a stance can also be applied to constitutional development.

It was at the Building the Constitution Conference, which was held in 2000 at Parliament Buildings in Wellington, that different perspectives emerged concerning the centrality of the Treaty. The objective of the Conference was

to involve a wider range of New Zealanders with as diverse a range of views as is practicable in a debate on the constitution which has already begun, and possibly to project forward a path for confirming broad-based debate. The conference was founded on the belief that the constitution belongs to the whole people, can draw its legitimacy only from a broad based agreement of the people and must not be changed without the approval of the whole people (James, 2000b, p. 439).

Over one hundred persons registered to attend the two day conference. About fifteen percent were Māori, although the organisers did not claim that those who attended were a statistical sample of the whole population (James, 2000a, p. 8). One of the acknowledged achievements of the conference was that it brought together divergent thinkers to listen to each other’s perspectives: “. . . Māori and other would-be reformers were confronted with outright opposition from business and some political interests at the conference, scepticism among ‘mainstream’ constitutional experts and unease among some moderate liberals” (p. 9).

As a result of the presentations and discussions at this Conference it became evident that issues concerning the Crown and the Treaty of Waitangi will need to be resolved, including the status of the Treaty in any written constitution, the rule of law and one person-one vote (pp. 11-12). Indeed the Treaty proved to be a major focus and there was a widespread view that it is the country’s founding document. Some Māori advanced the notion that the Treaty would need to be viewed as being above the constitution and embodying it in any written document would decrease its mana (p. 16). On the other hand, some non-Māori posited the view that, with the passage of time and lengthy practice, the Treaty was only the forerunner to a British-derived constitution (p. 18).

Several months after the Building the Constitution Conference was held, a Treaty Conference in Auckland was organised by Pākehā groups. It was their hope “that Aotearoa be governed by honourable kāwanatanga and tino rangatiratanga; that our living of our Treaty agreements give wellbeing to all people, hospitality to guests and care to our environment” (Treaty Conference 2000 Publication Group, 2000, p. vi). Māori Chief Judge Joe Williams, in his opening keynote address, asserted that any new constitution would recognise the Treaty of

Waitangi as foundational (J. Williams, 2000b, p. 7). Former Pākehā cabinet minister David Caygill also acknowledged the foundational nature of the Treaty in any written constitution (Peet, 2000, p. 150). It is debatable, however, whether this means that the Treaty is considered to be central in terms of policy and practice.

At another conference on Nation Building and Māori Development at the University of Waikato in 2000, Pākehā law professor Jane Kelsey, in her summation of the earlier constitution conference held in Wellington, maintained that an impasse had been reached. Māori had advocated for the Treaty of Waitangi and tino rangatiratanga to be central to a new constitution. Pākehā, mostly lawyers and politicians, were far more concerned with “technical realignments of the institutions of parliament, the executive and the judiciary” (Kelsey, 2000, p. 16). Kelsey’s generalisation is helpful in that it confirms the different Pākehā and Māori positions around the centrality of the Treaty. But as a generalised statement, it is also too simplistic. There are a range of perspectives regarding the centrality debate that are held within each ethnic group. This becomes more evident when commentators view partnership in terms of being transparent, authentic, equal and equitable as well as being incrementally pragmatic or radically innovative. I begin by reviewing the level of transparency that is present in terms of partnership.

6.1.2 Transparent Partnership

Some Pākehā and Māori believe that the notion of Treaty partnership is far from being transparent. A lack of clarity exists about who are the partners. The nature of their relationship or their responsibilities is also not easily understood. Nonetheless, an attempt has been made to elucidate partnership within a constitutional framework.

An initial issue that needs clarification is whether the partnership is clearly between Māori and the Crown or between Māori and non-Māori. The identity of the Crown prompts the question of whether this entity is the government and the courts. Pākehā academic, David Pearson, raises the conundrum of who should be the non-Māori partner: Pākehā or all other New Zealanders including Pākehā. As the population in Aotearoa-New Zealand becomes more diverse, he sees the dangers of racial division (Pearson, 2004, p. 311). The late Hugh Kawharu, Māori professor, acknowledged that while the Treaty was signed between Māori and the Crown as a relational covenant, the reality has been that such a covenant has been between Māori and non-Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand (H. Kawharu, 2005a, p. v). In this

thesis I acknowledge that the partnership is between Māori and the Crown, in other words, between Māori and the government and the courts. I also agree with Kawharu, however, that in practice the Treaty has emerged as a relationship between Māori and non-Māori.

Māori judge Eddie Durie (2000) argues that, legally, partnership has not been defined in terms of relationship but rather in the manner in which both Māori and the Crown should relate to each other (p. 203). In other words, Durie claims that partnership has not been legally defined. It is then not surprising that various commentators have expressed concern about this lack of transparency.

One of the earliest Pākehā to express an opinion on the Treaty of Waitangi and partnership was the playwright and publisher Bruce Mason. In 1993 he wrote a paper entitled *The Principle of 'Partnership' and the Treaty of Waitangi: Implications for the public conservation estate*. In this paper he refers to the *partnership myth*: "...Treaty partnership is ill-defined, confused, and misleading - dangerously so in regard to the Crown's obligations to all citizens and the potential for detriment to the majority of New Zealanders" (Mason, 1993). For Mason the notion of partnership is less than transparent.

Pākehā business person Roderick Deane (2000) contends that partnership "...as a concept appears to be a judicial invention and a complicated and ambiguous one at that" (p. 115). He acknowledges that such a partnership can be complex and not transparent. It can mean different things to different people. Pākehā academic Christopher Tremewan (2006) also maintains that a partnership between peoples is a romantic concept when, in his view, it actually takes place between elites (p. 96).

Pākehā Treaty of Waitangi educators Robert and Joanna Consedine talk of government hypocrisy and two-faced actions as examples of a lack of transparency. It is the Crown, in the form of past governments, that has preached partnership and concepts of good faith and trusteeship. Yet it is the Crown which has introduced economic policies that have severely disadvantaged the Māori partner. They contend that in the mid 1980s economic reforms impacted on Māori to the extent that about a quarter of them lost their jobs while the top ten per cent, overwhelmingly wealthy Pākehā, were greatly rewarded (Consedine & Consedine, 2005, p. 246). A two-fold increase in poverty among children between 1991 and 2004 took place (p. 247). Given this level of poverty, especially for Māori, the Pākehā political and media criticism of Māori education, health and social welfare funding would appear to be less than justified.

Two commentators refer to partnership as an illusion. Pākehā legal academic Alex Frame argues that to “dangle some illusion that this can be one race, one vote is not only dangerous but it is in a sense a cruel deception” as cited in (Slack, 2004, p. 161). Evan Poata-Smith, Māori academic, also refers to the illusion of a partnership (Poata-Smith, 2004, p. 74)

Oppressive colonialism still exists in Aotearoa New Zealand albeit in a more covert form. Some Māori have discerned partnership to be a mask for such colonialism (Maaka & Fleras, 2005, p. 299). Māori legal academic Ani Mikaere (2005) believes that behind the language of partnership the colonial oppressor continues to devalue Māori customary law or tikanga Māori (p. 330). Jane Kelsey (2004) asserts that it is hypocritical for the government to claim that “te Tiriti o Waitangi confers no binding rights on Māori, while claiming that private property rights are sacrosanct and negotiating international treaties that require the government to protect the rights of foreign investors and incorporations...” (p. 1).

A major problem for Māori academic Merata Kawharu (2005) is that there has also been insufficient guidance or advice concerning the roles and responsibilities of the partners and as a result the outcomes have been quite uneven (p. 114). A major impediment to successful partnership for some Māori has been the lack of Māori and Crown clarity concerning the Treaty generally, including a poor understanding of rangatiratanga in particular (p. 105).³ Such deficiencies have the potential to accentuate Māori social and economic difficulties (p. 108).

Pākehā and Māori have attempted to clarify the nature of partnership. Tremewan (2006) asserts that in reality a partnership allows “for re-contestation of 19th century political settlements in the context of 21st century social dynamics” (p. 96). Frame maintains that partnership is an outcome of cooperation and that cooperation is a better word than partnership. In his opinion cooperation is a more flexible and pragmatic approach (Slack, 2004, pp. 97-98). Furthermore, power sharing will depend on the context. As an example, in the area of Māori language, the role of Māori will be substantial. However, issues such as nuclear policy and immigration would be decided along democratic lines (pp. 160-161).

Pākehā professor of politics Andrew Sharp (2005) argues that partnership can be classified under three forms of constitutionalism. The first he terms *legal constitutionalism*. Here, it is

³ Sometimes commentators refer to tino rangatiratanga as rangatiratanga.

mostly Pākehā politicians and lawyers who claim that the law defines the nature of Treaty rights and that the partnership between Māori and the Crown is determined by the government (p. 313). *Māori constitutionalism*, however, is centred on the Treaty – “a biblically conceived ‘covenant’” (p. 313). Sharp notes that “Māori constitutionalism insists that the Treaty is a record of an agreement between Māori and Crown that set out the basic terms of New Zealand’s constitution” (p. 315). It acknowledges that, in the Māori language version of the Treaty, Māori did not cede sovereignty and that the *tino rangatiratanga* described in Article Two means control over not only material possessions but also culture, language and customs (p. 314). The Treaty is still regarded as binding for each partner today. The third form of constitutionalism is called *whakapapa constitutionalism*. Here iwi, hapū and whānau claim that they have the right to self-government which is based on whakapapa and not on legal or Treaty constitutionalism (p. 320). Sharp summarises mainstream thinking on the constitution as following two paths, namely, the incorporation of tikanga Māori and the Treaty into common law and the move in the direction of a written constitution (p. 324).

A person whose views exemplify Māori constitutionalism and the centrality of the Treaty is Māori professor and President of the Māori Party, Whatarangi Winiata (2005).⁴ He has attempted to clarify the nature of partnership by exploring the possibility of the co-existence of two sovereignties as a declaration of interdependence. He has linked Māori long-term survival with “the effective Māori retention of *tino rangatiratanga* over taonga Māori, including mātauranga Māori which has emerged from unique experience and unique conceptualisation”. Winiata alleges that the major disagreement which emerged between the two Treaty partners over the foreshore and seabed issue was a denial of *tino rangatiratanga*. In his view Māori failed to convince the Crown not to take advantage of their authority. As a result of the 2005 election the Māori Party, which is committed in its Constitution to *rangatiratanga*, entered Parliament, in other words, into the space described by Winiata as *kāwanatanga*. Winiata’s vision for partnership is the reconciliation of *kāwanatanga* and *rangatiratanga*.

Some Māori are more focussed on whakapapa constitutionalism. In her discussion regarding Ngāti Mutunga, Māori consultant Evelyn Tuuta (2005) asserts that *rangatiratanga* is more about everyday decision making by Māori rather than the wording of the Treaty (p. 176). The major priority which emerges is how to protect the tribe or iwi, family or whānau and

⁴ See p. 85 for the foundation of the Māori Party.

individual at the local level. For coming generations any relationships with the Crown and other outside agencies are primarily aimed at survival. Mason Durie (1995) also believes that partnership is at its strongest when whakapapa constitutionalism is evident (p. 87).

In the context of local government the need for partnership has become more apparent with tribal Treaty settlements contributing significantly to regional economies. More representation by Māori at the level of such government will become increasingly necessary for a better informed partnership (Sullivan, 2005, p. 127). Some Pākehā politicians nonetheless, question the need for such representation. This has been revealed in recent debates concerning the provision of Māori seats on the new council for the proposed supercity of Auckland. The National Party-led government has decided against the three reserved Māori seats which a Royal Commission of Inquiry had recommended (Fox, 2009, p. 4). This was contrary to the wishes of their political ally, the Māori Party.

A low level of transparency is evident in terms of partnership which has been variously described as ill-defined, confused, misleading, ambiguous, romantic, hypocritical and illusory. In an attempt to provide clarification, the categories of legal, Māori and whakapapa constitutionalism offer a clearer picture of three kinds of partnership that Pākehā and Māori are pursuing. Undoubtedly a diverse range of Māori and Pākehā perspectives exists regarding the definition or nature of partnership. If there is uncertainty about exactly what partnership means, it could also be argued that there will be real difficulty in attaining a level of authenticity.

6.1.3 Authentic Partnership

Different interpretations of the Treaty have complicated commentators' perceptions of authentic partnership and its attendant responsibilities. Controversial debates over the last six years concerning the ownership of the foreshore and seabed, the speech by Don Brash and neoliberal globalisation issues have led to strained relationships between Māori and the Crown. Yet despite these setbacks Māori have responded pragmatically by seeking real transformation on their part and also on the part of the Crown.

Self-determination and self-government for families, subtribes and tribes or whānau, hapū and iwi, which could be regarded as dimensions of tino rangatiratanga, have been downplayed by successive governments due to political exigencies. For Merata Kawharu, the Crown, in its partnership with Māori, continues to struggle to articulate its duties and

responsibilities. It also struggles to advance rangatiratanga which could be defined more generally as “trusteeship, customary authority and wise administration” (M. Kawharu, 2005, p. 109). This has been evidenced by weak statutory provisions concerning the Treaty and the scarcity of effective government development policies. Where these policies have been put into place such as in education, there appears to be little obligation on decision makers or governance bodies to secure rangatiratanga. For Crown educational agencies at the operational level partnership and rangatiratanga would appear to be acknowledged in varying degrees in terms of policy and resource allocation (p. 114). Kawharu describes a unique model where rangatiratanga is actively protected in an effort to improve outcomes in health although she concedes that there are issues concerning administration and resources (pp. 117-118). In addition, the responsibilities of all the stakeholders, Māori and the Crown, regarding rangatiratanga are still being clarified. Such clarification will be critical for authentic partnership and future development (p. 119).

Roger Maaka and Augie Fleras (2005), Māori and Canadian professors, describe the evolving nature of a partnership which seeks to balance “the right of the Crown to regulate on behalf of all citizens [kāwanatanga] against Māori indigenous rights to self-determining autonomy [tino rangatiratanga]” (p. 98). Pākehā professor David Williams (2005) contends that the primacy of the Māori language version of the Treaty, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, which was signed by most Māori chiefs, has been sidelined as attention has been focussed on the principles of the Treaty. He claims that governmental and judicial decision makers have failed to understand how the Treaty can impact on twenty-first century Aotearoa New Zealand (p. 369). For Williams, the principle of partnership needs to be understood in the light of kāwanatanga and tino rangatiratanga. He distinguishes between the national and local contexts in terms of notions of tino rangatiratanga such as local autonomy and adhering to tikanga values. He argues that the likelihood of progress is more promising in the latter situation. Nevertheless, Williams remains uncertain whether this local piece-meal approach will in the long-term satisfy Māori aspirations for rangatiratanga (p. 383). Already Whatarangi Winiata (2000) has concentrated on designing a national rather than a local or regional political model which reflects tino rangatiratanga in Te Tiriti (pp. 205-206). Yet David Williams (2005), still asserts that the partnership is a lasting and powerful covenant although one partner has denigrated Māori language and culture since 1840 (pp. 366, 373).

Since the Building the Constitution Conference in 2000, notions of authentic partnership have been the source of controversial debate. Paul McHugh, Pākehā legal academic, observes that

in the 1990s, even though Parliament was able to downplay tino rangatiratanga rights, it desisted from doing so (McHugh, 2005, p. 288). This situation was changed as a result of the foreshore and seabed controversy. He questions how Māori rights can be balanced with the rights of the rest of the nation (McHugh, 2005, p. 301). Partnership tensions emerged as the government contemplated its response to non-Māori judicial and political pressures and Māori resistance to proposed legislation. It is not possible here, due to constraints of space, to outline fully all the discussions regarding this debate. In short, a confederation of tribes at the top of the South Island sought a decision from the High Court to allow this grouping “. . . to apply for a Māori Land Court order declaring that land below the mean high water mark in the Marlborough Sounds was customary land” (Walker, 2004, p. 380). The Court of Appeal reversed a High Court decision and argued that Māori title to the foreshore and seabed had not necessarily been extinguished; the Māori Land Court could consider the matter. Pākehā opposition politicians moved to make political mileage out of this decision by stirring up public opinion. In response, the government signalled its intention to introduce new legislation to clarify the legal position regarding these matters including Crown ownership of foreshore and seabed.

At a national tribal or iwi gathering in Paeroa, Māori leaders' resolutions included the statement that “the foreshore and seabed belong to the hapū and iwi under our tino rangatiratanga” (p. 383). Obvious opposition existed to the proposed legislation at the consultation gatherings, or hui, which were able to be held between tribal representatives and the government. A major national Māori protest march, or hīkoi, in 2004 to the capital city, Wellington, reinforced this opposition. Despite intense Māori feelings about these matters, the government, influenced to a limited extent by Māori, passed the new legislation. Partnership between Māori and the Crown had been severely strained.

Another source of controversy was the speech by Don Brash which was delivered on 27 January 2004 to the Orewa Rotary Club. Māori Professor Ranginui Walker (2004) has described this speech as “a carefully crafted catalogue of generalities appealing to anti-Māori sentiment...” (p. 393). Brash had discerned, despite moves over the previous fifteen years towards partnership, a dangerous shift in the direction of separatism and steps towards race-based laws that were alienating a number of New Zealanders (p. 393). He rejected any ideas regarding tino rangatiratanga or any subsequent race-based funding as well as the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. In other words, he was wishing to negate all moves towards partnership. Much of what he was saying struck a chord with sections of the Pākehā

electorate and as a result the National Party surged ahead in the opinion polls (p. 397). The notion, promoted by Brash, that Māori were receiving special privileges, created a good deal of resentment among non-Māori, some of whom felt economically insecure.

A number of Pākehā commentators responded to these controversial debates. Jane Kelsey (2004) believed that Brash was likely to influence even the most conservative forces in Māoridom to take a strong stand to defend their rights under the Treaty of Waitangi (p. 7). None of this boded well for the kind of partnership which the Court of Appeal had discussed in 1987. Danish migrant and university lecturer Henrik Moller (2004) maintained that Treaty partnership had been severely mauled. He regretted that many years of cultivating genuine partnership would be lost: “The process has been dignified, mana of both partners to Te Tiriti o Waitangi has been growing and hope for eventual reconciliation remains. But fear has been rising too as Pākehā understand that real power sharing and real consultation is needed for true partnership” (p. 1).

Another controversial issue is globalisation which can be viewed through the lens of the Treaty of Waitangi and tino rangatiratanga. According to Kelsey (2005), the key thrust of the Ministry of Māori Development’s work since 2002 has focussed on the economic dimension. She has observed disturbing trends towards separating economic development from cultural and social development which gives advantages to market-driven economic development; Māori cultural and social development is required to fall into line with such a model of economic development (p. 84). In addition, globalisation places theories of neo-liberalism which Kelsey defines as “a highly individualised market-driven philosophy” (p. 81) and macro-economics above political power. It attempts to decontextualise economic development. In the Ministry’s 2003 report, *Māori Economic Development: Te Ōhanga Whanaketanga Māori*, one way that it achieves decontextualisation is by ignoring the huge diversity of Māori contexts that occur within and between whānau, hapū and iwi. Where there might be a clash between this neoliberal global model and Māori culture, the latter would need to make the necessary adjustments as cited in (Kelsey, 2005, p. 87). Tino rangatiratanga has been redefined by the Treaty partner, namely the Crown, to accommodate such a model.

Kelsey argues, after examining a number of international economic agreements which are binding on Aotearoa New Zealand, that the Ministry of Māori Development’s market model of Māori economic development is built on exploitation and decontextualisation. “In many ways the prospect for indigenous self-determination in matters of political, economic, social,

spiritual, and cultural affairs, [sic] territorial, cultural, identity, and language rights... has already been foreclosed” (p. 91). Essentially Kelsey is claiming that tino rangatiratanga, in terms of Te Tiriti of Waitangi, has been severely constrained by these economic agreements which lock Aotearoa New Zealand into following the neoliberal model. Such a model negates the possibility of authentic Treaty partnership.

Māori academic Maria Bargh (2007) agrees that neoliberalism has grave implications for Māori in terms of tino rangatiratanga. International economic agreements permit transnational corporations access to rights which Māori perceive as Treaty rights. Māori are also not involved in the negotiation of such agreements (p. 143). “Māori are resisting the continued limiting of tino rangatiratanga by foregrounding tino rangatiratanga and Te Tiriti, and calling for constitutional change to deconstruct the very system that allows neoliberal trade agreements to be entered into in this manner” (p. 144).

A combination of the foreshore and seabed debate, as well as Brash’s policy statements, caused apprehension and anger among Māori as both events represented a major shift away from authentic partnership. These feelings galvanised Māori into forming their own political party, the Māori Party, which was successful in securing four seats in the 2005 election at the expense of the incumbent Labour government. The Party was successful in not only winning a further seat in the 2008 election but also entered into an alliance with the incoming National Party-led government which included ministerial posts for Māori. Such political transformation by Māori has also led to renewed requests for changes by the Crown including a repeal of the foreshore and seabed legislation.

In the introduction of one of the latest collections of Māori writings entitled *State of the Māori Nation: Twenty first-century issues*, Māori commentator Malcolm Mulholland (2006) explicitly states that Māori are keen to discuss with their Treaty partner, “real change that delivers the power Māori have been denied since the Treaty was signed” (p. 12). What kind of real changes are being contemplated? Māori scholar Jessica Hutchings (2006) provides an example of such changes involving future collaborative partnerships between local authorities and iwi (p. 100). This kind of partnership would involve Māori in joint decision making, policymaking and power sharing processes. Only greater emphasis on Article Two of the Treaty is likely to accelerate the adoption of these processes.

Over the last twenty years the Crown has struggled to respond to Māori requests for more recognition of the centrality of the Treaty of Waitangi including Māori sovereign rights to

self-determination or tino rangatiratanga. Māori have perceived that the foreshore and seabed controversy, Brash's statements and globalisation, have led to lower levels of authenticity concerning Treaty partnership. Māori and the Crown are still debating and clarifying the duties and responsibilities of each partner. Such debates and clarification are critical for authentic partnership and future development. Authentic partnership is, of course, also closely connected to issues of equality and equity.

6.1.4 Equal and Equitable Partnership

For some Māori, power sharing and self-determination are currently perceived to be very limited in Aotearoa New Zealand. Equal partnership is seen increasingly as unlikely while the Crown controls the nature of such a relationship. Some commentators reject these constraints and instead argue the case for twin Māori and Crown sovereignties. Such constitutional equality is regarded as the forerunner to social, economic and political equality. A number of Pākehā politicians have major reservations about the term *partnership* especially if it involves these notions of equality. Yet another threat to either equal or equitable partnership is globalisation.

Durie (1995) acknowledges that while partnership is suggestive of equality, the reality is that the Crown imposes its own constraints on such a relationship (p. 87). Roger Maaka and Augie Fleras (2005) distinguish between “junior” Māori and “senior” Crown partners. They claim that, given the present societal structures, equal partnership is more likely to be a fantasy than a reality (p. 274).

The views of some senior Pākehā government politicians or cabinet ministers would tend to confirm that equal partnership is at the present time politically unlikely. These politicians, who have deliberated on the recommendations of the Waitangi Tribunal, have major reservations about the term partnership. Dr Michael Cullen, former Deputy Prime Minister, claims that the “partnership word has been a very dangerous word because it's led to expectations” (Slack, 2004, p. 23). He claims that the idea of equal partnership with veto power is a total anathema to Pākehā notions of one person one vote. Margaret Wilson, former cabinet minister and Speaker of the House, maintains that, pragmatically, Aotearoa New Zealand is also not well placed to put such a partnership into action. She believes that, due to the ill-defined nature of partnership, bureaucracies have struggled to put such a concept into action (p. 24). Sir Douglas Graham, former cabinet minister, also concurred that partnership

was a very inappropriate term (p. 99). For him partnership does not mean a shared management system (Graham, 2000 p. 194). At the national level the major political parties appear to have less than sympathetic perspectives regarding Māori self-determination or tino rangatiratanga. Such viewpoints are clearly influenced by the need to assuage non-Māori voter concerns.

Currently Māori depend on their partner to sustain systems capable of delivering partnership as well as aspects of tino rangatiratanga including resource protection. Treaty settlements are an example where this has happened and a limited level of restitution has occurred whereby control of these resources has returned to Māori (Sullivan, 2005, p.132). Some non-Māori are prepared to champion the cause of partnership and to support restitution; others are completely averse to doing so. Yet despite an improvement in the socio-economic position of Māori, the gap between Māori and non-Māori has not closed. In such a small country as Aotearoa New Zealand, future development will involve a growing Māori economy, investment and representation on decision-making bodies (p. 133).

At the Building the Constitution Conference in 2000 Māori lawyer and activist Moana Jackson (2000) proposed a shift in emphasis from focussing on constitutional partnership to a much more challenging and far-reaching question: “What relationships can be established in a constitutional framework freed from its colonising strictures and assumptions?” (p. 199). Such a question in his view would allow the Treaty to undergird constitutional equality which would lead towards reconciliation (p. 199). He argues in favour of recontextualising the Treaty within the framework of colonisation and then recognising the “. . . equally legitimate sovereign rights of Māori and the Crown to exercise governance. . .” (p. 197). He draws a close connection between the Treaty being marginalised by the Crown in the nineteenth century and the interpretation processes that have occurred over the last twenty-five years (p. 198). These processes in the Waitangi Tribunal, the courts and in Parliament have been briefly reviewed earlier. His definition of tino rangatiratanga clearly includes equality with the supreme sovereignty of the Crown. For Jackson any notion of partnership involves equal relationships.

Jackson is critical of the way that the Crown continually places Article One of the English text alongside Article Two of the Māori text which narrows the meaning of Article One in the Māori version (p. 199). In the English text Article One states that the chiefs “cede to Her Majesty the Queen of England absolutely and without reservation all the rights and powers of

Sovereignty . . .” (Belgrave, Kawharu, & Williams, 2005, p. 388). According to Hugh Kawharu (2005c) who has translated the Māori text literally into English, Article One declares that the chiefs “give absolutely to the Queen of England for ever the complete government over their land” (p. 392). In Kawharu’s opinion, at the time of the signing of the Treaty, it was impossible for the chiefs to understand government to mean sovereignty (p. 393). Therefore it can be argued that it is unjust to adhere to the English version of the Treaty when the overwhelming majority of the chiefs were only familiar with the Māori language understanding.

Any recognition of twin Māori and Crown sovereignties has major constitutional implications. Māori Land Court Judge Caren Wickliffe (2000) contends that a process of renegotiation by the two Treaty partners of the conventions and principles of New Zealand’s unwritten constitution would be needed to achieve a “structural realignment of current constitutional thought with Māori principles and structures of constitutionalism” (p. 246). Essentially this would involve a good working relationship between the two partners which fully recognises their equal status for co-existence and interaction (p. 256).

Clearly equal and equitable partnership would need to involve the whole nation. Robert Consedine and Joanna Consedine (2005) acknowledge that some excellent papers were delivered at the Building the Constitution Conference in 2000 but that this had been only a gathering of elite leadership. They propound the view that there is a need for greater informed discussion among all New Zealanders throughout the country (pp. 252-253). Any major constitutional change in their opinion is unlikely to occur for at least another generation.

Aotearoa New Zealand’s international relations and trade also have a significant bearing on the developing nature of equal and equitable partnership. According to the Consedines, the “threat to New Zealand’s survival as a nation cannot be under-stated” (p. 245). Aotearoa New Zealand does not exist in isolation from the rest of the world. Overseas organisations, such as the World Trade Organisation, the International Monetary Fund and transnational corporations, have had a huge influence on the economies of nation states. These bodies have been driven by the quest to increase the wealth of private investors. “Such organisations have little concern for the social, cultural, economic and environmental goals of a nation” (p. 246). As a result, it is possible that national political power will be weakened. International economic power could become paramount. The gap between the wealthy and the poor will

also be widened further. In addition, the possibility of social upheaval and a decline in optimism regarding this country's future could occur.

As with the partnership between Māori and the Crown, Kelsey (2005) argues that in international relations and trade there is the illusion of equality. Although partnership exists between nation states, the reality is that “the most powerful determine which voices are heard, what arguments are presented, and whose interests are promoted, protected, or sacrificed” (p. 91). The Māori partner has been remarginalised in a world where neoliberalism is at the centre. To move towards such a centre Māori will ultimately need to jettison their tikanga and their values. Essentially the Crown has entered into economic treaties which expose the other partner to being exploited by powerful international investors and transnational incorporations (p. 95). Nevertheless, governments have been reluctant to acknowledge such exposure as this could lead to a questioning of their agreement processes as well as bring into question the Ministry of Māori Development's Māori neoliberal economic development model (p. 98). In Kelsey's opinion, there is some vulnerability evident in the international institutions and agreements which are advocating neoliberal globalisation. Worldwide resistance, especially in the third world, appears to be increasing. This may provide a future window of opportunity for more equitable economic partnership nationally and internationally.

Māori and the Crown continue to debate and clarify the nature, duties and responsibilities of partnership. At the present time the level of partnership transparency, authenticity, equality and equity can be characterised as being low. Māori sovereign rights to self-determination are currently very limited. Without major constitutional change, which recognises the twin sovereignties of Māori and the Crown, social, economic and political equality and equity are unlikely to be achieved. Neoliberal globalisation also threatens such possibilities. For Māori, who have been waiting for justice since 1840, one of the issues is the speed at which change should take place. There are signs that some Māori are becoming keener to increase the rate of transformation.

6.1.5 Incremental Pragmatism or Radical Innovation

At the Building the Constitution Conference in 2000, referred to earlier, there appeared to be considerable tension between views of *incremental pragmatism* and *radical innovation* with respect to the Treaty (James, 2000a, p. 21). The view of the Chief Judge of the Māori Land

Court Joe Williams (2000a) is that central to the Treaty is the changing relationship between races (p. 47). Obviously this will result in transformation in terms of partnership roles and responsibilities. To a certain extent this reflects the incremental pragmatism mentioned above. It is a kind of ad hoc approach which attempts to erect or mend fences when the need arises. Not everyone at the conference agreed with this approach which led to some tension among the participants.

Indian professor Raj Vasil (2000), in a brief review of the thirty years since 1970, comments that there has been a dramatic change in the relationships between Māori and Pākehā (p. 216). He recognises that the Treaty has gained more acknowledgement and respect. He also contends that Māori view themselves as a national entity which has, as a result of the Treaty, equal status with the ruling Pākehā majority (p. 216). In Vasil's view what is needed are equally dramatic changes in the political situation to counterbalance the change in relationships. Such proposed changes could be described as radical innovation. Drawing upon the federation system of India he proposes one model which divides Aotearoa New Zealand into four provinces – each with its own government and revenue sources in addition to a reduced federal government (p. 217). In one of these provinces, the upper North Island, Māori would constitute a high proportion of the population. This could lead to a certain level of Māori self-government and self-determination. The other possibility which he canvasses is a Māori state within the state: “The government of the Māori state could have the responsibility for looking after the language and culture of Māori, their mass media, their education and skills, their health and housing, and their economic development” (p. 218).

Moana Jackson's perspectives on equal partnership,⁵ which were discussed earlier, are evidence that radical innovation was certainly present at the Conference. Another example of radical innovation is the model which Whatarangi Winiata advanced at the Conference. He proposed, based on recognition of a continuing relationship between the Māori and Crown signatories to the Treaty of Waitangi, two separate legislative bodies known as the Tikanga Māori House and the Tikanga Pākehā House. Over-arching these two houses would be the Treaty of Waitangi House whose functions would be to receive legislative proposals from the two lower houses for the purpose of testing them against the Treaty of Waitangi and the rules for consultation. “Any decision will require a majority of the Crown/tikanga Pākehā representatives and a majority of the tikanga Māori representatives” (Winiata, 2000, p. 206).

⁵ See p. 87.

Two years earlier Winiata had claimed that without such constitutional change “the fury of tino rangatiratanga will produce the true believers, namely, those who will die for the cause” (Winiata, 1998).

For some commentators a radically innovative way of viewing Treaty partnership is to recognise its limitations in terms of assisting Māori to achieve their aspirations. Maaka and Fleras (2005) claim that the retention of colonialism in the guise of partnership simply reinforces the status quo in terms of social, economic and political structures and processes. What Māori are proposing is something entirely different: “a rethink of partnership as a constitutional relationship between two foundational peoples involving power sharing and structural adjustment within the frame-work of a bi-national society” (p. 274).

Dominic O’Sullivan (2007) acknowledges that partnership will remain important as a constraint upon the Crown in its decision making regarding Māori resources but that the real difficulty lies in the different expectations of the partners and the diversity of perspectives that exist within each partner (p. 25). He believes:

The greatest limitation of the ‘partnership’ discourse is that it is not concerned with Māori development and advancement in Māori terms. Māori development and advancement needs to be unmistakably and explicitly the focus of any discussion that will serve Māori aspirations (p. 27).

O’Sullivan contends that if authentic, equal and equitable partnership is not possible and if partnership is unable to secure Māori cultural and economic aspirations, then Māori ought not to give priority to it (p. 208).

Treaty partnership is clearly a highly contextual, varied and contested notion today. Yet it was launched in good faith in 1840 by two major cultural groupings, Māori and Pākehā, and so this is recognised by the use of the term biculturalism. For many New Zealanders biculturalism has been limited to a largely symbolic recognition of Māori culture such as singing the national anthem and doing a haka in Māori before All Black rugby games. There is a debate about whether such biculturalism should be developed further through policy development and the distribution of resources. Another debate involves the relationship between biculturalism and multiculturalism. I now turn to examine the other side of Treaty partnership, namely, biculturalism.

6.2. Biculturalism

6.2.1 Centrality of the Treaty

In the 1986 Report of the Bi-cultural Commission of the Anglican Church on the Treaty of Waitangi, referred to above⁶, biculturalism is defined as “the theory that it is beneficial for two cultures to exist within one nation” (Bi-cultural Commission, 1986, p. 33). This form of co-existence, which can be seen as the antithesis of assimilation or integration, was arguably mandated for Māori and Pākehā in Aotearoa New Zealand by the Treaty of Waitangi. Its major features include a high level of interdependence, interaction and participation. The term can be applied, according to the Commission, not only corporately but also individually. It wryly observed in the mid 1980s that Māori had been coerced into becoming bicultural but that this was not required of Pākehā (p. 33). The Commission also drew a clear distinction between this kind of biculturalism which is beneficial to individuals and the country and apartheid, or separatism, which is considered to be malformed and is unsupported by the church. A further distinction is made between biculturalism and the principle of bicultural development.

The starting point for the Commission’s perspectives on the principle of bicultural development is that *culture* is defined “in its broad meaning of the customs and civilisation of a people,” (p. 19) that Article Three of the Treaty included “the freedoms of members of minority groups to protect and promote their culture...” (p. 19) and that Article Two means “in some cases, the State must take positive action to protect cultural values and not merely refrain from interfering with the protective steps taken by the group itself” (p. 20). In the Commission’s view a principle of bicultural development is implied which needs to be taken into account together with the principle of partnership.

In the public square it is the term *biculturalism* which is used rather than *bicultural development*. The close connection between partnership and biculturalism is reflected at times in the use of the expression *bicultural partnership*. The focus at this point, however, is beyond the church doors, namely, in the public square, where the term biculturalism has become frequently used since the 1980s. Crown policies concerning biculturalism did not evolve in a vacuum. Various forms of protest were a major factor. Pākehā academic Mark

⁶ See p. 74.

Williams (2000) argues that biculturalism originates from the 1960s dialogue of Pākehā liberals and Māori radicals leading up to the protests around the 1981 Springbok Tour (p. 89). Roger Openshaw, a Pākehā professor of educational history, “cites the opinion of Robbins that there was also the upsurge of counterculture and protest amongst American youth from the late 1960s to the mid-1980s as symptomatic of a religious and cultural crisis in which dominant values such as utilitarianism and individualism were challenged” (Openshaw, 2006, p. 114). It has been asserted that Māori protest followed the international protest movements focussed on civil rights in the United States and the Vietnam War (Harris, 2004, p. 19). Māori protests in the 1970s and the early 1980s included petitions to Parliament for Māori language in schools and on television in 1972 and 1978, the Māori Land March in 1975, the occupation of Bastion Point in 1977, as well as the protest march or hīkoi from Ngāruawahia to Waitangi in 1984. Māori were agitating for the Treaty to be fully recognised, in other words, to be central in government policy making and practice.

According to Pākehā academic Kelly Barclay (2005), biculturalism gained increased support as a step towards equality (p. 120). Against the backdrop of all these movements, the incoming Labour government in 1984 was also confronted with accusations of institutional racism in the state sector. The government began the task of introducing bicultural policies which Jane Kelsey has described “as a contemporary form of assimilation, incorporating Māori cultural practices and advisory officers into the fringes of existing state agencies”(Kelsey, 1996, p. 185). Biculturalism became a major state policy focussed on reducing cultural marginalisation and racism (Poata-Smith, 2004, p. 65). Nevertheless, it also sat alongside other policies aimed at developing Māori capitalism and devolving government-funded programmes and services to tribal or iwi authorities as well as extending the jurisdiction of the Waitangi Tribunal (p. 74).

Government departments received guidelines on the operationalising of biculturalism. The State Sector Act 1988 established the expectation for heads of government bodies “to recognise the aims and aspirations and employment requirements, [sic] of the Māori people and the need for greater Māori involvement in the public service” (Kelsey, 1996, p. 185). Government enthusiasm for this concept started to wane at the end of the 1980s as more attention was given to iwi and hapū rather than to Māori across the country (Sharp, 2004, p. 198). By this time it had been recognised as an important policy direction in state schools (Openshaw, 2006, p. 125). The education sector was one of various sectors that attempted to respond to Māori expectations in terms of actioning biculturalism (Maaka &

Fleras, 2005, p. 127). These efforts to placate Māori in the 1980s and 1990s marginalised some aspects of the Treaty including tino rangatiratanga. Even the devolving government programmes to tribal entities has been interpreted by commentators as a form of new colonisation in that the state sector tried to turn such service providers into effective managers of human and financial resources. The policies introduced by the Labour Government in the 1980s were continued by the National administration in 1990-1999. After the new MMP electoral system was introduced in 1993, there was a marked increase in the number of Māori Members of Parliament, which reduced the likelihood of any major shift away from biculturalism (Pearson, 2004, p. 301).

At times, Waitangi Tribunal reports have also placed Māori sovereignty or tino rangatiratanga at the centre or have remarginalised it. Pākehā academic Giselle Byrnes (2005) claims that the Waitangi Tribunal reports over the last twenty years reflect the changing political climate (p. 92). Just as the Tribunal has gradually developed its thinking on the principle of partnership, the same has occurred in terms of the concept of biculturalism.⁷ The attention paid to partnership has inevitably led to concentrating on biculturalism for Māori and Pākehā. In 1991 the Tribunal in its Ngāi Tahu Report predicted the emergence of a single bicultural nation” (p. 94) but five years later in its Taranaki Report promoted Māori sovereignty and moved away from earlier visions of such a single nation (p. 95). From the late 1990s until about 2005 the Tribunal moved back towards its earlier position of advocating biculturalism rather than bi-nationalism (p. 97). In the Wānanga Capital Establishment Report in 1999, biculturalism is defined as “an integral part of the overall Treaty partnership. It involves both cultures living side by side in New Zealand each enriching and informing the other” as cited in (Hayward, 2004, p. 35). The focus of the Tribunal’s reports since 2000 has been “the future recapitalisation of the hapū, that is, the importance of financially empowering Māori and enabling them to participate successfully in the capitalist market economy” (Byrnes, 2005, p. 98). After the foreshore and seabed controversy and Dr Brash’s statements on the state’s race centred policies and practices, the Tribunal in its reports appears to have strongly returned to supporting notions of Māori autonomy or, tino rangatiratanga (p. 99).

Māori political scientist, Dominic O’Sullivan, critiques biculturalism in his book *Faith, Politics and Reconciliation: Catholicism and the Politics of Indigeneity* (2005). He argues

⁷ See p. 74.

that, as a result of increased Māori assertiveness, Māori and Pākehā elites advanced biculturalism as a means of effecting reconciliation between Māori and the Crown/Pākehā (p. 211). He questions the assumption, however, that Māori and the Crown are homogenous groups. Biculturalism is perceived as having the potential to constrain self-determination (p. 219). He notes that, for Māori, biculturalism is only one of a number of priorities which include settlement of Treaty claims, self-determination, constitutional review, tribal development and economic and cultural progress (p. 220). Another assumption which he analyses is that institutional accommodation, in other words, the reforming of Pākehā institutions, will lead to more culturally responsive organisations. According to O'Sullivan, biculturalism is a "political philosophy that may or may not contribute to justice for Māori" (p. 221). It is a broad concept which can enable limited autonomy but ultimately the Crown retains control (p. 223). Nevertheless, he does concede that biculturalism has contributed to the raising of the profile of Māori political interests and to the building of a basis for shared policy making and implementation. While acknowledging these contributions, he believes that biculturalism will fail to satisfy Māori aspirations for as much self-determination as possible (p. 224). Indeed he asserts that there is an incompatibility between the Treaty of Waitangi which guarantees such self-determination or *tino rangatiratanga* and biculturalism. Even legislation or bicultural jurisprudence focussed on the principles of the Treaty instead of the Treaty *per se*, provides evidence for such a viewpoint (p. 245). Biculturalism has the potential to remarginalise the Treaty.

Paul Tapsell, Māori professor and former museum director, also critically examines biculturalism but he focusses more narrowly on the context of Te Papa Tongarewa Museum of New Zealand. He begins by defining biculturalism as one nation of two peoples (Tapsell, 2005, p. 266). As a result of Māori activism in the 1970s and 1980s and the highly successful Te Māori art exhibition in the United States in the mid 1980s, museums started to commit tentatively towards bicultural partnership (pp. 268-269). These initial Pākehā responses to Māori assertive claims to sovereignty have not yet, according to Tapsell, satisfied Māori aspirations. It appears that the governance processes of the majority of Aotearoa New Zealand museums continue to be monocultural and there is considerable disagreement concerning the meaning of biculturalism. Tapsell demonstrates through the Te Papa case study that the task of defining biculturalism in museum contexts is complicated by developments in politics and law involving the Treaty (p. 277). The Treaty is certainly not at the centre of these institutions' relationships with Māori.

Like partnership, the meanings of biculturalism for Māori and non-Māori are highly varied and contextual (Pearson, 1996, p. 262). They are also greatly contested. I have looked at the links between the Treaty and biculturalism. For some commentators, biculturalism only pays lip service or gives limited recognition to the Treaty. In the next section I will survey a major kind of biculturalism, termed *symbolic*, which would tend to support these views.

6.2.2 Symbolic Biculturalism

Colonial strategies of concession and containment are still evident in Aotearoa New Zealand in the twenty-first century. Pākehā academic Louise Humpage (2004), has critiqued governmental responses over the last three decades to Māori calls for self-determination. She contends that policies of assimilation and integration have been sidelined for a form of symbolic biculturalism which has “encouraged a celebration of Māori difference but only in limited areas of policy and in closely targeted, defined or compartmentalised ways” (p. 26).

Mason Durie (2005a) certainly attests to the diverse meanings of biculturalism: “at one extreme, a type of cultural exchange, at the other, an independent or semi-independent Māori organisation” (p. 180). Symbolic biculturalism can be seen as a way of exchanging culture but this can have real limitations. Despite efforts to promote biculturalism in the state sector there has been no significant increases of Māori working in this domain. There is also a relatively low number of Māori in senior management positions. Some of this can be attributed to a general downsizing of the state sector and the development of job opportunities within tribal authorities. Durie also recognises the advantages of biculturalism. There have been major changes in the governance processes of this country due to less monoculturalism, more Māori parliamentary representation and greater efforts to recognise Māori language, culture and well-being (p. 139).

Commentators disagree about whether biculturalism has actually replaced assimilation. Ranginui Walker (2004) argues that, in the second half of the last century, assimilation and integration were laid to rest and that Māori and Pākehā cultures “co-exist side by side in a symbiotic relationship” (p. 389). He defines Māori as bicultural and Pākehā as largely monocultural. Inter-marriage between the two ethnic groups or employment expectations can lead to a sense of ease in Māori contexts. Walker maintains that Māori intelligentsia have supported biculturalism especially in educational institutions despite some Pākehā maintaining that this is separatism (p. 390). Roger Maaka and Augie Fleras (2005) would

question whether assimilation has disappeared or whether it has simply been modified slightly to become “a fundamental monoculturalism with a few bicultural bits thrown in for good measure” (p. 98). Indeed they assert strongly that biculturalism is unlikely to become a reality unless Pākehā cease to be paramount (p. 275).

Pākehā academic Avril Bell (2004) warns about binary oppositions, like Māori and Pākehā, not to deny the celebration of difference but to ensure that such oppositions do not mask the common ground that are shared by both cultural groups (p. 103). Mark Williams (2000) concedes that, while such binary oppositions have promoted the contestation of settler narratives of nationalism and provided space for Māori grievances to be addressed, there is a limitation in that it can blur the diversity that exists in each grouping (pp. 88-89). Kelly Barclay (2005) claims that, if justice is the concern of biculturalism, characterising Pākehā as bad and Māori as good will not advance this cause (p. 124). He also rejects uncritical biculturalism including the idea that culture is somehow static. His post-colonial view “rearticulates oppositions between hybridity and authenticity as an on-going necessary tension rather than one that can be resolved...” (p. 133).

Undoubtedly symbolic biculturalism has real limitations in terms of policy development and implementation. It can mask the possibility of continuing assimilation. It tends to gloss over the commonalities shared by Māori and non-Māori. It also glosses over the diversity that exists within each cultural grouping. Nevertheless, it has succeeded in reducing a high level of monoculturalism in governance and has produced an environment more receptive to Māori language, culture and well-being.

6.2.3 Resource-Based Biculturalism

Singing the national anthem or doing the haka in Māori at an All Blacks test match, however, is not the same as developing policy which deploys substantial resources to advance Māori aspirations. Chinese-American-New Zealander academic James Liu (2005), in his summary of recent histories of Aotearoa New Zealand, contends that “institutions of governance are based on liberal democratic ideals with special allowance for biculturalism and the relationship between Māori and the Crown...” (p. 72). He argues that among Europeans/Pākehā there is a good deal of support for the general idea of biculturalism, but there is huge opposition to any notion of resource-based biculturalism (p. 76). Where there are Europeans/Pākehā who oppose symbolic biculturalism, such as the singing of the national

anthem in Māori or official ceremonies using Māori language greetings, Liu tentatively claims that this could be attributed to prejudice against Māori (p. 77). He acknowledges the tension that exists in the support for the general idea of biculturalism (p. 79) and the opposition to biculturalism based on resource distribution. He also notes that symbolic biculturalism is one way that Aotearoa New Zealand can be distinguished internationally especially when comparisons are drawn with Australia and the United States in terms of the treatment of their indigenous peoples. The opposition to biculturalism, which is based on the distribution and management of resources, according to Liu, can be attributed to a “serious conflict between the imperatives of liberal democracy, which emphasise individual merit and equal opportunity in the present, and biculturalism, which emphasises past injustices and intergroup relations” (p. 80). Yet, whether the predominating ideology is liberalism or biculturalism, there is always the possibility of injustice and marginalisation (p. 85).

O’Sullivan (2005) recognises the two kinds of biculturalism advocated by Andrew Sharp. The first is bicultural reformism, a form of symbolic biculturalism, which aims to encourage bicultural practices in the state sector. The second is bicultural distributivism, a kind of resource-based biculturalism, which would involve allocating resources, political power and employment according to the Māori percentage of the total population (pp. 211-212). The former kind of biculturalism has received far greater political support than the latter.

For one commentator all forms of biculturalism have significant limitations. American academic Hal Levine (2005) critiques biculturalism as the most effective means of pursuing indigenous rights (p. 105). He argues that biculturalism can impede partnership in the quest for resources. Levine’s working definition of cultural essentialism acknowledges that identity, whether individual or group, is determined by culture and the notion of claims and rights. Nonetheless, he believes there is an increasing view that socio-economic problems require political rather than just cultural solutions. In his review of the cultural safety movement in Aotearoa New Zealand’s health system, he has detected a significant shift away from cultural essentialism towards a much more intentional focus on the power of service providers and patients (p. 113). While Levine concedes that cultural essentialism is able at first to build a level of solidarity, it then moves onto a level of fragmentation where intergroup rivalry undoes the positive gains which have been achieved (p. 114). He advocates that a non-essentialist perspective on culture acknowledges multiple cultural sources and growing intercultural fluidity (p. 115). For Levine, more important than biculturalism, in

terms of indigenous rights, are issues of power, distribution of resources and political legitimacy (p. 116).

Pākehā, Elizabeth McLeay (2000), a lecturer in politics, in her discussions on the possibility of composing the political executive differently, claims that, to fulfil Treaty partnership responsibilities, cognisance needs to be taken of biculturalism requirements. She argues that the Constitution Act 1986 could give greater recognition to the status of Māori as tangata whenua by requiring “that a minimum number of Ministers must be Māori...” (pp. 303-304). In addition, she canvasses the possibility of Māori ministers being appointed from outside Parliament if necessary.

While the foreshore and seabed controversy resulted in a straining of the partnership relationship between Māori and the Crown, biculturalism as a term hardly figured in this debate between “exclusive majority ‘core’ values and identities” and “non-inclusive minority ‘cultural’ bases for membership” (Pearson, 2005, p. 34). This controversy is yet another case where biculturalism based on resources encountered huge opposition from non-Māori who essentially exercised the power of veto against Māoridom’s collective wishes to retain ownership of the foreshore and seabed. Pearson questions whether such a veto is part of democracy or an attempt to subvert it. He also asks whether collective minority aspirations can be met in a one person one vote political system (p. 35). Given that the Treaty of Waitangi was signed in 1840 by collective groups, namely Māori sub-tribes and the Crown, which guaranteed under Article Two “to protect the chiefs, the sub-tribes and all the people of New Zealand in the unqualified exercise of their chieftainship over their lands, villages and all their treasures” (H. Kawharu, 2005c, p. 392), the accommodation of collective minority wishes could be strongly advocated. For Maaka and Fleras (2005) this controversy represents a case study which poses the conundrum: bicultural politics or bi-national society? (p. 143). “The crisis clearly revealed the tension implicit in balancing Māori tino rangatiratanga rights to self-determining autonomy with the regulatory rights of the Crown to govern on behalf of national interests” (p. 144).

The other major controversy, discussed earlier in relation to partnership, was the speech by Don Brash in 2004. Avril Bell (2004) attributes the dramatic surge in political support for the National Party to Pākehā not being included in the political debates around biculturalism (p. 104). Pākehā, who were not well-informed concerning Treaty settlements or government policies, were vulnerable to political manipulation. Brash attempted to assert, firstly, that

Māori are privileged and, secondly, to deny socio-economic and health inequalities. Furthermore, he disputed whether there were any *real* Māori still living although he conceded that Māori culture has a special place in New Zealand culture. For Brash, biculturalism would appear to be a commitment to monoculturalism with some acknowledgement of Māori culture. Bell makes the point that Brash needed to appreciate that a living Māori culture will only survive when it is a major factor in policymaking, opportunities are provided for its transmission, and some priority is given to the Māori health and socio-economic position (p. 105). Engagement with a politics of refusal, in terms of Māori cultural identity and survival, in her opinion, is unlikely to lead to a good future for Aotearoa New Zealand.

For David Pearson (2005), Brash is totally opposed to notions of collectivity and so any acknowledgment of biculturalism is restricted preferably to individual private lives or choice (p. 32). Robert and Joanna Consedine (2005) maintain that Brash's comments can be seen in the context of a reassertion of *white supremacy* which will be contested by Māori who are better prepared than in the past to undertake such a task (p. 219). Yet another Pākehā commentator, David Slack (2004), asserts that there is a lack of transparency concerning the relationship between biculturalism and Māori rights (p. 151). While there may be some Pākehā recognition of Māori culture, this does not necessarily translate into support for indigenous rights or special status for Māori, or additional resources.

Māori observers also questioned the credibility of Brash's statements as well as his motives. Māori researcher Eljion Fitzgerald (2004) argues that Brash's denial of the Treaty of Waitangi as being relevant in twenty-first century Aotearoa New Zealand translates into a refusal to acknowledge the health and socio-economic inequalities between Māori and non-Māori. In turn this has the potential to allow such disparities to continue and to reverse the gains of the last twenty years (p. 56). Dominic O'Sullivan (2005) claims that Brash's speech was assimilationist in its intent and failed to recognise Māori cultural concerns or visioning. It was also an example of the Treaty of Waitangi being understated in a privileging of Pākehā individualism and a downplaying of Māori notions of collectivity (pp. 262-264).

Biculturalism has the potential to remarginalise the Treaty, especially tino rangatiratanga. Roger Maaka and Augie Fleras (2005) helpfully provide a framework which clearly acknowledges the debate which has occurred between biculturalism and bi-nationalism as a result of the former focussing on institutional accommodation and antidiscrimination processes rather than the latter option of self-determination and autonomy. In other words,

Māori have become increasingly suspicious of biculturalism which has not fulfilled the constitutional rights of Māori as a Treaty partner (pp. 140-141). The necessary policies and resources required for Māori to function as a genuine partner have also not been produced as a result of this concept. “Under bi-nationalism, Māori are seen as having two sets of rights: the rights of citizens and rights as indigenous peoples. One is concerned with equality, the other with equity; one focusses on sameness, the other with difference” (p. 142). Such bi-nationalism addresses among other things constitutional changes, power sharing, and authentic, equal and equitable partnership (p.142). Maaka and Fleras envisage a bi-national framework which encompasses bi/multiculturalism (p. 295). It is their contention that power-politics should be superseded by the imperatives of justice and wisdom (p. 297).

Resource-based biculturalism also has economic implications beyond the shores of Aotearoa New Zealand. Maaka and Fleras outline tensions that exist between indigenous peoples and the global market. Compared to colonialism, globalisation, in their view, is stealthier and less transparent. An example is international agreements which prevent governments from progressing beyond symbolic biculturalism to resource-based biculturalism. Māori rights to self-determination can be regarded as being too costly in the international marketplace (Maaka & Fleras, 2005, p. 299). Maaka and Fleras have discerned that it is these very rights held by indigenous Māori which could act as a restraint on globalisation excesses potentially threatening Aotearoa New Zealand’s sovereignty as a state. James Liu (2005) also acknowledges that biculturalism focusses attention on a sacred cultural core which will be critically important when transnational corporations attempt to take advantage of countries for their own purposes (p. 85). Pearson (2004) claims that some Pākehā intellectuals also perceive aspects of biculturalism under the Treaty of Waitangi “as projecting a local identity in the face of globalisation” (p. 310).

Not everyone, however, sees such a positive role for biculturalism. Elizabeth Rata (2003) is a Pākehā with a Māori surname who refuses to publicly state her ethnicity in line with her views on cultural essentialism. She argues that biculturalism is a danger to Aotearoa New Zealand’s position in the global marketplace (p. 24). The most important identity for Rata is national identity. Cultural and ethnic identities in a democracy impede attempts to create “a democratic international culture involving individual nations, regional blocs, and powerful global organisations such as the World Trade Organisation” (p. 24). Babadzan (2006) also anticipates the decline of cultural politics with the separation of the cultural from the political (p. 64). For some neo-liberals cultural identity is not a major facilitator of globalisation

processes. In their view biculturalism will, in the not-too-distant future, become a millstone around the necks of neo-tribal capitalist enterprises which seek to become a part of these processes (p. 63).

Considerable support exists among New Zealanders for symbolic biculturalism but there is much opposition to a biculturalism based on the distribution and management of resources. The foreshore and seabed controversy together with Brash's policy comments have provided more evidence of such a position. A major problem is that the general population of Aotearoa New Zealand is not well-informed on the Treaty or on biculturalism and so are easily manipulated by politicians. The concept of bi-nationalism, which acknowledges two sovereignties, is unlikely to gain widespread acceptance in the short term unless this situation is remedied. Whether biculturalism mediates or hinders globalisation is yet another issue. A major argument against biculturalism, however, is that it excludes non-Māori and non-Pākehā New Zealanders (O'Sullivan, 2007, p. 18).⁸

6.2.4 Biculturalism and Multiculturalism

Few Māori commentators appear to have written about the issue of multiculturalism. Former Māori Governor-General Bishop Sir Paul Reeves (2000), in his opening remarks to the Building the Constitution Conference referred to earlier, observes that Aotearoa New Zealand is bicultural and becoming more multicultural (p. 41). Rangi Walker (2004) claims that some Pākehā use multiculturalism as a reason for not allocating resources to Māori or for promoting learning Asian languages. Māori respond by counterclaims that the Māori language can only be found in Aotearoa New Zealand whereas Asian languages are thriving in Asia. Māori also advance the view that Pākehā need first to become biculturally comfortable with indigenous Māori culture: "Without taking the first step towards biculturalism, professed commitment to multiculturalism is at best no more than rhetoric and at worst ideological dissembling to deny equality" (p. 390). Dominic O'Sullivan (2005) claims that those who advocate biculturalism, whether Māori or non-Māori, often do not give sufficient recognition to the growing multicultural nature of Aotearoa New Zealand society. Like Walker, he also asserts that those "who are opposed to the recognition of Māori rights as the first inhabitants of New Zealand have often used biculturalism's apparent ignoring of other minority groups as a veil for expressing their intolerance of Māori aspirations" (p. 236).

⁸ See p. 89.

Furthermore, he perceives multiculturalism as a mask for prejudice which supports the notion that Māori are just another disadvantaged ethnic minority (O'Sullivan, 2007, p. 19).

Pākehā commentators have also noted this Māori hermeneutic of suspicion and its resultant tensions. Pākehā education professor, Stephen May (2004), confirms that many Māori perceive immigrant group rights as potentially harmful to bicultural partnership and multiculturalism as a form of containment as opposed to real power sharing (pp. 250-251). He acknowledges the tension that exists between biculturalism and multiculturalism. David Pearson (2004) also concurs with other Māori and Pākehā commentators that biculturalism has, over the last thirty years, been managed by governments “by adopting new spins on well-worn strategies of concession and containment” (p. 300). In other words, governments have allowed some changes to occur but have essentially retained ultimate power.

Pākehā sociologists, Allen Bartley and Paul Spoonley (2005), argue that the recent increase in Asian immigrants has “challenged the notion of biculturalism, the result being that Māori must defend the nascent bicultural partnership and recognition of the tangata whenua status...” (p. 139). Again the tension between biculturalism and multiculturalism is exposed (p. 141). This is a tension which exists not only for Māori and non-Māori but also for governments. Reconciliation will be necessary for future social cohesion. These two academics maintain that multiculturalism will only work in Aotearoa New Zealand if the Treaty of Waitangi is recognised. As a consequence of such recognition, biculturalism is acknowledged in the historical context of nation building (p. 146). Bartley and Spoonley maintain that these tensions between biculturalism and multiculturalism will only be reconciled when Māori are involved in immigration policymaking at governmental and non-governmental levels (p. 147). Mark Williams (2000) also raises the issue of whether biculturalism is the urgent precursor to multiculturalism (p. 95).

In considering multiculturalism, it is also useful to survey the perspectives of non-European New Zealanders. Migrant Nigerian academic Love Chile (2000) contends that Aotearoa New Zealand is “neither a practising bicultural nor multicultural society. At best it may be described as monocultural with multiple ethnic groups” (p. 62). Chile is adamant that the promises involved in the Treaty of Waitangi must be actioned before there are moves towards multiculturalism (p. 62). He notes that Māori are not involved in immigration policymaking and that the government also does not appear to make a concerted effort to encourage migrants to learn about biculturalism (p. 65). Indian New Zealander Arvind Zodgekar (2005)

asserts that not only is it necessary for multiculturalism to engage with biculturalism, but it is also critical for biculturalism to engage with multiculturalism as part of the process of partnership building (p. 147). Chinese New Zealander academics Manying Ip and David Pang (2005) also believe that a more inclusive approach “requires a courageous forging of multiculturalism alongside the continual development of biculturalism” (p. 187).

American Colleen Ward and Chinese New Zealander En-Yi Lin (2005) claim, as a result of their cross-cultural psychological research, that both biculturalism and multiculturalism need not exist in conflict but rather can co-exist well. “We further maintain that issues pertaining to cultural vitality and national identity can be separated from *te tino rangatiratanga* without undermining the principles enshrined in the Treaty of Waitangi/*Te Tiriti o Waitangi*” (p.169). For Lin and Ward, it is multiculturalism and the national identity referred to above⁹ which will assist Aotearoa New Zealand to cope with the impact of growing globalisation (p. 170).

Biculturalism and multiculturalism, however these terms or their relationship are perceived, appear to be highly contested. According to Roger Maaka and Augie Fleras (2005), given past history, both biculturalism and multiculturalism will not meet the political expectations of Māori (p. 22). Indeed past governments have espoused biculturalism and multiculturalism as ways of managing cultural diversity without unsettling established colonial power relationships (p. 274). For these two commentators neither biculturalism nor multiculturalism would appear able to be fully realised until the majority group cease to control or govern indigenous minorities (p. 275).

Several Māori and Pākehā commentators claim that biculturalism is a necessary, perhaps even urgent, precursor to multiculturalism. A number of academics have also commented on the tensions that exist between biculturalism and multiculturalism. Solutions offered to reduce these tensions include the involvement of Māori in immigration policymaking and increased dialogue between Māori and migrants. Yet without Māori sovereign rights to self-determination or *tino rangatiratanga*, it is unlikely that either authentic biculturalism or multiculturalism will be achieved. Without such rights the Crown will, in the future, continue to define these two terms and employ colonial management strategies of concession and containment.

⁹ See p. 101.

6.3. Future Partnership and Biculturalism

Māori envisage a future for Aotearoa New Zealand which recognises the Treaty, including tino rangatiratanga. Māori writer Patricia Grace (2000) affirms a saying in Māori which translates as: “You hold that handle of the kete [basket], I’ll hold this handle and we’ll bear the load together” (p. 24). Such an image assumes equal partnership with equal responsibilities. It also expects equal ownership of what is in the basket. There are also a number of other presumptions including equal contribution, equal say and equal fitness on a journey together. “But this journey is not happening in this way for us just yet. It is there as an image for the future, and for those who hold that image, believe in it, it means at least they may be at the beginning of that pathway” (p. 24). It is a vision of bicultural Treaty partnership which advocates transparency, authenticity, equality and equity.

Māori professor of education Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2006a-a), in her survey of Māori experience of neoliberal reform over the last twenty years, lists a series of lessons in the struggle for social inclusion.

For Māori people as iwi or tribal nations, social inclusion means the acceptance by society or, more precisely, by the social partner as defined by the Treaty of Waitangi, of some key aspirations and values held by Māori people and the expression of these through public policy, through social institutions, through an inclusive national identity and through a different kind of social experience for all who live in New Zealand (p. 247).

Smith argues that Māori visioning is still based on the Treaty of Waitangi and the principle of partnership. If her lessons are applied to advancing partnership, then it is still important for Māori communities to struggle to actualise equal partnerships and to reflect on their experiences (pp. 252-253). It is critical that such communities commit to a vision and shared values which will help to guide the negotiating of future partnerships. There is a need for people with a wide range of entrepreneurial, management and governance skills to be involved in the search for solutions. Equal partnerships must positively contribute to accelerated change, “...multi-layered with multiple strategies all working simultaneously and intergenerational” (p. 254).

Roger Maaka and Augie Fleras (2005) concede that such equal and equitable partnership in the future may not be achievable without major institutional and constitutional changes. In other words, they acknowledge that Māori are proposing a new kind of robust partnership in

the future. This would involve recognition of the twin sovereignties of Māori and Crown and the will to work on resolving differences in the spirit of partnership (pp. 292, 295).

Māori strategies in the future may well proceed more from Māori sovereignty, or *tino rangatiratanga*, when opportunities exist at whatever level, be that local or national, to establish partnerships. Whether power sharing and structural adjustments will lead to a closing of the gaps for all Māori is yet another issue. There is some scepticism that perhaps only the Māori elite will receive the major benefits (Tremewan, 2006, pp. 96-97).

Mason Durie (2005b) believes that Māori need to focus more on planning for the future rather than spending resources on settling historic grievances (pp. 10-11). Durie acknowledges the considerable potential for Māoridom with the possibility that in the middle of this century about a quarter of Aotearoa New Zealand's population could be Māori (p. 2). In advocating greater future orientation, he claims that there will be an increased emphasis on quality and high achievement in education and other sectors, *whānau* capacities might be increased, less reliance on state funding might take place with multiple revenue streams and serious training for managerial and governance positions might be instituted (pp. 9-12). One of the major themes which Durie explores in relation to the above goals is the notion of *extended relationships*. Here he challenges Māori to consider partnerships with bodies other than the Crown such as the private sector, global partners and other indigenous peoples (pp. 16-17).

Yet it is not only Māori who have visions concerning future partnership. The final chapter in Patrick Snedden's book (2004), *Pākehā and the Treaty: Why it's our Treaty too*, is entitled "Imagining the future with Article 2: From Treaty truth-telling to Treaty fulfilment" (p. 171). Here Snedden begins to imagine a kind of partnership which honours and fulfils the Treaty of Waitangi. He advocates the need to take a different approach by supporting Māori to take responsibility for themselves, including their own housing, health and education (p. 176). He claims that the future unity and prosperity of Aotearoa New Zealand is at stake (p. 177). To achieve such unity and prosperity, according to the Consedines (2005), it is necessary that ordinary New Zealanders become well informed about the Treaty debate (p. 252). They assert that this needs to occur through the wide-spread dissemination of information. "Any significant power-sharing and changes to the constitutional arrangements in this country need the broad support of the population" (p. 253). Here is an opportunity for the government and Treaty educators to work together to promote a national identity that is based on an authentic

partnership between the Crown and Māori which recognises and fulfils all three Articles of the Treaty (p. 254). Pearson (2005) agrees that better understanding of history will improve the possibility of more constructive debates which could lead to more imaginative discussions about relationships between Māori and Pākehā (p. 35). Avril Bell (2004) contends that there is a “need for a new cultural politics of engagement . . . by Pākehā with their history” (p. 104).

Given the changes of the last fifty years, Pearson (2001) is hesitant to forecast confidently what is likely to happen over the next few decades. “One thing we can be sure of, the power of ethnicity and nationalism to shape foreseeable future worlds is unlikely to dissolve” (p. 204). While he contends that there is space for optimism, in the short to medium term tensions will continue to exist. This would also apply to future bicultural partnership.

Trying to find commentators who are prepared to predict the future of biculturalism has proven to be difficult. Andrew Sharp (2004) argues that an increased number of New Zealanders who do not see themselves as either Māori or Pākehā, and globalisation are factors likely to shift governments and the general population away from biculturalism to multiculturalism (p. 204). Pākehā journalist Colin James (2000c) also predicts that within the next few years Treaty-based constitutional claims will be treated “as no more than issues of cultural rights and respect and lumping together multiculturalism and biculturalism” (p. 165). Erich Kolig (2006) claims that any future vision for biculturalism or multiculturalism will restrict, or infringe on, the liberties of others (p. 38). Paul Callister (2006), Pākehā researcher, raises the issue of dual ethnicity and multiethnicity New Zealanders which he maintains will complicate future debates regarding both partnership and biculturalism (p. 154).

Elizabeth Rata (2003) is highly critical of biculturalism. After a review of thirty years of biculturalism, she concludes that there is now more division between ethnic groups, Māori poverty is still evident, a new Māori leadership class has emerged who attempt to control the interpretation of the Treaty of Waitangi and there is a widespread conviction about the need to revive traditional Māori social relations (pp. 2-3). In Rata’s view it is the latter, namely, Māori attempts to revive tribalism which threaten Aotearoa New Zealand’s democracy (p. 3). She asserts that, for Aotearoa New Zealand’s future survival, it is critical that “national unity is based upon universal values of a shared humanity and a political organisation based upon the individual” (p. 13). The notion of bicultural partnership for her is antithetical to the universalism of democracy. Rata traces several stages where biculturalism has been defined

away from its initial pursuit of political justice and social inclusion towards an indigenous identity and then onto tribalism. In her view this has led to the remarginalisation of those Māori who are both poor and detribalised (pp. 13-14). She refers to the neotribe which is “a new socio-economic-political structure that has emerged within the global conditions of late capitalism and within the opportunities opened up by biculturalism” (p. 15). Such tribalism is the opposite of democracy according to Rata. Furthermore, it allows tribal leaders to act in anti-democratic and self-serving ways (p. 19).

For all the above reasons, Rata contends that biculturalism should be replaced in the future by democratic principles which would allow the emergence of a New Zealand culture - a kind of melting pot of immigrant cultures including Māori (Rata, 2003, p. 20). Such modernity would recognise political, economic and cultural commonalities. Cultural differences would be tolerated to the extent that they did not impinge on these commonalities (p. 22). Under this kind of ideology Māori culture would not be restricted to those who are ethnically Māori but would be open to any person as part of New Zealand culture (p. 23). Essentially Rata is promoting a national identity at the expense of cultural and ethnic identities. For her, inward looking biculturalism has failed to deliver on its original promises and needs to be replaced by a more outward looking democratic movement reflective of modernity. Other non-Māori commentators have affirmed some of Rata’s views, such as Erich Kolig on retribalisation (Kolig, 2006, pp. 31-32) and Alain Babadzan on neo-tribal capitalism and legitimising social and economic inequalities (Babadzan, 2006, pp. 61, 63).

Biculturalism also remains problematic for Māori because it has the potential to obstruct their quest for self-determination and to restrict innovative thinking. Dominic O’Sullivan (2007) asserts that the trouble with biculturalism is that, as a concept, it is too vague and has not been well implemented. “Biculturalism’s inherent intellectual and political flaw is that it is at once a strategy of control for governments and a strategy of limited resistance for Māori” (p. 30). He maintains that too much status has been attributed to the Treaty when it is international law which legally endorses self-determination. “The Treaty is an invaluable political reference point for placing Māori aspirations on the political agenda, but overemphasising its utility can obstruct thinking beyond the bicultural” (p. 214).

A major impediment towards achieving future partnership and biculturalism has been termed *Treaty Fatigue*. Three Pākehā, Frances Hancock, a community development consultant, together with two academics, David Epston and Wally McKenzie, have discerned that the

Treaty debates, which have been discussed in this chapter, are becoming progressively influenced by the phenomenon of Treaty Fatigue. According to these commentators, Treaty Fatigue can be characterised as the belief of New Zealanders that the Treaty of Waitangi is a problem which belongs to Māori. “Treaty Fatigue argues that the Treaty-Māori problem is ruining our nation by dividing people on the basis of race, which can only cause racial tensions, violence and social disorder” (Hancock, Epston, & McKenzie, 2006, p. 305). Furthermore, it promotes the idea that there is a Treaty industry which lawyers and consultants are exploiting for their own selfish ends. Disadvantaged Māori are also being deprived of benefits from government Treaty settlements. In addition, the Treaty is perceived as simply a historical document with no relevance for present or future policymaking and practice. A person mentioned by these three writers as an example of someone suffering Treaty Fatigue is Don Brash whose speech in 2004 has already been referred to several times in this chapter.¹⁰

Treaty Fatigue is manifested in conversations which promote the view that Māori should, alongside legal experts, solve these problems. A real difficulty is that not even these experts have been able to do the task. Therefore the whole Treaty situation has been an unmitigated disaster for the country. These three commentators claim that Treaty Fatigue promotes a willingness to avoid resolving Treaty issues. “Perhaps, most far-reaching, Treaty Fatigue invites an unwitting collusion into paternalistic ways of ‘seeing,’ thinking and acting that have the effect of marginalising Māori in their own country” (p. 306). Far from encouraging social cohesion, Māori are blamed for the problem of the Treaty and disunity is fostered along ethnic lines.

Hancock, Epston and McKenzie maintain that the antidote to Treaty Fatigue is *Treaty Hope* where the Treaty is perceived to be a document for the good of the country and its governance and management. Here the relationship between Māori and the Crown is based on “good faith, honour, reasonableness and justice” (p. 307). Indeed the task of the Crown is to recognise and actively protect Māori interests. Part of such recognition and protection is to make informed decisions often through consultation. A need exists to balance Māori interests with the emerging interests of the nation. Acknowledgement of Māori generosity in the settlement of Crown breaches of the Treaty is also considered to be part of Treaty Hope, as is the notion that the Treaty was meant to benefit both partners. New Zealanders are encouraged

¹⁰ See pp. 83-84, 99-100.

to engage with the Treaty and to make a contribution. There is also an appreciation of the need for goodwill as well as an acceptance of different perspectives including those that are innovative. “The effects of Treaty Hope on organisations, communities and the nation are that it heartens people to join rather than avoid conversations on the Treaty” (p. 308). Treaty Hope increases the possibility of the kind of engagement which can assist the development of Treaty-based policy and practice to prevent disunity and social upheaval. Good, respectful conversations are regarded as an essential starting point (p. 309).

6.4. Concluding Remarks

Bicultural Treaty partnership continues to be debated in Aotearoa New Zealand. Attempts by Māori and non-Māori to persuade the Crown to place the Treaty of Waitangi at the centre of its policy and practice, rather than the margins, have only been partially successful.

Government strategies of concession and containment are still apparent in the twenty-first century as evidenced by the controversies on the foreshore and seabed and Māori representation on the proposed new Auckland local body. Commentators acknowledge the low levels of partnership transparency, authenticity, equality and equity. Some urge that this situation be remedied to meet and honour Treaty obligations. There is also considerable recognition that biculturalism has its limitations although often for quite different reasons. One of the major unresolved debates focusses on whether resource-based rather than symbolic biculturalism ought to be a priority. Another unresolved debate involves the notion that biculturalism is the predecessor to multiculturalism. A further contentious issue is the speed at which transformation should take place.

As Māori seek to secure their sovereign rights to self-determination or tino rangatiratanga, there are debates beginning to emerge concerning the extent to which bicultural partnership can deliver on these aspirations. A bi-national framework, which recognises the twin sovereignties of Māori and the Crown, is critical for bicultural Treaty partnership. Without constitutional equality, there will not be social or economic equality or equity.

The diverse viewpoints (held mostly by elites) within and between different cultural groups are highly varied, contextual and contested. The Anglican Church needs to be aware of the complexities of the Treaty debates in the public square as it reviews and develops its Māori language and cultural regeneration mission and ministry. It also needs to intelligently and respectfully address its current regeneration policy in the light of these debates as well as issues

of Treaty Fatigue and Treaty Hope. A synthesis of the discourse in this chapter will occur in Chapter Eight to assist in the construction of a Treaty lens. One way of perceiving regensis in the Anglican Church has been developed here. I now turn to explore another way of looking at regensis which focusses on Māori theological perspectives.

Chapter 7. Contemporary Māori Christian Theologies

Māori have been doing Christian theology implicitly since the first interactions with a Pākehā missionary in 1814. Indigenous clergy and laity have told stories about these missionaries and their gospel messages, as well as Māori responses, for almost two hundred years. As these stories exist mostly orally, they are not easily accessible. Even the written sermons of those Māori clergy who received theological training have not been published. The settler church valued its own theologies but not those of the Māori. One of the earliest pieces of writing by the Reverend Ruawai Rakena (1971), a Methodist minister from Ngāpuhi in North Auckland and Ngāi Tahu in the South Island, was *The Māori Response to the Gospel: A Study of Māori-Pākehā Relations in the Methodist Māori Mission from its Beginnings to the Present Day*. Another example of an early writer was the late Reverend Māori Marsden (1975), an Anglican cleric from Ngāi Takoto, Te Patukoraha and Ngāpuhi in North Auckland.

Over the last fifteen years Christian Māori with theological training have written explicit theological reflections. Much of this contemporary writing is in the form of theses or has been published in theological journals. In the Anglican situation one of the direct benefits of major church constitutional change in 1992 has been the growth of Māori theological training institutions and the subsequent number of Māori theologians. I define Māori theologian as a person who identifies himself or herself as a Māori, has Māori ancestry and has received theological training. In the following chapter I review the works of twenty-three Māori theologians. Of the twenty male theologians, seventeen are Anglicans, two are Catholic and one is a Presbyterian. There are two Anglican female theologians and one Catholic. Almost all are over the age of forty. I have placed these theologians largely in historical order to acknowledge those whose writings are foundational and have been drawn upon by another generation. To underscore the diversity of Māori contexts, there has been an attempt to mention the major tribal affiliations and regional connections of these theologians.

After reading this literature from the point of view of the thesis topic, I then chose four main themes, namely, Māori spirituality, Māori ecclesiology, Māori theological education and Māori language and cultural regeneration. Māori theology is holistic and each of the themes closely connects with the others. In Chapter Eight these individual themes will serve as lenses

through which to view the contemporary policy and practice of the Anglican Church concerning Māori language and cultural regeneration.

7.1. Māori Spirituality

Māori spirituality will provide a background by which to later understand the diverse writings of Māori theologians on ecclesiology and theological education. When nineteenth century Māori turned to believing in Christ, they did so still carrying most of their communities' traditional spirituality. Conversion did not mean that they immediately dropped all their previous beliefs. Certainly *utu*, or payback, and warfare as well as cannibalism were behaviours which were dramatically affected. What had taken generations to build up in terms of belief systems did not disappear overnight. Indeed, it would take generations for these systems to be moderated by Christianity. In the twentieth century there were still remnants of pre-missionary religious beliefs. I can provide an example of such a situation from my own family. My great grand mother was a devout Anglican who said her prayers aloud in Māori based on the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) every morning and evening. However, she was still able to hold conversations with an owl or morepork which was seen as a spiritual messenger. She died in 1953. Her conversations occurred over one hundred years after the introduction of Christianity to our tribal region. From traditional Māori spirituality emerged Christian Māori spirituality which underpins contemporary Māori Christian theologies.

7.1.1 Māori Marsden

One of the earliest writers was the late Reverend Māori Marsden. Steeped in Māori language and culture, Marsden was not only an Anglican trained priest but also a *tohunga*, a person chosen by his elders to be taught in a traditional Māori school of learning or *whare wānanga* (Royal, 2003, p. xxx). Indeed it is this school of learning which could be regarded as foundational for Māori theology: teaching Māori spirituality while inevitably being influenced by the gospel. This school's establishment in the mid nineteenth century was a response to the insight that Māori *tikanga*, or values and customs, were being adversely affected by western culture (p. xxxi).

Marsden's first writings were published in 1975. These writings were called *God, Man and Universe: A Māori View*. In the 1980s and 1990s Marsden was regarded as one of Māoridom's foremost theologians and these initial writings received a good deal of attention.

In 2003 a collection of his writings, entitled *The Woven Universe*, was published; this was divided into two major sections, namely, the achievement of authentic being and the quest for social justice. He acknowledges from the outset that his approach is both passionate and subjective as cited in (Royal, 2003 p. 2).

Marsden asserts that all creatures attempt to achieve spiritual values but inevitably fall short. “Mana and tapu are spiritual qualities to which all may aspire and they are therefore ends which may be denominated as values” (p. 39). *Mana* is defined as “. . . divine authority and power bestowed upon a person divinely appointed to an office and delegated to fulfil the functions of that office” (p. 40). Sitting alongside of mana is *tapu*, which can be defined as the sacred: in other words, a person, place or thing can be situated away from ordinary or common life. There is a dimension to tapu which protects humans, places or objects from being tampered with or touched. If this is not respected, there will be “divine retribution - illness, death, mental ill-health, misfortune” (p. 40). Not unexpectedly, if divine retribution occurs, the individual’s mana can also be severely diminished.

For Marsden, spirit is the “ultimate reality” (p.33). The universe is seen by Māori “as at least a two-world system in which the material proceeds from the spiritual and the spiritual (which is the higher order) interpenetrates the material physical world” (p. 20). It is then argued that there can be little difference between what is social, cultural, economic and spiritual (p. 37). This holistic viewpoint on the material and spiritual worlds can be seen in the work of spiritual guardians such as Tangaroa, God of the Sea. Māori delivered incantations before leaving on a fishing trip, and when the first fish was caught, it was released as recognition of Tangaroa and as an offering (p. 67). Māori worldviews are, therefore, holistic. The secular and the spiritual are interconnected and interdependent.

7.1.2 Te Kitohi Pikaahu

Bishop Te Kitohi Pikaahu, who comes from Ngāti Kahu and Ngāpuhi in North Auckland, in his review of Marsden’s collection of writings, acknowledges that Marsden draws upon his own experience or knowledge (Pikaahu, 2005, p. 118). He maintains that, while there are traces of Christian Māori theology, the reader needs to search for it, and that what Marsden attempts to achieve is an elaboration of the Māori worldview which will provide future Māori theologians with a foundation upon which to build (p. 119). While Marsden concentrates on this worldview as being foundational, Pikaahu pays him the compliment of saying that he is

“a competent theologian albeit with evangelical tendencies” (p. 120). For Pikaahu, Marsden’s work is the entrée with the main course yet to come.

7.1.3 Henare Tate

The writing of Father Henare Tate, a Catholic priest from Ngāti Tamatea, Ngāti Manawa and Te Rarawa in North Auckland, can be seen as contributing to a smorgasbord of work which followed Marsden. Tate, in a collection of Catholic perspectives on spirituality entitled *He kupu whakawairua: Spirituality in Aotearoa New Zealand: Catholic voices*, locates his insights into Māori spirituality within a very significant event of the Catholic Church in Aotearoa New Zealand at the turn of this century, that is, the returning of the remains of Bishop Pompallier, the first Catholic bishop, to Aotearoa New Zealand (Tate, 2002, p. 39). He describes the spiritual pilgrimage, or hīkoi, with these remains, which took place throughout this country. It is in this setting that Tate explores the meaning of *tapu* by making a distinction between God’s innate being and sacredness, *te tapu i te Atua*, and God’s being-in-relationship with creation, *te tapu o te Atua*. It is from the latter that springs forth the spiritual power of *mana*. A further distinction is made between the inherent *tapu* of the person, *te tapu i te tangata*, and the *tapu* which is linked with relationships, *te tapu o te tangata* (p. 40). “Māori consider themselves to be socially and spiritually related to God, one another, and to their land” (p. 40). The spiritual significance of relationships, or *whanaungatanga*, is recognised and explained (p. 42). The final dimension of *tapu*, which is addressed, is the *tapu* of place starting with the intrinsic *te tapu i te whenua* as distinguished from *te tapu o te whenua* which acknowledges the relationships of the land (p. 43). Tate completes the section on *tapu* by examining the notion of restrictions (pp. 43-44).

Tate outlines the principles for addressing *tapu* and exercising *mana*, namely *tika*, *pono* and *aroha*. *Tika* is defined as the right relationships, exercise of *mana* and responses of people in the context of *Atua*, *tangata* and *whenua*. “*Tika* seeks to address, acknowledge, respect and enhance what exists, and everything about their existence including their relationships” (p. 45). *Pono*, on the other hand, is defined by Tate as, “. . . the principle that seeks to reveal reality as it truly is” (p. 46). *Pono* is linked with the notion of *walking the talk*, or, in one word, integrity. *Pono* can be seen to support *tika*. *Aroha*, which comes from God, is evidenced in the relationship between God and human beings and vice versa, as well as between persons in ways which are *tika* and *pono* (p. 47).

Tate elaborates the notion of *mana* that can be interpreted as “spiritual power and authority” (p. 47). *Mana* originates from God and so is interdependent with *tapu*. It aims at “addressing, acknowledging, enhancing and restoring *tapu*” so that goals can be reached. Like *tapu*, *mana* is also closely connected with *tika*, *pono* and *aroha*. The negative sides of violating *tapu* and *mana* including *noa* are examined as well as reconciliation processes inside and outside of the Church (pp. 48-50). Indeed, a major distinguishing feature between Marsden and Tate’s writings is the increased level of recognition of Māori ecclesiology by the latter. This includes a section on sacramental ritual and important spiritual moments throughout one’s life (pp. 50-51). Tate’s theology is more explicitly Christian than that revealed in the writings of Marsden.

Tate’s booklet, entitled, *Traditional Māori Spirituality in Encounter with Christian Spirituality*, explores the notion that traditional Māori spirituality and Christian spirituality may be able to exist compatibly together for their mutual benefit (2004, p. 1). He acknowledges that contemporary perspectives on Māori spirituality may differ considerably from the viewpoints and actual practice of those Māori who lived two hundred years ago or earlier. This has occurred as a result of the influence of Western culture which has had a dramatic impact on Māori ways of being and acting. His interpretation of Māori spirituality includes the *kaupapa* or “concept, doctrine or statement” and the *tikanga* or “process or way” in which the *kaupapa* is perceived and acted upon. “I understand Māori spirituality to mean both the *kaupapa* and *tikanga* are Māori” (p. 1). He asserts that in traditional Māori spirituality there are no explicit Christian elements. Likewise, Christian *kaupapa* and *tikanga* has no explicit Māori parts. Nevertheless, when there is a meeting of both spiritualities, it is possible that the *kaupapa* is Māori but the *tikanga* is Christian or that the reverse can happen (p. 2). Tate then proceeds to examine the region that he comes from, namely, Hokianga in North Auckland, in terms of the above framework. In addition, he also effectively uses this framework as he explores the life and background of Bishop Pompallier and the return of the Bishop’s remains from Paris to Hokianga as discussed earlier.¹

At the time that this thesis goes to print, Tate’s doctoral thesis is in the final stages of completion. His thesis is entitled *Towards some foundations of a systematic Māori theology: He tirohanga anganui ki ētahi kaupapa hōhonu mō te whakapono Māori*.

¹ See p. 115.

7.1.4 Manuka Henare

Dr Manuka Henare (1998) is a Catholic layperson from Te Aupōuri, Te Rarawa and Ngāti Kuri in North Auckland. Henare was formerly the national director of the New Zealand Catholic Bishops' Conference Commission for Justice, Peace and Development. He has been influenced theologically by both Marsden and Tate. For instance, Henare recounts that, in 1991, he was present at a religious gathering of Māori Catholics who were discussing issues of Māori authenticity in the Catholic Church. Towards the conclusion of this gathering Marsden was asked to comment on what he had heard. This Anglican priest and theologian translated the Māori word *tuturu* to mean authentic and real and encouraged all Māori to search for such cultural authenticity. He also reiterated the Māori perspective that there is “no disjunction between the sacred and secular, between the spiritual and material” (p. 97). Furthermore, Marsden advocated the need to retain a set of Māori principles, standards or ethics which could serve as useful lenses through which to view legislation and organisations in Aotearoa New Zealand.

For Henare the “maintenance of the religious view of life is dependent upon the maintenance of the culture and its many practices and rituals. In developing the culture, the religion is developed. In developing the religion, the culture is developed” (p. 101). These processes also involve searching for what is the right way, or *tika*. Such a search assists with the identification of a set of ethics which can be termed Māori rather than be attributed to a particular tribal group (p. 103). Indeed Henare warns against tribal essentialism where personhood is only defined through genealogy and social grouping (p. 114). For Henare, tribalism has its limitations as a system which is closed and which fosters differences between *iwi*. Both would tend to militate against inculturation, or the dynamic interaction between gospel and culture, and Māori self-determination (p. 116).

Henare draws upon the work of Tate who has described a code of Māori ethics which can serve to enhance understanding and decision making on a range of local, regional and global issues (p. 104). Examples of the kind of ethics explored by Tate include the ethic of *tapu* (being, potentiality and sacredness), the ethic of *mana* (power, authority and common good) and the ethic of *tika* (right thought, right action). A holistic view of Māori religion involves these ethics and others as well as phenomena such as rituals, ceremonies, sacred places, art, songs, dances, myths, legends, customs, indeed “all aspects of life” (p. 101). Despite this focus on culture, Henare is also wary of cultural essentialism “because the view that culture

alone defines the human person would seem to be in conflict with Christian theology” (p. 114). He also warns against culturalism which attempts to domesticate the gospel message (p. 117). In addition, he believes that inculturation should not be subjected to denominationalism. “What then of ecumenism, is it the approach? Yes, but only if it addresses the sin of a divided Christianity” (p. 117).

7.1.5 Wiremu Kaa

Archdeacon Wiremu Kaa of Ngāti Porou on the eastern coast of the North Island is a Māori theologian who takes a different position to Henare on tribalism and who surveys tribal spirituality. Kaa appraises a haka, or Māori dance, which was composed by Mohi Turei, a nineteenth century Anglican clergyperson from his own tribe (W. Kaa, 2007, p. 66). Kaa believes that this haka provides a strong message that it is possible for Māori and Christian spiritualities to live compatibly with one another. It reaffirms the importance of retaining a tribal spirituality while keenly supporting the new Christian spirituality (pp. 71-72). Kaa maintains that it is up to each individual or group to discern which spirituality should be followed. He claims that today each person from his tribe automatically has access to Ngāti Porou spirituality. Whether the person concerned wishes to acknowledge this, or value it, is over to that individual. The same is true in terms of any choices regarding Christian spirituality. Kaa surmises that tribes’ people, such as Turei, would have experienced a painful process of reconciling both spiritualities. In the twenty-first century he does not appear to anticipate any such pain.

7.1.6 Bill Tuhiwai

Pain is, nevertheless, a fact of life for Māori women who experience powerlessness and oppression. According to the Reverend Bill Tuhiwai who also is a member of Ngāti Porou, Māori culture has for a number of generations caused suffering for Māori women (Tuhiwai, 2005, p. 59). He focusses on customs regarding women not being permitted to undertake formal speechmaking on marae. Māori women “do have a place in Māoridom, and in society, but first we need to release them from the cultural bondage that imprisons them” (p. 60). He is equally concerned that the Church liberate Māori women (p. 61).

7.1.7 Whakahuihui Vercoe

The late Bishop Whakahuihui Vercoe of Tainui, Te Arawa, Tuhoe and Whakatōhea from mainly the Bay of Plenty in the central North Island has concentrated on the Māori spirituality of the marae and its immediate surroundings. Vercoe describes the marae as the wāhi rangatira mana or place of greatest mana, wāhi rangatira wairua or place of greatest spirituality, wāhi rangatira iwi or place that heightens people's dignity and wāhi rangatira tikanga Māori or place where Māori customs are given ultimate expression (Vercoe, 1999, p. 2). Unlike Tuhiwai, who has concentrated on what Māori women are not allowed to do on the marae, Vercoe gives attention to the special way that, according to Māori legend, the first woman, Hineahuone was created. He also canvasses the role of women as kaikaranga or the people who call visitors onto the marae or who answer this call (p. 4). The marae ātea, or marae courtyard in front of the main meeting house, where the formal speechmaking often takes place, is considered to be the domain of Tūmatauenga, the God of War. It is here that aggressive feelings, thoughts and comments are aired. Most tribes see this situation as not an appropriate one for women.

7.1.8 Te Waaka Melbourne

Archdeacon Te Waaka Melbourne (2000) is from Ngāi Tuhoe, a tribe located in the eastern Bay of Plenty. In his Master of Philosophy thesis entitled *Wairua Māori Rua Mano: Māori Spirituality 2000*, Melbourne discusses the spiritual ground upon which the Māori Christian Church was built. Clearly when Pākehā missionaries arrived in Aotearoa New Zealand, they began their work in a cultural and religious context which reached back into the distant past captured in traditional genesis stories. Melbourne relies upon such stories, which were written down largely by Pākehā scholars, to explore primal religion and Māori cosmology (p. 14). Melbourne was inspired to write this thesis after he had heard young Māori sing a song which outlined how they felt separated from God because of their employment, housing and financial situation and were contemplating, even cynically, a return to Māori gods (p. 1). At the conclusion of his thesis, Melbourne contends that these singers needed to be reminded that the Māori gods have continued to exist but also need to be re-discovered and re-interpreted through tino rangatiratanga, a guarantee of chiefly power, as portrayed by the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia (p. 122).

The interconnectedness of Māori spirituality and ecclesiology is explicit as Melbourne recalls the work of the Church Missionary Society and their role in the drafting of the Treaty of Waitangi, a spiritual covenant (p. 58). He also reviews the contribution of Māori to the spreading of the gospel in response to the evangelism of the missionaries. In some cases this involved Māori preaching peace and reconciliation among their enemies or calling off plans to attack Pākehā (p. 54). Māori spirituality was influenced in various degrees by Christianity and this was concretely expressed in carving, art and architecture as well as the performance arts. “The relation between gospel and culture for Māori in the nineteenth century was dynamic and complex” (p. 62). Melbourne explores the considerable impact of the gospel on the marae, a place which he sees as “the heart of the people and without it Māori people will cease to exist as a people. It is the last bastion of Māori where it displays its spiritual and physical existence . . . It is a place of refuge enabling Māori to be cleansed spiritually under their terms and values. It is where they pay homage to God and their ancestors” (p. 89).

The last section of the thesis focusses on tino rangatiratanga, and especially on its various positive manifestations in the 1990s. Archdeacon Melbourne begins by reviewing three national meetings, or hui, held by the central North Island tribe, Ngāti Tūwharetoa, for Māoridom. What emerged were three main areas of concern, namely, decolonisation, relationships between Māori and the Crown as well as between Māori, and constitutional change. The first of these concerns included the process of recovering life enhancing values and indigenous spirituality (p. 99). The issue of major constitutional change is taken up by the Anglican Church after reflecting on implicit notions of partnership and bi-cultural development in the Treaty of Waitangi (pp. 101-102). These notions were perceived by Anglican Māori and Pākehā as compatible with the gospel. Furthermore, it was recognised that tino rangatiratanga was operating in the early life of the Anglican Church as Māori themselves preached the gospel in their own language and within the context of their own culture (p. 103). It was later that the Pākehā settler church was established and became dominant in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Melbourne acknowledges that it is not easy to define Māori spirituality but what he has tried to do is to explore some aspects which might be illuminating for a younger generation (p. 118). He maintains that such spirituality is still evident today, “the ancient spiritual tradition remained alongside the new religion” (p. 121). Concepts of tino rangatiratanga have increased the opportunities for decolonisation. It could appear that Melbourne’s definition of tino rangatiratanga aligns more with, “the Pākehā interpretation created by the Church in

providing the Māori version for the Treaty of Waitangi” than with “Māori ancient traditional custom” based on barbaric custom and autocratic principles (Walters, 1996, p. 66).

Five years after submitting his thesis Melbourne (2005b) attempts to define spirituality by drawing upon his own experience of his elders’ understanding in that they were able to discern who had a Māori spirit and the kind of behaviour that is exhibited as a result of Māori spirituality. These elders were able to view a situation in terms of how strongly Māori it was. “There is the perception that wairua Māori (Māori spirituality) can only be understood by Māori who are well versed in Māori culture and language” (p. 24).

Melbourne then draws upon an analytical framework for Aboriginal spirituality, which is evident in the Anglican Church in Australia. He outlines four groups of Māori that he asserts exist in his own Church and other churches. These range from the first group who reject Māori spirituality in favour of Pākehā Christianity to the second group who critique Māori culture and only maintain aspects compatible with Christianity, and then through to the third group who are only committed to a traditional Māori spirituality. It is the fourth group that Melbourne himself identifies with, namely, the group that acknowledges the possibility of being fully Māori and fully Christian. “They allow the gospel to reshape the way they think and live, and form new patterns that move away from those assumed in their cultural frames”(p. 27). He maintains that contemporary Māori spirituality is a response to twenty-first century culture. It is different from but based upon traditional spirituality. He concludes by saying that, in his view, he is greatly surprised that, given history, Māori spirituality has been able to endure to this point in time (p. 28).

7.1.9 Jack Papuni

The Reverend Jack Papuni (2004) comes from Ngāti Porou on the eastern coast of the North Island. His Master of Theology thesis is called *‘We Answer the Call to Arms’ War Experience and its Toll on the Spirituality of the Māori Soldier Post-WWII*. In his discussions on Māori spirituality, Papuni draws upon the works of Marsden, Tate and Melbourne which recognise the impact of colonialism on the promotion of the gospel and Māori responses to Christianity. In addition, the role of ancestors in the context of genealogy, or whakapapa, is acknowledged as being critically important for not only the mana of the tribe and its land but also as models for the future behaviour of their descendants (pp. 12-13).

Papuni identifies and reviews Māori spiritual values, such as tapu, mana, tika, pono, and aroha which both Marsden and Tate canvass. He admits that many Māori soldiers fighting in the Second World War “would not have been able to maintain tapu restrictions. This would have affected their mana . . .” (p. 62). Such soldiers, who experienced loss of mana, on returning home were unable to contribute to their people at a level that was needed in terms of leadership. Some of the promiscuous behaviour of these young Māori while overseas was not tika or right. Even the falsifying of details including name and age, in order to enlist in the armed forces was neither tika or pono, right or true. “Violations of tika and pono lead to the diminishment of aroha and to the breakdown of the community” (p. 64). Nevertheless, aroha did exist between the Māori soldiers and various groups such as the Italians. Spiritual and military leaders of the Māori Battalion were expected “to address tapu and mana using the principles of tika, pono and aroha” (p. 65). However, as discussed above, leadership roles were often unable to be fulfilled by these soldiers on their return home as a result of wartime activities (p. 66). Many were in a state of negative noa with diminished mana and tapu and this became clear in their lives, which portrayed disorder, aggression, depression, hatred and isolation at home. These behaviours were exacerbated by their poor treatment by the Aotearoa New Zealand government concerning housing, education and employment (p. 68). Sadly, there was a lack of hohourongo, or reconciliation processes, to bring back tapu and mana. Papuni outlines, however, the various possibilities for reconciliation such as tangihanga, storytelling and prayer (pp. 70-71). Marsden and Tate’s analytical frameworks for Māori spirituality are used “to assist in the interpretations of the effects of war on the wairua of the C Coy veterans returning to their communities” (p. 71).

Papuni employs a further lens in the analysis of Māori soldier spirituality in the Johannine passion account (John 18: 1-21). A chapter of the thesis is devoted to this dimension. “It recognises that many men of C Coy sacrificed their lives in WWII on the understanding that they were in some way participating in the saving action of Christ who gave his life on the cross” (p. 82). While adventure was the main motivation, family and country can also be considered as factors. The gospel message from the scriptural passage chosen is that it is possible to heal the effects of war, even the more barbaric aspects, through honouring the deceased and supporting grieving families (p. 83). It is also important to recognise the mana and tapu of women to prevent abuse because of excessive drinking of alcohol. Yet the community and the Church were unable to facilitate reconciliation processes and healing and as a result, the cycle of abuse began. In his conclusion, Papuni asserts that the challenge for

Māori today is to return to their spiritual values and relationships in an increasingly fragmented society (p. 91).

7.1.10 Tui Cadigan

Another Māori theologian clearly influenced by Tate is Sister Tui Cadigan (sometimes also spelt Cadogan), a religious sister of the Catholic Sisters of Mercy, who comes from Waitaha, Ngāti Māmoe and Ngāti Tahu tribes in the South Island. Her master's thesis in theology, entitled *The Indigenisation of Religious Life for Wahine Māori in the Context of Aotearoa*, acknowledges that basic Māori spirituality continues to be transmitted from one generation to another and to influence the lives of Māori (Cadigan, 1998, p. 50). A major point which Cadigan makes, in terms of a right relationship with God, is that such a relationship is impossible if broken relationships with people or land exist. In a church community where there are relationship problems, reconciliation or hohourongo is needed (p. 65). "The crucial strand holding everything in tension is tapu of Atua, tangata and whenua, providing the connection that causes interdependence. Mana emanates from addressed or restored tapu supplying motivation for mission" (p. 136).

In the context of Māori women as religious sisters in the Catholic Church, Cadigan asserts that not only is contextual Māori theology necessary but that there is also a need for Māori feminist theology as well as liberation theology. Christian feminist theology allows Māori women to analyse critically the place of women in the Bible, cultural influences and, the perspectives of Jesus in terms of some of these women (p. 137). Māori tribal histories provide access to the spirituality of ancestresses, both historical and mythological. Māori liberation theology differs from that emanating from Latin America. "The oppression of Māori is more subtle and institutional and arguably more insidious than the blatant violence experienced by many other indigenous peoples" (p. 138). Cadigan argues that a hermeneutics of suspicion and retrieval is required when critiquing the church and Māori tikanga. She does acknowledge, nonetheless, the intrinsic tapu or sacredness of both Māori and Pākehā (p. 150).

Cadigan's contribution to a collection of Catholic perspectives on spirituality is called *Recovering Spirituality: The Story of Wahine Māori*. Initially Cadigan focusses on *mana wahine* both in traditional and contemporary settings. She acknowledges that such mana originates from God. Mana is defined as "the ability to cause to happen, to act, to effect, to mission, to give or to share" (Cadogan, 2002, p. 145). There are various forms of mana

associated with, not only the power and prestige of God and spiritual identities, but also with the land and the people. Mana wahine is perceived in terms of all three entities.

The spirituality of Māori women has been greatly influenced by ecclesiology. Cadigan approached Māori women closely involved in the Māori section of the Catholic Church. One of the questions that she asked was, "...whether the spirituality of *wahine* is obvious in, or valued by, the church" (p. 148). The overall response was disappointing in that this kind of spirituality has received scant attention, a response which is undergirded by a lack of knowledge. Cadigan recommends that even in liturgy there are possible innovative moves such as doing "a *karanga* at the elevation of the bread and wine, and to welcome the liturgy of the Word before the Gospel is proclaimed . . ." (p. 150). In contrast to the Church, she explores the multi-faceted illustrations of wahine spirituality in whānau, hapū and iwi contexts. Furthermore, she articulates the need for appropriate spiritual materials, artistic and written, some of which could involve storytelling, waiata or songs and kapa haka or group of action song performers (p. 151). Returning to the Church setting, she advocates "bi-cultural training for liturgists, and pastoral assistants beyond token gestures" (p. 152). Cadigan then briefly surveys a range of scriptural passages selected by Catholic Māori women and their responses to them in terms of the gospel message and the cultural context.

Cadigan, as she draws her writing to a number of conclusions, recognises the negative impact of violence on Māori women because of colonisation. However, she believes that it is possible to reconstruct a better future and she recommends to the Church several possible avenues for ameliorating an already serious situation within the Church and elsewhere. "When *wahine* are able to access culturally appropriate spirituality, they will be uplifted and their *mana* restored. Only then, will the appalling statistics of violence, chronic health concerns and deprivation begin a downward trend" (p. 153).

Cadigan (2002), in a chapter entitled Restoring Mana Wahine in *Overcoming Violence in Aotearoa New Zealand*, is again critical of the church which, alongside other colonisers, is accused of being one of the major contributors to violence perpetrated by Māori women. She attributes this kind of Māori dysfunctional behaviour "to the loss of any ability to maintain cultural integrity" (p. 68). Lack of Māori language and culture is perceived as leading to a lack of mana which has manifested itself in a lack of identity and well-being that are essential for "right relationship, with self, with Atua and with whenua..." (p. 72). It is Cadigan's view that such a lack of mana has caused a spiritual crisis which the church is not well placed to

deal with because of its failure to understand the holistic approach outlined by Marsden above, an approach which binds the spiritual and the material together.² “The lack of appropriate spiritual resources including relevant prayers, rituals, rites, symbols, songs, chants and spiritual leadership has created a spiritual void” (p. 69). For Cadigan, only Māori spirituality is able to restore the mana of Māori women.

In a collection of writings by members of the Catholic Church called *Land and Place. He Whenua, He Wāhi: Spiritualities from Aotearoa New Zealand*, Cadigan (2004) reflects on a three-way relationship between Atua (spiritual powers including the Christian God), whenua (land including vegetation and waterways) and tangata (human beings). Initially she focusses on the role of chiefs who are responsible for managing whenua which provides food, housing, clothing and a place for carrying out life rituals. It also is essential for self and group identity as well as for the maintenance of important connections to Atua and ancestors (p. 30). To be tangata whenua, or a person of the land, it is necessary to claim links to a tribal canoe or grouping and ancestral land such as mountains, rivers and lakes and marae or tribal gathering places (p. 31). The covenantal nature of the Treaty of Waitangi signed by chiefs and the Crown in the presence of Atua and his representatives is still recognised by Māori.

According to Cadigan, when tribes took responsibility for papatipu or ancestral lands as a result of a claim or conquest, the history of such acquisitions was passed down from one generation to another by the naming of significant land marks, the singing of poems and formal speechmaking (p. 33). Furthermore, the association with the land was confirmed by the establishment of fortified villages or marae. In addition, Māori were buried in cemeteries and other places to cement the links with such ancestral land.

The careful management of whenua to protect food and other resources involved right relationships between Atua, whenua and tangata (pp. 36-37). Here Cadigan draws upon Tate's three ethics, namely, tika, pono and aroha which were discussed earlier. If the tapu of the land was violated, then the mana of the person and his or her tribal groupings was diminished. While Papatuanuku, or Earth Mother, could be damaged through pollution or abuse, it is possible for healing processes to take place. “The depth of relationship Māori have with *whenua* cannot be explained without reference to the spiritual nature of such a relationship because of the link between Atua, tangata and whenua” (p. 40).

² See p. 114.

7.1.11 Tiki Raumati

Archdeacon Tiki Raumati, a retired priest from Te Atiawa in Taranaki on the west coast of the North Island, approaches spirituality from another angle – namely, the Anglican Church. He initially examines Anglican spirituality from a historical perspective. “The missionaries learned the Māori language very quickly and took advantage of Māori spirituality by infiltrating Māori understanding of God, their creator” (Raumati, 1998, p. 85). For Raumati, it is impossible to separate Māori spirituality and ecclesiology. He asserts that early Māori clergy did not write much on Māori spirituality because of the influence of missionaries and other religious teachers (p. 86). Indeed, there were clerics who attempted to separate themselves from traditional Māori spirituality. However, the “Anglican Church has come to realize that you will not get to the depth and inner being of Māoridom, or its spirituality, unless you let it be” (p. 86). According to Raumati, in liturgical terms, *A New Zealand Prayer Book*, published in 1989, is a concrete acknowledgement of Māori spirituality within the Anglican Church throughout Aotearoa New Zealand.

7.1.12 Eru Potaka-Dewes

Traditional Māori spirituality also underpins a form of Māori theology called *Atuatanga* which has been developed by the Māori Anglican Church’s tertiary training institution, Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa. One of its leading advocates was the late Reverend Eru Potaka-Dewes of Ngāti Porou from the eastern coast of the North Island. He claimed that there is only one source of *whakapapa* or human genealogy and that is Io-Matua-Kore or “God the Parentless because God does not have parents” (Potaka-Dewes, 2006, p. 51). He also acknowledged the place of Rangi, Sky Father, and Papatuanuku, Earth Mother. “Atuatanga encourages the student to understand the traditional customs and protocol of the tipuna (ancestors)...” (p. 50). Humanity is also given the supreme position in a creation which embodies the power or mana of Io-Matua-Kore or God. Potaka-Dewes maintained that there are three forms of such power, namely, *mana tangata* or “power derived from people strength,” *mana whenua* or “power from the land, its mountains, rivers, lakes, bush and trees including the birds...” and *mana atua* or “power with mankind’s link with the spiritual powers such as Tangaroa [God of the Sea], Papatuanuku...” (p. 54 my parentheses). In many ways this discussion on mana resonates with the thoughts of Tate whose writings were discussed earlier.

In Potaka-Dewes's review of the foreshore and seabed controversy in Aotearoa-New Zealand³, he relates the significance of the traditional Māori spiritual power Tangaroa who is perceived as "a reflection of God Almighty - in the form of the waves, of the energy that causes the waves to rise and fall, of the oceans and seas, and all creatures that live in these waters..." (Potaka-Dewes, 2005, pp. 51-52). He contends that the Crown, in the form of the Labour government, wished to replace Tangaroa by taking control of ownership of the foreshore and seabed. Essentially this means that Māori lose *kaitiakitanga* or guardianship, stewardship and trusteeship of the foreshore and seabed (p. 53). Māori spirituality here is seen as a critical part of the context for a major issue for many Māori. At a ministry school held in 2006, Potaka-Dewes elaborated further on *Atuatanga* which he defined as not only Māori or indigenous theology but also as a form of liberation theology (Potaka-Dewes, 2006, p. 3). He asserted that Tangaroa, in the form of the sea, for example, is a reflection "...of the one true and omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent God" (p. 4).

7.1.13 Turi Hollis

Archdeacon Turi Hollis from Te Aitanga-a-Māhaki, Rongowhakaata, Whakatōhea and Ngāti Kahungunu on the eastern coast of the North Island, in his research essay, *Developing a Māori Understanding of the Christian God: Must the Christian God Remain Pākehā?*, supports the notion of Māori developing their own theology "...and drawing on Pākehā theology as and when necessary" (Hollis, 1991, p. 60). He also advocates Māori understanding of the Christian God (p. 61). It is not therefore surprising that Hollis is supportive of Potaka-Dewes' notions of *Atuatanga* especially in terms of whakapapa or cultural genealogy. He asserts "...that Creation exists because of Te Atua and Te Atua exists because of Creation: one does not and cannot exist without the other" (Hollis, 2002, p.13). He defines *Te Atuatanga* as "how Māori perceive, understand and relate to all that is seen and unseen" (p. 28). The task of Māori spirituality is to describe how these connections take place. Whanaungatanga or relationships are manifested as a result of genealogical links. There are reciprocal obligations for Māori to meet the needs of their relations through care, support, hospitality and love (p. 27). This model of interconnectedness, he asserts, is a useful means of promoting ecumenism in Aotearoa New Zealand (p. 29).

³ See p. 82.

7.1.14 Moeawa Callaghan

Ms Moeawa Callaghan is an Anglican laywoman who comes from Ngāti Kahungunu, Te Whānau-a-Apanui and Ngāti Porou on the eastern coast and eastern Bay of Plenty of the North Island. Her master's thesis in theology, which is entitled *Theology in the Context of Aotearoa New Zealand*, focusses on reinforcing "...continuity between the person and actions of Jesus, as interpreted from the Gospel narratives, and Māori in their particular situation by identifying images of Jesus that emerge in the midst of our experience"

(Callaghan, 1999, p. 2). She initially reviews the historical context and development of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand, especially the emergence of the Māori section and the "counter-hegemonic struggle" among urban Māori in the latter half of the twentieth century (p. 25).

The Māori struggle for liberation from oppression centred on God rather than on his son, Jesus Christ (p. 26). As a result of her analysis of the initial stages of Māori evangelism, Callaghan believes that there are two images of Jesus which resonate with this history, first, "the image of Jesus as a person of the Spirit . . . (who) acted in accordance with the Spirit of God and as such transcended religions and cultural boundaries and transformed the social reality of the oppressed" (p. 26). Second, Jesus can be perceived as the eschatological prophet who connects with Māori as they struggle in hope to alleviate the pain of oppression.

Callaghan surveys three liberation theologies, namely, Latin American, Asian and Black American, to investigate their respective perspectives on spirit and eschatology. In her summary she asserts that the "image of Jesus as a person of the Spirit who, through prayer and action, transformed social reality is actualised in these three theologies" (p. 75). These theologies acknowledge the Spirit of the human Jesus and the influence of culture in liberation processes. However, it is only in Asian theology that culture is the main starting point for theological analysis. Each theology's thrust for liberation is grounded in its historical and contemporary cultural context (p. 76). In terms of eschatology there is a blending of indigenous spiritualities and Christian post modernity from which has emerged a new construction which historicises the Reign of God (p. 78). While the quest for justice is a common denominator, these liberation theologies have evolved from quite different situations. Each has the potential, nevertheless, to enlighten those from other oppressed contexts engaged in doing theology (p. 78).

The insights gained from the critique of Spirit in the three theologies above provide the impetus to explore this theme from a Māori viewpoint. Callaghan contends that it is the Spirit which provides the connection between the cultural traditions of the Māori and the historical Jesus (p. 86). “It is Jesus, as the one who embodied the Spirit and as such prayed and acted as he did, who set the example of how we should relate to others” (p. 86). This means that there is a need for Christian Māori to be committed to processes of examination of the self as well as culture. It is also necessary not to shut the door on non Christian Māori and their religious and spiritual frames of reference. This kind of openness is required as the gospel imperative is acted out and the meaning of neighbour is extended to include those of other cultures (p. 87).

In exploring eschatology from a Māori viewpoint, Callaghan begins with a brief survey of Māori traditions. “Early Māori had no end goal for history, perhaps because history was so inextricably bound to other realities” (p. 90). Yet there were spiritual goals that Māori sought to achieve, namely, divinity, authority, power and holiness. In her review of Church history, especially the arrival of missionaries and Māori prophets, there was a distinctive shift by Māori towards believing in the promise of a better future (p. 91). This promise has powered agitation for a more equitable partnership between Māori and Pākehā as envisaged in the Treaty of Waitangi (p. 92). “The prophetic role of the Anglican Church has concretised the principles held in the Treaty in its own spiritual, political and structural life” (p. 94).

7.1.15 Donald Tamihere

The Reverend Donald Tamihere, from Ngāti Porou on the eastern coast of the North Island, in his master’s thesis in theology, *Kua Oti Te Tuhituhi: Towards a Māori Exegesis of the Bible*, explores a model of biblical exegesis which, while acknowledging tribal diversity, draws upon Māori cultural understandings (Tamihere, 2002). One aspect of this model focusses on the resemblances between the text of Exodus 19 as well as associated texts and Māori cultural perspectives. In this study he initially chose the theme of mountain symbolism and its significance in both the ancient Mediterranean and Māori worlds. In the latter case, he draws upon the spirituality of his own tribe whose mountain, Hikurangi, is highly regarded (p. 133). “According to oral tradition, the North Island itself was fished up by the great Ngāti Porou ancestor, Māui. The first part of the land to emerge was the peak of Hikurangi, and upon this peak Māui’s canoe Nukutaimemeha became stranded” (p. 134). The mana and tapu

of this mountain are acknowledged by Ngāti Porou in both its tribal sayings and colloquialisms (p. 139).

The other theme which Tamihere investigates is the notion of ascent in both the ancient Near East and in Māoridom. In the Māori context he refers to traditional legends which narrate the ascents of Tāne and Tāwhaki. In the former story, Tāne, who was the son of the Sky Father, Rangi, sets out to climb to the uppermost heaven in order to secure the three baskets of knowledge for the benefit of humankind (pp. 146-7). Tāwhaki, on the other hand, ascends the heavens in order to search for his wife and daughter.

In his concluding remarks, Tamihere acknowledges that his explorative model has its limitations and therefore can be considered to be a beginning (p. 156). His ultimate aim would be to undertake Māori cultural exegesis through the medium of te reo Māori. As an initial foray, it does recognise the importance of Māori spirituality as an integral part of Māori cultural biblical exegesis.

7.1.16 Wayne Te Kaawa

The Reverend Wayne Te Kaawa (2001) is a Presbyterian minister from Ngāti Tūwharetoa in the eastern Bay of Plenty. Te Kaawa also focusses on Tāne and Tāwhaki but from a christological perspective. Here, the former figure is likened to Christ in that Tāne was created by a spiritual being, Io, the Supreme God, to separate Tāne's parents, Rangi, Sky Father, and Papatuanuku, Earth Mother. The purpose of the separation was to beautify Papatuanuku with vegetation, birds and insects, to bring back from the heavens the three baskets of knowledge and to form the first human being, Hineahuone (p. 25). Just as the Word became flesh and God sent Jesus Christ into the world to undertake various tasks including overcoming darkness, there are parallels that can be drawn with Tāne (p. 26). On the other hand, Tāwhaki is perceived to possess the purity of Jesus who carries out the will of God (p. 27). Another character in traditional legends is Māui who has been perceived as a mediator between Māori gods and Māori people (p. 29). Te Kaawa draws a comparison between the stories of Māui and the ministry of Jesus in Palestine. Both question established authority and oppressive laws (p. 30). Their deaths are also contrasted.

7.1.17 Summary

Contemporary Māori theologians owe a debt of gratitude to scholars, such as Māori Marsden, Henare Tate, Te Waaka Melbourne and Eru Potaka-Dewes, who have laid the foundations for the future development of Māori theology. These kaumātua, or elder, priests have examined either implicitly or explicitly the place of spiritual values such as mana, tapu, tika, pono and aroha. Melbourne, Tate and Tiki Raumati also draw the connections between traditional Māori spirituality and ecclesiology. In Melbourne's case he goes the extra step in exploring the church's notion of tino rangatiratanga. Manuka Henare, Jack Papuni, Turi Hollis and Tui Cadigan represent the faces of the next generation of Māori theologians who have built upon the already established platforms. Papuni and Cadigan use the earlier theological analyses to reflect on different but interconnected contexts, namely, World War II Māori soldiers and contemporary Māori women. Wiremu Kaa, however, draws upon the theology of a fellow tribe's person, Mohi Turei, an Anglican clergyperson from the nineteenth century. Bill Tuhiwai and Whakahuihui Vercoe, from their own perspectives as Māori men, examine the place of women on the marae which is considered to an important Māori cultural and spiritual public space. Both Don Tamihere and Wayne Te Kaawa discuss traditional Māori spiritual figures from diverse viewpoints. Moeawa Callaghan focusses, on the other hand, on the contribution of liberation theology and the mix of indigenous spiritualities and Christianity in a post-modern world. She advocates critiquing oneself and one's culture, including traditional spirituality, as part of the process of operationalising the gospel imperative. This offers the possibility that the dangers of tribal and cultural essentialism as well as culturalism and denominationalism, which Henare warns about, are exposed and countered. Over the last ten years there have emerged these critiques of Māori culture which have also been accompanied by a critique of the impact of ecclesiology on Māori spirituality.

7.2. Māori Ecclesiology

Christian Māori undertake their theological journeys facing the history of their churches (Nicholson, 1996a, p. 37). What has happened in the past cannot be downplayed or ignored. It is not possible to forget those who toiled in the nineteenth century to plant the seeds of the gospel whether they were Pākehā missionaries or Māori evangelists. For almost two centuries, the Māori Anglican Church has evolved as it has struggled to be liberated from colonialism and the settler church. It is also not possible to forget those who, over four or five generations, have been engaged in this struggle. To understand Māori theological thinking

today, it is necessary not only to build upon an indigenous spirituality but also to confront the changing nature and structure of the Māori Church. It is hardly surprising that many Māori give priority, theologically, to the Church which has developed in Aotearoa New Zealand since 1814, and then to the western church which has evolved over the past two millennia (p. 38). Māori theology focusses on the history of the Māori Church, and it remembers traditional stories and tribal histories. All these histories are the sources of Māori theological interpretation of God's work in the world, including the operations of the Church. Contemporary Māori theologians in their ecclesiological reflections, therefore, inevitably draw upon their knowledge of the past to situate and understand the diverse realities of the present church.

7.2.1 Hone Kaa

Archdeacon Dr Hone Kaa, who comes from Ngāti Porou, a tribe situated on the eastern coast of the North Island, in his master's thesis, historically and theologically explores the introduction of Christianity among his own people. He begins by examining traditional stories about a famous ancestor, Paikea. It was into these traditions, as a seedbed, that the gospel was planted (H. Kaa, 2000b, p. 35). However, it was another ancestor, Piripi Taumataakura, who, because of intertribal warfare, was taken as a slave to North Auckland by a northern tribe (pp. 75-78). He was exposed to teachings about Christianity and eventually returned home accompanied by a missionary whose knowledge of the Māori language greatly impressed the Ngāti Porou elders (p. 91). News of Taumataakura's homecoming spread quickly throughout his iwi and resulted in huge numbers of his fellow tribe's people arriving to hear him preach and lead the prayers taught by the missionaries (pp. 92-93). There is some debate, however, as to how well versed Taumataakura was in Christian beliefs. According to one version of history, Taumataakura tried to persuade his people not to enter into warfare but was unsuccessful. "He went to battle 'bearing in one hand te pukapuka (scriptures) and in the other a musket'" (p. 100). What Taumataakura managed to negotiate with his relations was that they not eat or mutilate those killed and that he be allowed to bury them in the name of his Atua, Jesus Christ (p. 101). "The arrival of the gospel heralded 'the god of Taumataakura.' It promised the 'New Way,' the end of eating human flesh, and the hope for the triumph of the church" (p. 102). This bold cultural and spiritual transformation is described against a historical background that provided a fertile environment for evangelism. The movement from killing and desecrating to caring for and

respecting people was, as Kaa contends, “a radical, philosophical, political shift” (pp. 106-107).

Kaa, in his review of the Māori art work of the famous Māori church, St Mary’s, in Tikitiki on the eastern coast of the North Island, acknowledges that Taumataakura has been commemorated as the carved figure holding up the baptismal font. “It is appropriate that he is so depicted because he is the first of Ngāti Porou to be baptised and it is right that he should be the one to welcome new members of the tribe into the body of Christ” (H. Kaa, 2005, p. 12).

Kaa draws upon church records and over forty years involvement in the development of the Māori Anglican Church as he reviews more recent history of the Anglican Church. He also draws upon the theological writings of James Cone, an Afro-American, and Dietrich Bonhoeffer, a German (H. Kaa, 2000a, pp. 50-52). He recounts poignantly the situation regarding the second Bishop of Aotearoa, Wiremu Panapa, who had advocated the abolition of his position as the Māori Anglican bishop as a result of exasperation and sorrow in terms of the Pākehā settler church. In 1968, contrary to church tradition, Panapa attended the consecration of his successor, Bishop Manuhua Bennett, and was, painfully, not allowed to participate fully (p. 58). It was Bennett, together with his supporters, who began to develop strategies to secure full episcopal jurisdiction, the right of election by Māori and a strong financial base (p. 59). The journey was not an easy one as the Māori church struggled to escape colonial captivity. Senior Māori were reluctant to think creatively and felt very insecure about changing the status quo (p. 60). Pākehā Church bishops were also critical of changes proposed by Bennett (H. Kaa, 2006, pp. 87-92). “In the cacophony of social and political change need for a quiet, rational and strong leadership was what Manu offered as he helped Māori struggle along the path of self-determination and self-identity” (p. 93). It was a theological journey of liberation based on hope.

7.2.2 Jenny Plane Te Paa

The radical, philosophical, political shift described above by Kaa would tend to negate a populist Māori view that portrays ancestors, such as Taumataakura, as being easily led by manipulative missionaries who were largely concerned with acquiring material wealth. Undoubtedly the most prolific writer of all the Māori theologians whose works are reviewed in this chapter is Dr Jenny Plane Te Paa who is Te Ahorangi, or the Principal, of the Māori

theological college, Te Whare Wānanga o Te Rau Kahikatea, which is based at the St John's College in Auckland. Plane Te Paa (also known as Jenny Te Paa), from Te Rarawa in North Auckland, questions any perspective that attempts to paint a picture of passivity on the part of early Christian Māori. "To perpetuate this view is problematic because it demeans the nineteenth-century Māori intellect, and it denies nineteenth-century Māori any capacity for critical visionary insight" (Plane Te Paa, 1998a, p. 90). Plane Te Paa asserts that such a viewpoint attempts to deny the evidence, such as the story of Taumataakura, that Māori were pro-active and keen participants in their own evangelism processes. The Reverend Robert Kereopa from Ngāti Tūwharetoa in the central North Island supports this perspective. He maintains that the most able and effective evangelists were Māori converts (Kereopa, 2003, p. 87). "Christianity was a cause that many Māori were willing to die for" (p. 87). Manuka Henare would go a step further and assert that in the mid nineteenth century the Māori worldview was certainly not "obliterated or wiped out." "It is likely that contrary to missionary expectations the traditional worldview may have been reinforced" (Henare, 1999, p. 96).

Plane Te Paa (1998a) is critical of Māori educators who have vilified Pākehā missionaries as a whole (p. 90). She is suspicious of such populist views not only because they fail to account for the complexity and, at times, the ambiguity, of the nineteenth century missionary context, but also, because they are used to reject the *Pākehā God* whose main concern was allegedly to support colonialism. While there is evidence that there were missionaries who wished not only to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ but also the gospel of the new culture of civilisation, this is only part of the complex web of motives (Kereopa, 2003, p. 87). Missionaries, such as Henry and William Williams, who were held in high esteem by Māori, were instrumental in gaining acceptance of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. The Church attempted to persuade Māori that what Pākehā said was absolutely true and sacred. "This would colour the image of missionaries in ensuing years, especially as many missionaries were able to accumulate excessive land holdings" (Kereopa, 2003, p. 87). Was each missionary motivated by love for Jesus Christ or, by his or her desire to be needed and respected or, by other wants? Certainly Plane Te Paa (1998a) is very conscious of the fact that "...little substantive critical enquiry has been undertaken by Māori educators into the multiplicity of factors which guided the work of the original missionaries in Aotearoa" (1998a, p. 90). Clearly, there is also a real need for such critical enquiry to be undertaken by Māori church historians.

Plane Te Paa (2004) has asserted that the Anglican Church as a public institution showed bold leadership “by declaring that it believed Treaty principles to be fundamentally Christian principles” (p. 91). The adoption of a new constitution based on such principles was seen to be *unprecedented*. However, despite the new constitution, Plane Te Paa maintains that Māori women in the Anglican Church are still suffering and struggling with racism, sexism and clericalism (p. 36). The latter two forms of oppression are especially evident within the Māori Anglican Church. “Over the years many male Māori clergy have simply assumed a form of imperious disdain, similar to that of the colonial oppressor” (p. 38). Plane Te Paa (2005a) contends that in the 1960s and 1970s the mission of the Anglican Church “was firmly embedded in an imperialist ecclesiology, with all its attendant attitudes and behaviours of superiority and arrogance – an ecclesiology shaped and formed by stubbornly residual colonial benevolence toward the indigenous Māori” (p. 68).

In the 1980s and 1990s there was a move from an ecclesiology which was essentially imperialist to one which was more liberating and focussed on redemptive justice (p. 71). Plane Te Paa believes that there still is “an inherent inequality between those historically ecclesially advantaged and those historically ecclesially marginalized and this inequality leads to injustice” (p. 72). When the new Constitution was being negotiated, the two major partners were not equally matched in that the Pākehā Anglican Church had well established academic institutions and a long held grip on church resources while the Māori Church had indigenous theological gifts and a minimal record of resource management or creation. Plane Te Paa argues that, for the Anglican Church to flourish, it will be necessary to draw upon each other’s strengths. However, what has happened is that the different cultural strands have withdrawn into their own corner rather than contribute “to a dynamic and mutually beneficial common ecclesial ground” (p. 72). Plane Te Paa argues that the main difficulty is that the Church has allowed secular, race-based ideologies to dominate in a context where an evaluation of a common mission and a theology of mission are urgently needed. Yet for Plane Te Paa even the focus on race is only part of a larger questioning of the politics of difference because of the *ghettoisation* of difference and the difficulties of collaborating or cooperating for the effective purpose of mission and ministry. “We must disrupt the hegemonic notion that God’s good life can be found in closed single issue or limited interest religious, ethnic, class or gendered communities. For here are found the source of ethno-nationalisms and fundamentalism which now threaten us all” (p. 49).

For Plane Te Paa (2008) , a major challenge facing the Anglican Church and other churches is to strive for relationships which stress interdependence at both local and international levels and to advocate for the dignity of all God's family while respecting the many differences. She argues that in the Anglican Communion the church in the United States and Canada has been unfairly treated (pp. 120-121). According to Plane Te Paa, indigenous people are more concerned about resolving injustice and undertaking the challenging task of mission and ministry than the issue of gay ordination in North America and elsewhere (p. 124). She advocates a level of interdependence where human beings are prepared to be transparent, exposed and transformed. Within the Communion she perceives the need for the gifts of the Spirit such as love, patience and kindness rather than "judgement, punishment, threat, and condemnation" (p. 131).

7.2.3 Manuka Henare

Manuka Henare (2003) could be regarded as a church historian who undertakes critical enquiry using the method of philosophical anthropology (p. 9). In his doctoral thesis, *Changing Images of Nineteenth Century Māori Society*, he recognises the contribution of Māori Marsden as "...a leading philosopher on traditional tikanga Māori and an evangelical Christian theologian" in terms of Māori moral structures (p. 93). Understanding moral structures is important in order to appreciate Māori interaction with Christianity in the nineteenth century. "The initial encounter with Christianity promised much but was quickly entangled with Pākehā settler politics and economics" (p. 94). Māori chiefs and religious leaders were able to adapt quickly to this context and to proactively use the new religion for their purposes (p. 95). Any notion that Māori were passive recipients of Christianity is not supported by Henare. "Such a view is consistent with agency, freedom of thought and intellectual sovereignty and is an internal inspiration" (p. 243). Indeed Henare asserts that "Māori were primary agents in the introduction of Christianity when they sought the missionaries who thus became the means to alternative sources of knowledge, codes of ethics and methods of judgement and making choices" (p. 244).

7.2.4 Moeawa Callaghan

Moeawa Callaghan (2006) also asserts that generally Māori gained benefits from the knowledge of missionaries and vice versa. Certainly there was a diverse range of missionaries whose relationships with Māori varied (p. 105). Callaghan maintains that the writings of

missionaries still have much to contribute today to theological and historical works despite being subject to twenty-first century critique. Missionary theologies clearly impacted on Māori to the extent that “the Gospel represented ethical, moral and spiritual well-being” (p. 106). Māori chiefs used scriptures to underpin their political critique at a conference called by the government in 1860 at Kohimārama, Auckland. Te Tiriti o Waitangi was regarded as a living sacred covenant. The Anglican Church, through its new constitution in 1992, has attempted to review and restore in part the terms, principles and relationships embodied in Te Tiriti (p. 108). Transforming such relationships has been interpreted by Callaghan as a form of reconciliation.

7.2.5 Robert Kereopa

Robert Kereopa (2003) divides Māori Anglican Church history into five stages. He begins with the Missionary Māori Church in 1814-1857 (pp. 86-87). He then proceeds to briefly examine the second stage, namely, the disastrous impact of the Pākehā settler church between 1857 and 1928 in the context of the Land Wars. This period also included the disempowerment of Anglican Māori by Bishop Selwyn. Furthermore, Anglican Pākehā rejected the request by Māori for their own bishop in 1877. It was only in 1928, as a result of incursions into the ranks of Anglican Māori by the Rātana Church, that Frederick Bennett was appointed the Bishop of Aotearoa (p. 89). The third stage considers the fifty years between 1928 and 1978 when the Māori bishop was placed, not only under the authority of the Pākehā Bishop of Waiapu, but was also only able to enter other Pākehā dioceses with the agreement of the incumbent Pākehā bishop. This was not always forthcoming.

The fourth stage explores the development of the Māori Anglican diocese. After six commissions of General Synod on Māori participation in the Anglican Church, in 1978 the Bishop of Aotearoa was granted diocesan status with Māori representation at General Synod. Yet the Māori bishop was still unable to provide unhindered episcopal oversight through the whole country without the interference of Pākehā bishops. Furthermore, he was unable to “select, train, ordain and license clergy and lay workers for Māori ministry” (Kereopa, 2003, p. 92). Although these constraints were unfair to Māori, the third Bishop of Aotearoa, Manuhuia Bennett, the son of Frederick Bennett, the first Bishop, established an innovative form of non-stipendiary ministry called *minita-ā-iwi* who were trained and ordained in the local tribal context. As a result the number of clergy expanded from 27 in 1978 to 204 in

1991 (p. 93). Kereopa has labelled the fifth stage from 1992 until the present as the Partnership Church.

7.2.6 Rangi Nicholson

In 1994 two years after the new Constitution of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia was adopted, I wrote an essay which was entitled *The Theological Implications of a Three Tikanga Church*. The writings of Afro-American theologian James Cone heavily influenced this essay. The theological starting point is the diverse Māori experiences of oppression and empowerment in Aotearoa-New Zealand (Nicholson, 1996b, p. 36). The theological sources are described as “Māori experience, Māori history, Māori language and culture, revelation, scripture and tradition” (p. 36). Here the norm of Māori theology is expounded as

the manifestation of the Triune God as the Māori God, Māori Jesus Christ and Māori Holy Spirit in true and real tikanga partnership and bicultural development which provides through aroha, or compassion, the necessary wairua, or soul, for Māori socio-economic, political and cultural liberation and praxis (p. 36).

The essay then proceeds to define partnership and bicultural development within the Anglican context, the diverse nature of Māori experience, and the critical importance of Māori history, language and culture (p. 37). Revelation for Māori can be interpreted as their actions to combat oppression and to undertake liberating and empowering processes which are validated through scriptural witness. Moreover, church tradition for Māori is largely focussed on Christianity in Aotearoa-New Zealand since the arrival of the first missionary in the early nineteenth century (p. 38). In terms of Māori ecclesiology, the major focus is on how the tradition of the Anglican Church is related to the oppression and empowerment of Māori and how it can facilitate authentic partnership and bicultural development to take place.

7.2.7 Tui Cadigan

In this section on Māori ecclesiology I have concentrated so far mostly on the Anglican Church. Tui Cadigan’s master’s thesis, which contains a strong ecclesiological component, briefly reviews Catholic Church history. Cadigan acknowledges that from a Māori perspective the past influences the future (1998, p. 1). She recognises the impact of Vatican II which critiqued all facets of the Catholic Church (p. 17). However, not all stakeholders in the Church have been able to benefit from the winds of change. Māori religious women have

been faced with continuing to be assimilated into the church or to strongly advocate for their own culture (p. 35). Three factors have mitigated against the latter option, namely, cultural loss, Pākehā resistance and lack of culturally appropriate resources.

While some Catholic communities have honoured Te Tiriti o Waitangi or committed corporately to bi-cultural partnership as part of their mission statements, the major stumbling block to full recognition of Te Tiriti has been an unwillingness to share power or give up some level of control. Since the sesquicentennial commemoration of the Treaty in 1990, Cadigan has also discerned a lowering of the intensity of Pākehā engagement as a result of globalisation. Notwithstanding this perceived trend, there is no scriptural justification for one cultural group or gender to dominate another (p. 100). What is expected in any relationship is justice and love (p. 101). Cadigan asserts that it is the members of any particular culture who are best placed to evaluate their own cultural practices (p. 102). When another culture attempts to undertake such evaluation, this is likely to be resisted. Christianity and colonisation violated Māori culture in attempts to disempower and assimilate. “It is possible, based on Māori experience, to argue that this mentality of religious and cultural superiority has survived and been fostered in the relationships between religious congregations and their native members” (p. 102). Such superiority falls outside the commandment of Christ to love one’s neighbour (p. 103). Pākehā recognition of these matters including the honouring of the Treaty “...has taken generations to arouse” (p. 107).

Cadigan espouses the covenantal nature of the Treaty and the need for collaboration between Māori and Treaty partners (p. 117). She maintains that the Treaty will only be honoured when these partners are merciful in their search for resolutions to current injustices. “The Treaty partners must grow towards a relationship of complementarity and interdependence in love, through justice and reconciliation” (p. 120). While Te Tiriti defines the nature of the relationship between Māori and Pākehā, it is the gospel which defines Christian relationship (p. 145).

In the penultimate chapter of her thesis Cadigan outlines fourteen aspects of religious life to be transformed in order to facilitate the advancement of indigeneity. These are the charisma or motivating spirit of a congregation, constitutional change, governance, formation, vows, theology, prayer, spiritual well-being, sense of community, mission, ministry, training, resources and language. The section on resources focusses on personnel, monies, properties, professional skills, land and vehicles. Equitable distribution of resources is required for Māori

“to provide competent, culturally relevant, professional ministry to their people...” (p. 150). Tika, pono and aroha processes of decision making are also advocated. For Cadigan, overall, if indigenisation is to take place, it will be motivated by five forces of equal value, namely, the gospel, the local context, cultural uniqueness, congregational constitutions imbued with charism, and Te Tiriti o Waitangi (p. 155). Any transformation will involve a level of stress, departures, chaos and excitement (p. 159).

7.2.8 Wayne Te Kaawa

Presbyterian clergyperson Wayne Te Kaawa (2001) outlines his ecumenical roots and context (pp. 19-20). He briefly traces some of the history of the Māori Presbyterian Church, or Te Aka Puaho, in the early twentieth century including a story about the meeting of the Reverend John Laughton, a Presbyterian missionary, with a senior leader of the Ringatū Church and a relative (pp. 17-18). A major focus of his synthesis, entitled *Māori Theology in Ministry within Aotearoa*, is the section on future ministry. Here Te Kaawa gives attention to five major issues. The first acknowledges the need to decolonise Christology, ecclesiology and ministry (p. 41). The second is called *grassroots theology* which attempts to support those who have suffered as a result of colonisation. It empowers such people to recover their language, culture, identity and self-respect (pp. 43-44). The third area is ministry with a prophetic and public face. Bishop Whakahuihui Vercoe and Te Rūnanga Whakawhanaungatanga i ngā Hāhi o Aotearoa, the Māori interdenominational group, are seen as exemplars of prophetic voices and very public faces of Māori theology and ministry (p. 46). While the communication of such prophetic, public messages in the news media is important, it is the marae which also serves as a very significant platform. “Māori people are amongst the most disadvantaged in society and therefore often need a mouthpiece to speak out and ask the hard questions that need to be asked” (p. 47).

The fourth focus is bi-cultural bridge building which involves working with the non-Māori sections of the Church in terms of Treaty of Waitangi partnership (p. 48). Acknowledgment and attainment of Māori self-determination, or tino rangatiratanga, within and outside the Māori Presbyterian Church is part of this ministry. “This means that Te Aka Puaho must be seen as being equal partners in terms of ministry, resources, finances, policies and legislation” (p. 49). The last issue is the tension between tribalism and nationalism or iwi and urban Māori (p. 50). Te Kaawa opts for a stand which does not favour or discriminate against either group (p. 51).

7.2.9 Summary

Over a period of almost two hundred years, there has been a gradual transformation from imperialist to indigenous ecclesiology. I canvass the diverse Māori experiences of oppression and empowerment by reviewing the tradition of the Anglican Church that is most important to Māori, namely, the tradition in Aotearoa New Zealand since 1814. Hone Kaa outlines the seedbed of Māori spirituality into which the gospel was planted in his own tribal region. What he describes are three kinds of transformation, namely, spiritual, cultural and political which are interconnected in a complex picture. Jenny Plane Te Paa analyses populist half-truths concerning the early Church to reveal such complexity. Robert Kereopa also shows that Māori were often willing and sincere converts as well as loyal supporters of the Church despite its colonialism. The history of the Māori Anglican Church, which he depicts, is clearly one of steady development despite the oppressive climate imposed by the Pākehā settler church. While Manuka Henare also asserts that Māori were active agents in the introduction of Christianity, Moeawa Callaghan recognises that nineteenth century Māori leaders benefited from missionary knowledge, including theologies, to the extent that their political critique could be underpinned by scripture. Kaa recounts personal experiences and surveys church records to reveal oppression by the settler church in the twentieth century. Plane Te Paa examines ecclesiology after the new Constitution to discover that inequality and injustice still exist in the Anglican Church. Yet she sounds a positive note in her encouragement to Anglicans of different cultures to build upon their strengths in interdependent, mutually affirming ways not only in Aotearoa New Zealand but also overseas. Callaghan also maintains that the new Constitution has only partially restored the terms, principles and relationships embodied in Te Tiriti as a form of reconciliation. Tui Cadigan, in her critique of the Catholic Church's treatment of Māori religious women, details historical and on-going oppression and the aspects of religious life which still need to be transformed. Wayne Te Kaawa, from a Presbyterian perspective, briefly reviews early missionary history and then proceeds to outline major areas for future ministry development. If Māori are to learn more about their ecclesiology and be effectively involved in major transformation, then theological education is a process which can assist such goals.

7.3. Māori Theological Education

Since the adoption of the new Anglican Constitution in 1992, there has been a heightened awareness of Māori spirituality and ecclesiology. This has paved the way for new Māori

Anglican theological educational institutions, courses and qualifications. Graduates from these institutions have been empowered in turn to reflect upon both Māori spirituality and the Māori Anglican Church. Yet Pākehā clergy were largely the gatekeepers of theological education for Māori prior to the 1980s. The length of time taken by Bishop Selwyn to ordain the first Māori, the Reverend Rota Waitoa, from Ngāti Raukawa in the southern North Island, is an example of such gatekeeping from the early history of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand. The theological colleges of the church have trained prospective lay readers and clergy over one hundred and fifty years to fulfil roles in the wider community. The history of the College of St John the Evangelist reveals the marginalised place of the Māori in the church and their struggle for empowerment. The establishment of Te Rau Kahikatea College in Gisborne in the nineteenth century, its closure and subsequent re-establishment at St John's College in the early 1990s reflects the changing fortunes of Māori theological education. The setting up of another Māori tertiary theological institution by the Bishopric of Aotearoa in 1996 signals yet another chapter in this unfolding story. Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa with its regional campuses at Māngere, Gisborne, Rotorua and Ōtaki grants diplomas and degrees in Māori theology, ministry and social services. It has been able to train a considerable number of minita-a-iwi or non-stipendiary clergy as well as laity throughout the country. I now turn to review those writings on Māori theological education.

7.3.1 Jenny Plane Te Paa

Over the last twelve years Plane Te Paa has pursued a relentless search to identify various forms of oppression and then to argue for changes to unjust structures. Theologically, she places the gospel imperatives of love, justice and peace at the centre alongside the experiences of mostly, although not exclusively, those who are Māori. She also arrives at a position where she advocates the primacy of Christian ethics over Māori and other knowledge systems.

Plane Te Paa's master's thesis is entitled "Kua Whakatūngia Anō a Te Rau Kahikatea: An Historical Critical Overview of Events which Preceded the Re-establishment of Te Rau Kahikatea Theological College of Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa." Plane Te Paa traces critically the selected history of St. John's College, Auckland, between 1843 and 1994, especially examining the effects of educational policy on Māori. The thesis gives further recognition to Māori educational responses to marginalisation. It also "...seeks to encapsulate what might be a relevant contemporary philosophy of Māori Anglican theological education for Te

Whare Wānanga o Te Rau Kahikatea, the Māori Anglican theological college” (Plane Te Paa, 1995, p. 10).

Plane Te Paa concludes that it is necessary for Māori to reclaim their own traditions concerning theology and to pursue new theoretical frameworks including an indigenous epistemological framework (pp. 147-148). Plane Te Paa advocates that “Māori experience must be placed at the centre of any analysis in order that fresh and authentic insights on those prevailing concepts, paradigms and epistemologies might emerge and be developed” (p. 149). Given the history of oppression for Māori Anglicans, Plane Te Paa concludes that, “...our first task is to systematically deconstruct all of the controlling images used so relentlessly and unethically in the teaching of theology” (p. 151). She propounds the view that a useful Māori Anglican theological starting point “...may be to insist that all theology, willingly or not, is by definition always engaged for or against the oppressed” (p. 151). However, Plane Te Paa concludes by not only proposing deconstructing oppressive images but also, “...(re)constructing a theology of justice and of peace ...” (p. 151).

Plane Te Paa (1996) continued to explore deconstruction and reconstruction processes in her contribution to the Selwyn Lectures at St. John’s College that focussed on *Church and State: Te Tino Rangatiratanga*. She declared that, “...unless as Anglicans we are prepared to engage a critique of all cultural assumptions from a theological perspective then we run the risk of perpetuating considerable injustice within our own cultural context” (p. 57). She warns against cultural isolationism and Māori nationalism that seek to maintain the oppression of women, the poor and the different (pp. 62-63). Plane Te Paa advocates in her presentation the development of “...new paradigms of community, of partnerships and of relationships within which all can belong and where none would seek to dominate” (p. 65). Essentially, she asserts that Māori language and culture needs to be analysed theologically in terms of the gospel imperative of love.

Plane Te Paa (1998b) claims to be committed to redemptive justice, which acknowledges, forgives and reconciles past grievances and pursues the rebuilding of relationships based on mutuality, not exclusivity, and reciprocity, not insularity (p. 90). For Plane Te Paa the cultural reality in Aotearoa New Zealand involves, in her terms, “interracial interdependence.” The Treaty of Waitangi means by implication that Māori language and culture is not the exclusive preserve of only Māori but its maintenance and development is also the concern of Pākehā. Such a view is embodied in her description of St. John’s College

as a model of Treaty-based partnership which is committed to a “bicultural, bilingual teaching, learning and worshipping environment . . .” (p. 91). This model can be seen as reflecting the gospel imperatives of justice and peace.

In an article entitled *Emerging Indigenous Theological College: Aotearoa/New Zealand*, Plane Te Paa (1999) elaborates her view of the situation in the late 1990s whereby Māori have entered an era of exploring new bicultural relationships (p. 66). In other words, Māori have largely left behind the politics of grievance and protest. Despite experiences of colonial oppression and cultural genocide, Māori have worked constantly for redemptive justice, which, “requires restoration and genuine opportunity for future flourishing . . .” (p. 69). In the context of the Anglican Church’s colonial history and the constitutional changes in 1992, Plane Te Paa claims that the Church is, “now genuinely inclusive in terms of cultural diversity” (p. 71).

Plane Te Paa’s doctoral dissertation is entitled, *Contestations: Bicultural Theological Education in Aotearoa New Zealand*. In the introductory chapter, Plane Te Paa reflects on the social and political context over the last two decades or so including protest concerning the Māori language. She canvasses the place of the Treaty of Waitangi within the Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and especially the notion of bicultural development (p. 42). Plane Te Paa maintains that the gospel vision of the Church is in danger of remaining in bondage to sexism, clericalism and racism (p. 36). Furthermore, she questions the position of so-called *cultural purists* who place race identity and ethnicity at the centre at the expense of analysing injustice for the marginal and oppressed (p. 65).

In the final chapter, *Transcendent Imagination*, Plane Te Paa (2001a) challenges Māori to realise their roles as local and global citizens in a capitalist world (p. 276). Plane Te Paa explores the implications of these challenges for bicultural theological education. Indeed, she contends that the Anglican Church’s sense of theological rationality will need to prevail over identity, gender, class or sexual politics. “What must have *transcendent* consideration is the theological challenge for all to live lives of ethical solidarity, first and foremost with the oppressed. The primacy of ethics over epistemology is paramount” (p. 284). While Plane Te Paa acknowledges that the process of deconstructing the impact of colonialism upon Māori has begun, what is also needed are intentional conversations between racial groups about their commonalities (p. 286). Plane Te Paa distinguishes between *cultural prophets* and cultural purists. Cultural prophets would be able to transcend their own ethnic particularity to

give critical attention to injustice (p. 288). On the other hand, cultural purists believe in emphasising difference in terms of how students are taught (p. 294). Bicultural theological education is committed to loving one's own culture but also loving the culture of the neighbour while "rejecting the worst of all traditions" (p. 294). A major challenge is to move beyond cultural purism that is focussed on 'self' to cultural prophesy which acknowledges both 'self' and 'other.'

In another publication in the same year Plane Te Paa (2001b) describes Māori cultural purists as "anti intellectuals . . . where romanticised theologies threaten the very possibility of mutuality and interdependence in any form of partnership" (p. 287). Yet the revised Anglican Constitution, as an act of redemption, has the potential to lead toward even further reconciliation processes in the search for justice for all human beings (p. 289).

In a collection of essays called *Thinking Outside the Square: Church in Middle Earth*, Plane Te Paa (2003) elaborates further on her thesis findings in a chapter entitled On Being Te Ahorangi: An 'Underside' Experience of the Constitution of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa. In the context of theological education, she stresses the importance of transforming unjust structures. However, in a further elaboration she asserts that the, "theological undergirding of the project has to be a commitment to liberating both oppressor and oppressed from their respective and intertwined tyrannies" (p. 318). While some Anglican Māori, after constitutional revision, concentrated theologically on autonomy, others were more concerned with the promise of partnership and bicultural development (p. 325). As a social change agent, Plane Te Paa opts solidly for the latter scenario with its attendant opportunities for transformation.

In her conclusion of *Being Church: A Māori Women's Voice and Vision*, Plane Te Paa (2004) places the discourse on racial politics and bicultural education into the context of economic globalisation. "Cultural survival must not be elevated above human survival; our critique must be far more profound and penetrating – even inside our own cultural frames of reference, our conversations must be more inclusive, more generous spirited and more realistic in the face of the real global threat" (p. 41).

Almost all of the theological reflections of Māori have focussed on Aotearoa New Zealand as the primary context. A notable exception is Plane Te Paa's contribution, as a Māori theological educator, to the discussions on the Israel-Palestine conflict. Here, Plane Te Paa, as a Māori, identifies with the indigenous people of Palestine in terms of the relationship to

the land as reflected through oral traditions, and visual and performing arts (2005c, p. 259). She undertakes a brief critique of Christian Zionism in which she perceives indigenous Palestinians to be humble and Christian Zionists to be arrogant.

Plane Te Paa (2006) also reaffirms her commitment to “recognising God’s promise of unconditional inclusion of *all whom God created* as inherently good and beautiful” (p. 17). She maintains that her mission is the transformation of unjust structures which promote the exclusion of any of the children of God including gays and lesbians. Underpinning her stance is the gospel imperative of loving our neighbour. In terms of theological education Plane Te Paa asks the question: “Are we educating for liberation or we are educating [sic] for domination?” (p. 23). For her this is related to issues of justice and eliminating oppression as well as the building of strong loving relationships among diverse Christians through theological education.

7.3.2 Robert McKay

Reverend Robert McKay (2005) is from Ngāti Kahungunu, Ngāti Porou and Tainui in the eastern and central North Island. McKay aims to define Atuatanga and its place in Māori Christian theology and, “to argue a case for recovering primal Māori words and concepts and apply them to a Māori Christian worldview” (p. 5). He acknowledges that Atuatanga is a Māori Christian theology moulded by a Māori spirituality which includes Māori “language, cosmology, history and religion” (p. 5). A clear distinction is drawn, nevertheless, between the “Abrahamic God” and the ‘gods’ of the Māori world. Atuatanga can be seen as a bi-cultural construct. The four sources of Māori theology are explicitly stated: The Bible Te Paipera Tapu, Māori spirituality, modern methods of biblical scholarship and the contribution of science and philosophy (p. 6). It is not by accident that scripture is the first source as McKay maintains that this is what links Māori theology and spirituality.

A curriculum review at Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa served as a catalyst for redefining Māori Anglican theology. “The result was a decolonising of our present curriculum and the reshaping of it in such a way that it now reflects a greater level of Māori indigenisation” (p. 6). The curriculum has been deconstructed and then reconstructed so that there is now far more Māori traditional words and cultural concepts (p. 8). Decolonisation involves not only the usage of these words and concepts but also, as importantly, the removal of western cultural overlays so that Māori spirituality is able to interact directly with scripture

itself (p. 9). McKay acknowledges that western Christianity and culture have brought a number of blessings for Māori but if Māori are to develop an authentic theology then this kind of Christianity and culture will need to assume a secondary importance (p. 10). He also does not wish to deny the influence of western theology. However, he does wish to relocate this theology to the margins and to give Māori culture more mana. “Atuatanga is in favour of reclaiming our reo [language], our whakapapa [genealogy], our whakataukī [proverbs] and pūrākau [traditional stories], and also of affirming the values intrinsic to both Christianity and te ao Māori [the Māori world] (p. 11).⁴ McKay claims that such a process would lead to a more positive self-image for Māori. Yet he does warn that tikanga Māori, or Māori cultural values and practices, will need, nevertheless, to be critiqued by the gospel.

In this model McKay also places the Bible at the centre of Māori theology. He argues that the central figures are God and the children of Israel. Furthermore, he contends that, “the epic biblical story of the struggle of Moses and the children of Israel in the quest for the ‘promised land’ has been an inspiration for Māori in our own struggle for political and social justice in Aotearoa” (p. 12). He believes that Māori do not need as a priority historical western cultural interpretation but rather to dialogue directly with the people of ancient Israel. McKay signals that a challenge for Māori is to aim for a very high degree of indigenisation as revealed in pre-European thinking in a concerted effort to lift the level of authenticity (p. 13). An example is the eucharistic liturgy, *Te Whakawhetai me te Whakamoemiti*, in *A New Zealand Prayer Book* (Church of the Province of New Zealand, 1989, pp. 476-490).

McKay asserts that the main aim of Māori theology “...is to give glory to God in the way we live and in the way we treat one another” (p. 14). Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa has selected ten values or priorities from the Māori world that include whakapapa or genealogy, reo or Māori language, wairuatanga or spirituality and whanaungatanga or relationships. He maintains, “...that the enculturation of Christian values with Māori values is an effective way of making the Christian message relevant for Māori today” (pp. 15-16). Ecclesiologically speaking, Māori were marginalised early in the history of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand. It has only been under the new Constitution in 1992 that the Māori Anglican Church is now well placed to undertake theological processes that better serve the needs of Māori.

⁴ The English translations of the Māori words in the brackets are mine.

7.3.3 Summary

Jenny Plane Te Paa has discerned that in a post modern world there is a diversity of Christian Māori theological realities. She has argued that, if the cultural imperative dominates the gospel imperative, there will be a greater risk of racism, sexism, heterosexualism and clericalism in the Anglican Church. Plane Te Paa maintains that Māori Anglican theology is always engaged for the oppressed and the reconstruction of justice and peace. Otherwise, such a theology runs the danger of cultural isolationism and Māori nationalism that will continue to oppress women, the poor, and the marginalised. In contrast to McKay, who has emphasised decolonisation of Māori theology, Plane Te Paa makes a stronger case for Christian ethics to be of much greater importance than Māori epistemology. For her the challenge for all Māori Anglican theological education institutions will be to conduct such decolonising processes in ways that are empowering and honour the gospel imperatives of aroha, justice and peace.

7.4. Māori Language and Cultural Regeneration

Māori spirituality was originally expressed through the Māori language in processes which resonated with Māori cultural values. Ecclesiologically speaking, the evangelism, teaching and fellowship of early missionaries occurred through the medium of this language and culture. Much of the theological education of Māori took place in the same way. Clearly, Māori spirituality, ecclesiology and theological education in the nineteenth century were interconnected and interdependent with Māori language and culture before assimilative church and state policies and practices eroded these resources protected under the Treaty of Waitangi (Nicholson, 2000, p. 49).

7.4.1 Māori Marsden

Marsden's theological reflections were referred to earlier in this review as foundational in terms of contemporary Māori Christian theology. According to Marsden, processes of colonisation led to cultural genocide which, “. . . produces spiritual and psychological insecurity . . .” as cited in (Royal, 2003, p. 39). Deliberate church and government policies and practices, which were aimed at assimilation, attempted to overpower Māori language and culture (p. 132). Between 1900 and 1960, there was a huge loss of such language and culture. It is Marsden's view that, “. . . it only seems fair that the perpetrators of cultural genocide upon the Māori should help now in the means of recovering their culture . . .” (p. 132). This is

seen as a step in the direction of real partnership and bicultural development which captures the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi (p. 139).

7.4.2 Rangi Nicholson

Māori language and culture are important sources of Māori Christian theology (Nicholson, 1996a, p. 37). In *Theological Perspectives on the Revitalisation of the Māori Language*, I assert that “Māori experiences of linguistic oppression and empowerment in Aotearoa-New Zealand are the theological starting point . . .” (Nicholson, 1996b, p. 30). I argue that the erosion of Māori language has been a very painful aspect of colonisation. “Māori speak of God in the context of linguistic and cultural brokenness” (p. 31). Yet it was God who created the Māori language and culture as a means of Māori glorifying the Creator (p. 33). I draw attention to Psalm 85, which asks whether God will be involved in revival and revitalisation processes so that God’s people may be joyful. Ecclesiology will support such processes.

In *Māori Language Revitalisation and Pastoral Counselling* the theological starting point is linguistic oppression and empowerment but this time from the perspective of “the political contribution of pastoral counselling to the revitalisation of the Māori language” (Nicholson, 1995, p. 1). Knowledge of te reo is perceived as being necessary for Māori wholeness and for full participation in their own culture (p. 4). This essay explores possible new Māori ministries and a holistic vision of Māori language pastoral counselling in which Māori are seen to possess “a wealth of undiscovered and undeveloped Māori language and culture assets and resources” (p. 6). For Māori Christians it also provides an opportunity to deepen and vitalise their relationships with a Māori speaking God, Jesus Christ and Holy Spirit. Such counselling would aim to work constructively through language crises and problems in order to bring healing to the culturally dysfunctional and broken either individually or in group situations (p. 7). For major Māori language revitalisation to take place, it will be necessary to return te reo to the home, family, neighbourhood and community. “It is in this context that pastoral counselling could make a significant contribution by providing social, cultural and spiritual guidance and practical support for older adolescents, young couples and families as well as kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa students and staff” (p. 9).

My master’s thesis in linguistics, *Hei Tīmatanga Kōrero: Māori Language Regeneration and Mihinare Clergy*, reviews some of the historical highlights of the Anglican Church’s relationship with the Māori language including the development of an orthography, or writing

system, print literacy, church conferences and meetings, schools, tertiary institutions and the Young Māori Party. A significant part of the research involved interviewing twelve senior Māori clergy who shared their experiences of the church and Māori language. There were also three recommendations on how the Anglican Church might contribute to Māori language regeneration (Nicholson, 2000, pp. 3-4). The first recommendation was to establish an archive where recordings of Māori speaking elders would be stored (pp. 154-155). The second was to develop Māori language church services to be held in Māori Anglican homes as well as pastoral care for such Māori speaking homes. The Church could publish Bible and Christian stories in Māori as well as produce videos, CDs and various computer programmes not only for these homes but also for Māori language medium and other educational institutions (pp. 155-157). The third recommendation was to appoint a Church committee “to promote the Church’s language vision, to plan and recommend policies, to lobby appropriate bodies and to organise the Church’s language regeneration programme” (p. 160.).

In Mā Te Mahi Ka Kitea: Brief Reflections on the Māori Language Courses of Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa, written when I held the position of Director of Māori Language Development at Te Taapapa ki Te Manawa o Te Wheke, the campus of Te Whare Wānanga in Rotorua, I began by reviewing concerns expressed about the Māori language curriculum for the Whare Wānanga that was originally designed for a tribal situation (Nicholson, 2003, p. 43). The review proposed that a group of course stakeholders discuss the learning outcomes of the courses. This group could include students and community members (p. 44). In addition, learning in a Māori language immersion situation and diverse student language competencies as well as regular classes or distance education options are examined. As a result of this research I contend that, in the Māori Anglican context, every language learner is potentially a Māori language regeneration theologian. It is argued, “Te Whare Wānanga may wish to discuss the possibility of including contextual and theological studies as part of its Māori language programme” (p. 46). There is also an initial attempt to draw connections between Māori language and Atuatanga or Māori Christian theology as well as Awhi Whānau or Māori social services and Minitatanga or Māori ministry studies.

7.4.3 Muru Walters

With the arrival of *A New Zealand Prayer Book* in 1989 Muru Walters (1995b) concedes that the liturgy became more contextual including the recognition of Māori as an official language

(p. 86). A presentation by Walters (1996) at a national conference on Māori language in 1995 also reviewed the development of Māori language liturgies (pp. 72-74). In a journal article in 1998 entitled *Mihingare and Karakia Māori: an Anglican Perspective on Māori Religious Incantations* Walters (1998) examines Māori Anglican prayers to conclude that they are genuinely indigenous (p. 80). He makes a distinction between traditional incantations, which are a form of ancient language that has been transmitted from one generation to another, and Christian prayers that empower people to take part in worship (p. 81).

7.4.4 Peter Wensor

The most substantial writing on Māori language and cultural liturgy occurs in the master's thesis in theology written by the Reverend Peter Wensor from Ngāpuhi in North Auckland. From the outset, Wensor contends that Māori language is a central part of Māori theology (p. 7). The review of Anglican Church history confirms the aim of early translators in their use of the Māori language to depict the God (p. ii). He also explores how literary devices in an oral tradition can be shaped for written communication and how grammatical structures are employed in the written text to construct Māori theology. In focussing on a Māori language liturgy in *A New Zealand Prayer Book*, he arrives at the conclusion that God is Māori in a way that represents a synthesis of Māori, Christian and Anglican traditions (p. 84).

At the time this thesis is going to print, Wensor's doctoral thesis is being prepared to be submitted for examination early in 2010. The working title of his thesis is *The creation of new Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa liturgical theologies as in the te reo Māori liturgical texts*.

7.4.5 Jenny Plane Te Paa

In terms of theological education, the Church Mission Society (CMS) in the early to mid nineteenth century sought to train prospective ordination candidates mostly through the use of Māori (Plane Te Paa, 1995, p. 41). However, Bishop Selwyn at St. John's College "reasoned that in order for Māori to become fully "anglicised" then instruction in the elements of the English language was imperative" (p. 47). When Māori theological students shifted to the original Te Rau Kahikatea located in Gisborne in 1883, those Māori students whose knowledge of English was restricted were taught completely in the Māori language by tutors who were fluent speakers. However, those who were competent speakers of English, unlike their fellow Māori students, were encouraged to sit the Grade examinations organised by the Anglican Church's Board of Theological Studies (p. 14). When Te Rau Kahikatea College

was closed in 1921, Māori students were enrolled at St. John's College in Auckland but their ministry training needs in terms of Māori language, culture, worship and community interaction were not met in the curricula offered at this college (pp. 88, 98). Despite repeated attempts to change this assimilative, inequitable situation over almost forty years, it was only in the 1960s that part-time short courses were offered in Māori language and tradition (p. 17).

As a result of urban migration in the 1950s and 1960s Māori advocated strongly in the 1970s and 1980s for changes to the employment, housing, education and justice policies and practices of the government. The Anglican Church did not remain unaffected by what Plane Te Paa described as Māori nationalism. In 1968 Reverend Kingi Ihaka (later Archdeacon Sir) also vigorously promulgated the need for all clergy to be educated in Māori language and culture (p. 112). Two years later the General Synod confirmed this need for the training of all ordinands (p. 114). As a result, the Reverend John Tamahori, (later Canon), joined the St. John's College staff as a Fellow in Māori Studies in 1971, and then as a Lecturer in Māori and Pacific Studies in 1975. However, Māori Studies was an optional subject and lacked the mana of other courses. In 1983 Mr. Muru Walters was appointed full-time Lecturer in Māori Studies.

In 1984 General Synod, as a consequence of Māori challenges, set up a "Commission Focussed on the Treaty of Waitangi and its implications for development of the Anglican Church in New Zealand" (p. 127). After extensive consultation with both Māori and Pākehā Anglicans throughout Aotearoa New Zealand, this Commission produced a report which contained a number of recommendations (p. 128) on the place of Māori language and culture in the education of ordinands and clergy. St. John's College was expected to take seriously these recommendations adopted by General Synod as resolutions.

Plane Te Paa asserts that while Māori language and cultural papers became compulsory, essentially the core theological curriculum and teaching pedagogy remained largely mono-cultural in the early 1990s (p. 131). As a consequence of input from Māori staff, especially Walters, and students, some of the courses began to adopt a more bicultural flavour. Yet as Plane Te Paa comments "it could be asserted that the compulsory Māori Studies papers were primarily of benefit to mono-cultural Pākehā students" (p. 131). A Bicultural Education Commission, established in 1988 to design "programmes within the Church of the Province for a better understanding of the meaning and practice of partnership and bicultural development on basic principles for race relations for the Church in this country" (p. 129),

reported to General Synod in 1992 that bicultural education could distract Māori from pursuing their own agenda for emancipation (p. 132).

Besides Te Paipera Tapu, or the Holy Bible, a major resource for Māori theological training up to the 1980s was *Te Rāwiri*, a Māori language version of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, which was first published in 1839, as mentioned in Chapter One (Plane Te Paa, 2006, p. 343).⁵ The chanting of Psalms drew upon the oral traditions of Māori. “The texts of Rāwiri, or David, were contextually perfect, for here were found the petitions and pleas of God’s people for help and relief from distress...” (p. 344). Several generations of Māori derived comfort from such a resource. It was in 1989, however, that *A New Zealand Prayer Book* was published which was received well especially by urban Māori who appreciated the major use of Māori language in orders of service. Besides reinforcing the Māori language regeneration movement, many Māori were also attracted by the poetic use of te reo in the liturgies. “Once the Prayer Book became more widely distributed, discussed, and experienced liturgically most Māori Anglicans reacted extremely favourably and with deep gratitude for the very liberal use of Māori language as well as for its exceptional quality” (p. 346).

7.4.6 Tui Cadigan

The Anglican Church is the context of the above discussion on Māori language and cultural regeneration. Tui Cadigan, however, reviews the place of the Māori language in the Catholic Church initially by acknowledging that te reo has “an intrinsic spiritual dimension” which is being diminished by contemporary Māori generally (Cadigan, 1998, p. 46). For Christian Māori the Māori language can be “spiritually uplifting” (p. 66). Despite Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Māori experienced loss of their language (p. 106). The domination of English provided the foundation for Pākehā cultural perspectives to prevail in all aspects of religious life (p. 151). Such linguistic domination has, according to Cadigan, been present in generations of Pākehā, “. . .nourished by a sense of superiority and a need to control” (p. 152). She believes that it is very important to retain te reo for cultural identity as well as for communicating meaningfully and deeply with God, ancestors, people and the land. She also maintains that it is difficult to discuss Māori spirituality given the state of Māori language loss (Cadogan, 2002, p. 144).

⁵ See p. 12

7.4.7 Perspectives of Other Māori Theologians

Most Māori theologians place a high value on Māori language and culture. Tiki Raumati (2000) maintains that Māori language “. . . is the very soul of my being. It confirms for me who and what, and where and why. It is also the mystery of my being” (p. 91). Te Waaka Melbourne (2000) asserts that the Māori language is the heart of the Māori culture (p. 87). Indeed, he quotes a Māori proverb, which essentially says that the culture is the flowers of a plant and the language is the roots. If the flowers are cut, the roots die and vice versa (p. 88). Whakahuihui Vercoe (1999) also maintains that Māori culture has been seriously endangered. “If nourishment cannot flow from the roots to the leaves, the plant will die: if the nutrients of Māoridom cannot find expression upon the Marae, then this culture will surely die” (p. 1). In his discussion of the foreshore and seabed controversy, Eru Potaka-Dewes (2005) outlines a sad situation where the Crown has redefined Māori language terms to suit its own culture (p. 57). Unlike this situation, Robert McKay (2005) believes that Māori Christian theology wishes to recover Māori language and culture as well as support Christian values (p. 11). Jenny Plane Te Paa (2003) asserts, however, that any process of cultural recovery will need to be ethical and not oppressive. She takes a stronger stand than McKay in that she advocates the primacy of the gospel imperative (p. 329).

7.4.8 Summary

Māori Marsden asserts that colonisation led to cultural genocide. According to Marsden, if the Anglican Church believes in the gospel imperative of justice, then the Church should assist regensis processes but that this will require courage, sacrifice and powersharing. Moreover, I claim that it was God who created the Māori language and culture for Māori to be whole people able to glorify the Creator. In terms of pastoral care, healing the culturally dysfunctional and broken can occur through counselling. I make three major recommendations to the Church which range from the recording of Māori speaking elders to supporting Māori language in Anglican homes through to the establishment of a Church committee for regensis planning, policymaking and practice. My contention is that there is potential to develop every Anglican Māori learner of Māori language into a regensis theologian.

Muru Walters explores the use of Māori language in the context of worship. From a liturgical perspective, Peter Wensor confirms the centrality of te reo Māori in theology. Jenny Plane Te

Paa explores the history of the Māori language at theological training institutions. She examines the impact of regensis on the Anglican Church in the 1970s and 1980s. She also reviews the Māori response to Māori language liturgical resources. Plane Te Paa also places priority on ethical regensis processes. In addition, several other Anglican Māori clergy express their view that Māori language and culture is to be highly valued. From a Catholic standpoint, Tui Cadigan affirms most of these Anglican regensis positions.

7.5. Concluding Remarks

With a few exceptions, Christian Māori theologians have only started to write explicit theological reflections over the last fifteen years. The diversity of their selected topics and tribal and geographic contexts is a major feature of this literature. In my reading of their writings from the point of view of the thesis topic, I chose to concentrate on four major themes, namely, Māori spirituality, Māori ecclesiology, Māori theological education and Māori language and cultural regensis. These interconnected themes will serve as lenses in the next chapter through which to view the Anglican Church's policies and practice concerning Māori language and cultural regensis.

The writings of Māori Marsden, Henare Tate, Te Waaka Melbourne and Eru Potaka- Dewes have proven to be foundational. A later generation, including Manuka Henare, Jack Papuni, Turi Hollis and Tui Cadigan, has effectively built upon these foundations. Male Māori theologians, Bill Tuhiwai and Whakahuihui Vercoe, have usefully surveyed the cultural and spiritual position of Māori women. Others like Wiremu Kaa, Don Tamihere and Wayne Te Kaawa face their history to draw upon earlier Māori theologies in revealing and creative ways. Hone Kaa, Cadigan and Moeawa Callaghan make separate helpful connections with liberation theology. Moreover, Henare warns against the dangers of tribal and cultural essentialism as well as culturalism and denominationalism.

Bold, liberating transformation from imperialist to indigenous ecclesiology has steadily occurred over almost two hundred years. Māori theologians, such as Henare, Callaghan, Cadigan and Te Kaawa together with Jenny Plane Te Paa, Hone Kaa and Robert Kereopa, have focussed on the tradition of their respective churches. Each of these commentators brings a unique ecclesiological contribution which together produces a colonial and indigenous church weaving. Woven into this fabric is the history of the development of Māori theological education by Plane Te Paa and Robert McKay. Like the wider church,

theological educational institutions face the dangers of racism, sexism, heterosexualism, clericalism, cultural isolationism and Māori nationalism. As decolonisation processes continue, the challenge will be to honour the gospel imperatives of aroha, justice and peace in all these contexts. A critical aspect of decolonisation is, of course, Māori language and cultural regensis. Marsden, Cadigan, Plane Te Paa and I alongside Muru Walters and Peter Wensor concentrate on various facets of this subject.

In the previous chapter I surveyed diverse viewpoints on Treaty of Waitangi debates which have been described as highly varied, contextual and contested. As the number of Māori theologians expands and their literature increases, there is also beginning to appear a complex theological picture in terms of variety, contextuality and contestation. I now move on to the next chapter where I will construct Treaty and Māori theological lenses through which to view a synthesis of regensis policy and practice.

Chapter 8. Synthesis

The Treaty of Waitangi was very much at the centre of innovative Anglican Māori language and cultural regeneration policy in 1986. Since the Anglican Church's constitutional changes in 1992, the two major partners have repositioned themselves concerning the Treaty. The implementation of this regeneration policy has resulted in practice which was not originally envisaged. This chapter reviews the Māori language and cultural policy and practice data of the Anglican Church through contemporary bicultural Treaty partnership and Māori theological lenses. First, it synthesises the Church's policies and the critical responses of twenty-five senior stakeholders from the three Tikanga to these policies to discern emergent trends. Second, it synthesises contemporary political, economic and constitutional debates in the public square, centred on Treaty notions of partnership and biculturalism. Third, seven major issues emerge from these debates as lenses through which to critique the policy and practice of the Anglican Church in terms of each Standing Resolution. As a result there are a number of trends which become apparent. Fourth, it synthesises a review of contemporary Māori theologies, giving heed to the four main themes: Māori spirituality, Māori ecclesiology, Māori theological education and Māori language and cultural regeneration. Fifth, a new regeneration theological framework unfolds to serve as another lens through which to critique Anglican policy and practice as further trends become evident.

8.1. Synthesis of Māori Language and Cultural Policy and Practice

The Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand has been involved in processes of implicit and explicit Māori language and cultural policymaking since 1814 when the gospel was first preached. CMS missionaries made a series of policy decisions in the early nineteenth century which included the development of a Māori language orthography, or writing system, and the subsequent introduction of Māori print literacy. Māori language and culture were perceived as tools for mission and ministry. Later, the Church produced Māori language periodicals and held church and educational conferences conducted in Māori. It also used Māori language as a medium of instruction at its Māori theological college as well as taught Māori as a subject at its Māori church secondary schools. Prior to the Second World War the focus for the Church was using the Māori language among Māori who were mostly native or first language speakers of te reo. A shift to speaking English rather than Māori became more noticeable in

the 1930s when teaching of te reo in church schools began to become the norm. Forty years later such Māori language courses started at St John's College in the mid 1970s. The report of the Bicultural Commission of the Anglican Church on the Treaty of Waitangi (1986) included several recommendations on Māori language, parts of which subsequently became Standing Resolutions of General Synod. These Resolutions appear to have been subsumed by the 1992 Constitution. Each Tikanga is now responsible for organising its affairs within its own cultural group parameters. Therefore they are able to make their own Māori language and cultural policies. Indeed the current situation within the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia concerning these policies is fluid and dynamic. I now synthesise these four bicultural Standing Resolutions and the mission Standing Resolution of General Synod across all three Tikanga in order to discern any emergent trends.

8.1.1 Ordination Training

The Standing Resolution on ordination training aimed to increase the knowledge of Māori language and culture among ordinands, or future clerical leaders, to a level where they would be able competently to lead church services in Māori on marae and elsewhere. Since 1986 Māori have taken courses in Māori language and culture at St. John's College and at Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa. It is questionable, however, whether these courses have been able to produce the level of competency, or fluency and confidence, which was originally envisaged. Most of this training, which has been introductory, has not been closely monitored. For many it has been supplemented by training in the field. Experienced clergy have mentored ordinands or the newly ordained in the church, at the marae or in the home. Most of those Māori interviewed were keen to retain the intention of this Standing Resolution as part of the bicultural development validated by the Anglican Church's 1992 Constitution. Some Māori perceive Māori language and culture, as well as Mihinare theology, as the gifts of Māori to the Anglican Church and even the wider church. While the foundations have been laid over the last twenty years, a great deal more still needs to be accomplished.

As for Tikanga Pākehā Anglicans, it is clear that only a few clergy have reached the levels of competency originally envisaged. For these clergy most of their Māori language and cultural knowledge was acquired as the result of working full-time in Tikanga Māori contexts. The new constitutional arrangements since 1992 have greatly limited the opportunities for Māori mission and ministry within Tikanga Pākehā. The introductory nature of Māori language and

cultural courses at St. John's College has also influenced the situation. Despite these constraints, it has been estimated by one well-placed informant that about a quarter of Tikanga Pākehā clergy, initially trained at St. John's College, would be interested in in-service training in Māori language and culture. Just how much Māori language they would wish to learn and whether there would be also a desire for immersion training is uncertain. Low actual usage of Māori language at different cultural settings, both Māori and Pākehā, raises questions concerning whether partnership and bicultural development are perceived as being important at the parish level. The other side of the coin is whether they are questions more rhetorical than real, raised only at provincial church meetings such as General Synod. Clearly there is a wide range of Tikanga Pākehā contexts. Those more likely to be sympathetic would tend to be located in regions with a higher percentage of Māori. If there is a demand, appropriate guidelines for ministry and laity training would need to take cognisance of such diversity. It is interesting to note that while all Pākehā informants wished to retain the Standing Resolution, there did not appear to be any major agreement as to how it might be implemented.

Until relatively recently there has not been a strong Pacific Island Anglican presence in Aotearoa New Zealand. This might account for the fact that Tikanga Pasifika students have not been expected to study Māori language and culture. With the emergence of congregations in Aotearoa New Zealand under the auspices of the Diocese of Polynesia, and the appointment of a bishop to encourage the development of mission and ministry, there exists the potential for some attention to be paid to Māori and their language and culture. While two informants were in favour of retaining this Standing Resolution, one wished for a new Standing Resolution which acknowledged the spirit of partnership.

8.1.2 Use of the Māori Language

The Standing Resolution on the use of Māori language has two major parts; one focusses on the acquisition of Māori words by English speakers and the other encourages Māori speakers to suggest the substitution of useful Māori words and to correct any misuse of such words. In reviewing what has occurred over the last twenty years or more, most Māori informants agreed that there had been an increase in the number of Māori words spoken by English speakers. Māori are perceived to be more enthusiastic than Pākehā. A further distinction was the context. It was more likely that an increase would occur at the provincial level rather than the parish level. It was acknowledged that there was some increase in listening to and

speaking Māori words. There was not the same increase in writing with the exception of *A New Zealand Prayer Book* (1989). It appears there has been very little substitution of Māori words with several notable special cases such as the names of prominent provincial bodies, for instance, Te Kotahitanga. Such efforts are simply the token use of Māori or symbolic flourishes. There are far more important regeneration priorities for an endangered language such as Māori. This may, in part, account for the mixed responses of the Māori interviewees about the retention of this Standing Resolution. As for the correction of English speakers, there was some disagreement about the extent of such correction. However, the need for compassion and encouragement, if speakers were corrected, was advocated.

There was agreement among Pākehā informants that there had been an increase in the use of Māori words. Overall, however, there has been little Māori language used in Tikanga Pākehā church services except for a few notable exceptions. The acquisition of liturgical Māori has been limited in most Pākehā contexts. Furthermore, cautionary notes were sounded that any language needed to be understood by the congregation, including migrants. As for the correction of English speakers, there is a need for culturally sensitive training or coaching. Most informants are in favour of retaining the main thrust of the Resolution with the emphasis more on compassionately assisting Pākehā than on correction of Māori language or enriching English.

According to Pasifika informants, there has been little observable Māori language vocabulary increase in everyday speech and writing. Again there have been some notable exceptions. In their view most Pākehā tend to use only familiar Māori words. While there has been a low level of acquisition, there has been a growing sense of critical awareness in terms of te reo being an important contributor to national identity, albeit in a tokenistic manner. The assessment of these Pasifika observers is that Tikanga Pākehā has much work to do in the area of not only acquisition but also status and critical awareness. Their experiences of Māori speakers correcting others have been relatively rare. However, they do advocate the need for sensitivity in any such processes. Overall, there was support for replacing this Standing Resolution with another one which is better worded and captures the spirit of partnership.

8.1.3 Kōhanga Reo

In the Standing Resolution on kōhanga reo there is an attempt to encourage churches to make their properties available for pre-school and adult language programmes. Parents, who are

English speakers, are also encouraged to consider an involvement in kōhanga reo. A review of what has happened over the last twenty years or so reveals that few Māori language courses were located at Māori churches. An exception would be Māori language courses organised by Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa. It was acknowledged that there were a considerable number of Māori parents, native speakers of English, who actively participated at kōhanga reo. In the view of Māori informants, the involvement of Pākehā was minimal. Language acquisition is the principal focus of this Resolution. In addition, there are questions involving status and critical awareness in terms of the advantages that could be accrued from taking part in a Māori language pre-school and the need for recognising that kōhanga reo represented a relatively fragile regeneration innovation in 1986. Overall, most Māori informants felt that not a great deal would be lost if this Resolution was deleted. There may be other means of encouraging Anglican Māori to increase their commitment to kōhanga reo and other Māori language medium educational institutions.

Again, for Anglican Pākehā, few instances of pre-school or adult Māori language courses were able to be cited. Little evidence exists that Pākehā wished to be involved in acquisition at this level. One of the reasons given for this situation was the low social status of the Māori language. It is not surprising that there was considerable support for a review of this Resolution due to a changing educational and cultural environment. If encouragement is a central focus, there may be a need for other promotional processes which raise the status of te reo.

Pasifika informants were mainly unaware of any Anglican communities which had made their facilities available. They were cognisant of the fact that some Anglican Pākehā do not wish to learn the Māori language and culture or indeed to share their resources. Tikanga Pasifika observers realise that trust and patience are required for progress to be made.

8.1.4 Māori Language Programmes

There are two main sections to the Standing Resolution on Māori language programmes. The first recommends that all educational bodies associated with the Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand accept the study of Māori language as an essential element in the curriculum. The second urges the inclusion of teaching programmes at suitable levels which explore the principles of partnership and bicultural development as well as exploring the words and

expressions used by the General Synod Bicultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi. In addition, knowledge of marae kawa, or marae protocol, is strongly recommended.

Most of the Māori informants were not able to review what has been happening in Tikanga Pākehā educational bodies over the last two decades or so. Those who did comment felt that the responses of such bodies had been largely minimal and tokenistic. In contrast, Māori educational bodies, not surprisingly, had embraced the teaching of Māori language at all levels although there was some concern about the quality of the teaching. While the acquisition of Māori was endorsed by these bodies, there were no references made to actual usage of the language beyond the classroom walls. As for the latter part of the Resolution concerning partnership and bicultural development, there was little knowledge of Tikanga Pākehā situations although several informants did confirm that Māori institutions focussed on these subjects. There was an acknowledgement that it was one thing to be critically aware, and something else to actually act. Overall, there seems to have been an increase in the understanding of Anglicans concerning marae protocol. While most were in favour of retaining the Resolution, there was a concern that it be promoted to achieve further progress. Suggestions for improving the Resolution ranged from more focus on implementation in the new constitutional context to using more recently developed resources.

Pākehā informants tend to believe that the response of their educational bodies in terms of teaching Māori language has been minimal. Any efforts to promote an increase in such teaching would need to be carefully thought out and dependent on the context. As for lifting the awareness of partnership and bicultural development, again there appears to have been a minimalist approach although there is importance attached to the Treaty of Waitangi and its principles. Overall, there appears to be a good deal of support for retaining this Resolution and for diverse initiatives to implement it.

From a Pasifika perspective there is support for the teaching of Māori in Anglican Church educational institutions in Aotearoa New Zealand. Leadership is seen as a critical factor in Tikanga Pākehā. There is a case for visionary and action orientated courses that provide bicultural training for Pākehā leaders. There appears to be a need for a frank dialogue with Pākehā to ascertain their feelings about priorities. As for the amount of teaching about the principles of partnership and bicultural development in Tikanga Pasifika institutions, little was proffered by these informants. Support was evident for an increased understanding of

marae protocol. Overall, Tikanga Pasifika was in favour of retaining this Resolution with the proviso that it be implemented at the discretion of each partner.

8.1.5 Principles of Mission

The focus of the worldwide Anglican Church Resolution is mission: evangelism, teaching, baptism and nurture, loving service, transforming unjust structures and safeguarding and renewing creation. It is clear from the response of the Māori informants that there is a diverse range of perspectives on mission. Evangelism through the medium of te reo Māori in a variety of Māori contexts is still a priority for the majority of these informants. How new believers might be taught and nurtured is an issue which elicited different responses. These ranged from giving attention to Māori language medium educational institutions, such as kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa, to encouraging Pākehā to give more status to Māori language and culture. Such diversity also extended to loving service in terms of defining aroha and its practical outworking by both Māori and Pākehā. The latter involved social service organisations. There are regensis dimensions in each of these mission areas. Changing linguistic and cultural injustice means, in terms of regensis, that attention is paid to increasing the acquisition, usage, status, critical awareness and quality of te reo.

Transforming unjust structures, which oppress Māori language and culture, requires that the Māori Anglican Church has the resources to undertake such a task. If Tikanga Pākehā were wishing to develop reconciliation further between the two partners, they could contribute to such transformation. As for protecting and renewing the environment, there was considerable support. This also included viewing reo and tikanga as part of God's creation.

It is clear from the response of Pākehā informants that evangelism can take place through the medium of Māori language and culture. Whether this would occur outside Tikanga Māori contexts is uncertain. If the low level response concerning teaching, baptism and nurture is any indication, there appears to be little support for Māori language evangelism in Tikanga Pākehā churches. Loving service through their social service agencies might involve Māori language and cultural regensis especially in responding to the needs of Māori. A diverse range of perspectives concerning the process of transforming unjust structures seems to be the most promising aspect of mission. Such transformation would involve concerted status and critical awareness planning as priorities with acquisition and usage of te reo as secondary developments. While there was some acknowledgement of Māori worldviews on creation, only one informant made an explicit link with reo and tikanga.

For most Anglican Pacific Islanders, Māori language and culture is not part of their mission. While there was an observation that it is important for Tikanga Māori and for partnership with Tikanga Pākehā, it is only considered relevant for those Tikanga Pasifika churches located in Aotearoa New Zealand. Issues of linguistic and cultural justice do not appear to receive much attention. Like Tikanga Pākehā, a focus initially on status and critical awareness and then on acquisition and usage may be possible in the future in this country. However, any developments will occur when Tikanga Pasifika deem these appropriate.

8.1.6 Emergent Trends

As a result of the synthesis of Anglican Church policy and the responses to this policy by twenty-five senior decision makers from the three major cultural groupings, several major trends have emerged. Tikanga Māori interviewees overall appear to be committed to the retention and future development of Māori language and culture. While there was some acknowledgement that the Anglican Church has laid foundations over the last twenty years, there is still a great deal of regensis work to be completed. Māori language and cultural delivery systems are still generally perceived to be a relatively important priority for mission and ministry. There appears to be less consensus, however, concerning how such systems might be constructed and operationalised.

By contrast, Māori language and culture is considered to be a low priority by Tikanga Pākehā in their mission and ministry in the twenty-first century. In spite of some prominent exceptions, acquisition and usage of te reo in most Pākehā church settings appears to be minimal. This is confirmed by observers from the other two Tikanga who would also describe Pākehā responses as being largely tokenistic. On the credit side, both Tikanga acknowledge the growth in Pākehā knowledge of marae kawa or marae protocol. There is also some Tikanga Pākehā support for the teaching and learning of Māori language and culture by Pākehā students and clergy persons. The general trend, however, would be for Pākehā to give priority to promoting the status of te reo and raising critical awareness in terms of transforming unjust structures which impede regensis.

As for Tikanga Pasifika, Māori language and culture is generally not part of their mission and ministry work. Nevertheless, as this Tikanga becomes more established in Aotearoa New Zealand, the potential exists for greater attention to be paid to te reo and tikanga. Moreover, there is also support from this Tikanga for Anglican bicultural educational programmes not

only for students but also for church leaders from Tikanga Pākehā. The priority for Anglican Pacific Islanders would seem to be similar to that of Pākehā in that consideration could be initially given to status and critical awareness planning. It needs to be noted that this cultural grouping is particularly explicit that any future developments will need to occur at the discretion of each Tikanga when deemed appropriate.

The Anglican Church has Treaty obligations and gospel responsibilities. It is, therefore, highly appropriate to view and critique this synthesis of Anglican Church regeneration policy and practice and its emergent trends through both bicultural Treaty partnership and Māori theological lenses. In this next section I synthesise the concepts of partnership and biculturalism in the public square as part of the process of constructing the first lens.

8.2. Synthesis of Partnership and Biculturalism in the Public Square

The Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia has chosen to embody the Treaty in its Constitution. It has been placed at the centre in terms of the Church's corporate ethos and policymaking. When I ventured beyond the church doors into the public square, I discovered that the Anglican Church, like Treaty educators and the Māori Party, is exceptional in the amount of attention that it gives to the Treaty. Partnership and biculturalism have proven to be critical indicators of how seriously Māori and the Crown perceive the Treaty. Bicultural Treaty partnership between Māori and the Crown is highly varied, contextual and contested in the twenty-first century. Therefore it is not surprising that there are several unresolved debates.

A fundamental debate has been whether the Treaty ought to be also central to the policy and practice of the Crown. A major debate has centred on the degree to which partnership is transparent, authentic, equal and equitable. Another significant debate has taken place around the speed at which transformation should occur. Principal debates on biculturalism have concentrated on whether symbolism is more important than resource allocation and whether multiculturalism is now a priority. Yet another debate has begun about the future shape of bicultural partnership.

8.2.1 Partnership

The Crown, the Waitangi Tribunal and the courts have gradually recognised the principle of partnership over the last twenty years in ways which expect reasonableness, good faith and

trust. Some senior Pākehā politicians including cabinet ministers, however, have declared that partnership is a very unfortunate or dangerous word because it leads to unrealistic expectations which are unable to be practically implemented. The views of these politicians regarding partnership are reflected by other Pākehā especially some of those involved in business or concerned about the management of public resources.

For most Māori, the Treaty of Waitangi is at the centre or near the centre in terms of policy and practice. It is still regarded as binding on both parties, Māori and the Crown, who are clarifying whether Māori self-determination or tino rangatiratanga in Article Two means “two sovereignties.” If such sovereignties are recognised, then partnership will need to be remodelled constitutionally to achieve structural change and power sharing. In contrast, for most conservative Pākehā politicians and lawyers the Treaty remains at the margins. It is the elected government which decides on the nature of partnership between Māori and the Crown. Some Pākehā, however, do acknowledge the covenantal nature of Treaty partnership.

A major problem is the low level of transparency around the concept of partnership. One of the difficulties is the question of the identity of the Crown. Is this the government and the courts? Or is it Pākehā, or all other non-Māori New Zealanders including Pākehā? Have only Māori and Pākehā elites been involved to date rather than all New Zealanders? Implicit in the thinking of some Māori is that partnership with the Crown is in reality a partnership with non-Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand. There is a need for a greater level of transparency concerning who are the partners. There is also a need for much more transparency regarding the legal roles and responsibilities of each partner in terms of joint decision-making, policy-making and power sharing.

Authentic partnership inevitably involves real consultation and power sharing. For some Pākehā, such consultation and power sharing would depend on the context. Māori decision-making regarding international economic agreements, or immigration, or foreign policy, would appear to fall mostly outside the scope of this kind of power sharing and consultation. A seemingly small minority of non-Māori commentators, however, would welcome Māori participation in even these areas of policy-making. It is not surprising that many Māori claim that it is the Crown which imposes its own constraints on any concept of partnership in a continuance of colonisation. Any suggestions that such a partnership is equal is referred to by some Māori as an “illusion” or a “fantasy” when the Crown perceives itself to be the dominant senior partner and Māori to be the minor junior one.

A number of Māori also advocate equal and equitable economic partnership. Some Pākehā commentators have raised the issue that neo-tribal capitalism driven by neo-liberal economic policies ironically risks remarginalising Treaty rights. One way that this occurs is through decontextualisation which ignores the huge range of Māori contexts. Such decontextualisation attempts to separate the economic from the social, cultural and spiritual. The Crown, through economic treaties, exposes Māori to being exploited by powerful international investors and transnational incorporations. Under the Treaty equitable economic partnership would offer the opportunity to moderate the consequences of such neoliberalism.

Five years after the enactment of the foreshore and seabed legislation by the government, this controversy continues to strain Māori and Crown relationships. The emergence of the Māori Party and their achievement of winning five Māori parliamentary seats at the last election in 2008 are visible signs of Māori discontent with this situation and their desire for transformation. The most recent controversy, which occurred in 2009, involves Māori representation on the new Auckland local body. Clearly Māori are still involved in processes of recontestation concerning Treaty partnership despite government strategies of concession and containment.

Tensions also exist within Māoridom regarding whether any changes and power sharing will be a gradual or an abrupt process; incremental pragmatism or radical innovation. Those who favour the former are concerned that a good working relationship is developed between both partners. Supporters of the latter seek overdue major constitutional change based on the Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Māori sovereign rights to self-determination or tino rangatiratanga. The same kind of tensions exists among non-Māori. Partnership in 1840, of course, essentially involved two major cultural groupings. In the next section I will discuss diverse contemporary viewpoints on biculturalism.

8.2.2 Biculturalism

Due to protest, both in Aotearoa New Zealand and overseas in the 1960s, 1970s and early 1980s, the Crown began introducing biculturalism in state agencies in an effort to reduce cultural marginalisation and institutional racism. In the 1990s, with the introduction of the new MMP electoral system which produced more Māori members of Parliament these bicultural policies became entrenched. As with partnership, the concept of biculturalism has steadily evolved in the thinking of the Waitangi Tribunal. In the mid 1990s the Tribunal

began to support bi-nationalism but later in the same decade swung back to biculturalism. At the beginning of the twenty-first century with the foreshore and seabed controversy, there has been some strong recognition of Article Two of the Treaty and tino rangatiratanga.

The notion of biculturalism is also highly varied, highly contextual and highly contested. Some Pākehā commentators have distinguished between symbolic biculturalism and resource-based biculturalism. In the former there is a good deal of Pākehā support for the general idea of biculturalism although in reality there is also a level of containment in terms of policies. Singing the national anthem in Māori, or performing a haka at All Black rugby games, are cited as examples of symbolic biculturalism which are acceptable to most Pākehā. In contrast, the latter option of resource-based biculturalism, which involves the distribution and management of mostly financial resources, has met with huge Pākehā opposition. One academic attributes such opposition to cultural conflict in a democracy that privileges individualism and equal opportunity over facing past injustices and intergroup relations. Another non-Māori has recognised that a major reason that governments have difficulty proceeding from symbolic to resource-based biculturalism is international economic agreements which subordinate indigenous rights to the market economy. It is these rights which could, however, act to restrain globalisation excesses threatening this country's sovereignty as a state.

Some Māori claim that, as a result of biculturalism, there have been changes such as less monoculturalism, more Māori members of Parliament and far more recognition of Māori language, culture and well-being. There has also been an acknowledgement that this notion has failed to deliver an increase in Māori managers in the state sector, or more tino rangatiratanga, or self-determination. On the other hand, other Māori would question whether symbolic biculturalism has resulted in anything more than a superficial gloss on monoculturalism. For many Māori, biculturalism has emerged in the twenty-first century as only one issue which sits alongside Treaty claims, self-determination, constitutional review, tribal development and other cultural and economic priorities. Indeed Māori appear to be increasingly suspicious of biculturalism despite its contribution to raising the profile of Māori political interests and more shared policymaking and implementation.

A number of non-Māori reject an uncritical biculturalism for a range of reasons. In their opinion this concept stresses difference rather than recognises commonalities. It also fails to acknowledge the diversity that exists within each cultural grouping as well as growing

intercultural fluidity. Other objections to biculturalism include its contribution to ethnic division, its lack of success in eliminating Māori poverty, its support of a new Māori elite and its advocacy of tribalism. For some conservative Pākehā, biculturalism opposes democratic ideals and values. Other Pākehā writers argue that past governments have used biculturalism as well as multiculturalism as forms of containment, in other words, to retain political power.

A debate has also emerged between biculturalism and multiculturalism. The question has been posed whether biculturalism is a precursor to multiculturalism. Māori continue to operate from a hermeneutic of suspicion concerning multiculturalism. This term is perceived to be a tool of Pākehā to prevent the allocation of resources or the realisation of aspirations. It has also been argued that without Māori self-determination neither biculturalism nor multiculturalism will be fully realised in Aotearoa New Zealand. Not all non-Māori, however, believe that these two notions need to exist in conflict. Among some Pākehā intellectuals there is a claim that biculturalism under the Treaty of Waitangi has a major contribution to make by projecting a local identity in the face of globalisation. Other non-Māori would maintain that multiculturalism would also fulfil the same function. More conservative Pākehā also assert that a national identity is more important than biculturalism. Indeed some predict that the Crown will opt for multiculturalism.

8.2.3 Future Partnership and Biculturalism

Few Pākehā or Māori are prepared to predict the future of partnership and biculturalism. Some Pākehā attempt to imagine a future partnership which honours and fulfils the Treaty of Waitangi. Such a situation would require major constitutional change and real power sharing. The problem is that the average New Zealander needs to become far more informed about Aotearoa New Zealand history and the Treaty debates and then be motivated to support significant transformation. This will take time. It would appear that there are no short or medium term solutions to the current tensions. There are no guarantees that biculturalism will continue to be supported. Some conservative Pākehā argue that it will be merged into multiculturalism by future governments. Factors which could also impinge on its future include globalisation and the increase of dual-ethnicity and multi-ethnicity New Zealanders. Yet another complicating factor is those New Zealanders who suffer from Treaty Fatigue and a lack of Treaty Hope.

For Māori the future of biculturalism is affected by the fact that its credibility has become increasingly suspect in the light of Māori expectations concerning self-determination. Indeed biculturalism is perceived as a government strategy of concession and containment as well as a limited strategy for the advancement of Māori aspirations. Greater acceptance of these aspirations through public policy, social institutions, national identity and new social experiences forms part of Māori visions and plans. Equal and equitable partnerships are more likely to lead to accelerated change which will consist of multiple intergenerational strategies at constitutional and institutional levels. Such change will be undergirded by recognition of the twin sovereignties of Māori and the Crown. In this light, bi-nationalism has the potential to encapsulate a bicultural partnership which is transparent, authentic, equal and equitable. A number of Māori advocate visioning and planning for a future which will include a higher percentage of those with Māori ancestry in the general population. For some Māori, however, local or regional tribal situations will continue to be the top priority rather than the national context.

The Anglican Church needs to be cognisant of the complex, unresolved Treaty debates that are taking place in the public square. The Church also needs to understand the highly varied, contextual and contested perspectives of (mostly) elites concerning bicultural Treaty partnership. In addition, the Church is challenged to address its Māori language and cultural regensis policy and practice in the light of these debates and perspectives. Therefore I now proceed to view this regensis policy and practice in terms of partnership and biculturalism.

8.3. Regensis Policy and Practice Through the Lens of Partnership and Biculturalism

In the previous two sections I synthesised first, the Anglican Church's policy and practice concerning Māori language and cultural regensis, and second, concepts of partnership and biculturalism emerging out of the Treaty of Waitangi. In this section I will review this policy and practice through the Treaty lens of partnership and biculturalism in the public square. To facilitate this process, I have selected seven major questions from my reading of contemporary Māori and non- Māori commentators. The first question asks whether Te Tiriti is at the centre of a Standing Resolution and its practice or whether it is at the margins. The second question tries to discern whether the level of partnership has been transparent, authentic, equal or equitable. The third question asks whether the transformation, in terms of partnership, can be described as either incremental pragmatism or radical innovation. The

fourth attempts to discover whether the biculturalism has been symbolic or resource-based. The fifth addresses whether there is any evidence of tension between biculturalism and multiculturalism. The last two questions endeavour to ascertain whether the changes envisaged by the policy and practice will need to be faced in the short, medium or long term and whether these changes need to occur at the provincial, national, regional or local levels of the Church or a combination of these contexts. At the end of this review I will analyse the trends which have emerged from the assessment of each Standing Resolution in terms of these questions. I now begin to examine again these five Standing Resolutions and the responses of the interviewees from each of the three major cultural strands in this order: Tikanga Māori, Tikanga Pākehā and Tikanga Pasifika.

8.3.1 Ordination Training

The major focus of the Standing Resolution was to teach ordinands Māori language and culture so that they would be able to effectively lead Māori language services in Māori settings. Given the context out of which the Resolution emerged, it is clear that originally it was envisaged as a major step towards implementing the spirit of Te Tiriti. For Tikanga Māori, while Te Tiriti is implicitly at the centre of this Resolution, in practice it has been marginalised by the Church's theological training institutions. It is questionable whether their courses have been able to produce the level of fluency and confidence that was initially hoped for. Furthermore, in terms of guaranteeing the future of te reo, its seriousness has been undermined by a lack of close monitoring.

In Tikanga Pākehā Te Tiriti has been marginalised in that a low level of Māori language competency has been perceived as meeting the needs of its clergy and lay people in the new constitutional environment. The notion that Pākehā, as signatories to Te Tiriti, might be committed to the retention or regensis of the Māori language does not emerge from the majority of those interviewed. As for Tikanga Pasifika, Te Tiriti is not explicitly mentioned as a central driving force in its Anglican ecclesiology in Aotearoa New Zealand or elsewhere.

For most in Tikanga Māori, partnership is not an issue which is highly visible in this Resolution. It could be argued that such a situation would tend to mitigate against true, equal and equitable partnership. Low actual usage of te reo Māori in Pākehā church contexts brings into question whether partnership can be seen to be more a rhetorical, provincial or national phenomenon rather than a practical, regional or local parish one. Diverse contexts are

perceived as the reason why there is a range of responses to the practical implementation of partnership. For some Pākehā, partnership is more likely to take place in those regions which have a higher percentage of Māori living within their borders. For Tikanga Pasifika, it is only relatively recently that Pacific Islander Anglican mission and ministry have become developed in Aotearoa New Zealand. There is potential, however, for real partnership to occur in the future. Overall, it would not appear that the past realisation of this Resolution has resulted in significant transparent, true, equal and equitable partnership.

While this Standing Resolution was radically innovative in 1986, its outworking was mostly, but not exclusively, incrementally pragmatic in the establishment of Māori language and culture courses in its training institutions. For Māori students, some of whom already had a level of fluency in the Māori language, a great many of these courses were largely introductory and not well set up to deliver the kind of fluency which was initially hoped for. The incremental pragmatism here was limited due to a lack of human and financial resources. For Tikanga Pākehā, once it became clear that its clergy would be much less required to minister to Māori after the new Constitution in 1992, then pragmatism ensured that few resources would be employed to meet the minimal levels of fluency that would be needed for mission and ministry. Such pragmatism was more likely to lead to action in regions where there was a higher Māori population. Tikanga Pasifika, for the most part, would appear to feel quite removed from the need to honour any aspect of this Resolution except perhaps for the possibility of some Māori language training in the future for those ministering to Pacific Islanders in Aotearoa New Zealand. Pragmatically, there are possibly more important priorities for Tikanga Pasifika as their Church is established in this country.

Tikanga Māori generally did not perceive this Resolution as being symbolic but rather a serious attempt to address critical training needs for Māori mission and ministry. From the beginning, it was anticipated that courses would need to be set up at St. John's College. This clearly would involve the need for human and financial resources. The biculturalism here, pre- and post-constitutional change, would be resource-based. Indeed the Resolution was strengthened by the 1992 Constitution's focus on bicultural development. As intimated earlier, however, the lack of these resources has thwarted the full realisation of the intent behind this Resolution. Here also was an opportunity for Māori to share their linguistic and cultural resources with the Treaty partner. For Tikanga Pākehā, as the full implications of a new post-constitutional environment have become more evident, there appears to have been less demand for Māori language and cultural training. In addition, there has been a move

towards more symbolic aspects of Māori language usage such as inserting in some contexts the Lord's Prayer in Māori into church services. In regions with a higher Māori population, there is a greater need for both symbolic and resource-based biculturalism. As for Tikanga Pasifika, there is little evidence of either symbolic or resource-based biculturalism which involves Māori language and cultural training.

If there is tension between biculturalism and multiculturalism, it is not a major issue for any Tikanga in terms of this Resolution. Māori are certainly focussed on biculturalism as are many Pākehā. On the one hand, congregations in these two Tikanga are becoming increasingly multicultural. On the other, Tikanga Pasifika is clearly multicultural as their church members come from diverse cultural groups.

The question of whether this Resolution should be retained in the short-term as opposed to the medium or long term does not emerge as an explicit issue. Most Anglican informants appear to wish to retain this Resolution but how each Tikanga might action it would appear to differ in the varying contexts. It would seem that, as far as it is possible to discern, Tikanga Māori and Pākehā are aware of the national, regional and local significance of this Resolution. Since most of the Tikanga Pasifika developments have occurred to date in the northern half of Aotearoa New Zealand, a regional or local focus is initially more likely.

8.3.2 Use of the Māori Language

The Standing Resolution on the use of the Māori language concentrates on English speakers acquiring Māori words and Māori speakers suggesting the use of Māori words and correcting any misuse. While Te Tiriti o Waitangi was not explicitly mentioned by interviewees from any Tikanga, it could be argued that the original intention was to put the Treaty into action through this Resolution. The result of this lack of explicitness is that the Treaty is not a major factor in most people's thinking here and so it is marginalised.

The possibility exists in this Resolution for partnership to be put into action. Clearly there was an expectation that more use of Māori language would enhance communication and, implicitly, relationships between Māori and Pākehā. The preamble foreshadows a win-win scenario where the languages of both cultural groups benefit. This is developed further in the recommendations. However, for Tikanga Māori most of the increase in speaking, or listening to, Māori had occurred by Māori speakers of English and not by Pākehā or Pacific Islanders.

This would tend to support the view that true, equal and equitable partnership has not been apparent in the first half of the Resolution.

As for the second half, there appear to have been few substitutions of Māori words except for several notable cases and some uncertainty about the extent of the correction of English speakers whether Māori, or Pākehā, or Pasifika. If the intention was to provide an opportunity for transparent, true, equal and equitable partnership, then the actual outworking of this Resolution over the last twenty years would confirm a low level of such partnership. If the second part of the Resolution is retained, then both Tikanga Māori and Pākehā would be in favour of sensitive, compassionate correction or coaching. Tikanga Pasifika observers would tend to confirm a low level increase in everyday usage of Māori, especially among Pākehā, and the need by Pākehā to work with Māori not only in the area of acquisition but also concerning status and critical awareness. The need for sensitivity by Māori in any correcting processes was supported by interviewees in Tikanga Pasifika.

In 1986 this Resolution may have been radically innovative for many Māori and Pākehā. It supports processes in which Pākehā are encouraged to increase their knowledge or acquisition of the Māori language and in which Māori are encouraged to suggest Māori words and to undertake correcting or coaching. In practice, there has been a low level increase in terms of acquisition, perhaps more pronounced at the provincial level rather than the parish one. Even in liturgical contexts there has been a limited response by Pākehā except for a few notable exceptions. As indicated earlier, if there has been a degree of pragmatism for Tikanga Pākehā, it has militated against increasing the use of Māori since the new Constitution. Tactfully, Tikanga Pasifika have alluded to the need for Tikanga Pākehā to reassess its level of pragmatism in terms of actioning this Resolution.

This Resolution provided an opportunity to action biculturalism. The reality of the last twenty years or more has been that this opportunity has not been taken up very enthusiastically by either Tikanga Māori or Tikanga Pākehā, especially since the constitutional changes. It also provided an opportunity for Māori to share their linguistic and cultural resources with Pākehā. To this extent it could be seen as resource-based biculturalism. However, with the limited response of Pākehā, the Resolution could be now perceived as representing symbolic biculturalism. This could account for the mixed Tikanga Māori responses to the idea of retaining this Resolution. For the survival of te reo in the Anglican Church and elsewhere there are more pressing priorities. Yet the fact that Tikanga Pākehā are generally in favour of

keeping this Resolution could confirm that it is a non-threatening symbolic move to which many of its congregations would be unlikely to object. However, as Tikanga Pasifika have asserted, more effort and work is still needed by Pākehā. This could imply the need also for far greater human, financial and cultural resources to be made available for biculturalism to effectively take place.

The original intention of this Resolution clearly was to focus on two languages and cultures, namely, English and Māori. Biculturalism was certainly the context for Tikanga Māori informants. However, some Tikanga Pākehā acknowledged the need for migrants to understand Māori words. There were signs of some tension between biculturalism and multiculturalism. Yet most Pākehā were in favour of retaining the main thrust of this Resolution. Tikanga Pasifika seem to be more concerned about the development of biculturalism by Pākehā than the introduction of notions of multiculturalism.

In the short to medium term there appear among Māori to be mixed responses to the idea of retaining this Resolution which is quite different to the response of Pākehā as indicated above. Interestingly, Pacific Island interviewees were mostly supportive of rewording the Resolution to include a more transparent biculturalism as part of partnership.

Some Māori have made a distinction between an increase of Māori language at the provincial and local levels. It was considered more likely to take place in the former context. No such distinction occurred in the responses of Pākehā. For Tikanga Pasifika, since most contact between Tikanga is likely to occur in a provincial setting, it could be argued that it is here that changes are necessary in terms of policy-making.

8.3.3 Kōhanga Reo

In the Standing Resolution on kōhanga reo General Synod encourages churches to make their properties available for pre-school and adult Māori language programmes. English speaking parents are also encouraged to become involved in kōhanga reo. For Tikanga Māori, Te Tiriti is implicitly at the centre of this Resolution in that the availability of human, physical, financial and cultural resources assists the retention of te reo Māori. The reality over the last twenty years or so has been that few Māori churches were involved with Māori language courses. In the eyes of Māori, the participation of Pākehā was negligible. This was also confirmed by Tikanga Pākehā interviewees who generally did not perceive this Resolution as being connected with Treaty responsibilities. In other words, the Treaty held a marginal

position here. Tikanga Pasifika were also unaware of Pākehā churches that had committed themselves to support kōhanga reo or adult Māori language programmes. This Tikanga was alert to the fact that some Pākehā reject the idea of learning the Māori language. Treaty connections were not discernible.

Originally this Resolution offered support for the Treaty partners to share their resources. Again the reality of what has occurred since 1986 has been less than convincing in terms of true, equal and equitable partnership for both Tikanga Māori and Pākehā. It could be claimed that although Tikanga Pasifika does not mention partnership here in explicit terms, this does not exclude the possibility of an implied relationship.

When this Resolution was first proposed, it could well have been perceived as a radical innovation. Here was yet another opportunity for Māori and Pākehā to collaborate on Māori language regensis projects which in the mid 1980s were short of resources. Few Pākehā offered their resources or were prepared to accept Māori cultural ones over the last twenty years. This is clearly a rejection of this innovation and a further step towards pragmatic cultural isolationism since the constitutional changes in 1992. Tikanga Pasifika, as indicated above, was mindful of the resistance of Pākehā to notions of partnership which involve major change on their part.

Māori respondents acknowledged the considerable number of Māori who were and have been involved with kōhanga reo. They also recognised the low number of Pākehā who availed themselves of these opportunities. There was little discussion of the implications of this situation for biculturalism whether it is symbolic or resource-based. If there was an implicit dimension here, it was that Pākehā had largely rejected biculturalism of any kind in the contexts raised by this Resolution. A possible reason for this rejection of biculturalism by Pākehā is that the Māori language has low social status. Another is an unwillingness to share resources. Like partnership, there are some Pākehā, in the eyes of Tikanga Pasifika, who would resist biculturalism. The notion of multiculturalism does not appear to be part of the consciousness of any Tikanga as far as this Resolution is concerned.

It is clear from the interviews that most Māori and Pākehā are in favour of either deleting this Standing Resolution from the General Synod list or reviewing it substantially. Given the changed context since 1986, in the short term there may be merit in seeking more effective options for supporting Māori language regensis. Tikanga Pasifika has astutely observed that trust and patience are required by both Treaty partners for progress to occur. This may not

happen in the short term. It is more likely to take place in the medium to long term. For Māori, any new initiatives would be welcomed at all levels whether these are national, regional or local.

8.3.4 Māori Language Programmes

The Standing Resolution on Māori language recommends the teaching of the Māori language and marae protocol in all Anglican educational institutions. It also urges the teaching of Treaty principles and associated words and expressions. Again, from a Māori perspective, the Treaty is implicitly placed at the centre. Furthermore, some Māori perceptions of Tikanga Pākehā are that their responses to this Resolution have been minimal and tokenistic and therefore the Treaty has implicitly been remarginalised. The intention of the Commission has been thwarted: namely, to place the Treaty at the centre of this Resolution. Anglican Pākehā confirmed that in their educational bodies the responses to General Synod's recommendations had been negligible. Nevertheless, it was acknowledged that importance was attached to the Treaty and its principles. Perhaps here the Treaty is placed between the centre and the margins. As for Tikanga Pasifika interviewees, there was no explicit support for the central place of the Treaty concerning this Resolution.

While a section of this Resolution focusses explicitly on partnership as a concept being taught in educational contexts, here is yet another opportunity for partnership to be put into action in the teaching of Māori language and marae kawa. The overall impression is that such partnership is not clearly evident. Māori institutions have gone ahead to put the Resolution into practice but there appears to have been little true, equal or equitable partnership in these processes. Tikanga Pākehā acknowledges that there is still some distance to go to fully implement this Resolution in terms of partnership. For Tikanga Pasifika, partnership does not appear to have a high profile in the context of this Resolution except for more understanding of marae protocol. However, there is recognition by Anglican Pacific Islanders of the need for Māori and Pākehā to develop more partnership.

The original intention of the Commission was to encourage radical innovation in church educational institutions. While Tikanga Māori institutions have been teaching te reo Māori and marae kawa for many years, the teaching of Treaty concepts is perhaps new in some situations. The impression is that there has been a good deal of incremental pragmatism but there is still room for improvement in the quality of the teaching of Māori language and

culture. In Tikanga Pākehā education centres the amount of radical innovation would appear to have been very limited. Although it is less easy to discern the level of incremental pragmatism, this is also at a relatively low degree. The same could also be said for Tikanga Pasifika which recognises the need for radical innovation on the part of their Pākehā partners.

The kind of biculturalism which has some appeal for most Māori informants is resource-based. Again there is an implicit perspective that Māori are involved in processes where Māori language and culture are shared with the other partners. On the other hand, some Pākehā notions of biculturalism in their educational bodies would appear here to be minimalistic or symbolic flourishes in a new constitutional environment. Little resource would seem to have been utilised in putting this Resolution into practice in these bodies. The same could also be claimed for Tikanga Pasifika institutions. It is maintained by Tikanga Pasifika that more resources are needed for Pākehā bicultural training courses which are both visionary and action oriented. While such training has the potential to be tokenistic, it is also possible, given the motivation and aroha, that it could be resourced at a level where such training is effective for gains in bicultural leadership to be made. The notion that this Resolution is concerned with any aspects of culture other than biculturalism is not apparent. Multiculturalism does not figure in the response of any Tikanga informants.

Most of the Māori interviewees were clearly in favour of retaining this Resolution. Some also advocated that more resources be made available to promote it in the future to achieve the potential that is present, and as yet unrealised, in the recommendations of General Synod. For many Māori informants more effort needs to be concentrated on implementing this Resolution in the new constitutional context as well as employing recently developed educational resources. Most Tikanga Pākehā also support the retention of this Resolution and appropriate initiatives in the various diverse contexts aimed at implementing it. Overall, Tikanga Pasifika believes that the Resolution should also be kept but with the condition that it be put into practice as each Tikanga sees fit. There seem to be inherent assumptions that the timeframe is short to medium term and that it be across all contexts as determined by each Tikanga.

8.3.5 Principles of Mission

At the centre of the Standing Resolution on the principles of mission is the current five-fold Anglican mission statement of evangelism, teaching, baptism and nurture, loving service,

transforming unjust structures and safeguarding and renewing creation. While Māori perspectives on the mission principles, in terms of te reo Māori, could be characterised as being diverse, the Treaty of Waitangi is not explicitly apparent in the thinking of those Māori interviewed. Again, the Treaty is, nevertheless, implied in some of the thinking of Māori when the focus is on Māori language evangelism. This is also the case when discussing changing unjust structures which endanger te reo, or perceiving reo and tikanga as an integral part of God's creation. In Tikanga Pākehā churches there is a low level of support for the use of Māori except for their social service agencies who respond to the needs of Māori. Since the Treaty guarantees the good health of the Māori language, then this kind of limited response could be interpreted as marginalising the Treaty. However, there were signs that, in terms of te reo, there is some advocacy for transforming unjust structures which are oppressive. While Anglican Pacific Islanders, who were interviewed, did not perceive Māori language and culture as part of their mission, as their church grows in Aotearoa New Zealand, it is possible that this might change. Certainly the Treaty did not explicitly figure in any of the observations of the Tikanga Pasifika interviewees and so, bearing this in mind, it could be asserted that the Treaty does not hold a central position in their assessment of mission.

Some Tikanga Māori respondents could envision a higher level of transparent, true, equal and equitable partnership if Pākehā are able to lift the status of te reo Māori through educational processes or are able to undertake regensis processes which exemplified a practical outworking of aroha in their social service agencies. Another way of supporting te reo is through transforming unjust structures which will require the Pākehā partner agreeing to the allocation of human and financial resources for this activity. While partnership was not a concept to the forefront of Tikanga Pākehā thinking, there are, nevertheless, possibilities of consciousness-raising which could be undertaken effectively. For Tikanga Pasifika, on the other hand, mission partnership is only appreciated, in terms of Māori language and culture, as a matter for the other two Tikanga. As Anglican Pacific Islanders develop their mission further in Aotearoa New Zealand, there is potential for future dialogue concerning partnership.

While it would appear that the majority of Māori informants seem to favour incremental pragmatism, there were also a number of radical innovations proposed such as focussing on Māori language medium educational institutions, or transforming unjust structures, or working with social service organisations, or lifting the status of te reo. Such radical

innovations were not readily apparent in the responses of Tikanga Pākehā interviewees. If there was an easily discernable pattern here, it tended towards a level of incremental pragmatism, if at all. As for Tikanga Pasifika, there is an acknowledgement of the need for changes to be made in terms of partnership between Māori and Pākehā, but whether these changes should be gradual or radical is not easily identified.

Biculturalism of any kind does not appear to figure prominently in the thoughts of Tikanga Māori informants. This does not mean that it is not present. Encouraging Pākehā to lift the status of te reo Māori or to support regeneration in their social service agencies could involve both symbolic and resource-based biculturalism. To change unjust structures which oppress Māori language and culture also means the provision of human and financial resources by the Pākehā partner. While the main focus of Tikanga Māori mission is on Māori, there is still room for Pākehā to be involved in terms of reo regeneration. But it is debatable whether Pākehā generally wish to be part of this kind of activity. Transforming unjust structures as well as loving service through the agencies referred to above would seem to be the aspects of mission with the most potential for Pākehā in the foreseeable future. Other forms do not appear to be a priority at this stage. This amounts to limited symbolic and resource-based biculturalism. As for Tikanga Pasifika, the biculturalism that matters most in this country for them involves Māori and Pākehā. Again, multiculturalism is not prevalent in any of the Tikanga discussions concerning mission in terms of te reo Māori.

Unlike the previous Resolutions, the informants were not asked whether they favoured the retention, transformation or abolition of the five-fold mission statement. Given that this five-fold mission statement is intended to be a guide for the Anglican Church worldwide, it will remain in the present and future as a framework for Māori language and cultural mission. The level of buy-in is questionable for each Tikanga. Clearly most Anglican Māori are strongly committed to an important role for te reo. The involvement of the other two Tikanga, while limited at this stage, could develop in the years to come.

8.3.6 Emergent Trends

As I have looked at the data regarding Māori language and cultural policy and practice of the Anglican Church through a bicultural Treaty partnership lens, a number of trends have emerged. It is clear that, for most of the Māori informants, the Treaty is largely implied to be located near the centre. I use the term “implied” advisedly as there was very little or no

explicit mention of the Treaty in the interviews but I sensed intuitively that it was a given. I did not at all receive the impression that the Treaty was being placed close to the margins. Nevertheless, it appeared in some ways to be heading in that direction. In contrast, my overwhelming realisation is that Tikanga Pākehā has to a large extent remarginalised the Treaty since the new Constitution in 1992. This can be termed Treaty slippage where the Treaty slowly slips away from being at the centre as it moves to the margins.¹ As for Tikanga Pasifika, the Treaty is generally not on the radar in the Pacific Islands. Such a marginalised position may change as their congregations become established in Aotearoa New Zealand. For Anglican Pacific Islanders, the Treaty can be perceived as largely a matter for the other two Tikanga. Certainly for the Māori and Pākehā members of the Bicultural Commission, the positions of each of their respective Tikanga are a departure from what was originally envisaged. In 1986 the Treaty was very much at the centre of the four bicultural Standing Resolutions that I have reviewed. Currently there is an overall trend away from such a position. While this is relatively limited for Tikanga Māori, it is very pronounced for Tikanga Pākehā in the new constitutional environment. There are some real doubts about whether the Treaty has ever been at the centre for most Anglican Pacific Islanders.

I attempted earlier to analyse partnership in terms of whether it is transparent, authentic, equal or equitable. The trend which has emerged across both Tikanga Māori and Tikanga Pākehā is that partnership regarding three of the Standing Resolutions occurs at low levels, if at all. Despite the aspirations of the Bicultural Commission that the four Standing Resolutions would greatly increase the level of partnership, there is little evidence of any substantial movement. It would be wrong to say that none has occurred in terms of regenesis because some Māori and Pākehā students have learnt the Māori language together and more Pākehā are now familiar with marae protocol. Again, where there is a higher Māori population, there is a greater likelihood of some partnership. Yet overall, partnership between Anglican Māori and Pākehā, after the constitutional changes in 1992, in terms of Māori language and culture, would appear to be low. As for Tikanga Pasifika, this is also generally the case. From the perspective of some Anglican Pacific Islanders, partnership is really for the other two Tikanga. The potential for a shift to involve them would seem to be enhanced with their development of mission and ministry in Aotearoa New Zealand.

¹ I first heard the term “Treaty slippage” used by the Reverend Diana Tana, Head or Tumuaki, of the Māori division or Taha Māori, of the Methodist Church of New Zealand, Te Hāhi Weteriana o Aotearoa.

All four Standing Resolutions were radically innovative in 1986. For Tikanga Māori there has been some pragmatic outworking of these Resolutions but overall it has occurred at a low level over the last twenty years or so. While there has been some innovation along the way, it has not been to any great extent. In contrast, the amount of Pākehā incremental pragmatism and radical innovation is much lower than that evident for Māori. Here again the impact of the constitutional changes is the reason for a level of pragmatism which acknowledges that Māori language mission and ministry is now mainly the concern of Tikanga Māori. The same can be said for Tikanga Pasifika. However, this Tikanga recognises tactfully that perhaps Anglican Pākehā could reassess their levels of both pragmatism and innovation in terms of a partnership which leads to transformation. Anglican Pacific Islanders are also aware of some Pākehā resistance to any notion of transformative partnership but, nevertheless, advocate a sense of hope that changes will eventually occur.

When the Bicultural Commission in 1986 promoted the four bicultural Standing Resolutions, it recognised the need for human, financial and cultural resources. It did not give the impression that it was interested in advancing a form of biculturalism that was merely symbolic. Certainly for Tikanga Māori there was an expectation that financial and human resources would be made available. For many of the Māori interviewees a lack of resources has thwarted the full realisation of the intent behind the Resolutions. Over the last two decades a low level of sharing of Māori linguistic and cultural resources with Anglican Pākehā has also taken place. Conversely, there has been unwillingness, or a limited response, on the part of Pākehā to receiving Māori resources. Pākehā concepts of biculturalism have veered away from providing any substantial financial and human resources. Instead there has been a move towards symbolic biculturalism where inserting the Lord's Prayer in Māori into church services is perceived to be the most appropriate way to proceed. Furthermore, some Anglican Pākehā reject both forms of biculturalism although perhaps the need for biculturalism is seen more in regions with a high Māori population. In spite of these constraints, there is still room for Tikanga Pākehā to be involved in pursuing biculturalism in areas of mission such as transforming unjust situations and loving service which have the most potential for growth. For Pākehā the trend is away from resource-based towards symbolic biculturalism. As for Tikanga Pasifika there is little evidence of either form of biculturalism as far as the Standing Resolutions are concerned. The biculturalism that matters most to the Anglican Pacific Islands interviewees involves Māori and Pākehā. There is the viewpoint that Pākehā need both kinds of biculturalism despite some resistance at times.

Moreover, more resources are needed for bicultural leadership training which would be visionary and action orientated.

If there is tension outside the doors of the church in the public square concerning biculturalism and multiculturalism, it is not a major issue for Māori in terms of the four Standing Resolutions. Tikanga Māori seem firmly focussed on biculturalism. The same is true for many Pākehā informants. If there is any tension at all, it is around the issue of migrants whose limited knowledge of Māori language is a concern to some Pākehā. Like Māori, multiculturalism was not generally part of interviewee consciousness for Pākehā. Tikanga Pasifika were also not concerned about multiculturalism. Instead their concern is about the development of biculturalism by Pākehā.

It is not easy to discern an overall pattern in terms of what kind of timeframe is envisaged for changing policy and practice. The exception is the Standing Resolution regarding the kōhanga reo which Tikanga Māori and Tikanga Pākehā would both like either to delete or review sooner rather than later. Differing contexts have an impact on whether the change process should be short, medium or long term. For instance, Māori language educational policy could be reviewed in the short to medium term. Perhaps a difficulty with this aspect of the critique is the lack of a definition of short, medium and long term. Again, Tikanga Pasifika observed that trust and patience is required by both Treaty partners. The impression is that transformation is more likely to occur in the medium to long term rather than in the immediate future.

Possible changes to policy and practice in terms of contexts is a little easier to discern. Tikanga Māori are aware of the diverse situations where regensis is able to take place whether they are provincial, national, regional or local. Yet any new initiatives would be welcomed at all levels. Like the other two Tikanga, Māori will determine which contexts are appropriate. For Anglican Pākehā, there is not quite the same level of comprehensive intent as for Māori. This is truer for Tikanga Pasifika whose congregations at this stage are largely based in one region. As for Tikanga Pākehā, those operating at the provincial level are more likely to encounter te reo than in some regional and local situations. This, of course, is a generalisation given that in Aotearoa New Zealand there are some regions which have decidedly more Māori than others. I turn now to focus on the process of synthesising the chapter which reviews contemporary Māori theologies.

8.4. Synthesis of Contemporary Māori Theologies

Māori continue to search for authenticity and justice at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Since 1995 there has been a considerable increase in Māori theological writing. The revised Anglican Constitution in 1992 stimulated the development of new Māori theological educational institutions which have produced the majority of contemporary Māori theologians. Anglican Māori clergy, such as the late Māori Marsden, the late Eru Potaka-Dewes, Te Waaka Melbourne, Hone Kaa and Tiki Raumati who were trained in the 1950s and 1960s, along with Henare Tate of the Catholic Church, have produced the theological foundations upon which contemporary Māori Christian theology has been built. Four major themes emerged as a result of my reading of this Māori theological literature from the perspective of the thesis topic: Māori spirituality, Māori ecclesiology, Māori theological education and Māori language and cultural regeneration. While each of these themes is interconnected and interdependent, there is also evidence of underpinning or underlying cultural and gospel values, such as mana, tapu, pono, tika and aroha.

Another result of my reading of this literature is that I have decided to privilege the theological writings of seven Māori theologians: Maori Marsden, Henare Tate, Hone Kaa, Manuka Henare, Jenny Plane Te Paa, Tui Cadigan and Moeawa Callaghan. Marsden and Tate's works have already been described as foundational. In this synthesis I will gradually extend their theological frameworks concerning God, people and land to include other significant contexts and texts in terms of the restoration of regeneration mana and tapu through tika, pono and aroha processes. The emphasis, however, in this thesis is given to aroha, in other words, to the gospel imperative of love, out of which flows the other gospel imperatives of justice and peace. This draws upon the prolific writing of Plane Te Paa. The liberation theology aspects of bold transformation have been contributed by the writings of Hone Kaa, Tui Cadigan and Moeawa Callaghan. Finally, Manuka Henare's warnings about tribal and cultural essentialism, culturalism and denominationalism also add to this new theological framework.

8.4.1 Māori Spirituality

Clearly it would be very naïve to imagine that all the gospel seeds planted in the nineteenth century fell on fertile soil in the Māori spiritual forest. It took several generations for a Christian Māori spirituality to produce new viewpoints on such closely linked concepts as

mana and tapu. Mana can be perceived as a quality or value which God provides. It enables tasks to be completed by a delegation of spiritual power and authority. Tapu, on the other hand, is focussed on the sacred which is a person, a place or a thing that is located outside the sphere of the ordinary or common. It is possible to distinguish between the inherent tapu of God and the tapu relationships of God with human beings and land. It is from these relationships that the spiritual power of mana springs forth. Human beings also have their innate tapu in addition to their tapu relationships to God, one another and land. Not surprisingly, there is also an inherent tapu of the land and a tapu which recognises the relationships of the land to God and humans. Mana addresses, acknowledges, enhances and restores all these forms of tapu so that goals can be achieved.

Tika, pono and aroha are principles or ethical guidelines for addressing, acknowledging, enhancing, restoring and exercising mana. Tika attempts to recognise and improve in appropriate and respectful ways whatever form of tapu is present, including relationships. Pono, on the other hand, is focussed on seeking the truth, or reality as it exists, in ways which spell integrity. This principle monitors tika processes to ensure that tasks are completed through the exercise of mana, or spiritual power and authority, delegated from God in processes that are transparent. Like mana, aroha can be traced back to God. The aroha relationship between God and human beings and vice versa as well as between persons is manifested in tika and pono thoughts, words and actions for the purpose of achieving the goals and tasks outlined above. When mana and tapu are violated, people who are in a state of negative noa behave in ways that are not tika or pono. When tika and pono are violated, then aroha is diminished. The marginalised and oppressed are especially at risk of diminished mana, tapu, tika, pono and aroha. The challenge is to recognise these situations and then to attempt to improve and enhance them.

8.4.2 Māori Ecclesiology

There are clearly close connections between Māori spirituality and Māori ecclesiology. I have canvassed the inherent tapu of God, people and land and their respective relationships. I can also speak of the tapu of the church and its relationships to God, people and land. Initially the Māori missionary church largely recognised the mana and tapu of Māori spirituality, people and the land. Slowly the gospel message over several generations redefined notions of mana, tapu, pono, tika and aroha in ways which emphasised the primacy of the aroha.

Transformation took place which mediated Māori concepts of utu or revenge and kai tangata or the eating of human flesh. Such transformations were certainly not passive but the result of critical Māori insight and evaluation in the light of the cultural, economic, political and spiritual context of the nineteenth century. Indeed many Māori evangelists were willing to die for Christianity. This is evidence of real agency. With the emergence of colonisation and the settler church the mana and tapu of the missionary Māori church was diminished. This occurred as a result of processes which were neither tika, pono or aroha, not only in terms of traditional Māori spirituality, but also in terms of the gospel imperatives of love, justice and peace. Anglican Māori were disempowered and oppressed by Anglican Pākehā decision makers as well as the colonial government.

From the 1970s there was a movement towards decolonisation with greater recognition and enhancement of the mana and tapu of the Māori Anglican Church and its relationships to the Pākehā Anglican Church and other denominations in ways which attempted to be tika, pono and aroha. These changes occurred alongside the greater recognition and enhancement of the mana and tapu of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and tino rangatiratanga by the Churches and wider society. The pursuit of a more authentic Māori church as well as social or redemptive justice increased in momentum. The new Constitution of the Anglican Church in 1992 empowered all the cultural groups to be liberated, both the oppressor and the oppressed, as well as explored and encouraged Tiriti-based notions of partnership and bicultural development. Despite the constitutional changes, however, there were still groups of Māori, such as women and homosexuals, within the Māori Church who remained marginalised and oppressed. With the benefit of hindsight, the two major partners, in terms of Te Tiriti, in the late 1980s and early 1990s were not equally matched as the Pākehā Anglican Church had retained most of the financial and human resources and the Māori Anglican Church had limited experience of either creating such resources or managing them. Despite such an inequitable situation, there is still a need to share these resources and to build upon the strengths of each cultural group in ways which foster interdependence, mutual affirmation and aroha. There is also a need to acknowledge and value in a positive manner the diversity of those who are members of the Māori Anglican Church. Undoubtedly advances, such as constitutional reform and power sharing, have occurred in the Anglican Church in the latter part of the twentieth century. But a new set of dangers and challenges has emerged: tribal essentialism where personhood is only defined through genealogy and social grouping, cultural essentialism where personhood is only defined through culture and culturalism where culture attempts to domesticate the

gospel. Although not new, denominationalism also has its downside. Progress to date in restoring the mana and tapu of the Māori Anglican Church could be jeopardised by these concerns because they have the potential to place constraints on tika, pono and aroha processes. One way of critiquing these dangers and challenges is through theological education.

8.4.3 Māori Theological Education

From the arrival of missionaries in the early nineteenth century, Pākehā clergy were the main gatekeepers of theological education for Māori prior to the 1980s. St. John's College exemplifies the marginalised place of the Māori and their quest for empowerment. When the missionary Māori church was rendered subservient to the settler church, Māori theological education was placed under the authority of colonial Pākehā educators. These Pākehā decision makers violated the intrinsic tapu of Māori theological education by refusing to give mana to Māori spirituality or a place of mana in the Church to Māori. Not only were the relationships between Māori and the Māori church disrupted but also the relationship of Māori theological education with Māori language and culture. This was especially increased after the closure of Te Rau Kahikatea, the Māori theological college near Gisborne, in 1921. The Pākehā Anglican Church attempted at times to diminish the mana and tapu of Māori theological education through processes which were not tika, pono or aroha.

Since the Anglican constitutional changes in 1992, there have been attempts to recognise and restore the mana and tapu of Māori theological education such as the re-establishment of Te Rau Kahikatea at St. John's College and the setting up of Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa in the early and mid 1990s. Whether such institutions have been established and managed in tika, pono and aroha ways is a topic for debate. Nevertheless, notions of tika, pono and aroha still need to be paramount. What this means in practice are conversations, relationships and collaboration within each Tikanga and with other cultural groups in order to encourage and empower the oppressed and marginalised. It is important to reject what is oppressive in any culture. It is also critical that there is love for Māori theological education as well as the theological education of other cultural groups in the quest for redemptive justice for all peoples whether in Aotearoa New Zealand or elsewhere. Theological education has the potential to build strong loving relationships among diverse Christians which are tika and pono as well as strengthening relationships with God. A scriptural underpinning of the gospel imperative of love is considered crucial to critique

Māori theological education. For Māori theologians, this may also involve the removal of western cultural overlays to allow a more authentic engagement between traditional Māori spirituality, Christian Māori spirituality and scripture. If Māori theological education pursues tika, pono and aroha processes, there will be much less chance of tribal and cultural essentialism or culturalism. In the next section I review a significant aspect of Māori theological education, namely, Māori language and cultural regensis.

8.4.4 Māori Language and Cultural Regensis

I begin now by focussing on the mana, and the inherent tapu of Māori language and cultural regensis and its relationships to God, people, land, the church, Te Tiriti o Waitangi and theological and other forms of education. Despite Te Tiriti guaranteeing the status of te reo, the mana and tapu of the Māori language has been diminished through processes of colonisation and cultural genocide to the extent that te reo has become highly endangered. Indeed post World War II urbanisation has been a major factor in hastening the demise of the language. Since God created the Māori language and culture so that the Creator could be glorified, then God will need to be involved for regensis to be successful by guiding the activities so that they attest to tika, pono and aroha. The Anglican Church has a crucial role to play in these processes. Many of those Māori who have little knowledge of te reo feel a loss of mana and tapu. In other words, they feel linguistically and culturally broken and as a result experience considerable embarrassment. A restoration of the mana and tapu of the Māori language in their lives may contribute to a regained sense of wholeness. Again, such a process needs to occur in ways that evidence tika, pono and aroha.

For major Māori language regensis to occur it is critical to return te reo to the land, home, whānau, neighbourhood and community including the marae which can be viewed as a place of great mana and spirituality. The community also includes primary, secondary and tertiary educational institutions. Theological colleges are another important educational site. The mana as well as intrinsic and relational tapu of te reo regensis needs to be restored to each of these significant contexts through the processes described above. In addition, for Anglican Māori, *Te Paipera Tapu*, *Te Rāwiri*, *Hīmene* and *A New Zealand Prayer Book*, as critical texts, also have vital roles to play in the church and its training venues as well as in the wider community.

8.5. Regensis Policy and Practice through Māori Theological Lenses

In earlier sections of this chapter I wrote syntheses of the Anglican Church's policy and practice concerning Māori language and cultural regensis and Māori theologies. In this section I review this policy and practice through Māori theological lenses. In order to advance this process, it has been helpful to concentrate on developing a theological framework around the notion of Māori language and cultural regensis. The themes of Māori spirituality, Māori ecclesiology, Māori theological education and Māori language and cultural regensis have served as a useful schema. However, as stated previously, given that those themes are interconnected and interdependent as well as underpinned by cultural and gospel values such as mana, tapu, pono, tika and aroha, it is now beneficial to outline a theology of Māori language and cultural regensis which draws upon all of these themes and values in an integrated holistic manner. The theological theme of Māori language and cultural regensis, which includes aspects of Māori ecclesiology and theological education, is now placed centre stage. It is then assessed from the perspective of Māori spirituality, namely, the values or ethical guidelines of mana, tapu, tika, pono and aroha. Each of the Standing Resolutions will be viewed through these spirituality lenses. I will begin by appraising the mana of Māori language and cultural regensis and its intrinsic tapu. Then I will proceed to the task of restoring the tapu relationships of regensis to God, people, land, churches, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, theological education, homes, marae and educational institutions as well as four key scriptural and liturgical resources: *Te Paipera Tapu*, *Te Rāwiri*, *Hīmene* and *A New Zealand Prayer Book*. Next I will survey the critical operation of tika, pono and aroha in terms of regensis. Again each Standing Resolution and the responses of the interviewees will be analysed in the following order: Tikanga Māori, Tikanga Pākehā and Tikanga Pasifika. It is clear, however, that most of the discussion focuses on the perspectives of Anglican Māori and Pākehā. For Anglican Pacific Islanders living in the Pacific Islands, these Standing Resolutions are not perceived to be a priority. With a stronger Anglican Pacific Islander presence in Aotearoa New Zealand in the future this could change.

8.5.1 Ordination Training

What informants thought about Anglican Church regensis policies will now be critiqued in terms of Māori theology. In the eyes of the interviewees this Standing Resolution on Māori language and cultural training for ordinands, or future clerical leaders, has arguably the most

mana in terms of regenesi. Most Anglican Māori, Pākehā and Pacific Islanders were in favour of retaining this Resolution.

In the practical outworking of this policy Māori question whether the status of Māori language and cultural training has been at a level which reflects the mana originally envisaged by the policymakers. For Pākehā there is a clearer sense of ambivalence due to the lack of actual opportunities to use the Māori language in their church settings. Given the diversity of these contexts, it is likely that the mana of regenesi is greater in some situations, especially in those places where there is a higher percentage of Māori. Currently Pacific Islander students are not expected to undertake such training. This attributes low levels of mana to Māori language and cultural regenesi in the Pacific Islands.

The intrinsic tapu of Māori language is indicated to some extent by the different viewpoints on mana in each of the three Tikanga. For Māori, clearly regenesi is a more tapu phenomenon than for the other two Tikanga. If the mana of both regenesi policy and practice increases, then this intrinsic tapu will do likewise. If the original policymakers perceived a high level of intrinsic tapu in the Standing Resolutions, there has been a lowering of this kind of tapu over the last twenty years just as there has been a lowering of mana.

Another dimension of regenesi tapu is its restoration in terms of relationships with the major contexts and resources. The triune God is not mentioned in the responses of the informants from the three Tikanga. The perceptions of the Anglicans, who took part in the interviews, were implicitly impacted on by their concepts of God. In a church context, God is a given within the boundaries of any discussion on whatever topic. However, none of those surveyed explicitly commented on the role of God in regenesi concerning this Standing Resolution or indeed in any of the other Standing Resolutions.

It is not clear to what extent restoration of tapu has taken place in the wider Māori, Pākehā or Pacific Island community as a result of the Standing Resolution. While land is not explicitly mentioned in either the policy or practice of the Church in regard to this Standing Resolution, it is present in the location of its worshipping centres. This could be surmised by the use of the word 'elsewhere' in this Resolution. For Anglican Māori there was little reference here to restoring the tapu relationship of Māori language and cultural regenesi to land. Likewise, this is the situation in the Tikanga Pākehā and Tikanga Pasifika churches.

The Māori Anglican Church has benefitted from this Resolution and the tapu of regenesis has been restored. The extent of such restoration is not explicitly mentioned and therefore is open to be debated. A number of Māori interviewees have observed, however, that there is still much more restoration work to be accomplished by the Church. In terms of Tikanga Pākehā the level of restoration is much lower. The actual desire for regenesis would appear to depend on the context. Those dioceses that have a higher percentage of Māori within their borders have more reasons to be involved in regenesis processes. In the Pacific Island Anglican Church there is little, if any, restoration taking place. Te Tiriti o Waitangi is not mentioned explicitly in the Resolution or in the responses of interviewees. While it has been asserted earlier that its presence is implied for Tikanga Māori, it is only one interviewee, a Tikanga Pasifika respondent, who acknowledges the spirit of partnership.

What this Standing Resolution does begin to do for Tikanga Māori is restore the tapu relationship of Māori language regenesis to theological education. However, the point needs to be made that this is a beginning and that there is much more restoration work yet to be undertaken. In contrast, there is a level of ambivalence from Pākehā about whether such theological education should contain anything more than introductory courses in Māori language, given the limited opportunities for Māori mission and ministry since the new Constitution was adopted in 1992. As intimated by one Pākehā informant, there may be some Pākehā who would be prepared to advance beyond such introductory courses. For Tikanga Pasifika Māori language and cultural training has yet to appear on their radar. In other words, Anglican Pacific Islanders have not yet acknowledged that there is, in terms of ordination training, a need for any involvement with Māori language and culture.

Another definition of 'elsewhere' in the Standing Resolution could be the home or kainga. While there has been some training undertaken in the home setting for Māori, there does not appear to be any recognition of the need to restore the tapu relationship of regenesis to this particular context by any of the Tikanga. It could be argued that the case for the marae is considerably stronger at least for Māori. It could also be claimed that it is weaker for the other two Tikanga since there are very limited opportunities to undertake ministry in this kind of context. While relatively speaking this may be the situation, there are questions for Māori about the level of competency produced due to current ordination training. A good deal more needs to be done to restore the tapu relationship with Māori regenesis here. Any links with educational institutions at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels are not evident. The

notion that ordination training might be involved with restoring the tapu of regenesis in any of these locations is simply not present for any of the Tikanga.

The key Māori scriptural and liturgical resources of the Anglican Church, namely, *Te Paipera Tapu*, *Te Rāwiri*, *Hīmene* and *A New Zealand Prayer Book*, do not figure in any processes aimed at restoring the tapu relationship with Māori language and cultural regenesis in this Resolution or any of the others. These texts are not broached by any of the interviewees. Nevertheless, it might be assumed by some of them, mostly from Tikanga Māori, that they are resources used in theological education.

The original intention of this Resolution was to give considerable mana to Māori language and cultural training for ordinands. The reality of the resultant educational programmes, however, has been a lowering of this mana with a subsequent diminution of both intrinsic and relational tapu. Māori language and cultural regenesis does not appear to be a major priority for any of the Tikanga today. It could be discerned that the time of constitutional change in the late 1980s and early 1990s was a watershed period for the Anglican Church and that since that time both the mana and tapu of this Resolution have decreased. If the task of tika, pono and aroha is acknowledging, enhancing, restoring and exercising mana, then these motivational forces have been ineffectual in maintaining mana and tapu at optimal levels in terms of Māori language and cultural regenesis. It would be wrong to assert that these processes are not present at all but it would seem that they are spasmodic and contextual. Tika attempts to recognise and improve tapu by appropriate and respectful ways. If this tapu has not been recognised or improved by the Church over the last twenty years, then it can be claimed that most Anglicans in Aotearoa New Zealand have not acted in appropriate and respectful ways concerning Māori language and cultural regenesis. The transparent picture of regenesis which emerges is one where the exercise of mana as delegated by God has not occurred at levels originally envisaged by the policymakers. The hoped for aroha relationship between God and human beings and vice versa and in interpersonal relationships has not occurred in tika and pono ways for the purpose of achieving Māori language and cultural regenesis. The mana and tapu of regenesis has been damaged and so people in each Tikanga have at times acted in ways that are not tika, pono or aroha. The challenge is to recognise this situation in not only this Standing Resolution but also in the other four.

8.5.2 Use of the Māori Language

For Tikanga Māori, there are mixed responses about retaining this Resolution. There is some ambivalence about the mana of Māori language and cultural regenesis which is present here. Many Māori, who are native English speakers, have enthusiastically increased the number of Māori words spoken which indicates some recognition of mana. Such an increase does not appear to have taken place for Pākehā according to Māori and Pacific Islander observations. Tikanga Pākehā claim that there has been an increase although the acquisition of liturgical Māori has been mostly limited. This would suggest that te reo generally has little mana despite a few notable exceptions. However, Pākehā informants, in general, were in favour of retaining the main intention of this Resolution including being assisted compassionately by Māori. It could be questioned whether, for Pākehā, the mana of partnership is more important than the mana of regenesis. Pasifika observers believe that the low level of awareness and reo acquisition by Pākehā needs to be remedied. This could be claimed to reflect the low level of mana which needs to be improved. While Tikanga Pasifika are aware of this situation for Tikanga Pākehā, there has also not been among Pacific Islanders any perceivable growth in the mana of regenesis as a result of this Resolution.

For Māori, the acquisition of their own language has mana and an intrinsic tapu but they view Pākehā responses to this Resolution over more than twenty years as reflecting a low level of both these values. It could be asserted that a key indicator of intrinsic tapu is the use of liturgical Māori. If this is the case, then the limited use of Māori language liturgy in Tikanga Pākehā churches would tend to indicate a low level of intrinsic tapu. The same also could be said for Tikanga Pasifika.

I now focus on the restoration of the tapu relationships of Māori language and cultural regenesis with major contexts and resources. The informants did not make any explicit references to God in this Resolution. To what extent restoration has occurred for Māori, Pākehā and Pacific Island communities is also not clear. Restoring the tapu relationship of reo regenesis to the land is not explicitly mentioned by any Tikanga. If restoring the tapu relationship of regenesis to the whole of the Anglican Church is considered, then this Resolution could be regarded as part of the original broad strategy to enable this restoration to occur. Generally this has not actually taken place in the local churches according to the interviewees. For Tikanga Māori, some restoration has taken place but the question has arisen whether this Standing Resolution is necessarily a priority. According to both Māori and

Pacific Island perceptions, Tikanga Pākehā's tapu relationship with regenesi has only been restored at a tokenistic or minimal level. Pākehā interviewees would tend to confirm these views. For Tikanga Pasifika, the situation overall concerning restoration could be discerned to be negligible given that it has only recently undertaken mission and ministry in Aotearoa New Zealand.

It is only Tikanga Pasifika which explicitly mentions partnership, implying Treaty of Waitangi partnership. Neither Anglican Māori nor Pākehā do so, which raises questions about the level of conscious thinking that has taken place since 1986 regarding Treaty partnership in terms of regenesi. Any association between this Standing Resolution and theological education reflects to a large extent the void of the three Tikanga Church in terms of restoring the tapu relationship. Theological institutions of the church do not appear in the eyes of the interviewees to figure at all in the past implementation of this Resolution. What can be said regarding theological education can be also reiterated for the contexts of the home, marae and educational institutions. Perhaps it is also not surprising that *Te Paipera Tapu*, *Te Rāwiri*, *Himene* and *A New Zealand Prayer Book*, as key resources, do not rate any mention in the contexts cited above.

It has already been claimed that the tasks of tika, pono and aroha is to provide ethical guidelines for addressing, acknowledging, enhancing, restoring and exercising mana. What has been written concerning the function of these principles of process, in terms of the previous Standing Resolution, can be repeated here, namely, that any evidence of their existence has been spasmodic and contextual. The hoped for widespread restoration of mana and tapu for regenesi has largely not occurred. This has happened in terms of this Resolution due to a lack of tika, pono and aroha, in other words, a lack of respect, transparency and compassion. Most in Tikanga Māori and Pasifika are sceptical of retaining this Standing Resolution because it can be seen as a minimalist or tokenistic intervention. In contrast, Tikanga Pākehā sees merit in its retention even if it is perceived to be an option which does not advance regenesi significantly.

8.5.3 Kōhanga Reo

Most of the Anglican Māori interviewed, not surprisingly, give considerable mana to the acquisition of te reo at whatever level. The Anglican Church's Bicultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi in 1986 believed that this Standing Resolution offered opportunities for

the Anglican Church to support fledgling regenesi s efforts in terms of kōhanga reo and adult education. The mana of regenesi s was endorsed by General Synod delegates but the opportunities offered were not taken up by any of the Tikanga in substantial ways. In practice this Standing Resolution failed to have the level of mana required for real traction to occur. This lack of mana for various reasons has prompted both Tikanga Māori and Tikanga Pākehā to believe that there is a need to search for other means of encouraging regenesi s among Anglicans. For many Pākehā te reo has low social status. In other words, it is not a language with mana. For some this perspective manifests itself in the clear stand that they do not wish to learn Māori language and culture. Tikanga Pasifika also believes that this is the situation for some Anglican Pākehā. While the intrinsic tapu of regenesi s in each cultural context is invariably reflected by the differing degrees of mana, it could be strongly argued that, for Māori and Pākehā, this Standing Resolution has lost most of its intrinsic tapu.

Any attempts at restoring the tapu relationship of regenesi s to God are not evident in both the Standing Resolution and its weak implementation. Here was also an opportunity to move with Anglican Māori and Pākehā into their wider communities. It was not, however, seen as a priority by any of the Tikanga in terms of mission and ministry in these communities. Restoration of the tapu relationship of regenesi s to the land was limited in the case of Māori and virtually non-existent for the other two Tikanga despite the potential envisaged by the original drafters of this Resolution.

The efforts of this Standing Resolution as a strategy to restore the tapu relationships of Māori language and cultural regenesi s to the church failed to gain the level of momentum which was hoped for at the outset. Despite the underlying ideology of partnership, there is no explicit mention of the Treaty of Waitangi. If there is a theological education dimension to the outworking of this Resolution, it was not a conscious one for interviewees from all three Tikanga. There is no restoration of the tapu relationship of regenesi s with theological education here.

Restoring the tapu relationships of Māori language and cultural regenesi s to the home and marae is not raised by those interviewed. Nevertheless, here was yet another potential opportunity for the Anglican Church to be seen to be supporting these critical regenesi s sites as a result of this Standing Resolution. The same comments can be made for educational institutions at whatever level but especially for kōhanga reo and adult learners. It would be wrong to give the impression that Anglican Māori interviewees do not support the initiatives

outlined in the Resolution but the critical opportunity for intervention would appear, especially for the kōhanga reo, to have been lost. Nonetheless, both Tikanga Māori and Pākehā recognise that the context has changed in the early twenty-first century. Furthermore, in the case of Anglican Māori, there may be alternative ways of supporting kōhanga reo and other Māori language medium educational institutions. For Anglican Pākehā the focus may need to be on increasing the mana or status of regenesis. Again, there is no mention of any of the key resources, such as *Te Paipera Tapu*, *Te Rāwiri*, *Hīmene* and *A New Zealand Prayer Book*, in relation to any of the above contexts.

The low level of mana and intrinsic and relational tapu in terms of regenesis can be attributed to the correspondingly low levels of tika or respect, pono or transparency and aroha or compassion. While there were a considerable number of openings for the Anglican Church to contribute to regenesis, at a time when such contributions were needed in many communities, the low level of mana and tapu proved to be stumbling blocks due to a lack of respect, transparency and compassion. From the viewpoint of some Māori interviewees, it is still not too late to redress the situation concerning regenesis at kōhanga reo and other Māori language medium educational bodies.

8.5.4 Māori Language Programmes

It is clear that Tikanga Māori has given considerable mana to regenesis in terms of this Standing Resolution. The teaching of the Māori language in all their educational bodies, mostly at the secondary and tertiary levels, has been adopted although there are questions about the quality of this teaching. In other words, regenesis as a policy has received a good deal of status but the actual implementation of the first part of the Resolution has occurred with varying levels of success and resultant mana. Those Māori interviewees able to comment on the responses of Pākehā educational bodies to this Resolution have described such responses as largely minimal and tokenistic. This can be summarised as mirroring a low level of mana. As for the second part of the Resolution concerning exploring principles of partnership and bicultural development, there was some evidence of these principles being taught only in Māori Anglican educational bodies. An increase in the understanding of Anglicans concerning marae protocol would tend to underscore for Māori some recognition of the mana of such teaching as part of regenesis processes.

Pākehā informants gave the impression that the response of their educational bodies to the recommendation for Māori language teaching had been largely minimal. This reflects a low level of mana. The same kind of response concerning partnership and bicultural development was also apparent although importance was, nonetheless, attached to the Treaty and its principles. Tikanga Pasifika believes that bicultural training is still necessary for Pākehā. However, Anglican Pākehā will need to decide whether this is a priority. Anglican Pacific Islanders are supportive of Māori language and culture being taught in church educational institutions in Aotearoa New Zealand. Overall, each Tikanga recognised the mana of this Resolution as reflected by the need to retain it as well as the diverse approaches required for its implementation. The level of regensis mana here would tend to indicate that there exists potential for future development in these educational institutions. As a result of this greater level of mana, there is also a higher level of intrinsic tapu noticeable regarding this particular Resolution compared to the previous one.

Restoring the tapu relationship of regensis to God is again not explicitly described by any of the interviewees. Likewise, there is no clear indication that the restoration of tapu regensis relationships might be possible in the wider Māori, Pākehā and Pacific Island communities as a result of the proposed educational initiatives. Land is also not a situation which is discussed concerning this Standing Resolution. The impact that these initiatives might have on the development of regensis in churches is also not canvassed by those interviewed. The ecclesiological dimensions of the Resolution are not examined which raises the question of whether the teaching of Māori language and culture is not mainly for the benefit of the church's mission and ministry but rather for citizenship or other perceived reasons. In fact, there could be a case for arguing that this Resolution is aimed at primarily restoring the tapu relationship of regensis to the Treaty of Waitangi. None of the informants from the three Tikanga viewed the Resolution in these terms. As for theological education, again it does not appear visibly on the radar screens of interviewees. It could have been assumed as a constituent part of the educational bodies whose practices were being reviewed and which would have included pre-school, primary, secondary and tertiary level institutions. It can be claimed that, in all these settings as well as in homes and marae, the tapu relationship of regensis is being restored. However, only primary and secondary schools are referred to by informants. *Te Paipera Tapu*, *Te Rāwiri*, *Hīmene* and *A New Zealand Prayer Book*, as for the previous Resolutions, do not appear, as key regensis resources, to be part of tapu restoration.

Compared to the previous Standing Resolution there are higher levels of mana and tapu (both intrinsic and relational), in terms of regenesi, in the implementation of Māori language and cultural policy in church educational bodies. This can be linked to correspondingly greater levels of respect, transparency and compassion by all three Tikanga. There is still room, nevertheless, for even higher degrees of tika, pono and aroha for both parts of this Standing Resolution. Closer monitoring of this situation in the future could help to ensure that this is more likely to be the case.

8.5.5 Principles of Mission

A diversity of Tikanga Māori viewpoints concerning the mana of regenesi emerged in terms of mission. It is clear that evangelism through the medium of the Māori language in a number of contexts as well as transforming unjust structures emerged as major priorities. Such priorities appear to be imbued with more mana. This does not, however, mean that other aspects of mission are considered to be unimportant and are therefore totally lacking in mana. The overall impression from Anglican Pākehā informants is that regenesi does not have much mana for mission in their churches. The exceptions are responding to the needs of Māori clientele in their social service agencies and the possibility of changing unjust structures. The latter would appear to have the most amount of mana. As for Tikanga Pasifika, it is clear that Māori language and cultural regenesi is not part of their mission and therefore has little mana. The level of the intrinsic tapu of regenesi reflects the amount of mana attributed to regenesi by each Tikanga. For Tikanga Māori there is considerable intrinsic tapu, while for Tikanga Pākehā there is much less and for Tikanga Pasifika it appears to be at an even lower level at this stage.

I now examine this Standing Resolution in terms of restoring the tapu relationships of regenesi to a range of contexts and resources. Firstly, despite the focus of this Resolution on mission, there was no explicit reference to God by any of the interviewees. As for the restoration of the tapu relationship to Māori, Pākehā and Pacific Island communities, there were also no easily discernible comments. Nonetheless, there could be an implicit acceptance of the importance of this Resolution for the Māori community by Tikanga Māori interviewees. No such similar importance is evident for Pākehā or Pacific Island communities.

Synthesis

Not surprisingly, there is no discussion about land, given the attention being paid to mission. There are comments, however, by Tikanga Māori regarding the transformation of unjust structures which oppress regenesis and the need for the Māori Anglican Church to have the resources to undertake this task. This is an element of restoration here which does not appear to be as strongly apparent in the other two Tikanga. Treaty of Waitangi obligations again do not enter into the picture. Theological education and other sites of nurture, such as homes and marae, also do not figure at all in the responses of any of the interviewees. The only educational institutions that are clearly regarded by some from Tikanga Māori as relevant, in terms of restoring tapu, are those that are Māori language medium. Neither of the other two Tikanga remark on these matters. Perhaps a context which is missing from the theological framework is that of the social service organisation which could be regarded as part of the church. Both Tikanga Māori and Tikanga Pākehā see this kind of situation as a possible place where regenesis restoration could occur.

The key resources of *Te Paipera Tapu*, *Te Rāwiri*, *Hīmene* and *A New Zealand Prayer Book* are not mentioned at all as far as this Resolution is concerned. Again, these resources may be seen as a given in terms of evangelism, teaching, baptism and nurture even though they were not raised as issues by informants.

Much diversity exists about what are the tika and pono ways to undertake regenesis mission. A good deal of aroha for regenesis is displayed in the responses of Tikanga Māori to this Standing Resolution. There does not appear to be the same level of aroha perceptible in the comments of the informants from the other two Tikanga. It would be wrong to give the impression that there is no aroha but it is not strong for Anglican Pākehā or Pacific Islanders. It seems that lifting the mana of regenesis will be necessary for any major growth in regenesis. This may lead to an increase in compassion as well as respect and transparency. Likewise, an increase in tika, pono and aroha may lead to a lifting of the mana of regenesis. For each of these three cultural groupings it could be argued that there is a need to debate what are the most respectful, transparent and compassionate methods of advancing regenesis as part of their mission. Any development, of course, will occur when each Tikanga deem it appropriate.

8.5.6 Emergent Trends

I have discerned a number of trends as I have viewed the Māori language and cultural policy and practice data of the Anglican Church through a Māori theological lens. When the Bicultural Commission advocated the four bicultural Standing Resolutions in 1986, the Anglican Church ascribed a high level of mana to these innovative policies. Nevertheless, over the last twenty years or so, there has been a gradual lowering of the mana of these policies as well as their implementation. It would be wrong, however, to give the impression that the same levels of mana have operated for each Standing Resolution or across all three cultural contexts. Moreover, such a lowering of mana has steadily impacted on the delivery of Māori language and cultural mission in each Tikanga in terms of the principles of mission.

For Tikanga Māori informants those Resolutions which focus on aspects of Māori language acquisition appear to have the most mana. But the problem has been in the implementation of such policies. In other words, the uneven quality of the Māori language programmes has at times diminished the mana of regenesis processes. Some Anglican Māori are ambivalent in that, while they may perceive good levels of mana among Māori, this is not the case for Anglican Pākehā. In terms of mission, Māori language evangelism and changing unjust structures would appear to rate more highly for Māori. For Pākehā the latter would appear to have the most mana alongside training which could occur at diverse levels depending on the setting. For many Anglican Pākehā, Māori language and culture has low social status or mana to the extent that some do not want to learn it. The same could also be said for Tikanga Pasifika interviewees as far as the Anglican Church in the Pacific Islands are concerned. It is interesting to note that this Tikanga agrees with the view regarding the low level of status given by Pākehā to Māori language and culture. There is some support here for transformation in the form of bicultural training for Pākehā as well as, not surprisingly, the teaching of te reo in church schools in Aotearoa New Zealand.

The intrinsic tapu of Māori language and cultural regenesis is reflected by the differing degrees of mana assigned to the policies and their practical outworking. Again in 1986 the original policymakers attributed a high level of intrinsic tapu to these Standing Resolutions but this has steadily decreased over more than twenty years. Regenesis for Anglican Māori has more intrinsic tapu than for the other two Tikanga. As for mana, Māori language and cultural acquisition has a good level of tapu. This is true also for some aspects of mission such as evangelism and changing unjust structures. Clearly there are differing levels

depending on the policy. This is evident also for Pākehā. It could be argued that an interesting indicator of the amount of this kind of tapu is the limited use of the Māori language in Pākehā liturgical situations. Regeneration is not a priority for mission in this Tikanga and this is mirrored by low intrinsic tapu in this context. An even lower ranking is manifest for Anglican Pacific Islanders.

I now move to assess the trends that have become evident in terms of restoring tapu relationships of Māori language and cultural regeneration to God, people, land, churches, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, theological education, homes, marae and educational institutions as well as key critical texts. The Bicultural Commission hoped that such a process of restoration would emanate from its policies. What emerges, however, is that overall some of these relationships have been gradually diminished and have been either tenuously maintained or almost lost completely.

Although it could be argued that God is a given in the church context, there was no explicit reference to the Creator by interviewees even in the area of mission. As for communities, it is not clear to what extent restoration has taken place or might even be possible. Although there is an implicit acceptance of the importance of regeneration policies by Tikanga Māori, such policies do not appear to be a priority. Overall for this Tikanga, the restoring of relational tapu would seem to occur at a low level, while for the other two it would seem to be heading towards a much lower level or is virtually non-existent. The same could be said in terms of land. No explicit mention of land is made by any Anglicans although it is obviously present in the location of worship centres, homes and marae.

In general, the reality for Anglican churches is that the original strategy to enable restoration to occur has been steadily ignored and as a result has failed to gain the hoped for momentum. While in the Māori Anglican Church some restoration work has occurred, the extent of such work is not transparent. Some Anglican Māori recognise that there is still a great deal more to be accomplished. In Tikanga Pākehā, it would seem that the degree of restoration is much less and, furthermore, is dependent on whether there is a high percentage of Māori living in a particular region. In the eyes of Anglican Māori and Pacific Islanders, the Pākehā tapu relationship to regeneration has only been restored at a tokenistic or minimal amount. This was largely confirmed by Anglican Pākehā informants. As for Tikanga Pasifika, little if any restoration has taken place.

The restoration of the tapu relationship of regenesis to the Treaty of Waitangi does not appear to be an issue for any of the Tikanga. Anglican Māori and Pākehā do not mention Treaty partnership. The high level of hoped for restoration by the Bicultural Commission in 1986 has not actually been translated into action. Again, it would be wrong to say that this is the case equally for each of the Standing Resolutions. For example, the Māori language programmes in church educational institutions appear to have more relational tapu than the other three bicultural policies. For Māori, it could be asserted that the presence of the Treaty is implied even though it did not rate even a mention in the interviews. It was only one Pacific Islander who acknowledged the spirit of partnership. Given the earlier discussion about Treaty slippage in Aotearoa New Zealand, perhaps it should not be a surprise that any restoration of the relational tapu of regenesis to the Treaty is highly likely to be increasingly limited.²

Theological education was most definitely a high priority for the Bicultural Commission in terms of restoring relational tapu in 1986. Clearly there has been some restorative work undertaken but for some Tikanga Māori interviewees there is much more yet to take place. For Anglican Pākehā, there is a level of ambivalence in terms of whether their theological training institutions should move beyond introductory courses. This is linked, of course, to the limited opportunities for mission and ministry among Māori since the constitutional changes in 1992. As for Tikanga Pasifika, restoration does not appear on their radar screens. Overall, the trend for all Anglicans would appear for such restoration to be maintained at low levels.

The restoration of the tapu relationship of regenesis to homes does not seem to be recognised by any Tikanga. If there is a trend here, it is that the home does not rank at all as a critical regenesis site despite the fact that for some Māori, regenesis has occurred in this setting. Much the same could also be said for the marae which hardly figures, if at all, in the policies or their implementation. The exception is the Standing Resolution on ordination training where the ministry opportunities for Māori on marae are considerably more numerous than for the other two Tikanga. The discernible trend for Māori here has been at times a low level of restoration. In other words, there is much more to be done to restore relational tapu in the marae context. As for educational institutions, any restorative work has happened at pre-school, primary and secondary school levels if it has taken place at all in the three Tikanga.

² See p. 180.

Tertiary education does not even rate a mention. It is only some Anglican Māori who posit the view that there is still a need for restoration with Māori language medium educational institutions. The case for English medium institutions that teach te reo is simply not present.

The key texts of *Te Paipera Tapu*, *Te Rāwiri*, *Hīmene* and *A New Zealand Prayer Book* do not figure at all in any processes aimed at restoring Māori language and cultural regenesis in any of the three Tikanga. It is not raised as an explicit issue in any feedback on the Standing Resolutions. Possibly Tikanga Māori would have assumed these resources are a given in any regenesis courses in theological education institutions.

In 1986 the Bicultural Commission focussed on the recovery of the mana and tapu of Māori language and cultural regenesis by promoting a new set of policies. It was the hope of the Commission to encourage high levels of mana and tapu by adopting four Standing Resolutions. It was also their hope that by tika, pono and aroha processes that their implementation would be considerably facilitated. What has gradually emerged over the last twenty or so years has been a lowering of this degree of mana and tapu. The actual practice of tika, pono and aroha or respect, transparency and love has failed to maintain this previously high level of mana and tapu in ways that have been continuous throughout the whole of the Māori, Pākehā and Pacific Islands Anglican Church. Māori language and cultural regenesis has proven not to be an explicit priority for any of the Tikanga. People in each Tikanga have at times acted in ways that have not been respectful, transparent or compassionate. Overall, the hoped for aroha has not taken place in tika and pono ways. As a result, the mana and tapu of regenesis has been progressively damaged. While this is true generally in the Anglican Church, there are some degrees of variance in terms of the different Standing Resolutions and cultural contexts. It would also not be right to say that there has not been any mana, tapu, tika, pono and aroha but it has not been apparent to the extent originally envisaged. It would also be wrong to promote the notion that the situation is hopeless and that there are no prospects for transformation. In Tikanga Māori there is still a good deal of hope and aroha for Māori language and cultural mission as well as developing regenesis programmes for Māori language medium educational bodies. As for Tikanga Pākehā, from a Māori spiritual perspective, the lifting of the mana and status of Māori language and culture will be needed for any major regenesis development. The same could be said for Tikanga Pasifika. Finally, it is clear that there has been a discernible trend among all three cultural groupings towards a diminution of these important Māori principles.

8.6. Concluding Remarks

In this chapter a number of disturbing trends have come to light. First, it is clear that the hopes and aspirations of the Bicultural Commission in 1986 have largely not been fully realised or honoured in terms of the four bicultural Standing Resolutions and their implementation. Second, most Tikanga Māori interviewees appear to remain committed to Māori language and cultural regeneration for mission and ministry in the twenty-first century. No such commitment is apparent from Tikanga Pākehā. As for Tikanga Pasifika, it is generally not part of their mission and ministry. Third, while most Anglican Māori informants have implied that the Treaty of Waitangi is near the centre, the research findings show that it is actually heading in the direction of the margins. Tikanga Pākehā appears to have moved well down the path of re-marginalising the Treaty, especially since the new Constitution in 1992. As for Tikanga Pasifika, it is doubtful whether the Treaty has generally appeared on their radar in the Pacific Islands. This may change significantly as their mission and ministry work is developed in Aotearoa New Zealand. Fourth, there has been a steady lowering of the mana and tapu of regeneration over more than twenty years. This has occurred as a result of a lack of tika, pono and aroha, namely, respect, transparency and compassion. Although this has taken place across all three Tikanga, it is very pronounced among Tikanga Pākehā and Tikanga Pasifika. Fifth, the impact of all these trends has been a steady weakening of Māori language and cultural regeneration mission and ministry from the levels originally envisaged in 1986. Finally, despite these disconcerting trends, there is still hope that such trends can be halted and reversed. It is still possible that bold transformation can take place. With these disquieting trends now unveiled, in the next chapter I consider the implications of these research findings for future regeneration development in the Anglican Church.

Chapter 9. Conclusion

Bold transformation of disturbing regensis trends within the Anglican Church can only take place through the gospel imperatives of love, peace and justice. Without Christ-like processes of respect, transparency and compassion, the mana and tapu of regensis mission and ministry will continue to decrease. This chapter draws together the various facets of the thesis to answer the research question which was posed in Chapter One. It then proceeds to discuss the implications of these findings for future regensis mission. Eighteen critical ministry contexts are briefly highlighted. Furthermore, nine major policy areas for future regensis development emerge in order of importance. The first three are urgent as the number of elderly Anglican Māori continues to dwindle rapidly. Partnership and bicultural development also figure prominently. Finally, to plan, implement and monitor these policy priorities, there is a proposal for a new institution of the Anglican Church.

9.1. Maintaining or Altering Current Regensis Policy and Practice

The research question asks: should current Anglican Church policy and practice concerning Māori language and cultural regensis be maintained or altered in the light of contemporary Treaty of Waitangi debates in the public square and Māori Christian theologies? This thesis has critiqued current Anglican regensis policy and practice through the lenses of Treaty debates and Māori theology. As a Tikanga Māori clergyperson, teacher and researcher, I strongly advocate that Tikanga Māori seriously consider altering its policy and practice concerning Māori language and cultural regensis to reverse several disconcerting trends and to undertake loving transformation. This involves bold transformation which will need to be, “. . . accelerated, multi-layered with multiple strategies all working simultaneously and intergenerational” (Smith, 2006a-a, p. 254). As for the other two Tikanga, their responsibilities in terms of mutual support are spelt out under Canon XX on common life and partnership:

Each partner and its constituent parts shall seek to ensure adequate provision and support is available to the other partners to assist in the effective proclamation and communication of the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the provision of ministry amongst the people whom each seek to serve, recognising that in partnership there is common responsibility and mutual interdependence.” (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2002, p. B38)

Conclusion

The Anglican Church needs to fully realise and honour the hopes and aspirations of the 1986 Bicultural Commission in order to place the Treaty of Waitangi firmly at the centre, as spelt out in the bicultural Standing Resolutions and the 1992 Constitution. The Church also needs to increase the mana and tapu of Māori language and cultural regenesis through the Christ-like processes of tika, pono and aroha, or respect, transparency and compassion.

Flowing out of aroha and the gospel imperative of love are the gospel imperatives of justice and peace which stem from tika and pono. One aspect of tika is respect for justice and peace. Pono ensures that such justice and peace is not only talked about but is also put into action. It monitors justice and peace to confirm that it is true and transparent. Justice and peace actually occur. The lack of monitoring of regenesis policies and practice in the Anglican Church since 1986 has been disquieting. I have already argued that there is a lack of tika, pono and aroha in the Church's regenesis processes. Without tika, pono and aroha, there will be no justice and peace. Yet the gospel imperatives of love, justice and peace are needed for bold regenesis transformation to authentically take place.

Ultimately it will be for each section of the Māori Anglican Church, namely, each of the five Hui Amorangi, to discuss, debate and decide what the most important issues regarding regenesis are. If such discussions, debates or decision-making occur, I would expect to see emerge not only a diverse range of responses in terms of the future development of regenesis mission and ministry, but also some areas of commonality. Nevertheless, on the basis of the research undertaken in this thesis I propose some major priorities in an attempt to answer this question: What are the few, crucial things that need to be done well and early (Fishman, 1991, p. 413)? The approach that I have adopted in my proposals is that of the middle axiom in that I do not wish to be so broad as to be meaningless or too involved with the intimate details as to be pedantic (Storrar, 2004, pp. 38-39). Te Rūnanganui o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa, the biennial synod of the Māori Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand, could establish a Commission to prepare major new developments in terms of regenesis policy and practice. The Māori Anglican Church could submit a report to General Synod which recommends a new set of Standing Resolutions and any subsequent changes to Anglican Church canons. I now turn to briefly survey future options for Māori language and cultural mission and ministry in the Anglican Church.

9.2. Future Māori Language and Cultural Regeneration Mission in the Anglican Church

I found that there is a diverse range of Anglican Māori perspectives on the five-fold Anglican mission statement in terms of regeneration. Evangelism through the medium of Māori language and culture, however, is still important for the majority. The possibility of bold innovation included focussing on Māori language medium educational institutions. Another priority is transforming unjust structures which require a higher level of bicultural Treaty partnership with Pākehā to lift the mana and tapu of regeneration mission. There is a clear need to devise strategies to increase the level of mana and tapu of this mission in respectful, transparent and compassionate ways not only for these two mission principles but also for the other three as well.

Another trend that has also emerged from my research findings in terms of Tikanga Māori mission is the continued importance of Māori language and cultural delivery systems. In other words, teaching and learning Māori language and culture is still considered to be a major priority. There is less consensus, however, about how such systems might be constructed and put into action. Nurturing Anglican Māori also involves the development of appropriate resources including the key biblical and liturgical texts which I have discussed earlier, namely, *Te Paipera Tapu*, *Te Rāwiri*, *Hīmene* and *A New Zealand Prayer Book*. Later in this chapter I will also briefly outline some possibilities concerning these texts as well as new Māori language and cultural resource development.

Another area of potential mission partnership with Tikanga Pākehā is in the area of loving service for the Māori clients of Māori and Pākehā Anglican social service agencies. Yet a further aspect of mission is the possibility of considering an endangered Māori language and culture as part of processes which safeguard and renew creation. The Hui Amorangi o Te Manawa o Te Wheke, a Māori Anglican diocese, in 2009 again confirmed the importance of the five-fold mission statement of the Anglican Church being delivered through the medium of Māori language and culture ("Reo Regeneration Planning Group Report," 2009, p. 57). As mentioned earlier, each of the five Hui Amorangi in the Māori Anglican Church may wish to engage in wide ranging discussion and debates on the nature of Māori language and cultural regeneration mission. Again, I would expect that there would be a diverse range of responses with some commonalities emerging. I now focus on the current and potential contexts for regeneration ministry.

9.3. Future Māori Language and Cultural Regenesi s Ministry Contexts

Eighteen important contexts for future Māori language and cultural ministry have emerged. These include the obvious four key church sites such as: Māori Anglican Churches, Māori Anglican church schools, Māori Anglican social service agencies and Māori Anglican theological education institutions. Ministry could also take place in eight types of educational locations: Māori language medium pre-schools, primary and secondary schools and tertiary institutions as well as their mainstream counterparts. Six other important regenesi s sites are the home, neighbourhood and community including the marae, media and workplaces. An inclusive approach applies to all the age groups as well as both genders. These layers of institutions and groups will need to discern the many diverse innovative strategies which will facilitate transformation. To be effective overall such strategies will need to be intergenerational. With eighteen important contexts there is a need to identify, as mentioned earlier, the few crucial things which the Anglican Church needs to do well and early.¹ I now review briefly nine major policy priorities for future regenesi s development in order of suggested importance. These priorities have the potential to lay a solid foundation for successful regenesi s in the Anglican Church.

9.3.1 Priority Area One: Archives and History

The number of elderly Anglican Māori native speakers is rapidly decreasing. It is critical that such elders be recorded on audiotape and videotape as soon as possible for intergenerational transmission purposes. In Chapter One I reviewed briefly the work of the Māori Language Planning Group in Te Hui Amorangi o Te Manawa o Te Wheke.² Recording these Māori language speaking elders in the range of regenesi s ministry contexts, mentioned in the previous section, is a matter of real urgency. These audio and video tapes will not only be an invaluable archival and historical record for present and future generations of Anglican Māori but also helpful resources for teaching and use in ministry sites to facilitate intergenerational transmission. Such recordings will need to be indexed and stored alongside other collections of regenesi s audio and videotapes of oral history as well as written contemporary and historical Māori language books, manuscripts and papers. Access to these collections could be facilitated through information technology. All these archives and histories could also

¹ See p. 206.

² See p. 18.

potentially contribute to the commemorations of the Anglican Church's Bicentenary of the first preaching of the gospel in 2014.

9.3.2 Priority Area Two: Theological Education and Ministry Formation

Another urgent priority is Māori language medium theological education and ministry formation. This is a major future project of the Māori Anglican Diocese or Hui Amorangi o Te Manawa o Te Wheke as briefly outlined in Chapter One.³ The Māori Anglican Church still has several theological educators who are native speaking elders. It also has a group of advanced second language learners, including a few graduates of Māori language medium secondary schools, who could benefit greatly by being exposed to these Māori language speaking elders. This kind of intergenerational transmission of Māori theology through the medium of Māori language and culture is essential for regensis mission and ministry as these second language learners will in the future become the repositories of Anglican Māori theology, language and culture. Given the limited linguistic, cultural and theological resources of the Māori Anglican Church, a strategic partnership of the two Māori Anglican theological institutions in such a project could be invaluable. The curriculum focussed on ministry formation could include theology, biblical studies, pastoral care, church history, missiology and liturgical studies. Week-long courses conducted by native speakers through the medium of Māori language and culture could be recorded on audio and videotapes for future teaching and ministry use. These courses could also result in a bilingual Māori and English dictionary of words and phrases for Anglican mission and ministry. Another related priority is the personal and professional development of Anglican Māori language professionals. There is also a need for the effective delivery of proficiency examinations. Besides Anglican elders, the Māori Language Commission could also be invited to assist with the planning and implementation of these initiatives.

9.3.3 Priority Area Three: Revision and Development of Key Liturgical Texts

A further urgent priority, considering the dwindling number of elderly native speakers, is the revision and development of key Māori language or bilingual biblical and liturgical texts. Again there is potential here for intergenerational transmission and collaboration between

³ See p. 19.

these elders and younger second language learners. As mentioned earlier in Chapter One, a revision of *Te Paipera Tapu* suitable for youth or young married couples has emerged in 2009 as an interdenominational project.⁴ Alongside this translation project is the potential to develop a bilingual Bible study programme. A literal English translation of the 1952 revision of *Te Paipera Tapu* would also value and honour the work of the 1946 Revision Committee. Another possible project is a bilingual study guide to *Te Rāwiri*, especially focussing on morning and evening prayers. The current *Hīmene* book could also be republished with the relevant bilingual scriptural references upon which the hymns are based as well as a literal English translation of the hymns. A bilingual study guide giving the historical background and theology of each hymn would be a useful resource. The development of contemporary singable Psalms and songs of praise in Māori appropriate for ministry, especially youth ministry, would be valuable. Yet another idea for youth ministry would be a new bilingual prayerbook aimed specifically at about the three quarters of the Māori population who are under the age of 40.

9.3.4 Priority Area Four: Research, Policies and Monitoring

A major problem in the implementation of the five Standing Resolutions has been the lack of monitoring over more than twenty years. As for future policies and programmes such as a twenty-five year strategy similar to that adopted by the Raukawa Trust Board, as discussed in Chapter One, there is a need for proactive Māori language and cultural planning for successful regensis mission and ministry to become a reality.⁵

This doctoral thesis has reviewed the Anglican Church's Māori language and cultural regensis policy and practice since 1986. It has viewed this policy and practice through bicultural Treaty partnership and Māori theological lenses. It is possible that other lenses could be used such as financial, historical and sociolinguistic lenses from any point in time since the preaching of the first Anglican sermon in 1814. The past or present policies or teaching programmes of St. John's College or Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa or the Māori church schools could also be examined. A survey of Māori Anglican church parishes or Hui Amorangi regarding their policies could also be conducted.

⁴ See p. 19.

⁵ See p. 17.

9.3.5 Priority Area Five: Publicity and Promotion

The mana and tapu of regenesis can be raised through more respect, transparency and compassion. It is clear that it is necessary to increase the critical awareness and status of regenesis through publicity and promotion. A series of initiatives needs to be developed and implemented to inform Anglican Māori and other Anglicans of the endangered state of regenesis mission and ministry and the future tasks required to reverse current disturbing trends through bold, loving transformation. Again the Raukawa Reo Strategy serves as a useful model in terms of its proposed interventions such as highlighting key messages through publicity and promotional material including a website, clothing, stickers, posters, signage and advertising and increased media exposure (2006, p. 16). It is also possible to increase Māori Anglican Church regenesis involvement in annual events like Waitangi Day, Matariki and Māori Language Week. The latter is a current project of the Māori Language Planning Group of the Hui Amorangi o Te Manawa o Te Wheke.⁶ In addition, there is potential to encourage individual churches to promote regenesis to its congregations and wider communities. Regional, national and international Anglican or ecumenical meetings on Māori language and cultural endangerment and regenesis in Māori and indigenous churches could also be held for networking, information sharing and promotional purposes.

9.3.6 Priority Area Six: Community Development

While the national Māori Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and each Hui Amorangi or Diocese may develop their written regenesis strategic plans, the same policymaking will need to take place at the local parish, or village, or township level. The development of the Raukawa Trust Board's multi-layered strategies for the tribe, marae and home can be viewed as a model for local community development. The government's current focus on home and community regenesis also acknowledges these contexts as pivotal sites. Likewise, the Church could develop pastoral care programmes to support such developments. As almost 75% percent of the Māori population is under the age of 40 and intergenerational transmission is vitally important, then regenesis for Māori Anglican youth and young married couples is fundamental. Contextually appropriate regenesis courses could be planned and delivered for this age group. The Māori Anglican Church could also initiate regenesis mission and ministry in Māori language medium pre-schools, primary and secondary schools and tertiary

⁶ See p. 19.

institutions as well as their mainstream counterparts. Kapa haka, Māori cultural performing groups, also have an important regeneration role in these institutions.

9.3.7 Priority Area Seven: Resource Development

The Māori Anglican Church has a tradition of Māori language printing and publishing which could provide a platform for future resource development. Stemming from the publications based on the key biblical and liturgical resources, mentioned earlier in this chapter, are the production of Bible or Christian Māori stories in Māori, with suitable illustrations, for young Māori speaking families as well as Māori language medium or mainstream pre-schools, primary and secondary schools and tertiary institutions (Nicholson, 2000, p. 157). A Māori language newspaper or magazine, also delivered online, could contain articles on Christian living, biblical, and historical information. It could also produce analyses of major issues affecting Māori in the twenty-first century (p. 145). As well as print opportunities, there are also the flow on possibilities of radio and television programmes on Māori and mainstream radio and television stations, videos, CDs, websites, blogs and other information technology delivery systems.

9.3.8 Priority Area Eight: Partnership

The Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia needs to return the Treaty of Waitangi to the centre in terms of its policy and practice. It also needs to pursue partnership at much higher levels of transparency, authenticity, equality and equity than has been the case over the last twenty years. Treaty Fatigue needs to be replaced by Treaty Faith, Hope and Love. Bold, loving transformation is required for just and peaceful regeneration mission and ministry in Aotearoa New Zealand.

I have already surveyed the principle of partnership in the Anglican Church's Constitution. Tikanga Māori has the power to organise its own affairs regarding Māori language and cultural regeneration mission and ministry while also being, "diligent in prescribing and in keeping open all avenues leading to the common ground" (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 1990, p. 10). The Māori Anglican Church's five Hui Amorangi or Dioceses will need to find common intra-Tikanga ground before finding such inter-Tikanga ground.

Conclusion

The common life and partnership canon of the Anglican Church, mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, affirms mutual support. To date, however, English is the de facto language of most common life meetings but the Constitution empowers Māori to choose the language and culture for the expression of her or his faith at the General Synod or other inter-Tikanga meetings. Under Standing Order 25 of General Synod members may speak in any language (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 2000, p.6). In applying the Constitution there is an expectation that the Māori and English texts shall be considered together (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 1990, p. 70). Translation services, supported by sophisticated technology, could encourage Māori language speakers to speak Māori not only in greeting members but also to debate issues and legislation in a sustained way. In the short to medium term this seems unlikely without translation services. Providing such a move was carefully introduced, the mana and tapu of regenesis could be raised. General Synod could set an example in terms of further embodying the principles of the Treaty in the institutions and general life of the Anglican Church as envisaged by the Bi-cultural Commission in 1986.

Yet partnership, in terms of the promotion of regenesis mission, need not be confined to Tikanga Pākehā or Tikanga Pasifika. There are also the possibilities of partnership with the Anglican Indigenous Network and minority or endangered language groups in the Anglican Communion as well as with other denominations in Aotearoa New Zealand and international Christian organisations such as the World Council of Churches. In addition, partnership could be forged with secular national Māori language organisations both governmental and non-governmental. Examples could be the Māori Language Commission and Te Rūnanganui o ngā Kura Kaupapa Māori, the national organisation for Māori language medium primary and secondary schools.

9.3.9 Priority Area Nine: Bicultural Development

The Bicultural Commission in 1986 defined bicultural development as, “the process whereby two cultures grow and develop within one nation in a spirit of mutual respect and responsibility” (Bi-cultural Commission, 1986, p. 25). What this thesis has discovered is that this spirit has diminished for both Tikanga Māori and Tikanga Pākehā. Within the Anglican Church’s Constitution, the principle of bicultural development “maintains the right of every person to choose any particular cultural expression of the faith” (Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia, 1990, p. 10). Of the cultures of the partners, one is

Conclusion

seriously endangered. It is then the responsibility of the whole Anglican Church to address Māori language and cultural regensis mission and ministry. Bicultural development needs to be more than the symbolic use of the Lord's Prayer in Māori in church services. It also needs to be supported by policies as well as human and financial resources. Until all Tikanga have honoured this principle then the possibility of multicultural development appears to be impeded.

For Anglican Māori the development process could also include dialogue and engagement with other denominations, with the Anglican Indigenous Network, with other minority or endangered language groups in the Anglican Communion and with international Christian organisations. National and international secular organisations are also further possibilities for future dialogue.

9.4. Mihinare Centre for Māori Language Regensis

If the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia believes that Māori language and cultural regensis mission and ministry is a vitally important issue, then it may seriously consider implementing the above nine policy priorities to lay the foundations for future development. If the Treaty of Waitangi and the gospel imperatives of love, justice and peace are at the centre of the Church's Constitution, then there is an urgent need to reverse several disturbing trends and lovingly transform regensis mission and ministry. The complex task of bold transformation requires a robust organisation which is able to facilitate major growth. Clearly, given the diverse ministry contexts, it is beyond the scope of any current theological educational institution to undertake such development. It is for all these reasons, as well as the history of policy and practice since 1986, that the establishment of a new institution, possibly across three Tikanga, has been proposed. A national Anglican Church institution, tentatively called the Mihinare Centre for Māori Language Regensis, is required to plan, implement and monitor new regensis policies and programmes.

9.5. Concluding Remarks

In this final chapter I have been able to answer the research question by recommending strongly to Tikanga Māori that they give serious consideration to altering their regensis policy and practice through bold, loving transformative strategies. The gospel imperatives of love, justice and peace are critical in terms of reversing disturbing trends and for transformation to occur. The five-fold Anglican mission can be delivered through the

Conclusion

medium of Māori language and cultural regensis. Eighteen important ministry contexts have been briefly canvassed. I have recommended, in order of urgency and importance, nine major policy priorities for future regensis development and a new national Anglican Church institution to plan, implement and monitor such policy priorities. I recommend that Tikanga Māori invite the other two Tikanga to consider assisting with the bold, loving transformation of the Church's regensis mission and ministry, given the current constitutional Anglican Church environment, especially in terms of common life and partnership.

Finally, it is clear that the Anglican Church has a crucial role to play in the revival and revitalisation of the Māori language. Conversely, the Māori language has a crucial role to play in the revival and revitalisation of the Church. This is encapsulated in a Māori proverb: "Mā te Hāhi ka ora ai te reo; mā te reo ka ora ai te Hāhi." Loosely translated into English, this means: "Through the Church, the Māori language will have life; through the Māori language, the Church will have life." The survival and flourishing of both the Anglican Church and the Māori language and culture is vital for future Māori mission and ministry. The most important factor to enable bold regensis transformation to take place is Christ-like love: "The greatest thing is love. Ko te mea nui, ko te aroha."⁷

⁷ 1 Corinthians 13:13

Appendix 1 Questionnaire

Doctoral Thesis Interview Questions

Name of participant:

Date of interview:

Location of interview:

How long have you been an Anglican?

What position, if any, did you hold in the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia in 1986?

Standing Resolutions of General Synod

The researcher reads the following statements to the participant:

“In 1986 General Synod received the report and recommendations of the Bi-cultural Commission of the Anglican Church on the Treaty of Waitangi. Several of the recommendations focussed on Māori language and culture, parts of which subsequently became Standing Resolutions of General Synod.”

The participant reads the first resolution from the Participant Reading Sheet.

A. Standing Resolution One

1. Do you know of any people who have studied Māori language and culture as part of their ordination training programmes?
2. How vigorous, intense and deep have these studies been in terms of clergy being able to conduct Māori language church services on marae and elsewhere?
3. Do you have any comments regarding future training programmes in Māori language and culture?

The participant reads the second resolution.

B. Standing Resolution Two

1. How much Māori language has been used over the last twenty years by English speakers in everyday speech and writing, in formal documents, and in liturgical revisions?

2. Over the last twenty years, in your experience, how much have Māori speakers suggested the substitution of Māori words or corrected English speakers' misuse of Māori words?
3. Do you have any comments regarding the future implementation of this resolution?

The participant reads the third resolution.

C. Standing Resolution Three

1. Do you know of any congregations or trustees of premises and plant who made their facilities available?
2. Do you know of any English speaking parents who were encouraged and did involve themselves and their children in Kōhanga Reo?
3. Do you have any comments regarding the future implementation of this resolution?

The participant reads the fourth resolution.

D. Standing Resolution Four

1. How widespread across the three Tikanga is the study of Māori language (as an integral part of teaching programmes) at Anglican pre-schools, primary schools, secondary schools and theological colleges?
2. How widespread is the teaching of the principles of partnership and bi-cultural development, various words and expressions as reported on by the General Synod Bi-cultural Commission on the Treaty of Waitangi and marae kawa or protocol?
3. Do you have any comments regarding the future implementation of this resolution?

The researcher reads to the participant the following statement:

“Later in 1988 and 1994 there was another Standing Resolution adopted by General Synod which potentially had a Māori language and cultural dimension.”

The participant reads the fifth resolution.

E. Standing Resolution Five

1. In your Tikanga what links exist between Māori language and culture and evangelism?
2. In your Tikanga what links exist between Māori language and culture and the teaching, baptism and nurture of new believers?
3. In your Tikanga what links exist between Māori language and culture and loving service or pastoral care?

Appendix 1

4. In your Tikanga what links exist between Māori language and culture and transforming unjust structures of society?
5. In your Tikanga what links exist between Māori language and culture and safeguarding the integrity of creation and sustaining and renewing the life of the earth?

Thank you very much. Kia ora rawa atu.

Appendix 2 Glossary

<i>aroha</i>	compassion, love
<i>Atua</i>	spiritual powers, Christian God
<i>haka</i>	Māori war dance
<i>hapū</i>	subtribe
<i>hīkoi</i>	protest march, spiritual pilgrimage
<i>Hīmene</i>	a collection of Māori language hymns
<i>hohourongo</i>	reconciliation processes
<i>hui</i>	gathering, meeting
<i>iwi</i>	tribe
<i>kaikaranga</i>	women who call visitors onto the marae or who answer this call
<i>kaitiakitanga</i>	guardianship
<i>karakia</i>	prayers, incantations
<i>karanga</i>	high-pitched call of welcome by women
<i>kapa haka</i>	group of Māori action song performers
<i>kaupapa</i>	concept, doctrine, statement
<i>kāwanatanga</i>	governorship
<i>kete</i>	woven basket
<i>koha</i>	gift
<i>kōhanga reo</i>	Māori language medium preschool
<i>kotahitanga</i>	unity
<i>Ko te mea nui, ko te aroha</i>	The greatest thing is love

Appendix 2

<i>kura kaupapa</i>	Māori language medium primary school
<i>mana</i>	divine authority or power
<i>manaakitanga</i>	caring
<i>mana atua</i>	power with humanity's link to the spiritual powers
<i>mana tangata</i>	power derived from people strength
<i>mana whenua</i>	power from the land, its mountains, rivers, lakes, bush and trees including birds
<i>marae</i>	courtyard area in front of the meeting house, the name of the whole complex of space and buildings, fortified village
<i>marae ātea</i>	marae courtyard in front of the meeting house
<i>marae kawa</i>	cultural protocols observed at a marae
<i>mātauranga Māori</i>	Māori knowledge
<i>minita-ā-iwi</i>	non-stipendiary clergy in Tikanga Māori
<i>mokopuna</i>	grandchild/ren
<i>noa</i>	without tapu
<i>papatipu</i>	ancestral lands
<i>pono</i>	integrity
<i>pūkenga</i>	being accomplished, skilled
<i>pūrākau</i>	traditional stories
<i>rangatiratanga</i>	chieftainship
<i>tamariki</i>	children
<i>tangata</i>	human being
<i>tangata whenua</i>	person of the land

Appendix 2

<i>tangihanga</i>	funeral
<i>taonga</i>	treasure
<i>tapu</i>	sacred, a person , place or thing, situated away from ordinary or common life
<i>Te Ahorangi</i>	Principal
<i>te ao Māori</i>	the Māori world
<i>Te Hāhi Mihinare</i>	missionary church, Māori Anglican Church
<i>Te Kotahitanga</i>	Provincial Ministry Training , Council of the Anglican Church
<i>Te Paipera Tapu</i>	Māori language Holy Bible
<i>Te Pīhopa o Aotearoa</i>	Bishop of Aotearoa
<i>Te Rāwiri</i>	Māori language version of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer
<i>te reo Māori</i>	Māori language
<i>Te Rūnanga Whāiti</i>	Standing Committee of the Bishopric of Aotearoa
<i>te tapu i te Atua</i>	God's innate being and sacredness
<i>te tapu i te tangata</i>	inherent sacredness of the person
<i>te tapu i te whenua</i>	the inherent sacredness of the land
<i>te tapu o te Atua</i>	God's being-in-relationship with creation
<i>te tapu o te tangata</i>	the sacredness of the person which is linked with relationships
<i>te tapu o te whenua</i>	the sacredness of the land which is inked with relationships
<i>Te Tiriti o Waitangi</i>	Treaty of Waitangi
<i>Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa</i>	Theological College of the Bishopric of Aoteaora
<i>Te Wiki o te Reo Māori</i>	Māori Language Week

Appendix 2

<i>tika</i>	right relationship, respect
<i>tikanga</i>	process, way, culture
<i>tikanga karakia</i>	form of church service
<i>Tikanga Māori</i>	Anglican Māori
<i>tikanga Māori</i>	Māori culture, customary law
<i>Tikanga Pākehā</i>	All Anglicans who are not Māori or Pacific Islanders
<i>tikanga Pākehā</i>	Pakeha culture
<i>Tikanga Pasifika</i>	Anglican Pacific Islanders
<i>tino rangatiratanga</i>	self-determination
<i>tīpuna</i>	ancestors
<i>tohunga</i>	Māori priest or expert
<i>tuturu</i>	authentic, real
<i>ūkaipō</i>	land as sustenance
<i>utu</i>	payback
<i>wahine</i>	woman
<i>wāhi rangatira iwi</i>	place that heightens people's dignity
<i>wāhi rangatira mana</i>	place of greatness
<i>wāhi rangatira tikanga Māori</i>	place where Māori customs are given ultimate expression
<i>wāhi rangatira wairua</i>	place of greatest spirituality
<i>waiata</i>	songs
<i>wairua</i>	spirit, soul
<i>wairua Māori</i>	Māori spirituality

Appendix 2

<i>wairuatanga</i>	spirituality
<i>wānanga</i>	workshop
<i>whakaaro</i>	thought
<i>whakapapa</i>	genealogy
<i>whakataukī</i>	proverb
<i>whānau</i>	family, extended family
<i>whanaungatanga</i>	relationship
<i>whare kura</i>	Māori language medium secondary school
<i>whare wananga</i>	traditional Māori school of learning, Māori tertiary educational institution
<i>whenua</i>	land including vegetation and waterways

Reference List

- Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia. (1990). *Constitution of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa, New Zealand and Polynesia*.
- Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia. (2000). *Standing Orders of the General Synod*. Retrieved June 17, 2004, from <http://www.anglican.org.nz/canons/Std%20Orders.pdf>.
- Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia. (2002). *Canons*. Retrieved June 17, 2004, from <http://www.anglican.org.nz/canons/Title%20G.pdf>.
- Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia. (2007). *Standing Resolutions of the General Synod*. Retrieved July 6, 2009, from <http://www.anglican.org.nz/Canons%20Reprint/Pdf.%20Files/12.%20Standing%20Resols%202006.pdf>
- Babadzan, A. (2006). Culturalism, neo-liberalism and the state: The rise and fall of neotraditionalist ideologies in the South Pacific. In E. Rata & R. Openshaw (Eds.), *Public policy and ethnicity: The politics of ethnic boundary making* (pp. 54-65). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barclay, K. (2005). Rethinking inclusion and biculturalism: Towards a more relational practice of democratic justice. In James H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 118-39). Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Bargh, M. (2007). A small issue of sovereignty. In M. Bargh (Ed.), *Resistance: An indigenous response to neoliberalism* (pp. 133-46). Wellington: Huia.
- Bartley, A., & Spoonley, P. (2005). Constructing a workable multiculturalism in a bicultural society. In M. Belgrave, M. Kawharu & D. Williams (Eds.), *Waitangi revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 136-48). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Beatson, E. (2000). *The Bi-cultural Commission of the Anglican Church on the Treaty of Waitangi 1984-86*. Unpublished Master of Arts Research Exercise, Massey University, Palmerston North
- Beatson, E. (2002). *Becoming a three Tikanga church: The Bi-cultural Commission on the Revision of the Constitution 1986-1992*. Unpublished MA, Massey University.
- Belgrave, M., Kawharu, M., & Williams, D. (Eds.). (2005). *Waitangi revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, A. (2004). 'Cultural vandalism' and Pākehā politics of guilt and responsibility. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand* (pp. 89-107). Melbourne: Thomson Dunmore Press.

Reference List

- Benton, R. (1991). The history and development of the Māori language. In G. McGregor & M. Williams (Eds.), *Dirty silence: Aspects of language and literature in New Zealand: Essays arising from the University of Waikato Winter Lecture Series of 1990* (pp. 1-18). Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Bi-cultural Commission. (1986). *Te Rīpoata a te Komihana mō te Kaupapa Tikanga Rua mō te Tiriti o Waitangi: The Report of the Bi-cultural Commission of the Anglican Church on the Treaty of Waitangi*: Provincial Secretary of the Church of the Province of New Zealand.
- Bishop, R. (2005). Freeing ourselves from neocolonial domination in research: A Kaupapa Maori approach to creating knowledge. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Third Edition* (pp. 109-38). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Byrnes, G. (2005). Nation and identity in the Waitangi Tribunal Reports. In J. H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 88-103). Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Cadigan, T. (1998). *The Indigenisation of Religious Life for Wāhine Māori in the Context of Aotearoa*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, U. of Auckland.
- Cadigan, T. (2002). Restoring Mana Wāhine. In *Overcoming Violence in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 66-73). Wellington: Philip Garside.
- Cadogan, T. (2002). Recovering spirituality: The story of wāhine Māori. In H. Bergin & S. Smith (Eds.), *He kupu whakawairua: Spirituality in Aotearoa New Zealand: Catholic voices* (pp. 141-55). Auckland: Accent Publications.
- Cadogan, T. (2004). A three-way relationship: God, land, people. A Māori woman reflects. In H. Bergin & S. Smith (Eds.), *Land and peace: He whenua, he wahi: Spiritualities from Aotearoa New Zealand*. Auckland: Accent Publications.
- Callaghan, M. (1999). *Theology in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand*. Unpublished MA thesis, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, California.
- Callaghan, M. (2006). Look to the Past to See the Future. *First Peoples Theology Journal*, 4(1), 104-9.
- Callister, P. (2006). Ethnic measurement as a policy making tool. In E. Rata & R. Openshaw (Eds.), *Public policy and ethnicity: The politics of ethnic boundary making* (pp. 142-55). New York: Palgrave.
- Chile, L. (2000). Biculturalism and multiculturalism: Are they mutually exclusive? In *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 62-6). Auckland: Treaty Conference 2000 Publication Group.
- Church of the Province of New Zealand. (1989). *A New Zealand Prayer Book: He Karakia Mihinare o Aotearoa*, Auckland: Collins.
- Consedine, R., & Consedine, J. (2005). *Healing our history: The challenge of the Treaty of Waitangi* (Revised ed.). Auckland: Penguin Group.

Reference List

- Cunningham, C. (1998). A framework for addressing Māori knowledge in research, science and technology. In *Te Oru Rangahau Maori Research and Development Conference* (pp. 387-97). Massey University, Palmerston North: School of Maori Studies, Massey University.
- Davidson, A. (1993). *Selwyn's legacy: The College of St. John the Evangelist, Te Waimate and Auckland 1843-1992. A history*. Auckland: The College of Saint John the Evangelist.
- Davidson, A. (1997). *Christianity in Aotearoa: a history of church and society in New Zealand* (2nd ed.). Wellington: New Zealand Education for Ministry Board.
- Deane, R. (2000). Globalisation and constitutional development. In C. James (Ed.), *Building the constitution* (pp. 112-7). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies Victoria University of Wellington.
- Durie, E. (2000). The Treaty in the Constitution. In C. James (Ed.), *Building the Constitution* (pp. 201-4). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies Victoria University of Wellington.
- Durie, M. (1995). *Whaiora: Māori health development*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (1998). *Te mana, te kāwanatanga: the politics of Māori self-determination*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (2003). *Ngā kahui pou: Launching Māori futures*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- Durie, M. (2005a). *Ngā tai matatu: Tides of Māori endurance*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (2005b). *Te tai tini: Transformations 2025*. Paper presented at the Hui Taumata 2005, Wellington.
- Fishman, J. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fitzgerald, E. (2004). Development since the 1984 Hui Taumata. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand* (pp. 43-58). Melbourne: Thomson Dunmore Press.
- Fox, D. (2009). Black Days. *Mana*, 88, 4.
- Grace, P. (2000). The Treaty of Waitangi and the expression of culture in Aotearoa. In *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 24-7). Auckland: Treaty Conference 2000 Publication Group.
- Graham, D. (2000). Here does sovereignty lie? In C. James (Ed.), *Building the Constitution* (pp. 193-5). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies Victoria University of Wellington.
- Hancock, F., Epston, D., & McKenzie, W. (2006). Forging Treaty hope: The application and relevance of narrative ideas and practices in developing Treaty-based policy and practice. *Community Development Journal*, 300-13.

Reference List

- Harris, A. (2004). *Hīkoi: Forty years of Māori protest*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- Hayward, J. (2004). 'Flowing from the Treaty's words': The principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. In J. Hayward & N. R. Wheen (Eds.), *The Waitangi Tribunal Te Roopu Whakamana i te Tiriti o Waitangi* (pp. 29-40). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Henare, M. (1998). *Hope and Māori self-determination*. Paper presented at the Theological Symposium on Hope, Palmerston North.
- Henare, M. (1999). Sustainable social policy. In J Boston et al (Ed.), *Redesigning the welfare state in New Zealand: problems, policies and prospects*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Henare, M. (2003). *Changing Images of Nineteenth Century Māori Society*.
- Hollis, T. (1991). *Developing a Māori understanding of the Christian God: Must the Christian God remain Pākehā?* Unpublished B Theol. research essay, Melbourne College of Divinity.
- Hollis, T. (2002). What's the problem? *Anglican Taonga, winter*, 12-4.
- Hui Amorangi ki Te Manawa o Te Wheke*. (2008, March 27-29). Waitetoko Marae, Waitetoko, Turangi.
- Hui Amorangi ki Te Manawa o Te Wheke*. (2009, March 19-21). Te Marae o Moko, Te Puke.
- Humpage, L. (2004). 'Liabilities' and 'assets': The Māori Affairs balance sheet, 1984-2002. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand* (pp. 25-42). Melbourne: Thomson Dunmore Press.
- Hutchings, J. (2006). (Re)negotiating (bi)cultural environmental management under the Resource Management Act. In *State of the Māori nation: Twenty-first century issues in Aotearoa* (pp. 95-105). Auckland: Reed Books.
- Introduction. (2008). In *Te Kawenata Hou: The New Testament* (pp. iii-iv). Wellington: Bible Society in New Zealand.
- Ip, M., & Pang, D. (2005). New Zealand Chinese identity: Sojourners, model minority and multiple identities. In J. H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations* (pp. 174-90). Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Jackson, M. (2000). Where does sovereignty lie? In C. James (Ed.), *Building the constitution* (pp. 196-200). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies Victoria University of Wellington.
- James, C. (2000a). Introduction. In C. James (Ed.), *Building the Constitution* (pp. 1-33). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies Victoria University of Wellington.
- James, C. (2000b). The political history and framework since 1980. In C. James (Ed.), *Building the constitution* (pp. 160-7). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies Victoria University of Wellington.

Reference List

- Kaa, H. (2000a). *Te whakaika: The seedbed*. Unpublished MA. thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland.
- Kaa, H. (2000b). A journey of hope and liberation. *First Peoples Theology Journal*, 1(1), 48-63.
- Kaa, H. (2005). A stained glass window: What do you see when you look through it? *First Peoples Theology Journal*, 3, 9-15.
- Kaa, H. (2006). Māori Struggles for Self Identify and Self Determination. *First Peoples Theology Journal*, 4(1), 82-93.
- Kaa, W. (2007). Ngāti Porou Spirituality. *Mai i Rangiātea*, 3, 66-73.
- Kawharu, H. (2005a). Foreword. In *Waitangi Revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. v-vi). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Kawharu, H. (2005c). A reconstruction of Māori text. In M. Belgrave, M. Kawharu & D. Williams (Eds.), *Waitangi revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 391-3). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Kawharu, M. (2005). Rangatiratanga and Social Policy. In M. Belgraves, M. Kawharu & D. Williams (Eds.), *Waitangi Revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 105-22). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Kelsey, J. (1996). From flagpoles to pine trees: Tino rangatiratanga and Treaty policy today. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Ngā pātai: Racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 177-201). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Kelsey, J. (2000). *Māori political legitimacy and national building*. Paper presented at the Nation Building and Māori Development Conference, Hamilton.
- Kelsey, J. (2004). *Speech to the ARENA forum on the seabed and foreshore in Auckland 3 February 2004*. Paper presented at the ARENA Forum on the Seabed and Foreshore, Auckland.
- Kelsey, J. (2005). Māori, Te Tiriti, and globalisation: The invisible hand of the colonial state. In M. Belgrave, M. Kawharu & D. Williams (Eds.), *Waitangi revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 81-102). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Kereopa, R. (2003). The Pihopatanga phenomenon: A journey of faith (1814-1999). *Mai i Rangiātea*, 1, 85-105.
- Kolig, E. (2006). Freedom, identity construction and cultural closure: The taniwha, the hijab and the wiener schnitzel as boundary markers. In E. Rata & R. Openshaw (Eds.), *Public policy and ethnicity: The politics of ethnic boundary making* (pp. 25-39). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Levine, H. B. (2005). Moving beyond cultural essentialism. In James H. Liu, Tim McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 104-17). Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Reference List

- Lineham, P. (1996). *Bible & Society: A Sesquicentennial history of the Bible Society in New Zealand*. Wellington: Daphne Brasell Associates Press, The Bible Society in New Zealand.
- Liu, J. H. (2005). History and identity: A system of checks and balances for Aotearoa/New Zealand. In James H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 69-87). Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Maaka, R., & Fleras, A. (2005). *The Politics of indigeneity: Challenging the state in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Māori Medium Education as at 12 November 2009*. (2008). Retrieved June 27, 2009, from http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/Māori_education/schooling/6040/32367
- Marsden, M. (1975). God, man and universe: A Māori view. In M. King (Ed.), *Te ao hurihuri: The world moves on* (pp. 191-219). Wellington: Hicks Smith & Sons.
- Mason, B. (1993). *The principle of 'partnership' and the Treaty of Waitangi: Implications for the public conservation estate*. Retrieved 28/01/2003, 2003, from http://www.publicaccessnewzealand.org/files/partnership_abstract.html
- May, S. (2004). Accommodating multiculturalism and biculturalism: Implications for language policy. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand* (pp. 247-64). Melbourne: Thomson Dunmore Press.
- McHugh, P. (2005). Living with rights aboriginally: Constitutionalism and Māori in the 1990s. In M. Belgrave, M. Kawharu & D. Williams (Eds.), *Waitangi revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 283-307). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, R. (2005). Atuatanga: A Māori theology and spirituality. *Mai i Rangīātea*, 2, 5-20.
- McLeay, E. (2000). Organising the executive under a changed constitution: The Cabinet. In C. James (Ed.), *Building the constitution* (pp. 298-307). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies Victoria University of Wellington.
- Melbourne, T. W. (2000). *Wairua Māori rua mano: Māori spirituality 2000*. Unpublished M Phil. thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Melbourne, T. W. (2005). Māori spirituality in the new millennium. *Mai i Rangīātea*, 2, 21-8.
- Metge, J. (2005). *Tui Tui Tuia: The Use of Māori in Worship in Te Tikanga Pākehā*. Christchurch: Diocese of Christchurch.
- Mikaere, A. (2005). The Treaty of Waitangi and recognition of tikanga Māori. In M. Belgrave, M. Kawharu & D. Williams (Eds.), *Waitangi revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 330-48). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Moller, H. (2004). *Is our Treaty relationship going to the dogs? A Pākehā's plea to other Pākehā to honour the Treaty of Waitangi*. Unpublished manuscript.

Reference List

- Mulholland, M. (2006). Introduction. In *State of the Māori nation: Twenty-first century issues in Aotearoa* (pp. 11-5). Auckland: Reed Books.
- Nicholson, R. (1995). *Māori Language Revitalisation and Pastoral Counselling*: Unpublished manuscript.
- Nicholson, R. (1996a, 2000). *The Theological Implications of a Three Tikanga Church*. Paper presented at the Theology in Oceania. Doing theology: Partners in conversation., Dunedin.
- Nicholson, R. (1996b, 2000). *Theological perspectives on the revitalisation of the Māori language*. Paper presented at the Theology in Oceania Conference: Doing theology: Partners in conversation, Dunedin.
- Nicholson, R. (2000). *Hei tīmatanga kōrero: Māori language regenesis and Mihinare clergy*. Unpublished MA. thesis, University of Canterbury, Christchurch.
- Nicholson, R. (2003). Mā te mahi ka kitea: Brief reflections on the Māori language courses of Te Whare Wānanga o Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa. *Mai i Rangiātea, 1*, 42-8.
- Nicholson, R. (2009). Anglican Māori Language and Cultural Policies: An introduction to the Standing Resolutions of General Synod. *Mai i Rangiātea, 4*, 37-43.
- Openshaw, R. (2006). Putting ethnicity into policy: A New Zealand case study. In E. Rata & R. Openshaw (Eds.), *Public policy and ethnicity: The politics of ethnic boundary making* (pp. 113-27). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Orange, C. (1987). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.
- O'Sullivan, D. (2005). *Faith, politics and reconciliation: Catholicism and the politics of indigeneity*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- O'Sullivan, D. (2007). *Beyond biculturalism: The politics of an indigenous minority*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- Papuni, J. (2004). 'We answer the call to arms': War experience and its toll on the spirituality of the Māori soldier post WWII. Unpublished M Theol. thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland.
- Pearson, D. (1996). Crossing ethnic thresholds: Multiculturalisms in comparative perspective. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Ngā pātai: Racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 247-66). Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press.
- Pearson, D. (2001). *The politics of ethnicity in settler societies: States of unease*. New York: Palgrave.
- Pearson, D. (2004). Rethinking citizenship in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand* (pp. 291-314). Melbourne: Thomson Dunmore Press.

Reference List

- Pearson, D. (2005). Citizenship, identity and belonging: Addressing the mythologies of the unitary nation state in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In J. H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 21-37). Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Peet, K. (2000). Insights from organising locally - Notes from "Building the Constitution" evening, 29 May 2000, Otautahi/Christchurch. In *Proceedings of Treaty conference 2000* (pp. 149-51). Auckland: Treaty Conference 2000 Publication Group.
- Pikaahu, T. K. (2005). [Review of the book *The woven universe: Selected writings of Rev. Māori Marsden*]. *Mai i Rangiātea*, 2, 117-20.
- Plane Te Paa, J. (1995). *Kua whakatūngia anō a Te Rau Kahikatea: An historical critical overview of events which preceded the re-establishment of Te Rau Kahikatea Theological College of Te Pīhopatanga o Aotearoa*. Unpublished MA. thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland.
- Plane Te Paa, J. (1996). A Māori perspective on te tino rangatiratanga. In J. Crawford (Ed.), *Church and state: Te tino rangatiratanga*. Auckland: College of St John the Evangelist.
- Plane Te Paa, J. (1998a). The politics of contemporary identity. In W. Ihimaera (Ed.), *Growing up Māori* (pp. 211-9). Auckland: Tandem Press.
- Plane Te Paa, J. (1998b). Korōria ki te Atua o te tika, o te aroha: Glory to the God of righteousness and love. *Stimulus*, 6(2), 89-91.
- Plane Te Paa, J. (1999). Emerging indigenous theological college. Aotearoa/New Zealand. *PTCA Bulletin*, 12(1&2), 65-75.
- Plane Te Paa, J. (2001a). *Contestations: Bicultural theological education in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, California.
- Plane Te Paa, J. (2001b). Leadership formation for a new world: An emergent indigenous Anglican theological college. In I. Douglas (Ed.), *Beyond Colonial Anglicanism: The Anglican Communion in the twenty-first century* (pp. 270-96). New York: Church Publishing.
- Plane Te Paa, J. (2003). On being Te Ahorangi: An 'underside' experience of the Constitution of the Anglican Church in Aotearoa. In R. B. a. H. Kempster (Ed.), *Thinking outside the square: Church in Middle Earth*. Auckland: St Columba's Press & Journeys.
- Plane Te Paa, J. (2004). Being church: A Māori woman's voice and vision. *In God's Image. Journal of Asian Women's Resource Centre for Culture and Theology*, 23(2), 35-41.
- Plane Te Paa, J. (2005a). From "civilising" to colonising to respectfully collaborating? *Theology Today*, 62, 67-73.
- Plane Te Paa, J. (2005b). Is God being served by the politics of difference? *First Peoples Theology Journal*, 1(3), 42-52.

Reference List

- Plane Te Paa, J. (2005c). A Māori Perspective. In N. Ateek, C. Duaybis & M. Tobin (Eds.), *Challenging Christian Zionism: Theology Politics and the Israel-Palestine Conflict* (pp. 255-62). London: Melisende.
- Plane Te Paa, J. (2006). From *Te Rāwiri* to the *New Zealand Prayer Book*. In C. Hefling & C. Shattuck (Eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer* (pp. 343-7). Oxford: Oxford.
- Plane Te Paa, J. (2008, March). *Empowering Women in Ministry*. Paper presented at the Dual Regional Consultation, Suva.
- Poata-Smith, E. T. A. (2004). Ka tika a muri, ka tika a mua? Māori protest politics and the Treaty of Waitangi settlement process. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand* (pp. 59-88). Melbourne: Thomson Dunmore Press.
- Potaka-Dewes, E. (2003). Ngā kete o te wānanga. *Mai i Rangiātea*, 1, 49-56.
- Potaka-Dewes, E. (2005). The foreshore and seabed controversy. *Mai i Rangiātea*, 2, 51-8.
- Potaka-Dewes, E. (2006). Atuatanga (A New Theological Voice) (pp. 25). Karapiro.
- Proceedings of Treaty Conference. (2000). Acknowledgements. In *Treaty conference 2000* (pp. vi). Auckland: Treaty Conference 2000 Publication Group.
- Rakena, R. (1971). The Māori response to the gospel: A study of Māori-Pākehā relations in the Methodist Māori Mission from its beginnings to the present day *Wesley Historical Society Proceedings*, 25, 1-38.
- Rata, E. (2003, June). *Rethinking biculturalism*. Paper presented at the Ngā Waka Conference, Auckland.
- Raukawa Trust Board. (2006). *Whakareia te Kakara o te Hinu Raukawa: Te Rautaki Reo a Raukawa, The Raukawa Reo Strategy*. Tokoroa: Raukawa Trust Board.
- Raumati, T. (1998). Anglican spirituality and worship among the Māori people. In K. Ward, C. Pemberton & W. Sitshebo (Eds.), *Anglicanism: global communion* (pp. 85-6). London: Mowbray.
- Raumati, T. (2000). *Being a Māori Christian in Aotearoa-New Zealand*. Paper presented at the Doing theology in Oceania: Partners in conversation, Dunedin.
- Reeves, P. (2000). Opening remarks. In C. James (Ed.), *Building the constitution* (pp. 41-3). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies Victoria University of Wellington.
- Reo Regeneration Planning Group Report. (2009). In *Hui Amorangi ki Te Manawa o Te Wheke* (pp. 57-9). Rotorua: Hui Amorangi ki Te Manawa o Te Wheke.
- Royal, T. A. C. (Ed.). (2003). *The woven universe: Selected writings of Rev. Maori Marsden*. Masterton: Estate of Rev. Maori Marsden.

Reference List

- Sharp, A. (2004). The trajectory of the Waitangi Tribunal. In J. Hayward & N. Wheen (Eds.), *The Waitangi Tribunal: Te Roopū Whakamana i te Tiriti o Waitangi* (pp. 195-206). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Sharp, A. (2005). The Treaty in the real life of the constitution. In M. Belgrave, M. Kawharu & D. Williams (Eds.), *Waitangi revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 308-29). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Slack, D. (2004). *Bullshit, backlash & bleeding hearts: A confused person's guide to the great race row*. Auckland: Penguin Group.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Smith, L. T. (2006a). Fourteen lessons of resistance to exclusion: Learning from the Māori experience in New Zealand over the last two decades of neo-liberal reform. In *State of the Māori nation: Twenty-first century issues in Aotearoa* (pp. 247-59). Auckland: Reed Books.
- Smith, L. T. (2006b). Researching in the margins: Issues for Māori researchers - a discussion paper. *AlterNative, Special Supplement*, 4-27.
- Snedden, P. (2004). *The Treaty of Waitangi: Source of disunity or template for cultural inclusion. from.*
<http://www.casi.org.nz/issues/community/Race%20Relations/PSresponsetoDrBrash.htm>
- Statistics New Zealand. (2008). *New Zealand Official Yearbook 2008: Te Pukapuka Houanga Whaimana o Aotearoa*. Wellington: Statistics New Zealand.
- Storrar, W. (2004). Scottish civil society and devolution: the new case for Ronald Preston's defense of middle axioms. In E. Graham & E. Reed (Eds.), *The future of Christian social ethics. Essays on the work of Ronald H. Preston 1913-2001*. New York/London: Continuum.
- Sullivan, A. (2005). The Treaty of Waitangi and social well-being: Justice, representation and participation. In M. Belgrave, M. Kawharu & D. Williams (Eds.), *Waitangi revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 123-35). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Tamihere, D. (2002). *Kua oti te tuhituhi: towards a Māori exegesis of the Bible*. Unpublished MTheol. thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland.
- Tapsell, P. (2005). From the sideline: Tikanga, treaty values and Te Papa. In M. Belgrave, M. Kawharu & D. Williams (Eds.), *Waitangi revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 266-80). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Tate, H. (2002). Stepping into Māori spirituality. In H. Bergin & S. Smith (Eds.), *He kupu whakawairua: Spirituality in Aotearoa New Zealand: Catholic voices* (pp. 37-53). Auckland: Accent Publications.

Reference List

- Tate, H. (2004, April 4-6). *Traditional Māori Spirituality in Encounter with Christian Spirituality*. Paper presented at the Pompallier Symposium: A Festival of History.
- Te Kaawa, W. (2001). *Māori theology in ministry within Aotearoa*. Unpublished Synthesis: Exit exercise, School of Ministry, Knox College, Dunedin.
- Te Pana, C. (2006). Update. In R. Nicholson (Ed.). Tokoroa.
- Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa. (1983). *Hīmene: Waiata tapu, Etahi inoi, Te Inoi a te Ariki, Te Whakapono o Naihia me ngā Āpotoro, Etahi Waiata a Rāwiri*. Rotorua: Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa.
- Te Puni Kokiri & Te Taura Whiri i Te Reo Māori. (2003). *Te Rautaki Reo Māori: The Māori Language Strategy*. Wellington: Ministry of Māori Development.
- Te Rito, J. (2008). Struggles for the Māori language: He whawhai mō te reo Māori. *MAI Review*, 2, 1-8.
- Tremewan, C. (2006). Re-politicising race: The Anglican Church in New Zealand. In E. Rata & R. Openshaw (Eds.), *Public policy and ethnicity: The politics of ethnic boundary making* (pp. 95-112). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tuhiwai, B. (2005). The powerlessness and oppression of women. *Mai i Rangiatea*, 2, 59-63.
- Tuuta, E. (2005). Feast or famine: Customary fisheries management in a contemporary tribal society. In M. Belgrave, M. Kawharu & D. Williams (Eds.), *Waitangi revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 168-86). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Vasil, R. (2000). Indigenous rights and the constitution. In C. James (Ed.), *Building the constitution* (pp. 214-8). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies Victoria University of Wellington.
- Vercoe, W. (1999). *Māori spirituality*.
- Waitangi Tribunal. (1986). *Finding of the Waitangi Tribunal relating to te reo Māori and a claim lodged by Huirangi Waikerepuru and Ngā Kaiwhakapūmau i te Reo Incorporated Society (The Wellington Board of Māori Language)*. Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal.
- Walker, R. (2004). *Ka whawhai tonu mātou: Struggle without end* (2nd ed.). Auckland: Penguin Group.
- Walters, M. (1995b). A new vision of God towards a new humanity in Christ: The story of Māori. In D. Carr (Ed.), *God, Christ & God's people in Asia* (pp. 81-9). Hong Kong: Christian Conference of Asia.
- Walters, M. (1996). Church and state: A Māori perspective on te tino rangatiratanga. In J. Crawford (Ed.), *Church and state: Te tino rangatiratanga* (pp. 66-74). Auckland: College of St John the Evangelist.

Reference List

- Walters, M. (1998). Mihingare and karakia Māori: An Anglican perspective on Māori religious incantations. *Stimulus*, 6(2), 76-81.
- Ward, C., & Lin, E.-Y. (2005). Immigration, acculturation and national identity. In J. H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 155-73). Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Wensor, P. (2003). *Understanding God in the Māori eucharistic text: Te Whakamoemiti me te Whakawhetai/Thanksgiving and Praise*. Unpublished M Theol. thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland.
- What does te reo Māori mean to you? (2005). [Power point]. Tokoroa: Raukawa Trust Board.
- Wickliffe, C. (2000). Multiculturalism and the constitution - lessons from another country: Fiji. In C. James (Ed.), *Building the constitution* (pp. 244-58). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies Victoria University of Wellington.
- Williams, D. (2005). Unique Treaty-based relationships remain elusive. In M. Belgrave, M. Kawharu & D. Williams (Eds.), *Waitangi revisited* (pp. 366-87). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, J. (2000a). Building the constitution conference. In C. James (Ed.), *Building the constitution* (pp. 44-7). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies Victoria University of Wellington.
- Williams, J. (2000b). The Treaty of Waitangi and western democracy in practice. In *Proceedings of Treaty Conference 2000* (pp. 3-8). Auckland: Treaty Conference 2000 Publication Group.
- Williams, M. (2000). Myths of nature and virtue. In C. James (Ed.), *Building the constitution* (pp. 88-97). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies Victoria University of Wellington.
- Winiata, W. (1998). *Reducing the socio-economic disparities in housing, employment, health and education*. Retrieved 23/11/2006, from <http://www.wairaka.net/ubinz/Hikoi/MaoriSolutionWiniata.html>
- Winiata, W. (2000). How can or should the Treaty be reflected in institutional design? In C. James (Ed.), *Building the constitution* (pp. 205-6). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies Victoria University of Wellington.
- Winiata, W. (2005). *The reconciliation of kāwanatanga and tino rangatiratanga*. from http://www.firstfound.org/wrrt2005/rua_rautau_lecture_2005,%20Whatarangi%20Winiat..
- Zodgekar, A. (2005). The changing face of New Zealand's population and national identity. In T. M. James H. Liu, Tracey McIntosh & Teresia Teaiwa (Ed.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 140-54). Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.

Reference List

Zodgekar, A. (2005). The changing face of New Zealand's population and national identity. In J. H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 140-54). Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.