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.

What is Bicultural Music Education?

A Pākehā Perspective from Aotearoa New Zealand

Sean Thomas Scanlen

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Music Education, the University of Auckland, 2019.

Abstract

What is biculturalism in music education in Aotearoa New Zealand? What, for that matter, is biculturalism – or what should it be? This research develops a critique of bicultural policies as they are present in the education system and in music classrooms in Aotearoa New Zealand and situates this critique in the context of a wider discussion about biculturalism in this country. It is argued that biculturalism must be understood as being part of the wider politics of colonialism in Aotearoa New Zealand; this conception of biculturalism includes the view that all forms of interaction between Māori and non-Māori throughout the history of this country are relevant to the discussion and that biculturalism is not merely a matter of government policy. This research draws upon literature from the fields of critical pedagogy and Kaupapa Māori studies in order to consider the way in which power structures relating to colonialism may be present in the music classroom, particularly those power structures that maintain and reinforce Pākehā dominance in society. It is argued that a critically bicultural music teacher will work towards the transformation of oppressive power structures in their schools and classrooms for the benefit of their students and communities.

Acknowledgements

As it turns out, this programme of study was a bigger undertaking than I expected. I have several people to thank and acknowledge.

To those directly involved in my programme of study – my supervisors David Lines and Te Oti Rakena, who have been patient and generous with their time and expertise and have given me opportunities that I did not always expect; Georgina Stewart, who helped me in the initial stages, was also for some time my supervisor, before taking up a position at another university; Dean Sutcliffe, who influenced some of the more musicological thoughts in the present study, and whose critiques have remained important to the entire document, and Alison Jones, who along with Georgina Stewart taught a paper that introduced me to important documents and conversations in the modern field of education in Aotearoa New Zealand. Thank you.

To those teachers whom I have had the privilege of working with: Pateriki Toi, Alec Solomon, and Karen Gilbert-Smith, principals for whom I worked at Taipa Area School, Tikipunga High School, and Whangarei Boys' High School respectively; Julian Atkinson, Marie Ringrose, and Leah Wilson, who to varying extents took me under their wing when I was starting out as a teacher of music and then of photography; and to those colleagues with whom I have most recently had the pleasure of working with, Sarah Edgecombe at Pompallier Catholic College and Ginny Hill at Whangarei Boys' High School, thank you. Sarah also has my thanks for reading an early draft of this thesis. I also acknowledge all of the students whom I have taught at these schools; in some ways, it is through teaching that I have learned the most.

I also wish to acknowledge Elizabeth Grierson for her perceptive commentary and suggestions. Thank you.

Last, but not least, I must thank my family and friends for their support and their great patience in putting up with me. There are those who have, in good humour, told me not to talk to them until I am a doctor; I hope this suffices.

Any errors that may be found in the text are my own.

Table of Contents

Abstract ii
Acknowledgements iii
Introduction 1
  Plan of Argument and Layout of the Thesis 3
  A Note on Style 4
  Conclusion (A Disclaimer) 5
Literature Survey 6
  New Zealand Music Education and Biculturalism 6
  Educational Crisis and Prince Esterházy's Salon 8
  Ethnicity, Racism, and Aotearoa New Zealand 13
  Multiculturalism, Anti-Racism and Decolonisation in Music Education 19
  Considering Assimilation 21
  Indigeneity and Music 23
  Conclusion 26
Methodology and Theoretical Concerns 27
  Methodology 27
    Critical Discourse Analysis 27
    Critical Pedagogy 32
    Position as Researcher 39
    Māori-Centric and Māori-Friendly Biculturalisms 41
  Theoretical Concerns 42
    Considering Pākehā Culture as White Culture 43
    Considering Whiteness in General 44
    The Universality of Whiteness and Music 46
    The Frankfurt School, Music Criticism, and 'High' and 'Low' Art 49
  Conclusion 55
Chapter One: Biculturalism, Partnership, and the Treaty of Waitangi 56
  Text 58
    English Text 58
    Māori Text 60
    English Translation of Māori Text 61

Context of the Treaty 62
The Nature of the Agreement 65
A Magna Carta Gnawed By Rats 70
The Māori Response: Protest and Resistance 73
Partisanship and Principles 78
Conclusion 80
Chapter Two: Examples of Biculturalisms 82
Āpirana Ngata 83
The Church in New Zealand and Paulo Freire 86
Alfred Hill: Music in Maoriland 91
The Bicultural Turn 102
Critiquing the Bicultural Turn 110
Conclusion 114
Chapter Three: The 'Official Biculturalism' and Educational Policy 116
Introduction to the Curricula 116
Biculturalism and The New Zealand Curriculum 118
Assessment and the National Certificate of Educational Achievement 124
Biculturalism and Teacher Understandings 129
Against Biculturalism and Cultural Responsiveness 135
Conclusion 139
Chapter Four: Perspectives on Difference in Music Education 142
Music Matters, Elliott, and Praxialists 142
Randall Allsup and Remixing the Classroom 149
Graham McPhail and Conceptualisation 152
Kaupapa Māori Scholarship 155
Biculturalism and Kaupapa Māori 160
Chapter Five: Critical Biculturalism in Music Education 163
Teaching for Critical Pedagogy 164
The Politics of Biculturalism 166
Student Voice and Polyphony 169
Considering Universals, Diversity, and Difference 174
Addressing Tokenism 179
Conclusion 181

Conclusion: What is Bicultural Music Education? 183
Non-Binary Biculturalism 184
Who is Biculturalism in Music Education For? 185
An Argument for A Critical Biculturalism 187
References 190

Introduction

Ko Manaia tōku maunga.
Ko Hātea tōku awa.
Ko Ngāpuhi tōku rohe.
Ko Scanlen tōku whānau.
Ko Sean tōku ingoa.

In the course of my work as a music teacher in high schools in Aotearoa New Zealand, I have found that there is a gap between the rhetoric and the reality of what in this country is known as biculturalism, or as 'Treaty of Waitangi partnership', or other similar phrases.[1] These terms – and for the sake of clarity, note that I use the term 'biculturalism' throughout this document and understand it to be in practice effectively synonymous in the New Zealand context with 'Treaty partnership' – are often used in the educational sector to describe the policies and practices put in place by government and schools with the aim of ensuring that schools are inclusive of both Māori and Pākehā peoples, cultures, and values.[2] In the present thesis I argue that biculturalism should be understood in terms of the wider politics of colonialism in Aotearoa New Zealand, and that in the context of music education, it cannot be simply understood as the interaction of Māori and Pākehā in the music classroom. Rather, I argue that the music classroom is affected by the way in which Māori and Pākehā (and other non-Māori) have interacted throughout the colonial history of this country.

I have included as the epigraph at the beginning of this chapter a short pepeha, a means of introduction in terms that are customarily significant to Māori culture. In it, I describe the mountain and river which I identify most closely with, those being Mount Manaia and the Hātea river in the Whangarei area where I was born and where I presently live. I identify the region claimed by Ngāpuhi as my rohe, and give my family and my name. A reader already familiar with pepeha will notice what I have omitted: I have not claimed affiliation with an iwi, hapu, or marae, considering that as a Pākehā I have no right to such.[3] I have also not claimed a waka, which are identified in Māori tradition as the vessels by which their ancestors arrived on the shores of Aotearoa from Hawaiiki. I have in

[1] Although I write with a New Zealand audience in mind, my interest is also potentially of interest to international scholars interested in themes such as the inclusion of indigenous peoples in music education, and I will therefore provide explanations of local terms and translations of Māori words. In this case, I will briefly note here that the Treaty of Waitangi was signed in 1840 by Māori chiefs and representatives of the British Crown, and, although the exact terms of the Treaty remain contested, it provided the British with the basis for the establishment of a colonial government in New Zealand. Aotearoa is the name given to New Zealand in the Māori language.
[2] The Māori are the indigenous people of New Zealand. The term Pākehā generally refers to those New Zealanders of European descent; sometimes the term 'New Zealand European' is used instead.
[3] A hapu is a sub-tribe; the word marae is more difficult to succinctly explain but can refer to a complex of buildings including a wharenui, or meeting-house, and its associated courtyard.

fact given this matter some consideration, as throughout the course of the year 2014 I attended te reo Māori (Māori language) night classes in Kaitaia where even non-Māori students were encouraged to develop pepeha that included identifications of iwi, hapu, marae, and waka. It was suggested that instead of claiming an ancestral waka, non-Māori could give the name of their car or another vessel of significance to them. My car, though, being a pleasant but profound shade of blue, and rather bulbous, has been given names such as 'the Blue Bubble' and 'Bug, the Blue Thunder' by my friends; considering 'Ko Bug, The Blue Thunder te waka' to be inappropriate for the occasion, I have discretely omitted the matter of the waka from my pepeha as a result.[4]

Here, then, is one aspect of biculturalism: a Pākehā man trying to introduce himself in Māori terms, and not able to do so very well. But now consider some difficulties facing Māori: even the mere exercise of typing out a pepeha reveals pervasive and inconvenient obstacles that work against expressions of Māoritanga such as the use of te reo Māori.[5] While of course it is understood that I succeeded in typing my pepeha, there were difficulties that the reader might not appreciate at first: the macron which marks long vowels and is important to the correct spelling of words is not a standard part of the computer keyboard, and it took some time and multiple key-presses to make them appear in the text, making the composition of the five lines of my small pepeha as time-consuming as writing something five times as long in English. Even then, once the issue of the special characters is overcome, one encounters the issue of unhelpfully helpful autocorrect technology. The goal of autocorrect is to automatically correct typographical errors, but in my case, it was a hindrance: for example, when typing out the word 'tōku', Microsoft Word's autocorrect feature insisted on changing this to 'took'. Te reo Māori is an official language of New Zealand, but how can it truly be considered a viable written language if such obstructions to its use are commonplace?[6]

At the outset I must also note that the present research is in no way meant in the sense of personal criticism directed at my colleagues, as with very few exceptions, I know all of my colleagues to date to be concerned for their students' wellbeing and educational achievement. A recent newspaper report stated that teachers often gave students food using their own funds, and further, that:

> …teachers had donated beds, bought dresses so girls could go to the school ball, paid for Chromebooks, given cash for rent or car repairs and stocked the classroom with stationery, cleaning supplies and sports equipment. (Franks, 2018).

---

[4] Although this was true at the time of writing, I discovered late in the process of editing this thesis that I have ancestors who arrived in New Zealand on the schooner *Osprey* in 1842. Ko *Osprey* te waka; but the larger point about the choices Pākehā have in constructing pepeha stands.

[5] Māoritanga can be understood as Māori-ness; te reo Māori is the Māori language.

[6] Consider also the case of predictive txt and the suggestions made by phone messaging apps; a friend of mine once showed me how, whenever she started to enter in the name 'Pukekohe', which is a town to the south of Auckland, the phone suggested a vomiting 'emoji' – related of course, to the English word 'puke'. 'Puke' in Māori refers to a hill.

This thesis aims instead to critique systematic problems within the educational system and to arrive at an understanding of what transformational praxis might look like in music education in secondary schools in New Zealand.

Plan of Argument and Layout of the Thesis

The main research problem that I seek to investigate is this: what is bicultural music education in Aotearoa New Zealand? In choosing this topic, my key interest is in regards to the theory and practice of biculturalism, so that I also consider successively broader questions: what is biculturalism in education in Aotearoa New Zealand? For that matter, what is biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand in general?

A key aspect of my argument is that music teachers must situate themselves in regards to bicultural politics, and that they cannot teach in a bicultural manner if they cannot understand their own part in reproducing, maintaining, or working against colonial power structures in and out of their classroom – at least, if biculturalism is understood as having the goal of achieving socially just and equitable outcomes for students and communities. As such, in my methodology section, I begin by considering my own position as a researcher – considering the validity of my research to rest on a similar reflective process – and go on to outline principles of critical pedagogy that inform the analysis of biculturalism that I carry out in this research.

In Chapter One, I argue that the Treaty of Waitangi provides an important starting point for the understanding of the discourse of biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand. I argue against the 'one New Zealand' myth, according to which all New Zealanders are one people, and consider the division between Māori and Pākehā. I argue that while partisanship along these lines has motivated colonial injustices, understanding how and why this basis exists is also a necessary aspect of understanding Māori resistance to Pākehā hegemony.

In Chapter Two, I consider various different examples of bicultural relationships and understandings, including those involving Āpirana Ngata, Alfred Hill, and the institutions of the church and of government. These different examples indicate the variety of forms that biculturalism can take, and the different ways in which the relations of power between Māori and Pākehā can be made manifest. The consideration of Ngata and Hill provides examples of biculturalism in music that is relevant to music educators; the consideration of institutionalised biculturalism provides for a consideration of views from Paulo Friere and New Zealand-based writers that are of interest to the critical understanding of biculturalism in general. I argue that the diversity of examples presented shows the futility of 'homogenised' versions of biculturalism.

In Chapter Three, I consider further the modern phenomenon of biculturalism in education. This particular variety of institutionalised biculturalism is that which most obviously affects teachers and students who abide by the bicultural policies of educational

institutions, but upon closer examination is revealed to be hypocritical in its goals: although the 'official' bicultural agenda purports to be inclusive of Māori and to work in their interest, Māori considerations are often incorporated in tokenistic and marginally inclusive manners, whereas Pākehā interests are usually most closely protected and promoted.

Chapters Four and Five are an attempt to arrive at a vision of what a bicultural music education might look like in Aotearoa New Zealand. Chapter Four is a survey of recent scholarship from the field of music education with a view to considering the treatment of difference in music education classrooms. It also includes a survey of Kaupapa Māori scholarship that includes perspectives about ways in which Māori and Pākehā can work together. Chapter Five develops key aspects of a critical biculturalism, one that seeks to be conscious of the power structures of colonialism as they are present in and otherwise affect one's classroom, and that seeks to transform this situation for the benefit of one's students and communities.

A Note on Style

Throughout the general text, I use macrons when using names and quotations in te reo Māori to represent long vowels. I do this even when quoting work that does not, and have attempted to the best of my ability to represent the proper spelling of words and names according to modern conventions of writing in te reo Māori. It must be noted, though, that I do not use a macron in the word 'Maoriland': this word is a Pākehā construction dating from a time when the orthography of te reo Māori was not systematic, and although today some do use a macron in this word, I have chosen not to do so in order to recognise the awkwardness of the coinage. Note that in the bibliography I have aimed to reproduce titles and other bibliographical information as accurately as possible, as this is an area where textual fidelity is of prime importance.

An editorial choice in a similar category is that I refer to the term 'Kaupapa Māori' with capitals on both words in my own usage. When I quote passages that refer to Kaupapa Māori as 'kaupapa Māori' or similar I do not change the source, except to add a macron to the 'a' in 'Māori' where appropriate.

In addition, as te reo Māori is an official language of Aotearoa New Zealand, whenever I have used it in the course of this research I have chosen to present it in normal script, except for when it forms the title of a book or piece of music, in which case I use italics (as I do for such titles in English). The purpose of this editorial choice is to avoid 'othering' the use of te reo Māori; however, as already mentioned in a footnote in the introduction, for the convenience of readers who are not familiar with the language, translations are provided in the text or in footnotes.

The proper means of referring to this country has occupied a perhaps unreasonable amount of my attention in writing this research. In the spirit of biculturalism, I generally refer to the name of this country as Aotearoa New Zealand, although when I use the country

name as an adjective (in the sense of, say, 'New Zealand education'), I simply use 'New Zealand', considering the full double-barrelled expression of 'Aotearoa New Zealand' to be unwieldy in adjectival use, and considering alternatives such as 'Kiwi' to be too colloquial for academic purposes. When referring to this country as a colony, I also use only 'New Zealand', considering that to refer to the colony of New Zealand in, say, 1850 as 'Aotearoa New Zealand' would be anachronistic in that the modern sense of biculturalism in which I use the term was not present in that era. In a similar sense, I sometimes use 'Aotearoa' to refer to this country in pre-European times.

I do not change sources that use American English spellings, even though I use New Zealand English spellings when not quoting sources.

Italics are used to highlight theoretical terms that I wish to be understood as having special meaning in the context of this research.

Conclusion (A Disclaimer)

The reader may note that there is in fact not a great deal of emphasis on the specifically musical aspect of bicultural music education in the present thesis. This is the case for two main reasons: firstly, because I consider it necessary to develop a critical approach to biculturalism in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand before one can develop a critical approach to biculturalism in music education in Aotearoa New Zealand, but also because music as commonly conceived in schools and in the curriculum is a Western construct. A kapa haka performance, for example, might include aspects that have much in common with Western conventions of music, such as singing harmonised waiata (songs) to a guitar accompaniment; however, it will commonly include prominent aspects of chant and dance, such as in the performance of genres such as haka and waiata poi, that would seem to be outside the scope of music according to the Western understanding but which in the Māori view are integral parts of the tradition which should not necessarily be understood as belonging to a different paradigm of performance.

This is not to suggest that I set out to ignore the field of music education literature; quite to the contrary, in fact. In recent years there has been a growing field of music educators who have taken a view of music education that takes into account social critique. The most prominent of these is David Elliott, according to whose notions of music and music education as praxes teachers must understand music in their classroom as originating from students as musicians, with socially-based motivations, rather than as an object (Elliott & Silverman, 2015); in addition, scholars such as Deborah Bradley and Juliet Hess have drawn on principles of critical pedagogy to arrive at anti-racist conceptions of music education. The work of such scholars is of direct relevance to the present thesis and it is my hope that the present research will be a useful contribution to the field of critical music education in addition to informing the understanding of biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Literature Survey

New Zealand Music Education and Biculturalism

It could be said that there are more questions than answers when it comes to the subject of biculturalism in music education. For example: what should be taught in a bicultural classroom, and how? How much emphasis should be placed on Western music, and how much on Māori music? These are perhaps the most immediate problems for teachers working in a bicultural context to solve, but they are not the only ones. Consider the following list of questions compiled by Tracy Rohan, a music educator based in Aotearoa New Zealand:

> Is the classroom a valid setting for the teaching of diverse musics? Should music education be informed by the cultural heritages and ethnic identities of the students in the classroom and the wider school community? What is the relationship between ethnicity and musical identity? Who is qualified to teach diverse musics? What dispositions, understandings, and support do teachers need? Should culture-bearers from the community be invited into the school to teach such musics? If so, what challenges are associated with this? Should classroom teachers try to replicate the transmission methods of the peoples who made the music? Might Western learners be disadvantaged by the introduction of unfamiliar pedagogical approaches? What should we teach? How do we evaluate the authenticity or appropriateness of the musical examples we use in the classroom? If 'multicultural' music education forms only a small part of the music education experience, is it undermined or negated by the rest? (Rohan, 2018, p. 43)

Some of these questions could be the subject of entire research projects in their own right, particularly those concerning the problems of authenticity, ownership, and the means and ends of teaching and learning that the present research project cannot hope to address fully. Rohan in fact speaks of multicultural education and though her questions are relevant to the present research, I argue in the present thesis that the study of multiculturalism is a slightly different affair to the study of biculturalism. Therefore, I pose further questions: what is biculturalism? Why should we be bicultural? How should music education be bicultural? What is the relationship between theories of biculturalism and of Kaupapa Māori?[7]

To date, there has been relatively little work specifically concerning biculturalism in secondary music education, and that which has been done has been carried out largely by doctoral students. Sally Bodkin's research into musical practices and identity in early childhood centres touches upon matters of relevance to the present study, and is revealing of certain Pākehā attitudes to biculturalism:

[7] Kaupapa Māori scholarship critically considers issues relevant to Māori people and does so from a specifically Māori perspective.

> My research was often regarded as being focused on the bicultural aspect of the music programme. Pākehā teachers expected that, as the Māori songs were the 'cultural' songs, therefore they must be the music I was studying (Bodkin, 2004, p. 36).

At a surface level, Bodkin's observation is revealing of a certain understanding on the part of the Pākehā teachers which has broader implications for music education in Aotearoa New Zealand beyond the early childhood education sector: it is Māori songs that can be considered 'cultural', or different, or non-mainstream, and 'normality' is centred in a place of Pākehā comfort. It also indicates that there is a common assumption that a stated concern for matters of culture and identity in education is effectively a coded way of being interested in Māori, Māori culture, and Māori identity: as the dominant culture, perhaps the nature of Pākehā culture is to be considered self-evident.

Douglas Nyce (2012) in his own PhD thesis addressed matters of music education in primary schools and developed a vision of musical pedagogy that combines aspects of Māori and other Polynesian traditions of music and music education with aspects of European models of music pedagogy. He reports that a substantial number of New Zealand primary schools already report the use of Māori and Pasifika methods of music education, but also that most primary schools avoid the teaching of musical literacy (pp. 336 – 337):

> … it seems that the philosophy and methods used by a large proportion of New Zealand schools centre around Māori and Pacific Island cultures and/or avoid methods which are culturally linked to music literacy… 35% of schools reported using Māori methods, while 19% used Pacific Island Cultural based methods….
>
> Though *prima facie* approaches which lack a literacy component may seem to have a negative impact on music education, Māori and Pacific approaches are, I believe, New Zealand music education's unique strength. I suggest that Maori and Pacific approaches constitute a largely unified Polynesian approach, a national music philosophical approach using the 'national methods' of New Zealand and Oceania… I believe that Māori and Pacific methods already incorporate much of the best of an eclectic primary curriculum (the best of the best, if the eclectic curriculum is viewed as taking the best from each philosophy and method for use in music planning and instruction):
>
> 1- bodily movement as an integral part of music instruction (as per Dalcroze, Orff, Kodály, Gordon)
> 2- singing as an integral part of music instruction (as per Dalcroze, Orff, Kodály, Gordon)
> 3- use of rhythmic instruments (as per Dalcroze, Orff, Kodály, Gordon)
> 4- use of individual and choral singing of 'national' songs (as per Kodály)
> 5- development of and performance through choral ensembles.
> 6- rote learning as an aspect of initial musical study through the 'lining out' of text and music

There are certain aspects of the 'Māori or Polynesian music educational philosophy' – a curious term that I will return to – that Nyce specifically identifies and approves of, such as the supreme importance of the sound produced and of the body as the instrument, the belief in the importance of the meaning of the text in relation to the music, and the importance of learning by rote (pp. 337 – 338).

Nyce's pedagogical vision, in its considered adoption of aspects of both Māori and Pākehā musical traditions, can be considered to be a 'best of both worlds' approach, at least as defined from his perspective. To my reading, the synthetic and interpretive nature of Nyce's work, and in particular the parallels he draws between cultures, leaves Nyce open to criticism from those of Māori and Pasifika backgrounds who may not appreciate being considered together as a largely homogenous category (as in the case of Nyce's development of a single 'Māori or Polynesian' music educational philosophy), or the fact that Nyce seemingly most approves of those aspects of musical education practice drawn from Māori and Pasifika cultures that align well with European theories of musical pedagogy, thus privileging a 'white' view of music education. This latter point raises the broader question: what is music education for? If it is indeed considered to be a means for students to learn 'white' musical conventions, then perhaps this may not be considered such an issue, but if it is considered otherwise, then such an approach will be problematic. I consider the ends of music education in Aotearoa New Zealand in more depth in Chapter Five.

This is not to dismiss Nyce's work: in drawing connections between the 'Māori and Pacific approaches' and the work of the various European theorists he makes a contribution to the music education literature not found elsewhere. Indeed, Nyce's work is a singular piece of scholarship: although his approach is broadly encouraging of the use of pedagogical approaches drawn from Māori and Pacific cultures in school music education, the arguments he makes in favour of these approaches are derived independently, without reference to the work of scholars such as Russell Bishop, who – as will be discussed further in the present research – sought to find ways of introducing principles of Kaupapa Māori education in mainstream schools. In this way, Nyce's is a boldly independent voice.

Educational Crisis and Prince Esterházy's Salon

As a means of introducing themes of broad importance to the present study, I turn now to the concept of crisis in education. That there is in fact a crisis in education has been the cry of researchers for some time, in many different fields of education, addressing education in general, or the field of music education, or the education system in Aotearoa New Zealand. bell hooks, writing in the context of the United States, is one figure declaring a general crisis:

> There is a serious crisis in education. Students often do not want to learn and teachers do not want to teach (hooks, 1994b, p. 12).

For the sake of brevity and so as to limit the scope to a manageable degree, I will focus here on the concept of crisis in music education. That music education is indeed in crisis has been

an argument made for years, although since different authors have different areas of concern, grasping a collective sense of the nature of the crisis in music education is a slippery endeavour. However, it would seem that broadly, the crisis is manifested in a clash of ideals and practicalities: the egalitarian notion that all students should have access to music education and that all students should have the opportunity to succeed; the reality that much of 'conventional' or 'classical' Western musical education is or has been concerned with musical repertoire that is viewed as élite; and the reality that music education in Western cultures has previously not been egalitarian at all, but rather one where the privileged few get access to the instruments and tuition necessary to develop skill.

Nearly forty years ago, in 1981, Michael Prescott wrote of a crisis in music education in North America, noting cuts in music programme funding, declining numbers of students, and a reduction in the importance of music within schools as compared to reading, writing, and math (1981). Prescott may as well have been writing of modern-day music education, as the concerns he raises – funding, student numbers, emphasis being placed on science and technology subjects – remain relevant today.

But the notion of crisis in music education has a long history, and begins to be described in terms that are decidedly problematic the further back one looks. In 1970, for example, the *Music Educator's Journal* wrote of music education in urban schools in nothing short of apocalyptic terms:

> The face of America's cities is pockmarked. Mass exodus has left festering inner cities – domiciles of the destitute victims of disease, hunger, crime, drugs, broken families, and hopelessness. Poverty, segregation, and bankruptcy blight the people and thwart the work of every institution. The poor – be they white, black, Mexican-American, or Puerto Rican – bring their environment with them into the schools. Society's sickness touches every subject in the curriculum, including music… ("Urban Culture: Awareness may save our skins," 1970, p. 37)

Though this crisis in music education is described in terms apparently inclusive of peoples of every race in the above quote, it seems – in the editorial quoted – to be correlated with black students and the departure of white people:

> Mobility within the urban population also causes difficulties for the music teacher. "I just get a group in fair shape and suddenly I'm teaching all new students." White people keep running away. Once a community and school turns fifty percent black [*sic*], it takes only a year to go to ninety-five percent. In Atlanta, at least seven schools have recently gone through the change from total white to total black. All-city performing groups in cities like Philadelphia follow the same discouraging pattern (ibid., p. 38).

That urban schools in the U.S. in the 1970s faced crisis is not in dispute, but this characterisation of the crisis is problematic, as it reveals racial prejudice ('the same discouraging pattern'). This particular racial prejudice is not limited to the discussion of 1970s urban music education; the mass exodus of the *Music Educator's Journal* is similar to the phenomenon known as 'white flight' in New Zealand, a term I have used in educational

contexts to refer to schools that once had large proportions of white students and now have largely Māori rolls. This term in New Zealand is widely understood and used in other contexts as well, such as in reference to the 'browning' of New Zealand rugby (Grainger, Falcous, & Newman, 2012). At the risk of stating the obvious, if 'white flight' is considered to be a crisis in music education, then the crisis is defined in ways that paint Māori students, families, and communities in a negative sense – a problem that could be solved, it is implied, by reversing the exodus of white people. Educators should take care to think instead in terms of equity and inclusion and effective teaching and learning outcomes for their students.

The crisis in music education can also be understood in curricular terms that concern the way in which teachers should respond to popular taste. As problematic as the description of the crisis by the *Music Educator's Journal* is, it addresses issues that remain relevant today, as Carol Frierson-Campbell has pointed out (2006, p. xii):

> The disadvantaged student isn't particularly interested in learning the names of the instruments of the orchestra. He isn't 'turned on' by cowboy songs. He won't easily enthuse over studying stringed instruments. He doesn't want our Lincoln Centers. He isn't interested in classical music; in fact, he'll tell you with complete certainty how dull it sounds compared to James Brown or Aretha Franklin. The old image, the old ways, and the old music education curriculum are developing cracks… ("Urban Culture: Awareness may save our skins," 1970, p. 38)

One need only replace James Brown and Aretha Franklin in the above quote with modern musicians such as Kanye West, Rihanna, or Six60 (a contemporary New Zealand reggae band) to imagine students with similar attitudes in present-day New Zealand. Indeed, a similar problem in music education also exists in the New Zealand music classrooms of today: although it is possible for students to study the music of Kanye and Rihanna in the modern-day music classroom, or indeed that of James Brown and Aretha Franklin, there remains a bias towards 'classical' musical conventions, which remain the subject of the (optional) external examinations in the subject.

When the *Music Educator's Journal* in 1970 wrote that 'the old music education curriculum' is 'developing cracks', this would seem to imply that there was time when there was not a crisis in music education: that is, that the 'old music education' was entirely satisfactory. This may not have been true: in 1928, *The Musical Times* printed a contribution from the famous Russian music critic Leonid Sabaneev titled 'The Crisis in the Teaching of Theory'. Sabaneev complained of the 'tragedy' of musicians of various sorts – composers, theorists – who 'collected the experience of bygone years and sincerely believed that the formulæ they compiled were the actual laws governing creative work and not merely partial instances of those laws', and further, noted that this tragedy 'has existed for more than a hundred years' (Sabaneev & Pring, 1928, p. 986).

Writing elsewhere, Sabaneev went on to describe a societal crisis afflicting music:

> The stratum of society which maintains a cultural level of taste is surrounded by a vast concourse of crude and uncultivated persons who, nevertheless, are not

> altogether neutral in their appraisal of art and its phenomena. Complete neutrality was characteristic of the masses in earlier times, when they held entirely aloof from cultural matters… (Sabaneev & Pring, 1932, p. 77).

This critique harkens back to days of monarchy, noble patronage, and the courtly ways of old Europe, and indeed Sabaneev writes fondly that there was a time 'when Prince Esterházy's salon provided musical culture for the whole world' (ibid., p. 77). In fact, Sabaneev's critique may be understood as the precursor to the present perception of a crisis of music education, for Sabaneev's masses did not display deference to cultivated taste, and in fact were 'not altogether neutral'. Considered in these terms, modern people and students of music must be considered to go wildly astray, listening as they do to musicians such as Aretha Franklin and Six60. In modern times, it might be said, the masses have developed their own salons.

For all their antiquated nature, opinions similar to Sabaneev's – bemoaning the participation of the commons – are still held in some areas of the music education establishment. For example, a recent publication collecting lectures given in honour of Bernarr Rainbow was titled *Music Education in Crisis*, with Peter Dickinson, the editor, stating that 'Western classical music has suffered a severe setback in an era of mass democratic culture' (Dickinson, 2013, p. viii), and Claus, Lord Moser wrote that 'unless we achieve a change of climate many of today's children may join the ranks of the philistines' (Moser, 2013, p. 21). Although he writes that he accepts the value of popular music, he also wishes to ensure that its very popularity does not marginalise classical music:

> All music is exciting and deserving of encouragement. All types of music have things in common, and one kind can often open the door to others. I passionately want to ensure that the doors to classical music are kept widely ajar (p. 29).

As a classically-trained musician myself, I have nothing against Lord Moser's sentiment about keeping the doors to classical music open; but I cannot help but feel that given the privileged and élite nature of classical music in Western society, it will not be lost any time soon.

The crisis in music education is also a crisis of teacher quality and of school resourcing. Te Oti Rakena has noted that primary-school music teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand receive little music education as part of their teaching training, and that teacher professional development tends to focus on the so-called 'STEM' subjects, and that further, this reflects international trends (Rakena, 2018). Linda Webb (2016) has found that primary teachers were generally not confident or competent musicians, that they were not adequately prepared to teach music by teacher training institutions, that the government focus on literacy and numeracy marginalised the 'music-sound arts' curriculum area, and further that in schools where funding or rural isolation is an issue, that music specialists cannot be hired.[8] The problem of providing specialist education and finding funding is also apparent in secondary education, albeit in different ways. Rakena has also pointed out that

[8] Lord Moser also notes the paucity of skill in the arts in teachers in the United Kingdom (2013, p. 31).

the overwhelming majority of finalists and winners of the Big Sing competition, a New Zealand-wide choral competition, are high decile schools – in other words, those schools that have access to 'time, space, and better resources to support' their participation in the Big Sing (Rakena, 2018).[9] This points to the fact that although all, or nearly all, secondary schools may have specialist music teachers, there are still fundamental problems of access and equity of achievement outcomes in New Zealand schools.

Broadening the discussion beyond music education, there is also a crisis of Māori education, as manifested in the relative underachievement of Māori students when compared to students of other ethnicities. In Aotearoa New Zealand, this has been referred to by the racially-tinged epithet 'the long brown tail', used in reference to graphs of student achievement data as sorted by ethnicity (Stewart, 2014). Kaupapa Māori scholarship and educational practice has sought to work against this crisis, but it has been a long journey. In 1981, the same year that Prescott was writing his article about music education crisis in North America, Graham Hingangaroa Smith in New Zealand 'called on the Minister of Education to openly declare and publish the Department of Education's policy on Māori students. The reason for this challenge to the Minister was to find out what "was" and "was not" being done about the Māori schooling crisis which [he] was now observing at first hand…' (G. Smith, 1997, p. 19). Writing in 1997, he defined this crisis as referring to 'the ongoing plight of Māori underachievement in education and schooling', and noted the problematic nature of the '"taken for granted-ness" of Māori under-performance relative to that of non-Māori' (ibid., p. 43).

More recently, Russell Bishop, architect of the Te Kotahitanga initiative that sought to improve the experience of Māori students in mainstream schools goes into further detail on the problems facing Māori students and their teachers:

> In New Zealand schools, in comparison to majority culture students (primarily of European descent): the overall academic achievement levels of Māori students is low; Māori suspension rates are far higher than those of Pākehā, and they are over-represented in special education programmes for behavioural issues; Māori enrol in pre-school programmes in lower proportions than other groups, and they tend to be over-represented in low-stream education classes. Māori are more likely than other students to be found in vocational curriculum streams, they leave school earlier with fewer formal qualifications, and they enrol in tertiary education in lower proportions.

[9] In Aotearoa New Zealand, the decile system is used to apportion funding between schools. High decile schools are understood to be those schools serving relatively more wealthy communities, and so the term 'decile' is synonymous with relative degrees of privilege. Successive governments have considered reforming the decile system, and different means of funding schools may indeed be implemented in future, but the longstanding legacy of thinking in terms of school deciles is likely to persist for some time in the educational discourse of New Zealand.

> What is of great concern is that this situation has not just developed recently, but is part of the persistent pattern of educational disparities first identified in the late 1950s… (Bishop, 2012, pp. 38 – 39).

It would seem, judging from this survey of crisis in education, that such crises are difficult to solve, and – as one may perceive from a reading of Sabaneev – may be nigh-on perpetual or recurrent in nature. I have focused here on the two educational crises that most concern the present study – that which is found in music education and that which is found in Māori education. Both would appear to be difficult to resolve; both present an ongoing challenge for teachers and researchers to address.

Ethnicity, Racism, and Aotearoa New Zealand

As already demonstrated by the terms 'white flight' and 'long brown tail', important themes in the present research include ethnicity and racism. These themes have been of considerable scholarly and indeed popular interest, particularly since the advent of the civil rights movement in the United States of America. Just as the topic of biculturalism is today of pressing interest in schools in Aotearoa New Zealand, the topic of race – especially as it concerned the practice of racial segregation – was one of the defining characteristics of the civil rights movement. As Wendy Leo Moore writes:

> During the civil rights movement, from the mid-1950s until the early 1970s, a legal shift took place, and laws that were explicitly racist were challenged and began to be dismantled…In the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* case, the Supreme Court ruled that legally imposed racial segregation in education violated the guarantee of equal protection under the law found in the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution (Moore, 2008, p. 78).

It is worth noting that New Zealand did not and does not enforce strict racial segregation, but in the past developed a system of 'native' schools (Barrington, 2008; Simon & Smith, 2001), and in the present day has parallel curricula designed to cater for Māori- and for English-mediums of instruction. Teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand therefore face a particular professional challenge in regards to the politics of ethnicity that is unique to education in this country.

Following this period of civil rights struggle came a period in North American and in Western European countries that has been termed the 'ethnic revival', a period from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s that was characterised by the 'rejection of the war in Vietnam, the 'do-it-yourself' movement, the civil rights struggle, the campus riots, the return to romantic simplicity and spontaneity of the flower children and the hippies, the widespread anti-big business, anti-atomic energy and anti-big labor sentiments…' (Fishman, 1985, p. xii). Elizabeth Rata, a scholar based in New Zealand, has described ethnic revival as having two forms: identification, which is 'individuals' self-identification with an ethnically defined

group', and categorisation, which 'refers to the political recognition of the ethnic group as a social category' (Rata, 2017, p. 2). She goes on to state:

> Claims for political recognition and enhanced rights for minority, immigrant, and indigenous groups in Western nations led to various types of official multiculturalism, most notably the inclusion of ethnic categories in state institutions and the development of targeted policies such as affirmative-action policies (ibid.).

The ethnic revival in New Zealand saw a marked increase in the political fortunes of Māori following a period of activism, and this has popularly been called the 'Māori renaissance'. Kolig defines this Māori renaissance as having two key elements: the demand that the special position of Māori as the indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand and as signatories of the Treaty of Waitangi be recognised, and the 'insistence on cultural distinctiveness' (Kolig, 2000, p. 236). Modern bicultural policy in New Zealand has its origins in this discourse of ethnic revival.

Of course, in the 1980s the topic of race became the subject of intense public debate in Aotearoa New Zealand for reasons quite independent of the Māori renaissance. In 1981, the South African rugby team, the Springboks, was invited to tour the country, which prompted discussion of the South African policy of apartheid. The invitation was particularly controversial as it appeared to be contrary to the spirit of the 1977 Gleneagles agreement which stated that the member countries of the Commonwealth of Nations agreed that 'there were unlikely to be future sporting contacts of any significance between Commonwealth countries or their nationals and South Africa while that country continues to pursue the policy of apartheid', and the 1981 Springbok tour therefore provoked international concern. In the face of such criticism, proponents of the tour argued that the tour was the responsibility of the New Zealand Rugby Union, not the Government (Newnham, 2003, pp. 5 - 8).

The tour prompted protest, with those who opposed the policy of apartheid clashing with those who were more interested in the game of rugby. Newnham writes, for example:

> The last Springbok tour in 1965 also started at Gisborne with a full-scale Māori welcome at Poho O Rawiri marae. This time the feeling was very different. In a very un-Māori way, the invitations to the welcome had been vetted closely to exclude known opponents of the tour. Well-dressed Pākehās were prominent among the guests, while a number of angry Māoris, young and not so young joined the protestors at the top of the road leading to the marae. At a break in the marae proceedings, the Māoris went up to the door.
>
> Speaking powerfully and almost in tears, Social Welfare worker Hone Ngata, great-great-grandson of Sir Āpirana Ngata, castigated those who would refuse him entry to his own marae. "Last week", he said, "I was Master of Ceremonies at a function here and to-day because you are fooled by racists, you do not let me in. You talk of hospitality. Perhaps we are too hospitable. We always put out a hand and say 'Kia Ora'. Now I think if Hitler were alive we would welcome him." (p. 21)

There were extraordinary scenes of protest and other moments of high human drama in response to the tour: not least of these was the incident in which Pat McQuarrie stole a plane with the intention of disrupting a rugby match due to be held in Hamilton, which was simultaneously the scene of protests involving two hundred protestors standing on the pitch in front of some twenty thousand angry spectators (Shears & Gidley, 1981, pp. 40 - 52).

The fact that race was a central point of the protests regarding the Springbok tour led to uncomfortable reflections on New Zealand's own internal racial politics. Elizabeth Rata writes that it was generally felt that there was a strong degree of hypocrisy in protesting the human rights issue of apartheid in South Africa while simultaneously turning a blind eye to issues of Māori rights and grievances in New Zealand:

> … similarities in kind, if not in degree, were made between the overt oppression suffered by the black majority and the more benign oppression suffered by Māori at the hands of a white majority. Despite the enormous differences between the South African apartheid police state and the New Zealand's advanced brand of social democracy, sufficient parallels were drawn between the common colonial heritage of South African whites of British origin and New Zealand whites for the Pākehā…to confront uncomfortable issues… (1997, pp. 14 – 15).

Rata goes on to argue that the national discussion of racism and apartheid prompted the adoption of biculturalism in New Zealand.

If the civil rights movement can be said to have contributed to the ethnic revival, it may be considered to have had another lasting effect as well: unlike in the past, where for example, elected members of state legislatures in the U.S. enacted the so-called 'Jim Crow' laws, today it is socially unacceptable for one to be perceived as racist. However, social inequalities ordered along racial lines still exist such that people of colour, as a population, suffer disadvantage compared to the white population even despite the lack of overtly racist efforts to maintain this status quo. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva has coined the term 'racism without racists' – see his book of the same name (2010) – to describe the mechanisms in which people may intentionally or unintentionally further racist ideology. He argues that there are different understandings of racism: 'Whereas for most whites racism is prejudice, for most people of color racism is systemic or institutionalised' (p. 8), and works to identify the institutional means of so-called 'color-blind racism'. He finds four main ways in which this more subtle form of racism is carried out: *abstract liberalism*, in which ideals such as 'individualism' and 'equal opportunities' are evoked in order to oppose affirmative-action policies, while being unconcerned with the pressing social realities of inequality; *naturalization*, in which it is claimed that it is simply normal for people of various races to associate with one another, and that any bias in this respect can be excused because '*they* (racial minorities) do it too'; *cultural racism*, in which it is argued that people of a particular race have particular cultural values or practices that explain their disadvantage, such as not valuing education as much as whites do, or having too many children; and *minimization of racism*, in which it is argued that racism is no longer of primary importance in determining a person's opportunities, such that people may argue that 'it is better now than it was', for example (pp. 28 – 29).

Colour-blind racism is not simply the denial of the effects of racism on people of colour, or on ethnic minorities. It also involves colour-blindness towards the importance of whiteness, a point which is bound up most obviously in Bonilla-Silva's conceptions of abstract liberalism and minimisation of racism. Robin DiAngelo has said of white people that:

> We consider a challenge to our racial worldviews as a challenge to our very identities as good, moral people. Thus, we perceive any attempt to connect us to the system of racism as an unsettling and unfair moral offense. The smallest amount of racial stress is intolerable – the mere suggestion that being white has meaning often triggers a range of defensive responses. These include emotions such as anger, fear, and guilt and behaviours such as argumentation, silence, and withdrawal from the stress-inducing situation (DiAngelo, 2018, p. 2).

Colour-blind racism is also present in Aotearoa New Zealand. Graham Smith, for example, has described how Māori were suddenly placed in a position where they were judged to be on, to use deliberate scare quotes, 'an equal playing field' due to the economic reforms that followed the election of the fourth Labour Government in 1984 (G. Smith, 1997, p. 30):

> The disadvantage which accrued to many poorer Māori families in the ideological shift to the 'level playing field' was to be further exacerbated by economically constructed definitions of equity, which was now to be defined in terms of 'treating everyone the same'. This of course takes no account of existing or 'historical' inequalities and it makes the false assumption that everyone starts off on an equal 'footing'. The outcome of this approach is that the *status quo* is likely to be sustained: those who are already disadvantaged will remain so. Inequalities, within this constructed definition, are to be explained as the fault of individual 'mismanagement'. This ideology has been extended into education to explain educational underachievement… (pp. 30 – 31).

It might be noted that the 'level playing field' was not a concept settled-upon by Māori, but rather decided by the (Pākehā-controlled) government. However abstract or liberal the idea of an equal playing field might seem, then, it must be understood in terms of ethnic politics.

Mica Pollock has coined the term 'colormute' to describe a phenomenon that goes further than mere racial 'colourblindness'. Colourmuteness – as I choose to spell it here – is a phenomenon where one chooses not to speak, or is forbidden from speaking, about race altogether. She gives the example of Proposition 209, a Californian proposition that was approved by a majority of voters that outlawed the official acknowledgement of race, making racially-based policies of affirmative action in education impossible. As she notes, far from creating an equal playing field, racial disparities in enrolments at the University of California in fact increased: '*deleting* race words can actually help *make race matter more*' (Pollock, 2004, pp. 2 – 3).

The politics of ethnicity in Aotearoa New Zealand are often less subtle than the 'equal playing field'. Consider the famous speech given in Orewa in 2004 by Don Brash, then leader of the National Party, in which he said:

> …the topic I will focus on today is the dangerous drift towards racial separatism in New Zealand, and the development of the now entrenched Treaty grievance industry. We are one country with many peoples, not simply a society of Pākehā and Māori where the minority has a birthright to the upper hand, as the Labour Government seems to believe (Brash, 2004).

Patrick Snedden has commented that after this speech, 'there was an initial outbreak of Pākehā angst that support for Māori had gone too far ' (2005, p. 182), which appears to be supported by political polling records: following Brash's speech the National Party enjoyed a 17 point jump in the polls ("Poll puts National ahead of Labour," 2004). Robin DiAngelo has written of a phenomenon she terms *white fragility*, which manifests as the 'silence, defensiveness, argumentation, certitude, and other forms of pushback' that emerges 'when we try to talk openly and honestly about race', as a result of 'social forces that prevent us from attaining the racial knowledge we need to engage more productively,' and which 'function powerfully to hold the racial hierarchy in place' (2018, p. 8), and the Don Brash speech can be understood as a manifestation of this phenomenon.

The politics of ethnicity are also worthy of consideration in regard to mainstream schools in Aotearoa New Zealand, in which there is a pervasive bias towards Pākehā culture, whether overt or unintended, and 'colour-blind' or otherwise. Consider the following two accounts from Māori writers. The first is by Moana Maniapoto, describing her experience trying to find a school for her daughter that would support her daughter's learning of te reo Māori (2017, p. 198):

> Three years ago, I set up an appointment with the principal of our lovely local school.
>
> 'Our daughter is currently in a total immersion situation,' we said to the principal. 'How can your school support her learning?'
>
> 'We have excellent English remedial programmes,' he replied.
>
> Come again? Maybe I needed to reframe that question.
>
> 'There's nothing wrong with her English,' I said. She's bilingual. How can *we* help *you* to support her reo?'
>
> There was a pause.
>
> 'Well,' he said. 'There isn't really enough community interest in the Māori language.'
>
> Not true. I'd talked to parents who had lobbied to get the language taught but couldn't gain traction.
>
> 'It's an official language,' barked The Father.
>
> 'It's the right of all kids, not just Māori, to learn te reo,' said I.
>
> He smiled. We didn't feel the love.

This anecdote demonstrates an instance in which it was presumed that English need be the only language found in schools. It also demonstrates the importance to Māori of meaningful

inclusion in classrooms of Māori language and culture. There is specific relevance to music education here, for Moana Maniapoto is one of New Zealand's foremost Māori musicians. Her concern with ensuring that her daughter had access to te reo Māori in her school is a reminder that music-making does not simply occur in a vacuum but is made by people who are participants in and affected by the politics of ethnicity.

Patricia Johnston (1998) also writes of her experiences as a student at school. Among other memories that she shares, she relates an incident where she was disciplined for speaking te reo Māori:

> I spoke some Māori at school just the once. A boy in front accused me of swearing and saying some dirty words. My arguing with the teacher that 'e noho' meant sit down (because I couldn't see the blackboard) seemed to infuriate her.
>
> I got the strap.
>
> It was my first day at school.
>
> I never spoke Māori at school again (p. xi).

Johnston was far from alone in being disciplined for speaking Māori at school, as the analysis by Linda Tuhiwai Smith and Judith Simon of the experience of teachers and students in Native Schools (2001) has shown. The Native Schools were a parallel school system that is no longer extant that was established with the goal of providing Māori students with an education in European cultural values. Although the policy was variably implemented and enforced by different teachers in different schools, the use of the Māori language was generally supressed, sometimes violently, in order to encourage the adoption of English.

More recently, bicultural policy in *The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum* document of 2000 was the subject of a critique by Jonathan Mane-Wheoki:

> Official biculturalism is politically and ideologically driven. But how does it work out in practice? (Mane-Wheoki, 2003, p. 84)

He is careful to distinguish between monoculturalism, biculturalism, and multiculturalism; monoculturalism he sees as an unrealistic ideology held by Pākehā who ignore the realities of the increasingly complex bi- and multi-cultural society that is Aotearoa New Zealand. He does not see issues of multiculturalism as superseding those of biculturalism, and sees recent immigrants as 'tangata Tiriti' (ibid., p. 86), here by the exercise of the Crown. Accordingly, he writes that it is the 'perplexed monoculturalist' who wonders why biculturalism remains of importance in an apparent age of multiculturalism, and that:

> It is the racist monoculturalist who would bemoan as 'special treatment' and 'political correctness' the prioritising of the Māori arts in the general *Arts Curriculum* and disparage as 'separatist' and 'apartheid' the 'parallel curriculum statement' (ibid., p. 87).

He further notes that the *Arts Curriculum* document of 2000 is 'not a culturally equalised document', and is rather a 'very Pākehā, Eurocentric document' (p. 88) – a criticism that is

useful to bear in mind when considering the later *New Zealand Curriculum* document that is the subject of analysis in this thesis.

Multiculturalism, Anti-Racism and Decolonisation in Music Education

Much of the literature on multicultural music education is written from the perspective of North American scholars. As Constance L. McKoy writes, a 'point of demarcation' for the consideration of multiculturalism in this literature is the so-called Tanglewood Symposium held in 1967, which bore the title *Music in American Society*, in which participants considered challenges facing the profession. McKoy, writing five decades after this symposium, reflects that the product of the symposium may seem contradictory in modern times:

> On one hand, there are statements that seem inappropriate, insensitive, and/or exclusionary. Some terminology is dated by today's standards (the words 'man' and 'mankind' are used throughout in reference to humanity). Descriptors such as sociocultural 'conditions', 'culturally disadvantaged', and 'culturally deprived' that exhibit implicit cultural bias are frequently used…Indeed, while the Symposium placed great emphasis on addressing the needs of students in urban school settings, to my knowledge, there were no Symposium participants from the same racial and ethnic groups as the students who most frequently populated those settings (McKoy, 2017, p. 4).

On the other hand, as McKoy writes, there were statements that were prescient and foreshadow present concerns in education, such as 'the need for culturally responsive and relevant music teaching pedagogy' (p. 5).

More recent scholars have sought to analyse issues relating to music education and multiculturalism using themes and analytical devices drawn from the field of critical pedagogy, and in so doing tackle some of the problematic biases in the profession noted by McKoy in her review of the Tanglewood proceedings. This literature, too, tends to take a position somewhat removed from the New Zealand perspective; for example, Deborah Bradley notes that the 'decolonizing efforts' of music teachers 'are usually framed as multicultural forms of music education' (Bradley, 2006, p. 3). For the purposes of this research, of course, decolonising forms of music education is better understood as existing within the framework of biculturalism, because this encapsulates the colonial relationship between Māori and the European settlers.

Bradley argues that educators interested in social justice should learn to 'bring race into the dialogue' (Bradley, 2006, p. 3), which she argues is particularly necessary in the field of music education, where race is not only little discussed, but where attempts to critically discuss race can in fact lead to silence. She argues that this reflects the institutionalised whiteness of music education, where discussion of race is uncomfortable, where it is avoided for fear of being labelled as being 'racist', and where the avoidance of this discussion is perceived as a gracious response (ibid., pp. 5 – 6). Elsewhere, Bradley

references the work of Bonilla-Silva, arguing that this culture of silence in music education regarding race works to create a 'racism without racists' (Bradley, 2015, p. 22).

It is not only the avoidance of the discussion of race that troubles Bradley, but also the avoidance of the discussion of politics. In a reflection on a graduate music education class, she notes that she had anticipated that a debate about the place of politics in music education would arise in response to questions such as 'what musics we choose to teach, how we choose to teach them, why we select some musics and avoid others, and what is implied by those choices.' Bradley notes that when the word 'apartheid' was mentioned in a graduate seminar in which she intended to explore the meanings of *Siyahamba*, a South African freedom song, a student asked whether it was possible to discuss such issues without being 'political', which for Bradley indicated that the racial injustice of apartheid 'was dangerous discussion terrain' (Bradley, 2012, pp. 189 – 190). For Bradley, this alienisation of political critique from the understanding of music is problematic, and she argues against the censorship of politics in education, lampooning this by terming 'politics' the 'p-word', and suggests that an uncritical avoidance of political concerns may coerce one 'into unconscious submission to White supremacist thinking' (pp. 194).

Another prominent (and prolific) scholar of multiculturalism and related issues in music education is Juliet Hess, who has in a series of articles also investigated ways in which music educators may pursue an agenda of social justice in their classrooms. She advocates an anti-racist music education that works against white supremacy; that critiques liberalism (drawing on the work of Bonilla-Silva), so that issues of race and racism are not able to be easily dismissed; that problematises the marginalisation of non-dominant voices in society; that unmasks unequal power relations; and that challenges the institutions that facilitate these unequal relations of power (Hess, 2015b, pp. 70 – 71).

Like Bradley, Hess has considered the matter of discussing race in the classroom – in one study, by considering the practices of two teachers in majority White schools in Canada who incorporated Afrocentric music in their courses, noting the relevance of this music to much of the modern popular and jazz repertoire, and its influence on 'art music'. These teachers justified their curricular choices by noting that they wanted their students to be aware of 'the richness of the music and the extreme oppression, violence, and racism embedded in the history behind the music.' One wanted students to learn to recognise their privilege; the other wanted students to gain respect for 'what she considered a marginalized population'. Hess states that:

> Centering music and oppression of marginalized groups in these two predominantly White schools was a powerful counterhegemonic strategy…Although results varied, there were certainly moments when students received the message (Hess, 2018b, pp. 134 – 135).

The arguments made by the teachers interviewed by Hess are able to be understood in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand as compelling arguments for the provision of a bicultural music education even in schools where Māori students are the minority or entirely absent: teachers can teach their students how to think critically about issues such as colonialism in

Aotearoa New Zealand and elsewhere, and about the marginalisation of Māori and of other minority populations, and in so doing, work against Pākehā hegemony.

Hess has also considered problems facing teachers in seeking to include musics of non-Western cultures in the classroom, noting that most music teachers have an education that privileges the learning and reproduction of White culture. She states that:

> In music education, 'both/and' – fluency in classical music and another music – is acceptable (or more acceptable now than historically), but 'either/or' – fluency only in a non-classical music is unacceptable (Hess, 2018a, p. 9).

While I would argue that it is acceptable in the present day for a music teacher in Aotearoa New Zealand to not be a classical musician, Hess's argument is still relevant: in my own teacher training, a course requirement was the completion of an NCEA Level One external achievement standard exam booklet, which was designed to test one's knowledge of Western music theory. Hess argues that this institutionalised whiteness can create a gap between teachers and students who practise genres such as hip-hop, which can lead to misunderstandings. In the case of hip-hop pedagogical research, Hess argues that what is needed is 'a practice of vigilantly asking questions about race, power, and positionality' (ibid., p. 10). This advice would seem to be relevant to professional music educators as well.

Considering Assimilation

An important concept in the discussion of ethnicity and education in Aotearoa New Zealand is the concept of assimilation, which in the local context is viewed quite differently to the way in which it is understood in North American literature, which is generally favourable of assimilationist concepts. Herbert Gans, for example, writes of acculturation as being 'a predictable adaptation to, as well as an exploitation of, opportunities in a new social environment that is often essential to the survival of all newcomers, not just immigrants', and of assimilation as being 'the newcomers' acceptance into the mainstream American populated by long-term native borns. That acceptance often requires permission to enter, which can be denied or postponed' (2017, p. 1410). According to this view, assimilation into the dominant culture is that which is desired by immigrants and newcomers to America, and to work against the desire to assimilate is to work against the interests of these people.

As Richard Mulgan writes, the policy of assimilation was at one point the policy of the New Zealand government, which viewed it as a benign force for developing an orderly society:

> New Zealand was often described as an egalitarian, homogenous society. The dominant racial ideas were harmony and assimilation, two races becoming increasingly intermarried and indistinguishable…(Mulgan, 1989, p. 1).

But Mulgan goes on to note that assimilationist policy has been rejected by Māori, who view it as a threat to the survival of their culture (ibid.). Instead of desiring integration with the

colonial culture, Māori often insist on a deliberately defined 'otherness'. Simone Drichel writes of the importance of such expressions of otherness:

> Even after more than a decade of official biculturalism, it appears, assimilationist thought is deeply ingrained in a large section of New Zealand society, making it all the more important to insist on a viable form of collective Māori otherness, such as biculturalism has sought to enable since the late 1980s. A maintained – even accentuated – binary distinction between two 'peoples', Māori and Pākehā, therefore remains a crucial factor in preventing a return to assimilationist policies (Drichel, 2008, p. 591).

In this vein, I go on to argue in this thesis for a critical approach to biculturalism that enables deliberate expressions of otherness.

Famously, when the Treaty of Waitangi was signed, Governor Hobson proclaimed: 'He iwi tahi tatou: we are one people,' thus promoting an assimilationist agenda. As Ranginui Walker relates, Crown policies were swift and efficient in their implementation: Governor George Grey in 1847 insisted that instruction in schools be carried out in English, to more quickly assimilate the Māori populace into the European, and by 1979, as a result of the continued suppression of the Māori language in schools, it was feared that the language was in danger of extinction (R. Walker, 1990, pp. 146-147). Walker goes on to deliver this assessment of assimilation:

> The only way that colonisers can exculpate themselves is in the hope that the natives will do the decent thing and die out, or if they survive, become assimilated. But assimilation is not a real option, because the coloniser as the oppressing class has created a dichotomy of white dominance and brown subjection. In creating that dichotomy, the coloniser thinks that he has created a unified society. The illusion of national unity is maintained by the ideology of one people. But the oppressed know… that they must struggle for their liberation, and a basic component in that struggle is their own consciousness of themselves as an exploited class defined on the basis of ethnicity (pp. 151 – 152).

Walker's argument here draws on Freirean theories of oppression, in which there is an irreconcilable difference between oppressor and oppressed, one that cannot be bridged by the oppressor, who by virtue of their oppressive nature 'can free neither others nor themselves' (P. Freire, 1996, p. 38). Walker therefore argues that assimilationist policies in Aotearoa New Zealand are doomed to fail due to this irreconcilable duality between oppressor and oppressed, and that it is Māori who as the oppressed in this duality have the power to resist and transform this situation. Recalling Drichel's characterisation of bicultural policy as enabling expressions of otherness, I suggest that perhaps the goal of bicultural policy should be one that enables expressions of resistance and transformation.

An anti-assimilationist agenda in the classroom is one that might appear to contradict the ideals of inclusive education, which generally seek to minimise divisions between students. Alison Jones writes of her experience teaching a class that was streamed by ethnicity, with Māori and Pasifika students in one stream and mostly Pākehā students in

the other. She noted that Pākehā students were somewhat indignant of this approach, expressing a desire to learn from their fellow students; on the other hand, Māori and Pasifika students were generally supportive (pp. 301 – 302).

> When the marginalized other desires separation, rather than sharing, liberal and radical teachers' and students' taken-for-granted principles of benevolent or even critical equality are troubled and shaken' (Jones, 1999, p. 300).

One often speaks of inclusion as a desirable goal in educational settings, but Jones' writing here indicates a different perspective: that a deliberately inclusive classroom can in effect be a site of colonisation or imperialism when it forces minority groups to conform to the demands of powerful groups that they be included – or, to put it another way, assimilated. What is needed, then, is a critical evaluation of the means and ends of inclusive education: who is to be included, why, and for whose benefit?

Indigeneity and Music

Even though the study of indigeneity – or, as it is sometimes called, aboriginality – shares many things in common to studies of race and ethnicity in that it can consider the marginalisation of and prejudice against a particular group of people defined on ethnic or racial grounds, it is distinguished from these fields in that scholars of indigeneity often consider issues of sovereignty, self-determination, and means to reclaim some or all of what was lost to colonial and imperial processes of domination and conquest.[10] Whereas much of the literature on racism focuses on North American voices, due in part of course to the fact that most scholars in this field hail from North American countries, the study of indigeneity lacks such a strong centralised viewpoint. This results in a situation where although there is much literature from around the world dealing with the indigenous experience, not all indigenous experiences are able to be generalised from one population to another. This is recognised by Linda Smith, who states:

> The term 'indigenous' is problematic in that it appears to collectivize many distinct populations whose experiences under imperialism have been vastly different (2012, p. 6).

It is also worth noting that indigenous voices tend to be relatively less prominent even in literature concerned with multiculturalism or anti-racism or similar topics, as in nations such as the United States of America and Canada, where much of this literature originates, indigenous populations remain relatively marginalised populations when compared to, for example, Black and Latin peoples. It may even be considered that for all the good that the

[10] As the use of the word 'aboriginal' now has the connotation of referring to the indigenous people of Australia I prefer the term 'indigeneity' to refer to indigenous issues in general and refer to Māori or specific peoples when writing in regard to those peoples in particular.

civil rights movement wrought, the so-called ethnic revival passed the indigenous populations of these countries by.

Frances Rains has described ways in which indigenous peoples must be constantly vigilant in the struggle against oppression and the struggle to protect their knowledge and ways of life in the face of hegemonic amnesia and ignorance. In a striking passage, she notes that this battle may be waged even after death: '…even after we die, we are still of exploitative value.' She proves this point by citing Wendy Rose's poem 'I Expected My Skin and My Blood to Ripen', which opens with a citation from a 1977 auction catalogue listing the sale of moccasins and other artefacts taken from the dead bodies of Native Americans killed in the 1890 Wounded Knee massacre, noting that this is a literal 'perverse appropriation of indigeneity' (Rains, 1999, p. 327). In Aotearoa New Zealand, a view sometimes heard is that the Māori culture is dead or irrelevant: consider the nineteenth-century sentiment that Māori were a dying race, or the modern view held by some that Māori language is irrelevant in light of the modern global society – why not learn Chinese or some other 'useful' language? In light of the history of colonialism in this country, such perspectives perhaps deliberately ignore the role that the dominant culture played in suppressing Māori, and therefore these perspectives show the type of hegemonic amnesia or ignorance described by Rains. Māori resistance to such hegemony is unflagging, as described by Ranginui Walker in his seminal book, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End* (1990).

Nathalie Piquemal argues that teachers and researchers should adopt the following ethical principles when engaging with indigenous peoples: 'A commitment to difference, a commitment to reciprocity, a commitment to beneficence and respect for persons, and an ethic of caring' (Piquemal, 2006, p. 115). Drawing on the ethical work of Levinas, she notes that:

> Living ethically with the other means coexisting with the other while allowing him or her to preserve his or her irreducible otherness (ibid., p. 118).

She goes on to cite policies of assimilation through school systems as being contrary to this understanding of relational ethics. In this she echoes the work of Jones in arguing for the interests of those who do not wish to be assimilated.

Though Piquemal writes from a non-indigenous perspective, Levinasian ethics have prompted scholarship from the indigenous perspective as well. Te Kawehau Hoskins, writing from a Kaupapa Māori perspective (Kaupapa Māori being understood here as a research paradigm concerned with centring Māori perspectives), notes Levinas' concept of responsibility to an absolute Other, a responsibility that she identifies as being infinite, unlimited, and non-reciprocal, and applies this to theoretical terms derived from Māori culture, such as whakapapa, mana, and manaaki. She suggests that the acknowledgement of whakapapa, which might be translated as genealogy or descent, enables one to 'acknowledge the unique singularity of each being'; that the acknowledgement of mana can be understood as engaging with a person's self-conception of themselves; that aroha (love) should be extended unconditionally and without relying on reciprocation, and is an

important part of acknowledging mana; and that through 'practices of manaaki – through greeting and welcoming, in providing hospitality and in caring for others, mana is recognised and uplifted' (Hoskins, 2012, pp. 91 – 92). Hoskins goes on to note the impossibility of fulfilling this infinite responsibility to the Other, and argues that the understanding of Māori ethical and political relations that she outlines provides a basis for critiquing essentialist conceptions of Kaupapa Māori principles and of broader Māori political activism, such as those which assert 'binary logics' (i.e. the colonist-oppressed duality), which and argues that such fixed positions are ultimately unproductive and unsustainable. She further argues that in making claims and asserting rights, Kaupapa Māori 'inevitably creates exclusions', and calls for Māori to orient themselves towards 'social and political theorisation to relationality, not opposition and autonomy' (ibid., 95).

There are issues relating to the use of indigenous music that have begun to be explored in the literature. Beverly Diamond has critiqued the treatment of indigenous musics in society. Unlike in Western culture, where the social conventions behind the recording and sharing of music are more-or-less well understood and established and involve ownership rights, copyright legislation, royalty payments, and licencing, etc., the conventions behind the ownership, recording, and use of indigenous music differ from one people to another, and in some cases may not be well-established. But where society offers indigenous musics and musicians challenges, it also offers indigenous musicians opportunities to have their voices heard: for example, Diamond notes the work of Moana Maniapoto, whom she credits with communicating powerful social critiques through her music. She argues that this critique extends right to Maniapoto's choice of genre and the way in which she combines elements of Māori musical techniques with that of, in this case, reggae: 'the pop style is a strategic choice for social critique of course since audiences will hear hard-hitting messages in an easily audible form' (Diamond et al., 2018, p. 29). An interesting caveat is that Maniapoto deliberately chose not to perform 'tribal music', such as that used in ceremonies:

> 'We don't do any tribal music on stage; we keep ceremonial song separate from stage performance,' explained Moana, 'but we like to take elements' (p. 28).

This sense of there being a right way to engage with indigenous music, and the fact that such right ways of doing things are not necessarily known outside of the culture where it originated, must be taken on board by music teachers. One might consider that in the Māori musical tradition there are exacting standards on how a given song should be sung, as evidenced by Mervyn McLean (see McLean, 1996 and 2004), there is a high degree of emphasis on the meaning conveyed by the text of a song, and the place of text in Māori music is arguably of relatively greater importance than it is in Western music due to the fact that it is a mainly sung or chanted repertoire. For example, Āpirana Ngata's collection of *Ngā Mōteatea* (see, for example, Ngata, 2004) is a collection of song texts, now published with CDs to ensure that the melodies and harmonies of a given song do not get lost.

The relative lack of written forms of Māori music is a challenge for music teachers working in mainstream music classrooms, one that McLean's attempts to transcribe songs is not equal to. The challenge is one of epistemology and the value and authority that is given

to different traditions. Frances Rains has addressed the issue of the value of indigenous knowledge:

> When the dominant group does not value the means of communication of the oppressed, which is often the case in such power differentials, then it is likely that much of what the subaltern group knows is lost to the powerful, or as I like to say, lost on the powerful. Consequently, when a group that only values the written word confronts and oppresses a group with an oral culture, then the knowledge or understandings that the oral culture maintains and is responsible for are not valued or shared (Rains, 1999, p. 324).

It is worth dwelling on the phrase 'lost on the powerful'. Is the value of Māori music lost on teachers or on students? Further, what are the ways in which Māori traditions of performing arts are valued and shared in the music classroom? What is the place of indigenous knowledge in a bicultural music classroom?

Conclusion

As can be observed from this brief literature review, there is much scholarship that has dealt with the idea of there being a crisis in music education – even if the nature of that crisis is not agreed on – and there is much concerning the topics of ethnicity and indigeneity. There is some literature that has considered the topic of critically anti-racist music education, but this has been developed in response to the North American context – as indeed, has most music education literature – and at times has only general relevance to the study of anti-racism in Aotearoa New Zealand, which has different demographics and different racial politics. There is little literature directly concerning the place of indigeneity in relation to Western music classrooms, and there is little literature that has considered biculturalism in music education in the New Zealand context in any depth. The present research will therefore offer perspectives that draw on broad themes discussed elsewhere, but will speak to an area of the literature that has received relatively scant attention from scholars to date.

Methodology and Theoretical Concerns

Methodology

This present chapter comprises two parts. Firstly, I engage in a discussion of the stuff of the methodology itself that is employed in this thesis, including information about how source material was gathered and analysed, and my position as a researcher in relation to the process of carrying out this research. Secondly, I engage in a discussion of theories that are important to the present thesis so that there is no confusion as to what is meant by these terms in later chapters. These theoretical considerations largely concern matters of ethnicity, class, and race, and the discussion of these theories plays a large part in the development of the critical perspective outlined in the present thesis.

Critical Discourse Analysis

This thesis will proceed through use of critical discourse analysis (CDA) in order to engage with the work of critical pedagogy in the field of music education. Generally speaking, critical discourse analysts view discourse as social practice, and utilise a wide range of analytical methods in their work; in this particular study, biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand is treated as being a matter of discourse, and it is subjected to analysis in order to achieve a critical understanding of it. The precise meaning of these words is given more thorough definition later, but suffice it to say for the present that the aim of this critical inquiry is to query whether biculturalism in fact achieves its stated goals, those being to do with partnership, the Treaty of Waitangi, and the peaceful and equitable relationship in New Zealand of Maori and Pakeha peoples. The work of critical pedagogy, likewise, is understood as involving the systematic critique of relationships of power in the classroom and in the wider community to work against the oppression of those who are subject to disadvantage, and indeed, to work towards the transformation of oppressive relationships of power. The overall aim of this thesis is to critically consider biculturalism in music education in Aotearoa New Zealand in these terms.

CDA is not a single methodology so much as it is a research paradigm: that is, critical discourse analysts usually subscribe to at least some shared understandings about the nature of discourse, the means of analysis, and the types of conclusions that might be reached. An over-arching goal of CDA is to critique society. In the words of Thao Lê and Quynh Lê:

> The main mission of CDA is to examine social injustice which is manifested in various social practices and to take a stance against social abuse, racism, social prejudice and discrimination against dominated or marginalised people with less power (Lê & Lê, 2009, p. 4).

Lê and Lê note many criticisms directed against CDA as it has been practiced, including that it tends to be Eurocentric, that it focuses heavily on the analysis of text instead of taking a more expansive view of discourse, and that CDA in itself is not a 'systematic or rigorous' methodology. In answer to this latter point, they state the following:

> As CDA is a multidisciplinary approach, CDA proponents are 'united' in their voice against social injustice and social abuse. They may not be 'uniformed' in adhering to a mainstream of research approach. Those with a linguistic background may focus their analyses on linguistic features whereas those with a sociological background may pay more attention to issues at the 'macro-level' (ibid., p. 11).

The extent to which scholars of discourse, to use a deliberately loose phrasing, embrace a diversity of approaches is summarised by Fairclough et al., who note that there is a division 'between those who see discourse analysis as including detailed analysis of samples of actually occurring text and talk and those who do not', that there is 'a great deal of conceptual confusion around the term "discourse"', and go on to engage in their own criticism of the practices of critical discourse analysts (Fairclough, Graham, Lemke, & Wodak, 2004, p. 4). It is therefore necessary to address these points in this methodology section so that the work of this thesis is clear to the reader.

Firstly, the word 'discourse' is used in a sense that is not entirely textual. 'Biculturalism' itself is understood as a discursive phenomenon, one that can be perceived in human interactions, knowledge, and behaviour as much as it can be perceived in texts. There are certainly texts that are used: the Treaty of Waitangi, for example, is given some close attention; however, as befits a thesis on music education, I also analyse musical examples. I do this in a manner that suits my particular goals: when analysing the song *Te Harinui*, I quote lyrics so that the colonial bias in the song is made apparent, but when analysing Alfred Hill's string quartets, I cite passages from the score. It is worth remembering at this point, though, that music is more than lyric sheets or dots, lines, and stems on the page; my position is that the most important part of music is the performance of music and the shared experience of music-making, and this is itself a theoretical position that will be explored later in this document when I turn in Chapters Four and Five to the topics of music and music education as praxes and explore Christopher Small's concept of 'musicking' (1998). Similarly, even though at times I refer to texts for evidence, what is the subject of analysis is not so much the texts in question but the events and relationships between people and peoples that they describe: my use of accounts by, as examples, William Colenso and Ranginui Walker are examples of this use of text.

The theoretical basis for the concept of discourse that I use draws mostly on the work of Michel Foucault (see, for example, 1994, 1995, 2010). Discourse in this sense is not merely speech or text: rather, it refers to the production and transmission of knowledge in society through means both verbal and non-verbal. Being located as it is in the social interactions and relationships between people, it is a social construct:

> Discourse, as a social construct, is created and perpetuated by those who have the power and means of communication. For example, those who are in control decide who we are by deciding what we discuss (Pitsoe & Letseka, 2013).

In treating biculturalism as a discursive phenomenon, I intend to analyse it in such a way as to discern who, in any given situation, has the power and means of communication. It is important to acknowledge that scholarship is not above this discursive phenomenon, and is not neutral, but exists within it. I acknowledge my own position as researcher, as in the words of Pitsoe and Letseka's quoted above, it falls to me to decide what is discussed in this thesis, and from that I construct an argument about who we are and who we should be. Where appropriate, I have incorporated viewpoints from Kaupapa Māori scholars, who work to advance Māori interests and present specifically Māori understandings of various matters, so that my voice – my Pākehā voice – is not the only voice in this thesis.

An important aspect of Foucauldian discourse is that of discontinuity. Foucault rejects the notion that history should be understood as a linear development of ideas and institutions, instead arguing that knowledge and human understandings developed not in a continuous evolution over time in a kind of steady march towards enlightenment, but instead in fits and starts and through epistemological schisms and innovations. In *The Order of Things* (1994), he makes the point with reference to biology and natural history:

> Historians want to write histories of biology in the eighteenth century; but they do not realize that biology did not exist then, and that the pattern of knowledge that has been familiar to us for a hundred and fifty years is not valid for a previous period. And that, if biology was unknown, there was a very simple reason for it: that life itself did not exist. All that existed was living beings, which were viewed through a grid of knowledge constituted by *natural history* (pp. 127 – 128).

Similarly, in *Discipline and Punishment*, Foucault begins by giving an account of the execution of Damiens, a Frenchman who attempted to assassinate King Louis XV in 1757; in the course of his execution his flesh was torn by pincers, his hand burned with sulphur, and a mixture of molten lead and sundry other materials poured in his wounds, and only after all of this was he was drawn and quartered. In the event, the quartering was botched, leading his executioners to cut the prisoner with knives to assist the horses in their task. Foucault juxtaposes this punishment of the wretched Damiens with a French prison timetable written a mere eighty years later, which in contrast is sober and regulated. He notes that although the execution and the timetable 'do not punish the same crimes or the same type of delinquent', 'they each define a certain penal style' (Foucault, 1995, p. 9). By juxtaposing these two penal styles, one that could belong to the Middle Ages and one that seems decidedly modern, Foucault finds a discontinuity in the French approach to punishment.

Accordingly, I take the approach that the history of biculturalism is one that is discontinuous: rather than attempting to construct a linear narrative of bicultural relationships since the Treaty of Waitangi, and rather than attempting to create a theory of biculturalism that accounts for the wide variety of relationships between Māori and Pākehā, I take the view that there have been different bicultural encounters between Māori and

Pākehā that at times bear little relation to others. In other words, I write not of *biculturalism* but of *biculturalisms,* and rather than seeking to find uniting comparisons between the different biculturalisms in Aotearoa New Zealand, work instead to highlight the diversity of the bicultural experience.

I now turn to the means of analysis of discourse that I employ in the present study. Kendall and Wickham (1999) suggest that a simple first step to discourse analysis – though they use the word 'simple' cautiously – is the recognition of a *corpus of statements*. Statements, also sometimes called utterances, can be understood as constituent parts of a discourse, and as Kendall and Wickham point out, can be '"things" as well as "words"' (ibid.). The discourse of biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand is one comprised of a great number of statements, and the recognition of a corpus of these statements for the purpose of analysis in the present thesis is no small task. As will be noted by the reader, I have chosen statements that seem pertinent to the present study, which has a particular focus on music and music education: thus, I begin with the Treaty of Waitangi and also analyse the church in New Zealand, which was an early colonising presence, but also include analyses of Alfred Hill, Āpirana Ngata, and government educational policy documents such as the *New Zealand Curriculum* and the Achievement Standards that count towards the National Certificates of Achievement.

I freely admit that my choices in this regard are idiosyncratic and might not have been replicated by another researcher. Rather, they reflect my own position as a white New Zealander, as a practicing Anglican, and as a secondary music teacher. My training as a composer led me to be interested in early New Zealand composers, which led me to the study of Alfred Hill; my experience as a church-goer means that perhaps my analysis of the church is more enthusiastically in-depth than other researchers might have cared to conduct; my perspective as a secondary teacher means that I am interested in the finer details of NCEA Achievement Standards, which are the means by which students earn their qualifications at high school, but teachers in other situations would probably find these details less interesting than I. My perspective as a white New Zealander means that I view 'white' culture and institutions with an insider perspective and, inevitably, Māori culture and institutions as something of an 'other'. It is my position that none of these choices that arise from my own position as a researcher are wrong, per se, and it is my contention that they allow an informed critical analysis of the discourse of biculturalism. However, perhaps other researchers from other perspectives would be able to offer other valuable perspectives and analyses of other fields of music education and of other genres of music.

Aside from my own experiences, another important guiding principle in the selection of my corpus of statements is that of *intertextuality*. In general terms, the principle of intertextuality means that no one text can be read in isolation, but must be understood in relation to others. In the words of Graham Allen:

> Meaning becomes something which exists between a text and all the other texts to which it refers and relates, moving out from the independent text into a network of textual relations. The text becomes the intertext (G. Allen, 2011, p. 1).

This study of biculturalism has proceeded through the study of existing texts and musical scores, and has not involved fieldwork of the gathering of original data. This is no loss, however, as the network of textual relationships uncovered thereof has proved to be of great interest, and at times, some of the relationships have proved to be surprising: consider, for example, that Paulo Freire (1996), who is primarily of interest to this research as the author of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, which is the seminal text in the field of critical pedagogy, also occupies a position of importance in the discussion of the role of the church in biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand. As discussed in Chapter Two, he took part in a conference, and offered a scathing critique of the efforts of some of the participants. As Allen says:

> From the simplest utterance to the most complex work of scientific or literary discourse, no utterance exists alone… All utterances are **dialogic**, their meaning and logic dependent upon what has previously been said and on how they will be received by others (2011, p. 19, emphasis original).

A guiding theme in my research has therefore been to follow the links between text and to highlight those which are of interest, particularly inasmuch as this enables the understanding of statements and the context in which they were made. However, this approach has not been confined simply to the sustained critical analysis of discourse: consider, for example, the account in the literature survey of crisis in music education and in education more broadly, in which I observed that there is a longstanding habit of authors claiming educational crisis for reasons that are broadly revealing of the attitudes of the author towards disadvantaged groups in the societies of their times.

Finally, I should describe the means by which the matter of analysis itself was approached in this study. Having identified my corpus of statements, I subjected statements to analysis by asking questions such as the following:

- What context was this statement made in?
- What were the processes of production and interpretation of this statement?
- Does any particular statement represent a moment of discontinuity – does it belong to a new discursive formation – or is it a re-inscription of an active discourse?
- What relationships of power affect what can be said and who could speak?
- What relationships of power affect what is true and what is not?

When I speak of biculturalism and biculturalisms, I allow for the prospect of discontinuity: *new* ways of being bicultural. One such discontinuity may be argued to have occurred following the civil rights movement in the United States, which prompted world-wide reconsidering of relationships between ethnic groups. In Aotearoa New Zealand, for example, two different phenomena emerged prominently following the civil rights period in the US: the so-called 'Māori Renaissance', a period of marked political activism by Māori, and the introduction of what I have termed 'mainstream biculturalism', the widespread adoption in government policy of principles of biculturalism. At the same time, I allow for the prospect of the continuation of an active discourse: for example, the same colonial impetus that allowed Alfred Hill to appropriate Māori music and culture in his

compositions still appears to be present in present-day Pākehā usages of Māori music, such as the adoption and popularisation of songs like *Pōkarekare Ana* as national folksongs.

Critical Pedagogy

The critical nature of this critical discourse analysis, as befits a study of education, owes much to the principles of critical pedagogy developed by Freire (1996). The precise meaning and application of the word 'critical' in this context is a matter of some debate and discussion: see, for example, the articles 'What is critical about critical pedagogy' by Alexandre Guilherme (2017) and the similarly titled 'What is critical about critical pedagogy? Conflicting conceptions of criticism in the curriculum' by Hanan A. Alexander (2018). Alexander notes of the word 'critical' that it:

> …connotes awareness of the myriad ways in which people dominate one another and consideration of whether or to what extent it is possible to conceive social relations that ameliorate if not all at least some of the most egregious effects of this domination (p. 903).

Guilherme, writing in an editorial for a special edition of the journal *Policy Futures in Education*, notes the perspective that in recent times, critical pedagogy has become irrelevant because it has 'lost its ability for self-criticism, and therefore of reforming and renewing itself' (p. 4). Part of the work of this thesis is therefore to interrogate principles of critical pedagogy in light of the work of indigenous and Kaupapa Māori scholars so as to arrive at an understanding of the place and of biculturalism in music education pedagogy that is not irrelevant or ineffectual.

The word 'critical' in 'critical pedagogy' can also be understood as referring to the work of critical theorists such as those of the Frankfurt school, whose analyses of society provide scholars of critical pedagogy with important analytical tools (Giroux, 2017). But I find Joan Wink's narrative consideration of the term 'critical' useful: she notes a critical pedagogy class in which one of her students considered and rejected various meanings of the word 'critical', as referring to critical thinking; to a critical essay (as of artwork, presumably); to a critical person, in the sense of one 'who is inclined to judge severely'; to a critical moment, in the sense of an important moment; and to a critical element, in the sense of something essential. The use of 'critical' that the student finds most appropriate is in fact in the sense of 'critical condition', as in a crisis (Wink, 2011, p. 11). The aptitude of this description will be clear to the reader who recalls the discussion of education crisis in music education and in Māori education in Aotearoa New Zealand that I included in the literature survey, and this research can be understood as a response to these crises.

But what of critical pedagogy itself? In short, critical pedagogy considers how teachers and students may become aware of the ways in which oppressive relationships of power are present in classrooms and communities, with a view to taking action so that the conditions that allow the replication or maintenance of oppression are able to be

transformed for the positive benefit of all concerned. In this, it takes a deliberately political stance in both analysing existing power relationships – that is, politics – and takes action to work against oppression. As a student of music education, I have arrived at the critical pedagogical literature in a way that is perhaps unusual, and which differs from what might be the usual graduate student experience of taking classes directly in critical education. My introduction to critical pedagogy came instead in the form of a class in Auckland, New Zealand that specialised in research methods in Māori education scholarship, and in which I came to learn of the likes of Graham and Linda Smith from Georgina Stewart and Alison Jones. It took me some time to understand that the Kaupapa Māori approach to critical pedagogy was in fact quite different to that most commonly described in the literature, which as Elizabeth Ellsworth (1989) argues, assumes a white, male, heterosexual, etc. approach. In contrast, the Kaupapa Māori literature privileges a Māori perspective, and insofar as it is relevant, many of its leading scholars are female. In assuming a Māori perspective, Kaupapa Māori criticism avoids some of the problems associated with the homogenisation of hybridity in the service of hegemonic interests. Instead, Kaupapa Māori theory maintains a focus on Māori interests. Although I do not seek to adopt a Kaupapa Māori position here – I am not Māori, after all, and Māori interests are not necessarily my own, so it would be hypocritical, if not downright fraudulent of me to try – I view Kaupapa Māori scholarship as an important source of critical viewpoints with which to consider the matter of biculturalism in music education.

The field of critical pedagogy at large can be understood as developing from the theories of Paulo Freire, particularly with the translation into English of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* in 1970 (Malott, 2011). Freire developed the notion of 'transformational praxis' as part of his concept of a pedagogy of liberation, according to which the marginalised of society can, through education, free themselves from oppressive social structures. Some basic themes of Freire's educational philosophy can be observed as early as July of 1958, when he spoke of the need to base adult literacy education in the 'consciousness of the day-to-day conduct lived by the learners so that it could never be reduced to a mere knowing of letters, words, and sentences' at the Second National Conference on Adult Education in Rio de Janeiro (A. M. A. Freire & Macedo, 2000, pp. 17 - 18). The development of conscientisation, the awareness of power relations in society and one's contribution to maintaining or reproducing them, remains a key goal of critical educators. In Freire's words:

> Conscientisation implies…that when I realise that I am oppressed, I also know I can liberate myself if I transform the concrete situation where I find myself oppressed (P. Freire, 1974, p. 25).

Conscientisation, then, is an essential aspect of the critical study of biculturalism, as it enables one to recognise one's place in relation to power structures and means of oppression. The work of conscientisation is a key task of the present thesis: in critiquing my own position as a researcher and teacher, I attempt to become conscious of my own part in the politics of biculturalism as well as the role that others play, and I argue that such a process of conscientisation is a vital part of the development of critically bicultural education practice for others.

This is perhaps a more complex task than it may appear, as a simple transposition of an oppressed and oppressor binary framework – which is one of the key theoretical concepts in Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* – onto the Māori and Pākehā relationship risks the creation of essentialist perspectives and is in fact uncritical. Te Kawehau Hoskins argues against such 'dominant-subordinate, colonise[r]-colonised' analyses, which 'can be too deterministic, offering simple reductionist explanations that, for example, cast all Māori as colonised victims'. She notes, for example, that such binary conceptions leave little place for Māori agency (Hoskins, 2012, p. 89). Kuni Jenkins has argued that frameworks of critical theory are indeed inadequate to analyse early Māori and Pākehā relations:

> Māori seemed to have gone to considerable lengths to establish and maintain links with Pākehā… notions of resistance and notions of Māori as victims of colonisation were difficult to accommodate simply into the story of Māori-Pākehā relationships in the nineteenth century (Jenkins, 2000, p. 6).

For Jenkins, the development of the principles of aitanga, a word which she uses to describe 'a set of practices and processes which are played out in meetings between people' and which prizes reciprocity, the 'giving and receiving by both parties equally committed to a relationship', provides a means to analyse Māori-Pākehā relations (ibid., 26).

Mica Pollock has noted that in the United States of America, 'the more complex inequality seems to get, the more simplistic inequality analysis seems to become' (Pollock, 2004, p. 111). Her argument centres on an analysis of the multicultural nature of California City, and emphasises the diversity of peoples and degrees of advantage they possess within that city (ibid., p. 114). Though this argument is relevant within the multicultural context of Aotearoa New Zealand, it also has relevance within its bicultural context, as both Māori and Pākehā identities have become more complex, in terms of music and otherwise. I can speak to this from my own practice as a community musician involved in theatre in the town of Whangarei, which has some involvement from local Māori singers interested in musical theatre, of which two have told me on separate occasions that they see themselves as 'white' Māori because of this aspect of their musical interests and other aspects of their identities: one told me that a friend had told her that she was 'brown on the outside and white on the inside'. Though there is an element of humour in such descriptions, in my observation, both singers were committed to identifying as Māori, and their 'whiteness' was not seen as interfering with the ability to identify as Māori. Thus, the goals of critical pedagogy in a bicultural context must be understood as being complex, catering to a wide range of identities and musical interests, and rejecting essentialised notions of what 'Māori music' is and what 'Māori musicians' might be interested in.

I do not wish to reject the tools of critical theory and critical pedagogy in the present study, but I do accept the view the Māori and Pākehā relationship does not fit the simple conception of oppressed and oppressor that lies at the heart of critical theory. For example, there are many Māori musicians who have considerable interest in and have gone to considerable lengths to develop skills in Western music, both classical and otherwise, and to regard the actions of such musicians as being the mere result of hegemonic power relations results in a similar problem to the one encountered by Jenkins. The task of conscientisation

in the bicultural context, then, must transcend simple binary notions of colonising and colonised musical practices and people, and must instead work to identify oppressive power relations as they work to hamper the agency of students in their music-making and music learning. Perhaps Jenkin's theory of aitanga is useful here, as it gives voice to the 'serious aspirations of Māori in the ongoing partnership with Pākehā'. Through being conscious of one's position as a teacher, or indeed as a student, music teachers and students can become aware of such aspirations and to build positive and mutually beneficial learning relationships.

Other key concepts in studies of critical pedagogy are those of *transformation* and *praxis*. Transformation follows the process of conscientisation and, in simple terms, involves the change of the oppressive circumstances which one has become aware of; the means of enacting such change is that of praxis. However, praxis, as transformative action, is only truly praxis in Freire's understanding if it is the result of critical reflection. Action without praxis, in Freire's words, 'is pure activism', and not viable (Freire, 1996, p. 48).

The ends and means of transformative praxis in the context of bicultural music education in Aotearoa New Zealand must be understood as having to do with ethnicity and culture. However, as Ricky Lee Allen has pointed out, the field of critical pedagogy evolved with the primary goal of addressing inequalities in society caused by class and capitalism, and problems stemming from race have been considered secondary considerations, to the extent that 'darker-skinned groups in the US, particularly Blacks and Indians, have been reluctant to join our educational movement' (R. L. Allen, 2005, p. 54), and as a result attempts to construct a critical pedagogy of anti-racism, one that works against white supremacy in society and the classroom. It is worth noting that criticisms of capitalist models of society are indeed rife in Freire's work, including in his famous attack on so-called 'banking models' of education, in which students (ideally) meekly receive knowledge delivered to them by their teacher, and are judged on their capacity to reproduce it. Freire essentially argues that such education is in fact worse than no education at all:

> In the banking concept of education, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing. Projecting an absolute ignorance onto others, a characteristic of the ideology of oppression, negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry (Freire, 1996, p. 53).

Freire instead endorses models built on the generation of knowledge through mutual discussion, inquiry, and the posing of problems.

Allen's argument that critical pedagogy has seem limited uptake amongst people of colour is perhaps not valid in Aotearoa New Zealand, where Māori scholars have indeed drawn on the theory of critical pedagogy in developing Kaupapa Māori approaches to education and research. What is of interest to the present study, however, is that Allen instead works towards a model of critical pedagogy based on anti-racism and does so explicitly from the perspective of a white researcher. This is important to note in the context of the present study, as the majority of teachers, and certainly the majority of music teachers

in Aotearoa New Zealand are Pākehā, and therefore hold relatively privileged positions in New Zealand society. Strikingly, he critiques the role of white educators:

> We should not be surprised that white educators working in urban communities act out roles as 'white knights', whose mission is to rescue people of color from oppression. White guilt and misguided generosity only serve to create an environment where people of color must pledge allegiance to the meritocracy myth. White educators and administrators do very little to form cross-racial solidarity against the larger problem of white supremacy (R. L. Allen, 2005, p. 60).

The idea of white educators rescuing people of colour from oppression is problematic, because according to Freirean thought, it is only the oppressed who are capable of freeing themselves (and their oppressors) from the oppressive condition, through the processes of conscientisation and transformative praxis: 'the oppressor, who is himself dehumanized because he dehumanizes others, is unable to lead this struggle' (Freire, 1996, p. 29). Allen instead suggests that:

> …whites who are in solidarity with people of color need to appropriate our white power and privilege as a way of subverting that same power and privilege (Allen, 2005, 63).

He further notes that whites must work with, rather than independently of, people of colour, or be complicit with white supremacy. Allen's words present a powerful challenge to white teachers of music in Aotearoa New Zealand looking to adopt a critically bicultural pedagogy. He suggests that teachers must find ways to express cross-racial solidarity; to appropriate white power and privilege in the cause of subverting it; and to work with those whose interests biculturalism aims to serve. For the present work of research, as well, there are implications, chiefly that of the need to avoid attempting to (and indeed, impossibility of) rescuing anybody from oppression directly through this work. I make the argument throughout that white teachers of music must adopt a critical view of Western music and the relations of power in their classrooms, and consider this to be a call to action to music teachers to work towards the subversion of white hegemony in music education.

Scholars of anti-racism such as George Dei have been influential to critical scholars of music education such as Juliet Hess and Deborah Bradley, who both cite Dei's work frequently. Dei makes the following comments about anti-racist research:

> …anti-racial racial research must capture the 'real/everyday' politics, socio-material realities, as well as the institutional practices and the resistances engaged in by subjects with or without explicit or conscious 'paradigms' to articulate them… A critical research methodology must explore how the subjects of study resist continuous external and internal colonizing tendencies. What popular forms of consciousness inform these resistances and the subjects' interpretations of everyday practice? (Dei, 2014, pp. 15 – 16)

Although not written initially as a response to Dei's words, the aims of the present research align broadly with Dei's argument here. I engage in a wide survey of the politics of biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand, including a consideration of Māori resistance to

breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi (in Chapter One). I also consider various different 'practices' or instances of biculturalism, and consider how these biculturalisms can be understood as involving relations of domination and resistance (Chapter Two). I also consider institutional debates about biculturalism in Chapter Three.

It must be noted, though, that perhaps this research is not best characterised specifically as anti-racial, but rather *anti-colonial*, in the same way that research into ethnicity and race is different in some ways to the study of indigeneity. George Dei has also written of anti-colonialism, and emphasises the need to refer to indigenous epistemologies in anti-colonial analysis:

> The anti-colonial discourse works with the idea of the epistemological power of the colonized subjects. (Dei, 2006, p. 3).

He continues, saying that:

> Particular and different interests are served by knowledge systems, and the anti-colonial aim is to subvert dominant thinking that re-inscribes colonial and colonizing relations (ibid.).

What is needed, then, in the investigation of biculturalism in music education in Aotearoa New Zealand is the analysis of the way in which different interests are served by knowledge systems in place in music classrooms. In seeking to avoid re-inscribing colonial and colonising relations, one must return to the point made by Hoskins and Jenkins, that a simple binary framework of coloniser-colonised and Māori-Pākehā is reductionist and overly simplistic. The challenge for anti-colonialism in Aotearoa New Zealand, then, is to find ways of working within the explicitly bicultural framework in ways that respect and allow space for diverse identities.

The anti-racist and anti-colonial perspectives that I have mentioned are not in conflict, and offer different means of analysing bicultural discourse. However, it must be understood that the key concern of Māori has not been phrased or understood primarily in terms of combatting racial prejudice in the same way that, for example, the civil rights movement in the U.S. was, even though this is a key aspect of biculturalism. The more important issue for Māori is that of sovereignty and the right of self-determination, a point which is considered in more detail in Chapter One. The issue of Māori sovereignty in relation to the institutional power of the New Zealand Government and the 'soft' power of Eurocentrism is therefore the most important issue for the purpose of the present study. In this I agree with the statement of Waldorf, who has said that '…racial analysis must also center Indigenous sovereignty rather than working only within the nation-state framework toward equality' (Waldorf, 2014, p. 82). She goes on to ask: 'What pedagogies would enable both white students and students of color to understand their positionality as it relates to colonialism in North America?' (ibid., p. 83). When applied to biculturalism, I certainly agree with the need for teachers and students to consider themselves in relation to colonial structures of power in Aotearoa New Zealand, and in considering a wide range of 'bicultural' scenarios in Chapter Two work towards an understanding of the way various actors have been positioned in relation to these structures of power in New Zealand society.

Critical pedagogy has not gone without criticism itself. Elizabeth Ellsworth famously argued that critical pedagogy may in fact work against its purported goals: that is, that 'key assumptions, goals, and pedagogical practices fundamental to the literature on critical pedagogy…are repressive myths that perpetuate relations of domination' (1989, p. 298). She notes that 'the overwhelming majority of academic articles appearing in major educational journals, although apparently based on actual practices, rarely locate theoretical constructs within them', and that 'educational researchers who invoke concepts of critical pedagogy consistently strip discussions of classroom practices of historical context and political position', leaving the theoretical terms of critical pedagogy to operate at an abstract level. Such abstraction obscures the political agenda of critical pedagogues, to the extent that she avoided such terminology when choosing the name for a university class that dealt with anti-racism: 'I wanted to avoid colluding with many academic writers in the widespread use of code words such as 'critical', which hide the actual political agendas I assume such writers share with me – namely, antiracism, antisexism, anti-elitism, anti-heterosexism, anti-ableism, anticlassism, and anti-neoconservatism' (ibid., p. 300).

Ellsworth suggests that critical pedagogy promotes a single agenda in the classroom:

> …only one 'political' gesture appears to be available to the critical pedagogue. S/he can ensure that students are given the chance to arrive logically at the 'universally valid proposition' underlying the discourse of critical pedagogy – namely, that all people have a right to freedom from oppression guaranteed by the democratic social contract…' (ibid., p. 304).

However, Ellsworth argues that the 'myths of the ideal rational person and the "universality" of propositions have been oppressive to those who are not European, White, male, middle class, Christian, able-bodied, thin, and heterosexual' (ibid., p. 304). She suggests that critical pedagogy purports to interrogate racism, sexism, etc. through the tools of philosophical rationalism 'made possible through the exclusion of socially constructed irrational Others – women, people of color, nature, aesthetics' (ibid., p. 305). Further, she criticises the stated goals of critical pedagogy, such as empowerment: 'student empowerment has been defined in the broadest possible humanist terms, and becomes a "capacity to act effectively" in a way that fails to challenge any identifiable social or political position, institution, or group' (ibid., p. 307).

As noted previously, one of the defining hallmarks of Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* is the very concept of the oppressed vs the oppressors, an essential us vs them dynamic. Ellsworth challenges this too, arguing that this is too simplified and 'fails to confront dynamics of subordination present among classroom participants and within classroom participants in the form of multiple and contradictory subject positions' (ibid., p. 315). In this, her position is similar to those later taken by Te Kawehau Hoskins and Kuni Jenkins.

I find myself sympathetic to Ellsworth when she writes that:

> Given my own history of white-skin, middle-class, able-bodied, thin privilege and my institutionally granted power, it made more sense to see my task as one of

> redefining 'critical pedagogy' so that it did not need utopian moments of 'democracy,' 'equality,' 'justice,' or 'emancipated' teachers – moments that are unattainable (and ultimately undesirable, because they are always predicated on the interests of those who are in the position to define utopian projects). A preferable goal seemed to be to become capable of a sustained encounter with currently oppressive formations and power relations that refuse to be theorized away or fully transcended in a utopian resolution – and to enter into the encounter in a way that owned up to my own implications in those formations and was capable of changing for my own relation to and investments in those formations (ibid,. p. 308).

Like Ellsworth, I do not seek utopian moments or an ideal biculturalism, and indeed I doubt that such a thing is possible. And also like Ellsworth, I seek to enter into the critical encounter, in this case with biculturalism, in ways that critique my own position in relation to the relations of power in the bicultural context. I would argue that without such self-awareness, it is difficult to express solidarity with anti-racist and anti-colonial causes.

Position as Researcher

I now turn to the task of situating myself as a Pākehā scholar of biculturalism – or, in other words, a non-Māori scholar of affairs that concern Māori. In this latter sense I am not alone; prominent scholars in the field of education and sociology who are likewise Pākehā include Anne Salmond and Alison Jones, and in the fields of music and ethnomusicology, Richard Nunns and Mervyn McLean. In particular I wish to reflect on Anne Salmond's famous book, *Two Worlds: first meetings between Māori and Europeans 1642 – 1777* (1991). The concept of there being two worlds implies two fundamentally different epistemes: two different frameworks of knowing, of understanding, of doing, and of being. To some extent there remain two worlds in Aotearoa New Zealand today, which I can characterise as Māori and non-Māori. I understand myself as being situated squarely in the latter camp. How, then, should I understand my relationship with the Māori world?

A concept in this respect is that of *manuhiri* (also spelt manuwhiri, depending on dialectical variations), which can be understood as meaning 'visitor'. My understanding of this term in the context of this research draws on an account given by James Ritchie, who describes his participation in the Ngāti Pōneke community, a Wellington-based pan-tribal group of Māori.

> The Pōneke community claimed to be non-tribal. That was its charter statement. Everyone was welcome 'irrespective of race or tribe or creed', as the elder, Kīngi Tahiwi, told every visitor or newcomer (sometimes looking in my direction!). This was, no doubt, a necessary charter for a new institution specifically designed as a home for all, as a safe reception-place while people made their transition to city life. But I soon realised that no one left behind their tribal identity and that, within the structure of the club, tribal affiliation was one of the most important internal

> networks – one from which, by blood, I had to accept exclusion. However much accepted, I was still, in that sense, manuwhiri (Ritchie, 1992, p. 18).

Certainly when I have worked in predominantly Māori schools, I have been accepted as part of that community, but there were always times when, like Ritchie, I perceived that I was nevertheless an outsider. I have come to understand that this is not a bad thing, and that there are times when one must be able to accept and work within the bounds of such a position. I am far from the first to consider the idea of being manuhiri in such a way. A reflection on accepting the status of being manuhiri in general life as a New Zealander is given by Sandra Winton:

> To be one who is welcomed and accepted here by the graciousness of the Tangata Whenua, is different from being here as of right, and is better – because it is my true and just place (Winton, 1986, p. 9).

This conception of being welcomed and accepted by the graciousness of Māori gives a different understanding of, for example, the Treaty of Waitangi. Whereas it may be understood in primarily legalistic or contractual terms – I certainly tend to envisage it in such ways – the conceptualising the act of signing it as an act of welcome is a powerful counternarrative.

This concept of manuhiri has important implications for my own understanding of myself as an insider to various extents in different parts of the education sector. As manuhiri, I do not seek to be understood as an insider in Māori circles, and this is a deliberate decision on my part. Ladislaus M. Semali and Joe L. Kincheloe report how some Westerners take a different approach to indigenous populations:

> Too often Western allies… don't simply want to work with indigenous peoples – they want to transform their identities and become indigenous persons themselves. As a teacher and researcher on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, I (Joe) watched this "wanabe" phenomenon play out on numerous occasions (Semali & Kincheloe, 1999, p. 20)

In other words, some non-indigenous researchers have attempted to become, in a sense, 'insiders' in the indigenous communities they work with. Perhaps this speaks to a human desire to belong or to fit in, but such co-option of indigenous identities has been treated with scorn by indigenous scholars. Consider, for example, phenomenon of Disney and Pocahontas, which demonstrates the popular appeal of taking on aspects of indigenous identity:

> A new stereotype is born – voila! – an Indian woman in the image of a Barbie. The ideal 'Indian princess,' I mean how lucky can we get? Every girl now wants to be Pocahontas. What a concept! (Rains, 1999, p. 321)

I take as a caution the memory of a Pākehā colleague who spoke proudly of deliberately wearing greenstone, developing a tan while working outdoors, and 'using so many kupu in [her] korero' that she was taken for Māori by her school's teacher of te reo, who was

interested in knowing her iwi.[11] This, to her, was success. I could not attempt similar efforts without feeling as if I were being deceitful and unethical.

On the other hand, I am a member of the Pākehā community, and can confidently assert a position as being so situated. As a teacher wishing to work against inequalities in the education system and in society, but also as a person who has benefited from being on the favourable side of those inequalities, I therefore take on a position similar to that articulated by Robin DiAngelo in *White Fragility* (2018), who writes that:

> …in speaking as a white person to a primarily white audience, I am yet again centering white people and the white voice… though I am centering the white voice, I am also using my insider status to challenge racism. To not use my position this way is to uphold racism, and that is unacceptable; it is a 'both/and' that I must live with. I would never suggest that mine is the only voice that should be heard, only that it is one of the many pieces needed… (pp. xiv – xv).

My adoption of such a position differs slightly from that of DiAngelo, such as in my use of terms such as Pākehā and non-Māori as useful replacements to 'white' in the context of the present discussion of biculturalism, and my consideration of issues relating to colonialism in addition to those of racism. However, my intent remains similar: although I write from a white perspective, and though my voice is central to the present research, I aim to challenge racist and colonial power structures inherent in the present system of education.

Māori-Centric and Māori-Friendly Biculturalisms

The study of biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand is a relatively niche affair. A key theoretical analysis that informs the present study, however, is Patricia Maringi Gina Johnston's conception of *Māori-centric* and *Māori-friendly* biculturalisms (1999). She writes of Māori-friendly biculturalism as being that which 'a focus that promotes an emphasis on cultural differences as a means of addressing Māori desires for more Māori language and culture in schools.' According to this view, increased access to Māori culture should reduce prejudice and discrimination and create positive self-image and safe environments for Māori. She writes of Māori-centric biculturalism as including 'a political focus that targeted structural inequalities and unequal power relations contributing to Māori educational under-achievement', actively contesting and challenging 'decision-making processes which marginalise Māori interests' (p. 77). She argues that 'Māori-friendly' approaches generally allow Pākehā to determine the 'level and manner of Māori involvement' (p. 78), and prefers a Māori-centred approaches, arguing that otherwise Māori interests are not being properly

[11] 'Sprinkling kupu in her korero', in this context, means to use as many Māori words as possible in place of their English equivalents in everyday speech. 'Te reo' is literally 'the language', understood in context to be the Māori language, and one's 'iwi' is one's tribal affiliation.

met. In other words, the term Māori-friendly could well be replaced with Pākehā-centric in many situations.

The mediation of Māori means of representation and interaction with state institutions, and the need for Māori to be able to determine the terms of their participation in society, is a major theme of Johnston's work. For example, she has said that the 'real test for Māori is who actually decides how the Treaty will be translated into practice at the institutional level' (Johnston, 1992, p. 13). This is one way in which one can understand biculturalism in the educational setting, and this meaning is reflected in the term 'Treaty of Waitangi partnership,' which is effectively synonymous. The present research is in fact concerned with the analysis of who holds power in relation to the theory and practice of biculturalism in the music education classroom, and whose interests biculturalism serves.

As noted in the literature survey, Alison Jones has noted that strategies of inclusion in which a marginalised group is deliberately 'accepted' by a dominant group are not necessarily the goals of all concerned:

> What if 'togetherness' and dialogue-across-difference fail to hold a compellingly positive meaning for subordinate ethnic groups? What if the 'other' fails to find interesting the idea of their empathetic understanding of the powerful, which is theoretically demanded by dialogic encounters? What happens when the other refuses to join in the 'multiple voices for mutually empowering conversation' in the progressive classroom? (Jones, 1999, p. 299)

Johnston's concept of Māori-centric biculturalism is one form of resistance to notions of biculturalism that centre Pākehā interests rather than those of Māori. The implication of the ideas of Māori-centric and Māori-friendly biculturalisms to the present research is that biculturalism in and of itself is not a policy welcomed by all, but is one that deserves careful scrutiny. What, after all, is the purpose of bicultural policies? Perhaps it is the case that only if they work against the 'structural inequalities and unequal power relations' (to borrow Johnston's phrase quoted earlier) that negatively affect Māori, and only if they operate with Māori consent, may they be said to serve Māori interests.

Theoretical Concerns

What follows in the remainder of this chapter is the consideration not of methodology *per se* but rather of theoretical terms, the definition and understanding of which is important in order to conduct and understand the position I take in relation to the analysis of discourse. The following discussion of ethnicity, class, and race in relation to music and education is of great importance in the development of the critical orientation of this thesis.

Considering Pākehā Culture as White Culture

In this research, I generally equate the term *Pākehā* with white New Zealand culture. This is consistent with a view of biculturalism as encompassing Pākehā and Māori peoples, but omits the perspectives of other, non-white and non-Māori, immigrant peoples in Aotearoa New Zealand. At the outset, I accept this as a limitation of my study, and do not seek to diminish the experience of these other peoples, but I also do not seek to dwell on them, considering it to be outside of the scope of this study, which seeks to focus primarily on an analysis of the effects of British colonialism in this country. However, in truth and in day-to-day life, some of these people may too identify as Pākehā. The following reflection on the theory of whiteness in relation to Pākehā culture may be relevant in only a limited way to these people.

For the purpose of the present study, I take the view that Pākehā culture is that which emerged primarily amongst the immigrant British settlers. If, as Fishman argues, ethnicity can be considered 'both the sense and the expression of "collective, intergenerational cultural continuity," i.e. the sensing and expressing of links to "one's own kind (one's own people)," to collectivities that not only purportedly have historical depth but, more crucially, share putative ancestral origins and therefore, the gifts and responsibilities, rights and obligations deriving therefrom' (Fishman, 1985, p. 4), then I argue that Pākehā culture can be understood in these terms as the white culture that has evolved in New Zealand from its Victorian British roots.

There are certain clichés that can be used to describe Pākehā culture, and for all that they may be clichés, they still serve to describe something of the Pākehā experience. Pākehā culture is present in the New Zealand accent, in the works of New Zealand artists and musicians, in the way that New Zealanders take pride in their industries – farming and the production of fine wool, dairy, lamb and beef products, and in the way that New Zealanders value their sporting achievements and at the Olympics and Commonwealth Games enjoy dividing the medal count by the national population, so as to arrive at a figure of success *per capita* rather than directly comparing medal counts against bigger, more populous nations. It is number eight wire, the 'she'll be right' attitude, sausage sizzles to raise money for charities and school trips, mince pies with tomato sauce, pavlova, and beers on a summer's afternoon in the backyard or by the beach. It is a wavering commitment to flags and the monarchy, sometimes committed, sometimes decidedly half-mast; it is the place names such as Cape Maria van Diemen (mere kilometres from Cape Reinga), the Remarkables, Mackenzie Basin, and Mount Difficulty; it is the sometimes myopic insistence that we are all equal.

Pākehā culture is a specifically New Zealand type of whiteness. Michael King claims that the term is an indigenous New Zealand expression, to be used in preference to 'tauiwi', which he translates as meaning strange tribe or other race and finds offensive due to the connotations of otherness that it lays on white people (King, 1991, p. 16). He also makes the

claim that there are distinct and obvious expressions of Pākehā culture that derive from but are different to European cultural expressions:

> …the music of Vivaldi and Bach is European, not Pākehā; the music of Jenny McLeod and From Scratch is Pākehā, not European. The stories of Chekhov and Roald Dahl are European; those of Owen Marshall and John Cranna Pākehā. The films *Diva* and *Fitzcarraldo* are European; *Smash Palace* and *Vigil* are Pākehā (ibid., pp. 16 – 17).

The word 'Pākehā' is therefore in some ways more useful than that other common phrase, 'New Zealand European', for it explicitly refers to the distinct white culture that has evolved in Aotearoa New Zealand over the years. It is worth noting that as New Zealand becomes more multicultural, and the proportion of Pākehā becomes relatively smaller as a part of the total population, the relative dominance and importance of Pākehā concerns may also be considered to diminish. As a result, in the following research, I at times speak of biculturalism as involving Māori and non-Māori, rather than specifically Māori and Pākehā, when such distinctions can be made in these terms.

Considering Whiteness in General

Given that I spend so much time critiquing whiteness in the present study, I might appear critical of whiteness itself: that is, that in arguing for biculturalism and for the interests of Māori I argue against the interests of Pākehā. Not so: I am white, I enjoy many aspects of white culture including that of the Western musical tradition, and do not seek to diminish or denigrate it. However, I recognise that one of the privileges of the dominant position that white culture enjoys is the ability to not see the experiences of those of marginalised cultures even as it – deliberately or inadvertently – works to maintain its dominance over them. As I argue in this thesis, music teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand should conduct themselves in the bicultural context in an ethical way, and I argue that this involves working against the harmful effects of white hegemony.

In critiquing whiteness, I aim to work against the phenomenon that Robin DiAngelo has termed *white racial innocence*, according to which it is assumed that white people bear little or none of the burden of discussing and critiquing race:

> Because people of color are not seen as racially innocent, they are expected to speak to issues of race (but must do so on white terms). This idea – that racism is not a white problem – enables us to sit back and let people of color take very real risks of invalidation and retaliation as they share their experiences (2018, p. 62).

White racial innocence can result in resentment from people of colour, who resent being given the task of educating white people. Elizabeth Ellsworth has written of the 'resentment by some students of colour for feeling that they were expected to disclose "more" and once again take the burden of doing the pedagogic work of educating white students/professor about the consequences of white middle-class privilege' (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 316). Bearing

this in mind, I argue that teachers and scholars in Aotearoa New Zealand should be aware of and value the work of Kaupapa Māori researchers, who have done much to articulate Māori positions. In the face of the burden conferred by the phenomenon of white racial innocence, the very production of the Kaupapa Māori literature can be understood as a generous gesture.

I further argue that Pākehā themselves have a responsibility to work against their 'innocence', but note that the participation in the process of discussing ethnicity and enacting change must be done in ways acceptable to Māori. Kaupapa Māori researchers, for example, claim for themselves the authority for, on behalf of, and about Māori in part due to past instances of gross misconduct on the part of non-Māori researchers. Consider the following passage by Linda Tuhiwai Smith:

> Just knowing that someone measured our 'faculties' by filling the skulls of our ancestors with millet seeds and compared the amount of millet seed to the capacity of our mental thought offends our sense of who and what we are. It galls us that Western researchers and intellectuals can assume to know all that it is possible to know of us, on the basis of their brief encounters with some of us. It appals us that the West can desire, extract, and claim ownership of our ways of knowing, our imagery, the things we create and produce, and then simultaneously reject the people who created and developed those ideas and seek to deny them further opportunities to be creators of their own culture and own nations (L. T. Smith, 2012, p. 1).

Even those who are sympathetic to indigenous concerns are not always successful in their approach. Semali and Kincheloe have warned:

> Walking the well-intentioned road to hell, Western scholars dedicated to the best interests of indigenous peoples often unwittingly participate in the Western hegemonic process. The question: how can the agency, the self-direction of indigenous peoples be enhanced? must constantly be asked by Western allies (1999, p. 20).

How can non-Māori avoid pouring millet, or likewise avoid walking any roads to hell, well-intentioned or otherwise? I argue that successful involvement in bicultural praxis requires constant reflection on the part of non-Māori, and the questions suggested by Semali and Kincheloe are useful starting points for critical reflection: how can the agency and self-direction of indigenous peoples be enhanced? In a bicultural educational context, how can one promote or support expressions of mana motuhake and tino rangatiratanga in one's interactions with Māori students, community members, and even colleagues?[12] As I argue in chapter four, a bicultural praxis must be sympathetic to Kaupapa Māori viewpoints, and so these questions are essential components of biculturalism.

[12] Rough translations of mana motuhake and tino rangatirantanga are, respectively, 'self-determination' and 'sovereignty'.

The Universality of Whiteness and Music

New Zealand music is a predominantly white music, as might be expected from an artform largely imported by European colonists and globalised Western media. It is true that there is an indigenous tradition preserved by Māori, but for the most part, when we speak of music in New Zealand we understand that we are speaking of a primarily Western art. This is even reflected at the level of schooling, where – although the two traditions of music are not strictly segregated – Māori music is for the most part taught in Māori Performing Arts classes and Western music is understood to be the domain of Music classes. The whiteness of the subject matter and the fact that Māori Performing Arts are often taught separately to 'general' music classes poses a theoretical and practical challenge to music teachers wishing to engage in bicultural praxis. I argue here that music in the Western tradition tends to have a bias towards expressions of whiteness, and that expressions of such whiteness can be uncritically misconstrued as being 'universal', and further, that this is harmful to efforts to work against the effects of white hegemony.

The nature of whiteness in music has been conceptualised by Julia Eklund Koza, who writes of the effect of whiteness in music. Reflecting on auditions at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, which requires a vocal audition to enter its music education programme, she notes that it requires 'music from the European/American high art *bel canto* tradition' – and specifically prohibits repertoire drawn from jazz, pop, rock, folk, 'or other musical theatre' genres. As Koza concludes, 'knowing and loving any kind of music is not sufficient; only one musical language is permitted' (Koza, 2008, p. 148). Koza writes of the worry that this process of auditioning both excludes potential applicants who are skilled in other musical styles and produces music educators who are ill-equipped to do anything other than teach the high art tradition, fostering 'a vast cultural divide between themselves and many of their students' (ibid., p. 149). More strikingly, however, she notes that whiteness can be present in musical performance itself, and that it is favoured by audition panels:

> Borrowing a concept that has emerged in the language arts area, the judges want to see and hear the musical counterpart of so-called standard English… they are listening for cultural capital; more significantly, they are listening for affirmations of Whiteness. Not just any Whiteness will do, either; art song with a country twang will not cut it (ibid., p. 150).

As is the case at Koza's university, the 'high' tradition of music in New Zealand – that which is elite and prestigious and taught in the academy – is a white one, or at least dominated by white voices. I would argue that even when non-white students are present in the university, particularly in the 'classical' areas of music – performance, composition, etc. – they are most often working in ways that conform to the expectations of white culture.

It is not enough to give generalisations, though, and so I will consider a specific case of a white discourse in the New Zealand music academy. For me, perhaps the most obvious tradition of such a musical discourse in New Zealand is that which originates with Douglas

Lilburn, who found fame as a composer and sought to create a uniquely 'New Zealand' sense of musical identity; indeed, I consider myself to be trained in music in this tradition, having studied music composition as an undergraduate, and having studied with teachers who, when they wished to impress their students – and I was duly impressed – told stories about how they had met Lilburn.

At a time when many composers were grappling with profound changes in the nature of music that went with the societal changes wrought by World Wars I and II – the end of Romanticism, modern and post-modern compositional movements, the birth of the popular music industry, the development of electronic musical instruments, and the increasing importance of universities as patrons and employers of composers, there was an urge to make meaning of all this change and to develop guiding principles so as to understand where one might be headed in artistic terms. Some famous movements evolved around the likes of Schoenberg and serial technique, John Cage and his aleatory technique and provocative explorations of the nature of music, and Philip Glass and minimalism. In New Zealand, Douglas Lilburn was no different, and in a speech in 1946 at the first Cambridge Summer School of Music – the name implies the start of a tradition, though the summer schools did not become such – laid out the grounds for his vision of music composition in New Zealand. Lilburn's words are worth examining for what they reveal about the nature of whiteness in New Zealand music. That this speech has been printed at least twice, in 1984 and in 2011, shows the importance that his ideas are given in the New Zealand musical community.

A particularly troubling theme for Lilburn was the idea of nationalism, and the issue of developing a sense of a New Zealand identity:

> A moment ago I said that we are New Zealanders. This sounds a very obvious statement. We are all conscious of the fact to some degree or other, and we grumble about it, but as yet I don't think we've really explored deeply enough into it. Perhaps I could say that we're not really New Zealanders at all, that we are only in process of becoming (Lilburn, 1984, p. 8)

I would argue that Lilburn's 'process of becoming', at a psychoanalytical level, is closely related to the need by Pākehā to reconcile feelings of postcolonial guilt (a theme that will be explored in detail later). Both needs would seem to stem from a postcolonial desire for belonging, to find one's place, or even for reassurance, after being orphaned from the motherland.

Lilburn goes on to consider the relationship of his New Zealand music to that of the European tradition. He even uses the term 'universal' to describe European music, but appears to reject the notion that it could be understood as such by New Zealanders, and likewise rejects wholly identifying New Zealanders with the music of Europeans:

> It's possible to believe that Bach or Beethoven wrote the greatest music ever written or likely to be written, that this music is what we like to call universal, and that the deepest reaches of spirit we know in ourselves can be discovered in and through this

> music. Yet, I think there are parts of our personalities and conditions of living here at this present time, that cannot be identified with this music (ibid., p. 9).

Likewise, Lilburn rejects the European tradition of incorporating folk music into classical composition in order to inform the development of national traditions of music:

> I think that a national music in the sense in which the words are used of Spanish or Russian music for instance, is quite impossible of achievement here. We have no folk-song, nor characteristic rhythms of the kind that arise from folk dance, and without these things a national music in the accepted sense is out of the question (ibid., p. 10).

There is some deeply problematic use of language in this last quote that deserves to be pointed out: the sentiment that 'we have no folk-song', as clearly Lilburn did not consider Māori music to be folk-song, and that 'a national music in the accepted sense is out of the question', leaving one to consider what the accepted sense might be. Does acceptable national music need to conform to Western paradigms of musicality? Is it essentially white, or white in origin? In any case, I argue that such statements demonstrate the essential whiteness of the tradition that Lilburn established.[13]

Later in his speech, Lilburn directly addresses the issue of Māori music. He shows some self-awareness, indicating that he is not well-qualified to speak about the issue, but nevertheless proceeds to speak anyway:

> There is also Maori music that has been used by some of our composers. If I try to talk about it I'm on rather dangerous ground, because I've read very little about it, and living mainly in the South Island have heard very little of it. My impressions of it are that in its purer state as a part of Polynesian culture, it is about as foreign to our own cultural sources as say Javanese or Siberian folk music; that as we live here generation after generation, the circumstances that shape us may fuse some of this Polynesian quality into our own ethos; but that the attempts that have been made to use it for the founding of a national music here have been based more on a wish to practice nineteenth-century theories on the subject than on any ability to fuse a Polynesian culture with our own: that the Maori tunes used in this way were not strictly Maori at all but strongly influenced by missionary hymns and other early influences: and that the Maoris have shown themselves much more able and willing to absorb our culture than we to absorb theirs (p. 21).

Leaving aside Lilburn's ruminations on what it is to be pure in a Polynesian sense, it is clear that he did not consider Māori music to be relevant to *his* concept of a New Zealand national music, as 'it is about as foreign to our own cultural sources as say Javanese or Siberian folk music…': for all that he sought to reject the European tradition of music, he understood

---

[13] For a scholar interested in biculturalism, Lilburn might have been considered to have raised enough hackles at this point, but for this particular scholar, composer, and organist he manages to land not one but two blows, as he then goes on to reject traditions of music education 'better designed to produce church organists than to produce composers' (p. 17)!

himself as a person of European descent practicing music derived from that tradition. There is a startling irony in the fact that he feels fit to define what Māori music is – not that derived from missionary hymns or other early influences, apparently – even in the face of his admission that he is unqualified to speak about Māori music, and his acceptance that Māori are more willing and able to adapt to 'our culture' than 'we' to 'theirs' indicates an unquestioning acceptance of Pākehā dominance in Aotearoa New Zealand. This sentiment of Lilburn's, that Māori are generally willing and able to assimilate into Pākehā culture, is not without controversy of an anonymous sort: in the copy of Lilburn's speech that I examined, somebody had underlined this passage and wrote in the margin: 'not anymore'!

This concept of universality, invoked by Lilburn as a general description of the European tradition, deserves consideration in light of the present discussion, for if European music is universal, then the universe is white. For this reason, I am sceptical of claims about the universality of musical features or characteristics, and take the position that such claims should be subjected to critical analysis. I return to this topic in later chapters, in which I consider what it might mean to be a critically bicultural teacher of music in Aotearoa New Zealand.[14]

The Frankfurt School, Music Criticism, and 'High' and 'Low' Art

I turn now to the critical practice developed by the so-called Frankfurt School, which has become highly influential in the fields of arts and social critique, and which was to influence scholars in the fields of critical pedagogy and in musicology, albeit in different ways. Famous scholars associated with this movement include Max Horkheimer, Walter Benjamin, but of particular importance for the present study because of his musicological leanings is Theodore Adorno, whose ideas about music and jazz and the implications that these have for our understanding of critical theory I will discuss in more detail.

The Frankfurt School had its origins in the Weimar Republic, that tumultuous interwar incarnation of Germany in which the Wilhelmine institutions of the German Empire began to give way as National Socialism gained influence and power. Thomas Wheatland gives a useful account of the formation and exile of the Frankfurt School to give context to this period. He writes that Germany's surrender and the changes wrought in society as a result affected the scholars of the Frankfurt School deeply:

> These were pivotal events that molded the moral and political beliefs of the men who populated the Frankfurt School. These experiences made them acutely aware of the

[14] For an engaging consideration of what might be truly universal in music – that is, what musics might be found in extra-terrestrial contexts – see Sebastian Von Hoerner's 1974 article on the topic, in which he notes many of the biological features necessary for music appreciation: the ability to perceive audio signals and the ability to analyse frequency, for example (Von Hoerner, 1974). Of course, as music is a culturally-constructed concept, whether extra-terrestrial beings would engage in musical practices at all, even if biologically able, is a moot point.

> suffering and the barbarism that human beings were capable of inflicting on each other (Wheatland, 2009, p. 5).

Wheatland goes on to argue that the intellectual developments of the Weimar period were highly influential to the Frankfurt group, who in pursuing the development of a 'comprehensive theory of contemporary society' found modernism in the aesthetic and intellectual senses to be central to their emerging theory:

> This led members of the group to study psychoanalysis, modernist literature, and atonal music, as well as to develop a more general theory of art that concentrated on its capacity to criticize contemporary reality and to offer fleeting glimpses of utopian possibilities (p. 6).

The Institut für Sozialforschung was set up in association with the University of Frankfurt by Felix Weil, using funds provided by his father, Hermann. In 1931, Max Horkheimer assumed the position of director of the Institute. Like Weil, he came from a wealthy Jewish German family; he was made a junior partner in his father's firm, but the work was to generate in him a sense of guilt, 'and led Horkheimer to speculate about the circumstances and psychology of the workers who staffed the factories' (p. 14). I quote this passage particularly to draw attention to this feeling of guilt, and would argue that there are parallels between Horkheimer's sense of guilt at his wealth and the feelings of guilt experienced by many privileged white New Zealanders in connection with colonisation and biculturalism. Horkheimer was motivated to pursue his interest in the working class, just as many white New Zealanders have interested themselves in the affairs of Māori (myself of course no exception), and under his direction, a study primarily supervised by Erich Fromm concluded that there were clear signs of 'passivity and psychological escapism' in the working class of Nazi Germany. Wheatland suggests that these findings are important, as 'they suggest an important set of reasons for the working class's failure to block the rise of Nazism' (pp. 25 – 26). Ultimately, when the Nazi Party came to power in January of 1933, most of the members of the Frankfurt School – aware that their status as prominent left-wing intellectuals would make them targets, as would the fact that many of them were Jewish – took it as their cue to leave Germany and to continue the work of the Institute elsewhere (pp. 29 – 30).

Guilt of a slightly different nature – that of survivor's guilt – was to motivate the writing of Theodore Adorno. As a Jew, he was the target of Nazi persecution, but had the means to escape Germany in time to avoid becoming a victim of the genocidal impulses of that state at the time of the Second World War. Claussen and Livingstone note that his survivor's guilt informed much of his work:

> The idea of Auschwitz had been present in almost all of Adorno's writings since the mid-forties. The guilt of having survived drives Adorno's social criticism onward with "the unwavering radicalism of spirit" which seems appropriate to an avant-garde artist. Adorno's critical theory is nourished by a feeling of solidarity with suffering that distinguishes it from all forms of academic scholarship (Claussen & Livingstone, 2008, p. 267)

I will draw attention here to the idea of studying suffering in critical theory. The idea of solidarity with the suffering, or of identifying as being suffering, is an important one in critical theory. Most relevantly for the present study, the acknowledgment of collective suffering is an important part of the concept of resistance in Kaupapa Māori theory (G. Smith, 1997, p. 44). As a methodological step, the identification of suffering and developing an awareness of such, and of injustice, and of oppression, is an important part of the research process.

For Adorno, critical thinking includes a reflexive element. In a reflection on Adorno's theory, Schweppenhäuser states:

> …critique reflects on itself. For part of the process, it derives its norms from the situation under analysis. For Adorno, it is a first principle of critique that 'it confronts realities with the norms to which those realities claim to subscribe; actually adhering to the norms would be a better way.' (2009, p. 17).

Thus, I introduced this research project with the observation that in the case of biculturalism, our rhetoric is not the reality: that is, the norms to which bicultural education policies claim to subscribe are manifestly not present in New Zealand society.

The critical theory of the Frankfurt School has methodological implications for the present study. As Robin DiAngelo has said, 'all systems of oppression are adaptive; they can withstand and adjust to challenges and still maintain inequality' (2018, p. 40). The critical theorists paid much attention to the oppressive conditions present in Europe in the early part of the twentieth century – notably those of the Third Reich, but also those of Soviet Russia, both totalitarian regimes that were notably new; that is, they replaced old orders. Schweppenhäuser writes that Horkheimer and his fellow researchers were interested in explaining why 'human beings, seemingly with free will, accept the return of old hierarchies', and notes that 'critical thinking in this sense aims to grasp the intricate involvement of reason in the overall processes of social self-reproduction' (2009, pp. 16 – 17).

For the sake of clarity, I do not seek to draw connections between the governments of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia with educational policy in New Zealand, but will dwell on the term *social self-reproduction* and on DiAngelo's observation that systems of oppression are adaptive. The concept of social self-reproduction is in fact of key importance to the present research, as I aim to consider how in Aotearoa New Zealand, despite numerous initiatives and attempts at reform, the education system continues to fail its Māori students and communities: that is, those involved in the education system are in some way continuing to reproduce oppressive conditions and adapting them to modern circumstances.

Perhaps the most famous (or infamous) aspect of Adorno's writing on music is his polemical approach to jazz, which has variously been attacked as racist or elitist. At the very least, his views on the subject are startling: Schweppenhäuser writes that 'in the 1930s Adorno was convinced that radio listeners who enjoy hearing Ella Fitzgerald sing "A Tisket, A Tasket" accompanied by Chick Webb's orchestra must be sadomasochistic individuals in Erich Fromm's sense, stomping on their secret longing for the return of childhood happiness' (2009, p. 112). Jamie Owen Daniel (1989) and Robert W. Witkin (2000) have both

provided surveys of the critical reaction to Adorno's writing on jazz, and sought to explain or defend Adorno's position. I will summarise the discussion here and consider a further question: what does Adorno's writing on jazz and popular culture mean for critical music educators, given Adorno's position as a pioneer in the field of critical music study?

I will cite extracts from 'On Jazz', published in 1936 as 'Über Jazz', here in order to demonstrate the way in which Adorno's position may be understood as elitist or even racist. Adorno certainly appears to appear to disparage jazz in part due to its popular appeal to even the lower classes of the day:

> …jazz permeates all levels of society, even the proletariat – in Europe, only some specifically agrarian groups can be excepted from its influence. Often, the dependent lower classes identify themselves with the upper class through their reception of jazz. To them, jazz is 'urbane', and thanks to it, the white-collar employee can feel superior when he sits with his girlfriend in a beer hall. And yet in this only the 'primitive' elements of jazz, the good danceable beat of the basic rhythm, are understood: the highly syncopated 'hot music' is tolerated, without its penetrating more specifically into our consciousness – all the more so because the cheap dance clubs are unable to pay virtuoso orchestras, and the mediated reproduction of the music through the medium of radio is even less impressive in its effect than a live orchestra (Adorno & Daniel, 1989 - 90, pp. 49 – 50).

In this passage, Adorno critiques the passive reception and enjoyment of the 'primitive' elements of jazz by the proletariat, and further critiques the reception of jazz via the radio transmission than via virtuoso orchestra (not that orchestral performance is good to start with, as demonstrated by Adorno's use of the words 'even worse'). Adorno goes on to use language that is similar to that of Lilburn's treatment of Māori music, in which he pondered what music could 'strictly' be considered Māori, in his discussion of jazz:

> The extent to which jazz has anything at all to do with genuine black music is highly questionable; the fact that it is frequently performed by blacks and that the public clamors for 'black jazz' as a sort of brand-name doesn't say much about it, even if folkloric research should confirm the African origins of many of its practices (Adorno & Daniel, 1989 - 90, p. 52).

And of course, he famously remarked that 'the skin of the black man functions as much as a coloristic effect as does the silver of the saxophone' (ibid., 53). These remarks, when considering Adorno's position as a white European researcher, appear to be at the very least condescending or patronising towards the agency or musical self-expression of black people.

Adorno's broader point in 'On Jazz' relates to the commodification of jazz and the imposition of a single form of musical understanding on the popular tastes of the masses: jazz in this sense is a restraint on the individual, and acts as an oppressive agent. When he says that 'the more democratic jazz is, the worse it becomes' (ibid., p. 50), it is because in its sheer broadness of application it becomes banal and eventually 'glorifies repression itself as the incidental music to accompany the current collective' (ibid.). When he criticises Duke Ellington for drawing on the music of Debussy and Ravel, he does so because, as Adorno

argues, in so doing Ellington commodified the music of these composers and removed any radical potential from it: 'Even yesterday's music must first be rendered harmless by jazz, must be released from its historical element, before it is ready for the market' (ibid., 59 – 60). But this argument is couched in an uneasy combination of racial references and questionable value judgements. For example, Adorno specifically notes that Ellington is a black jazz artist drawing on the music of European composers, resulting in 'a fine nuance within a crass schema' (ibid.). It is worth noting that Adorno did not only single out jazz for criticism: although he approved of the development of free atonality, he disapproved of the rigid formulaic nature of twelve-tone serialism (Witkin, 2000, p. 152), just as he disapproved of what he saw as the 'fundamentally rigid and immobile structure beneath the interplay of superficial deviations, excesses, and interferences' that characterised jazz (ibid., p. 154).

In summarising the critical reaction to Adorno's writing on the subject, Witkin states that '…Adorno's attack on jazz seems to be out of sympathy with informed opinion on the subject; at worst it appears to be reactionary and possibly racist' (2000, p. 145). Daniel makes a more strident defence of Adorno; he references Miriam Hansen's response to a later Adorno essay as 'otherwise balanced', except for what she characterises as Adorno's implicit racism evident in his jazz scholarship, which Daniel considers 'disturbing' (Daniel, 1989, p. 39). Daniel argues that to understand Adorno's comments as racist is to misconstrue them. For example, in reference to Adorno's remark about the colouristic import of a black musician's skin, Daniel argues that 'Adorno is condemning with such a remark the fetishization of the black American…' (ibid., p. 41). Catherine Gunther Kodat makes the following argument against those who consider Adorno racist or elitist:

> …they consider it in a kind of double isolation, first by ignoring or minimizing the very real differences between what Adorno heard as jazz and what most readers today understand jazz to be; then by failing to see how his essay works as part of a larger critique of culture industry 'pre-digestion' of music generally. Indeed, the claim that Adorno's criticism of jazz must stem from his own racism or anti-American elitism can only be made if one is unfamiliar with his equally scathing attacks on such culture industry phenomena as they celebrity of Arturo Toscanini and the programming practices of 'classical' music radio (Kodat, 2003, p. 6).

In other words, to accuse Adorno of racism or elitism, and to thus dismiss his words, is possibly to misinterpret his words, and is certainly to miss the greater points he makes about music and other creative industry practices.

So, to what extent are Adorno's arguments relevant to music teachers? In one respect, Adorno's concerns with the repressive nature of musical form are relevant to music teachers. Witkin notes that for Adorno, the question of musical form had moral value, such that it was possible to speak of a moral musical praxis:

> Adorno's utopian vision of a moral social praxis is of a process of social interaction that is truly historical in character, with individuals changing and being changed by each other in socially productive relations from which a social whole or totality is always emergent. A moral praxis in music means that the elements of a composition

> are governed by the same dialectical principle of structuration. It is the all-important process of mediation and change among the elements (notes) that constructs temporality and historicity in the music. Moreover, it does so from below, from the free and spontaneous development of the musical elements in their mutual relations and not from above, by the imposition of a transcendental form or order upon them (p. 148).

This concern with musical form has been articulated in a simpler form by Stephanie Lees, who has noted the increasing trend of teachers teaching song-writing in New Zealand secondary school music classrooms in conjunction with music industry competitions such as the Smokefree Rockquest. Lees asks: 'has the pinnacle of achievement in composition become the three-minute, radio-friendly song with a strong hook and chorus?' (Lees, 2018, p. 161). Is it the case that music teachers today, in preparing students to write radio-friendly songs, are in fact engaging in immoral musical praxis? Are music teachers in fact reproducing repressive social relations when they teach such styles of song-writing to their students? If so, how should music teachers then teach song-writing? In answer, I suggest (and go into more detail later, in chapter 4), that teachers should in fact teach principles of criticism as an integrated part of their curriculum, and that the goal of teachers should be in fact to develop an understanding of such issues in their students.

There are also implications for music teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand in regards to understanding the place of elitism in music and music education – and, for all that his defenders might protest otherwise, Adorno's comments about the proletariat and the inability of cheap beer halls to hire virtuoso orchestras suggest an elitist outlook. I would argue that there is indeed a historical preference for the elite and the cultured in Western classical music, as demonstrated by Sabaneev's appeal to the musical tastes of Prince Esterházy. Further, where there is a high culture, there is also a 'low' culture. In 1939, Clement Greenberg penned a pugilistic consideration of kitsch: 'popular, commercial art and literature with their chromeotypes, magazine covers, illustrations, ads slick and pulp fiction, comics, Tin Pan Alley music, tap dancing, Hollywood movies, etc., etc.' (p. 39). Greenberg does not accept it as 'true culture', noting that even when it produces 'something of merit', 'these accidental and isolated instances have fooled people who should know better' (p. 40 –41). In his attack on the mass-produced, so-called 'kitsch' of the culture industries, Greenberg echoed Adorno.

I take the position that there is little place in Aotearoa New Zealand for music teachers to cling to these old notions of high and low culture, embracing the high and rejecting the low, and to thrust such views upon students. I agree with Freire when he states that such elitist positions are 'neither liberating nor human, nor humanising' (Freire, 1974, p. 28), and argue that the goal of bicultural education should not be to raise students into elitist musical cultures but to critique the elitism present in music education. In a purely bicultural sense, music that is practiced by Māori in traditional and contemporary senses is often not that which would have been considered high culture by the likes of Clement Greenberg, unless they happen to study classical music in the Western tradition, and so to cling to

Eurocentric notions of high culture – to teach only music in the Western canon – amounts to a rejection of biculturalism.

Further, consider that the technological and commercial impetus of globalisation meant that popular 'low' culture, including the products of the music industry, was exported worldwide to people of many cultures, including Māori, where it provided important artistic influences. Mitchell and Waipara (2011) have commented on the 'vast impact on Māori musicians by reggae maestro Bob Marley', and prior to Marley, the impact of Jimi Hendrix (p. 8). Jennifer Cattermole (2011) identifies stylistic elements of haka in the reggae music of David Grace, such as in the song 'Pakaitore', and identifies melodic movement characteristic of traditional waiata in David Grace's 'Matua Whaea' and Hori Chapman and Ahurangi's 'Toro Atu' (p. 47-49). She contends that the use of such characteristic melodic movement and the use of close triadic harmonies derived from church choral singing differentiates 'local reggae' from that of Jamaican reggae (p. 49). To reject 'low' culture is therefore to reject many forms of music that are of importance to Māori.

This discussion of Adorno's treatment of race has methodological implications for the present research in that it demonstrates the way in which care must be taken to refer to race and ethnicity in a respectful manner, and in a way that is appropriate given one's position as a researcher; one wonders if Adorno's words would have raised quite so many hackles were they written by a black jazz musician, or indeed, if they would have been written at all from that perspective. The discussion of elitism has implications of a different sort, in that it implies that a critically bicultural teacher must recognise elitist sentiment amongst musicians, which is associated with 'high culture' and excludes those outside this stratum, and work to reduce the exclusionary possibilities inherent in such music in the music classroom.

Conclusion

In asking 'what is biculturalism in music education?', the present research develops an understanding of the discourse of biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand and a critical awareness of the way in which inequities stemming from the history of New Zealand's colonisation are present in and affect the music education classroom. It does this through the examination of a wide range of discursive statements, including texts, one of which is the Treaty of Waitangi. Other key pieces of evidence that are examined include pieces of music and passages of scholarly literature. In accordance with scholarship based on critical pedagogy, I hold that the development of this critical awareness, or consciousness, is a vital part of the development of a critical approach to biculturalism and is necessary if one is to implement bicultural policies and practices that transform educational inequalities. There is a danger that without a critical approach, oppressive colonial power relations may in fact be reproduced by teachers and students in the name of biculturalism. In the following chapters, I turn to the task of developing a critical understanding of biculturalism and understanding its implications for music education in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Chapter One: Biculturalism, Partnership, and the Treaty of Waitangi

1. Not on a snowy night
   By star or candlelight
   Nor by an angel band
   There came to our dear land

      Te Harinui
      Te Harinui
      Te Hari-nu-i
      Glad tid-ings of great joy

2. But on a summer day
   Within a quiet bay
   The Māori people heard
   The great and glorious word

3. The people gathered round
   Upon the grassy ground
   And heard the preacher say
   I bring to you this day

4. Now in this blessed land
   United heart and hand
   We praise the glorious birth
   And sing to all the earth

When one considers biculturalism, one inevitably considers the Treaty of Waitangi. It is the foundation of bicultural New Zealand, as it is the Treaty which formally established the Māori and Pākehā partnership. The study of the Treaty provides a fascinating glimpse of the early relationship between the European colonists and the various Māori peoples, and is a moment of key importance in the development of this relationship. It was still possible at the time of the signing of the Treaty for Māori to imagine an Aotearoa without colonists, after all, for the British presence on these shores was tenuous and weak, and the signing of the Treaty was by no means a *fait accompli.* The early politics of Aotearoa New Zealand were very different to those of today, but the decisions made in this period continue to have ramifications for life in Aotearoa New Zealand today.

The study of the Treaty is not limited to a consideration of the text, but is also the study of the way in which it has been interpreted, understood, and in some cases, forgotten about; it is the study of the decisions made with respect and without respect to the document, such as whether to engage in trade or to engage in war; and it is the study of the way in which Māori and Pākehā have understood their relationship as being one of partnership, as co-signatories, or as being adversarial, based on opposing interests. In this

way, the discourse of the Treaty can be understood as a major part of the discourse of biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand. I make the argument here that the supposed spirit of partnership popularly associated with the Treaty has been co-opted by Pākehā to serve Pākehā ends, and that the idea of a bicultural partnership stemming from the Treaty is in fact better characterised as a bicultural partisanship that favours one group over the other in the dominant bicultural discourse.

In the epigraph that opens this chapter, I quote the words of the Christmas song *Te Harinui*, a popular depiction of early Māori and Pākehā interactions, which describes the events of the missionary Samuel Marsden's arrival in New Zealand. This song is relevant to the present study in several ways: it is a musical depiction of biculturalism; it describes the role of the church in the European settlement of New Zealand, which will be considered in more detail in the next chapter; and it demonstrates the point being made here, that the process of colonisation has been co-opted by Pākehā to serve Pākehā ends. After all, the purpose of the song can only be understood as being to glorify the colonising agent; Māori agency is rendered passive. In this I am reminded of a story about Vicky, a North American teacher, which is related by Joan Wink:

> When she started teaching the junior high students, she noticed that the history of the local Native Americans was never studied or even mentioned. The week before Thanksgiving, she asked a Native American eighth grader what Thanksgiving was all about, and his response was, 'The white man taught the savages how to plant.' The room, filled with European Americans and Native American students, nodded in agreement (Wink, 2011, p. 69).

The white man taught the savages how to plant; the white man taught the Māori how to pray. Thanksgiving and *Te Harinui* celebrate the colonising agent, *Te Harinui* going so far as to co-opt Christmas into the cause (ironic, given the lowly circumstances of Jesus' birth, when the Roman Empire controlled Judea). These, then, are examples of dominant discourses that continue long after the events they depict, to minimise the agency of indigenous peoples.

To counter the narrative demonstrated by the example of *Te Harinui*, it is important to note that there was in fact considerable Māori interest in Marsden's arrival, a perspective wholly omitted in the words of the song. There was, in fact, benefit to Māori in there being some European presence in Aotearoa in general (though I hasten to add that I have chosen these words carefully; they are words not applicable to the events that followed the signing of the Treaty, when the process of British settlement effectively overwhelmed Māori control of Aotearoa). As Kuni Jenkins writes, Ruatara of the northern tribe Ngā Puhi had met Marsden while travelling overseas and was excited by the prospect of introducing aspects of Pākehā life to his people, for Europeans possessed technology and knowledge that Māori could benefit from. Jenkins therefore argues that the relationship between Marsden and Ruatara had aspects of aitanga, a mutually beneficial relationship, as Marsden's mission satisfied both of their goals of 'pursuing a meaningful intervention into Māori society' (Jenkins, 2000, p. 87):

> For Duaterra [Ruatara] contact with Pakeha meant a huge technological transformation of Māori society. For Marsden contact with Māori meant an evangelical, and imperialist transformation of Māori society (ibid., 88).

In order to continue to counter the narrative of the popular discourse relating to the Treaty, in which Māori have no agency, in this chapter and, in fact, throughout this thesis I will seek to consider the way in which Māori sought to act for their own benefit and, conversely, the way in which Pākehā have worked for their own. In this way I (somewhat rhetorically) return to the question of bicultural partisanship: might it be the case that rather than being 'united heart and hand' as *Te Harinui* claims – that is, rather than being a land of 'one people', do we in fact retain different interests according to our cultural and ethnic identities? With this thought in mind, I further ask: as a meeting point of these different interests, how does the Treaty function as part of bicultural discourse – who controls what may be known about it, and to what ends?

Text

The texts of the Treaty as presented herewith are taken from the publication printed to accompany the *He Tohu* exhibition of constitutional documents at the New Zealand National Archives (*Te Tiriti O Waitangi: The Treaty of Waitangi 1840*, 2017, pp. 116 - 118). I have attempted to hew closely to the text as presented, including in matters such as punctuation and capitalisation, and in editorial decisions such as italicisation and spacing. I indent the texts here to show that they are quotations.

English Text

> Her Majesty Victoria Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland regarding with Her Royal Favour the Native Chiefs and Tribes of New Zealand and anxious to protect their just Rights and Property and to secure to them the enjoyment of Peace and Good Order has deemed it necessary in consequence of the great number of Her Majesty's Subjects who have already settled in New Zealand and the rapid extension of Emigration both from Europe and Australia which is still in progress to constitute and appoint a functionary properly authorised to treat with the Aborigines of New Zealand for the recognition of Her Majesty's Sovereign authority over the whole or any part of those islands – Her Majesty therefore being desirous to establish a settled form of Civil Government with a view to avert the evil consequences which must result from the absence of the necessary Laws and Institutions alike to the native population and to Her subjects has been graciously pleased to empower and authorise me William Hobson a Captain in Her Majesty's Royal Navy Consul and Lieutenant Governor of such parts of New Zealand as may be or hereafter shall be ceded to Her Majesty to invite the confederated and

independent Chiefs of New Zealand to concur in the following Articles and Conditions.

Article the first
The Chiefs of the Confederation of the United Tribes of New Zealand and the separate and independent Chiefs who have not become members of the Confederation cede to Her Majesty the Queen of England absolutely and without reservation all the rights and powers of Sovereignty which the said Confederation or Individual Chiefs respectively exercise or possess or may be supposed to exercise or to possess over their respective Territories as the sole sovereigns thereof.

Article the second
Her Majesty the Queen of England confirms and guarantees to the Chiefs and Tribes of New Zealand and to the respective families and individuals thereof the full exclusive and undisturbed possession of their Lands and Estates Forests Fisheries and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess so long as it is their wish and desire to retain the same in their possession; but the Chiefs of the United Tribes and the individual Chiefs yield to Her Majesty the exclusive right of Preemption over such lands as the proprietors thereof may be disposed to alienate at such prices as may be agreed upon between the respective Proprietors and persons appointed by Her Majesty to treat with them in that behalf.

Article the third
In consideration thereof Her Majesty the Queen of England extends to the Natives of New Zealand Her Royal protection and imparts to them all the Rights and Privileges of British subjects.

[signed] W. Hobson Lieutenant Governor

Now therefore We, the Chiefs of the Confederation of the United Tribes of New Zealand being assembled in Congress at Victoria in Waitangi and We the Separate and Independent Chiefs of New Zealand claiming authority over the Tribes and Territories which are specified after our respective names, having been made fully to understand the Provisions of the foregoing Treaty, accept and enter into the same in the full spirit and meaning thereof in witness of which we have attached our signatures or marks at the places and the dates respectively specified.

Done at Waitangi, this Sixth day of February in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty.

The Chiefs of the Confederation

Māori Text

The editors note that this text is reproduced as written in 1840, and that 'wh' is not used as might be expected in the present day as it was not used in written Māori texts of the period.

Ko Wikitoria te Kuini o Ingarani i tana mahara atawai ki nga Rangatira me Nga Hapu o Nu Tirani i tana hiahia hoki kia tohungia ki a ratou o ratou rangatiratanga me to ratou wenua, a kia mau tonu hoki te Rongo ki a ratou me te Atanoho hoki kua wakaaro ia he mea tika kia tukua mai tetahi Rangatira – hei kai wakarite ki nga Tangata maori o Nu Tirani – kia wakaaetia e nga Rangatira maori te Kawanatanga o te Kuini ki nga wahikatoa o te wenua nei me nga motu – na te mea hoki he tokomaha ke nga tangata o tona Iwi Kua noho ki tenei wenua, a e haere mai nei.

Na ko te Kuini e hiahia ana kia wakaritea te Kawanatanga kia kaua ai nga kino e puta mai ki te tangata maori ki te Pakeha e noho ture kore ana.

Na kua pai te Kuini kia tukua a hau a Wiremu Hopihona he Kapitana i te Roiara Nawa hei Kawana mo nga wahi katoa o Nu Tirani e tukua aianei amua atu ki te Kuini, e mea atu ana ia ki nga Rangatira o te wakaminenga o nga hapu o Nu Tirani me era Rangatira atu enei ture ka korerotia nei.

Ko te Tuatahi
Ko nga Rangatira o te Wakaminenga me nga Rangatira katoa hoki ki hai i uru ki taua wakaminenga ka tuku rawa atu ki te Kuini o Ingarani ake tonu atu – te Kawanatanga katoa o o ratou wenua.

Ko te Tuarua
Ko te Kuini o Ingarani ka wakarite ka wakaae ki nga Rangatira ki nga hapu – ki nga tangata katoa o Nu Tirani te tino rangatiratanga o o ratou wenua o ratou kainga me o ratou taonga katoa. Otiia ko nga Rangatira o te wakaminenga me nga Rangatira katoa atu ka tuku ki te Kuini te hokonga o era wahi wenua e pai ai te tangata nona te wenua – ki te ritenga o te utu e wakaritea ai e ratou ko te kai hoko e meatia nei e te Kuini hei kai hoko mona.

Ko te Tuatoru
Hei wakaritenga mai hoki tenei mo te wakaaetanga ki te Kawanatanga o te Kuini – Ka tiakina e te Kuini o Ingarani nga tangata maori katoa o Nu Tirani ka tukua ki a ratou nga tikanga katoa rite tahi ki ana mea ki nga tangata o Ingarani.

[signed] W. Hobson Consul & Lieutenant-Governor.

Na ko matou ko nga Rangatira o te Wakaminenga o nga hapu o Nu Tirani ka huihui nei ki Waitangi ko matou hoki ko nga Rangatira o Nu Tirani ka kite nei i te ritenga o enei kupu. Ka tangohia ka wakaaetia katoatia e matou, koia ka tohungia ai o matou ingoa o matou tohu.

Ka meatia tenei ki Waitangi i te ono o nga ra o Pepuere i te tau kotahi mano, e waru rau e wa te kau o to tatou Ariki.

English Translation of Māori Text

Attributed to Professor (later Sir) Hugh Kāwharu, 1988.

Victoria, The Queen of England, in her concern to protect the chiefs and subtribes of New Zealand and in her desire to preserve their chieftainship and their lands to them and to maintain peace and good order considers it just to appoint an administrator one who will negotiate with the people of New Zealand to the end that their chiefs will agree to the Queen's Government being established over all parts of this land and (adjoining) islands and also because there are so many of her subjects living on this land and others yet to come.

So the Queen desires to establish a government so that no evil will come to Maori and European living in a state of lawlessness.

So the Queen has appointed 'me, William Hobson a Captain' in the Royal Navy to be Governor for all parts of New Zealand (both those) shortly to be received by the Queen and (those) to be received hereafter and presents to the chiefs of the Confederation chiefs of the subtribes of New Zealand and other chiefs these laws set out here.

The First
The Chiefs of the Confederation and all the Chiefs who have not joined that Confederation give absolutely to the Queen of England for ever the complete government over their land.

The Second
The Queen of England agrees to protect the Chiefs, the subtribes and all the people of New Zealand in the unqualified exercise of their chieftainship over their lands,

villages and all their treasures. But on the other hand the Chiefs of the Confederation and all the Chiefs will sell land to the Queen at a price agreed to by the person owning it and by the person buying it (the latter being) appointed by the Queen as her purchase agent.

The Third

For this agreement therefore concerning the Government of the Queen, the Queen of England will protect all the ordinary people of New Zealand and will give them the same rights and duties of citizenship as the people of England.

(signed) William Hobson
Consul and Lieutenant-Governor

So we, the Chiefs of the Confederation and the subtribes of New Zealand meeting here at Waitangi having seen the shape of these words which we accept and agree to record our names and marks thus.

Was done at Waitangi on the sixth of February in the year of our Lord 1840.

The Chiefs of the Confederation

Context of the Treaty

As may be gathered by a reading of the Treaty's text, the Treaty was not the initial step that allowed the advent of British colonisation in New Zealand. Rather, there were already British subjects living in New Zealand at the time of the signing of the Treaty: its signing was a belated affair in response to the relative anarchy that existed amongst the European population in Aotearoa in the early nineteenth century, and effectively transformed the process of *de facto* colonisation already in effect through the private efforts of various British citizens and companies into a colonisation *de jure*, one that formally brought New Zealand under the protection of Queen Victoria and provided formal grounds for the establishment of a colonial government. Like Marsden, many early British settlers were missionaries. Other Europeans operated in New Zealand with pecuniary motives in mind, such as those who sought to meet the strong demand in Europe for raw materials that could be found in New Zealand, such as timber, flax, sea-mammal oil, and seal fur (King, 2004, p. 105).

One private company in particular was established with the specific intent of colonising New Zealand and making a profit in so doing: the New Zealand Company. It was the result of the work of Edward Gibbon Wakefield, who wished to attract capitalists to purchase land in New Zealand, and to attract migrant labour to work on the land purchased

by capitalists; his scheme attracted substantial investment from British investors. The cities of Wellington, Nelson, and New Plymouth were established by the New Zealand Company, and Dunedin and Christchurch were founded by the Scottish Free Church and the Canterbury Association respectively along similar models to the former cities; only Auckland grew without such planning. These settlements grew quickly; Wellington, for example, had 2500 settlers in 1841, and 4000 by 1843 (King, 2004, pp. 149 – 153).

That Waitangi in the Bay of Islands was the site of the Treaty's signing was no accident: at the time, the Bay of Islands was home to concentrated European activity. The settlement of Kororāreka, near what is now the town of Russell, developed to service the needs of whaling ships, and James Busby in his capacity as British Resident made his residence at Waitangi, just across the water from Kororāreka. Michael King notes that due to this, the Bay of Islands became the 'first major arena for prolonged and intensive Māori-Pākehā interaction' (2004, p. 110). Famously, the fact that there was no police force, nor any system of law and order at all, led to Kororāreka becoming known as the 'Hell-hole of the Pacific' (ibid., p. 111). Both Māori and Pākehā had an interest in seeing the European presence in the country properly governed, as the situation was becoming untenable.

Before Busby's appointment as British Resident in 1832, British affairs had been administered entirely from New South Wales. Busby arrived with a mandate to protect settlers and traders, protect Māori from exploitation by Europeans, and recapture escaped convicts, but, as King writes, he was not provided with the means to enforce his authority (2004, pp. 135 – 137). Claudia Orange writes that Busby had a mandate to direct Māori towards settled governance, and argues that his work was in harmony with Māori interests:

> Ships built in New Zealand sailed without an acknowledged national flag and register, and became liable to seizure. In 1830 Sydney Customs seized the Hokianga-built *Sir George Murray*. The chiefs Patuone and Te Taonui were aboard, and the seizure was seen as an insult to their mana. Busby proposed to resolve certification and create a national flag: by having chiefs acting in a 'collective capacity' this would be a step towards a government of confederated chiefs. On 20 March 1834, twenty-five chiefs at Waitangi voted for a national flag (*Te Tiriti O Waitangi: The Treaty of Waitangi 1840*, 2017, pp. 9 - 10).

Later, Busby was to convince the chiefs to sign a declaration of independence in an attempt to ward off the apparent interest of the French Baron de Thierry in establishing a French nation-state. Orange writes that Busby

> …called a meeting of chiefs on 28 October 1835. Thirty-four northern rangatira responded to the potential threat de Thierry posed to Māori authority, and signed He W[h]akaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tireni (translated as Declaration of the Independence of New Zealand).

The text in te reo Māori was put together by Māori with the assistance of the missionary Henry Williams and the scribe Eruera Pare. In English, the Declaration asked King William IV 'to be the parent of their infant State… its Protector from all attempts upon its independence'. The signatories, the United Tribes of New Zealand (Te Whakaminenga o Nu

Tireni), pledged to assemble at an annual conference to frame laws for peace, justice and trade (*Te Tiriti O Waitangi: The Treaty of Waitangi 1840*, 2017, p. 10).

Busby promptly dispatched the Declaration to the Colonial Office. It was to prove significant when it came to later British efforts to formalise their presence in New Zealand, as the British 'decided that sovereignty would need to be officially ceded in consequence of the earlier recognition of Māori independence' (O'Malley, Stirling, & Penetito, 2010, p. 28). Orange writes that Busby's reasoning behind causing the chiefs to declare their independence was that Britain would be able to control Māori government and law-making, with the goal of establishing a British protectorate (*Te Tiriti O Waitangi: The Treaty of Waitangi 1840*, 2017, p. 10). One might also consider that given his relatively powerless position, he would have needed to recruit the local Māori chiefs to support his effort to repel de Thierry. In any event, the British government, as a result of continued complaints from Busby about the unruly conditions in the colony, petitions from Sydney and New Zealand traders, and fulminating disquiet at the prospect of the New Zealand Company formally colonising the country and setting up its own system of government, sent William Hobson to take the steps needed to formally establish a British colony (King, 2004, pp. 137 – 138).

Māori also had an interest in formalising the British position in their country. Ranginui Walker writes of this, noting for example that Hongi Hika gave his protection to the mission station established in Kerikeri in 1819 'because he hoped that their presence would attract more ships to the Bay of Islands, thereby increasing his chances for trade. The missionary blacksmiths were also useful to him for repairing the muskets he had already managed to acquire and was using in tribal wars' (1990, p. 81), and that Europeans were of value to Māori in that they could trade for muskets and other items, such as fishing hooks and axes, and in that they could teach what Walker terms 'the useful crafts of carpentry, domestic management and agriculture' (ibid., p. 86). A further benefit to Māori of the Treaty was that it appeared to provide a means to regulate the growing European presence in the country and their interactions with Māori. Walker writes that, by 1839, '…another thousand Europeans had settled in New Zealand and land speculation in a free market, unregulated by law or a central administration, was creating new tensions as some tribes realised that they had surrendered too much for too little.'

One may conclude that the Treaty came to be seen as necessary for two main reasons. Firstly, there was the legal matter of Māori independence, without which the Treaty might not have been envisaged. As suggested by O'Malley, Stirling, and Penetito, because Busby had persuaded Māori chiefs to declare their independence, it was necessary to negotiate a transfer of sovereignty if there was to be a legitimate British government in New Zealand. Of course, ironically enough, it would seem that Busby initiated the signing of the Declaration as a means of protecting British interests in New Zealand. Second, there is the practical matter of the need to establish British governance in the country: the growing British population in New Zealand was causing disruption to the Māori people, and the anarchic conditions ran contrary to British ideals of settled government and certainly to the civilising mission of the church, and the colony was too distant to govern effectively from New South Wales. Perhaps nothing speaks more for the hegemonic power of the British

Empire in the early nineteenth century than the fact that it effectively colonised New Zealand without its government ever initially intending to do so; the colonisation of New Zealand was therefore effectively colonisation as afterthought.

The Nature of the Agreement

The Treaty is an agreement between the government of Queen Victoria, represented by William Hobson, and the gathered Māori chiefs of New Zealand. The English version can be understood as representing the British understanding of the objects of the Treaty: that proper governance be established in the colony, that sovereignty be ceded by the chiefs to the Crown, and that certain guarantees be made to Māori, such as the undisturbed possession of their properties and the provision to them of the same rights enjoyed by British subjects. However, as will be obvious to the reader who has seen the multiple translations of the Treaty presented above – in English, in Māori, and retranslated from Māori into English – there are manifest problems with the translation of the text. Indeed, issues of intelligibility between Māori and English cultures lie at the heart of the problem that this present part of this research attempts to resolve – that of what could be thought, said, or done at the signing of the Treaty, and what could not.

The problem of mutual unintelligibility between the gathered cohort of chiefs who spoke te reo Māori and the gathered British settlers is an obvious practical difficulty that could not have been overlooked by those present. An attempt was made by the British to mitigate this difficulty by producing a draft of the Treaty in Māori, but this raises a further problematic point: that the power to dictate the terms of the Treaty lay entirely with the British, who drafted and translated the text, and presented it to the gathered chiefs. It was not mutually negotiated, and indeed, one can only speculate as to the type of text that might have been produced by Māori had they decided to present the British with a counterproposal. As it stands, we must recognise that the text and the intentions behind it were British in their origins.

The matter of the translation of the Māori text of the Treaty has occupied a great deal of scholarly attention in recent years. At issue is the fact that the Māori text and the English text differ in meaning. Thus, precisely what the gathered British subjects and the Māori chiefs agreed to in signing the Treaty has been a moot point. O'Malley, Stirling, and Penetito write:

> William Hobson arrived at the Bay of Islands in January 1840. He had not been provided with a draft treaty, though [his] formal instructions and earlier precedents provided a strong guide as to what ought to be included. Hobson received assistance from James Busby in preparing an English-language draft, and this was subsequently translated into Māori by the missionary Henry Williams and his son Edward (2010, p. 36).

Ranginui Walker writes that as a result of this drafting process, there were 'four English versions and a translation into Māori which matched none of them. The English version from which the translation was made has yet to be found. Consequently, the official English version of the Treaty lodged with the Colonial Office does not match the Maori version which the chiefs of New Zealand signed' (1990, pp. 90 - 91). He continues:

> The purpose of the Treaty embodied in the first article was the cession of chiefly sovereignty over New Zealand to the Queen of England. That is made absolutely clear in the English version… But the Māori version does not accomplish that purpose because its meaning was obscured by Henry Williams whose translation, when retranslated back into English, reads:
>
> > The Chiefs of the Confederation, and all Chiefs not in that Confederation, cede absolutely to the Queen of England forever the complete Governance of their lands.

Walker states that the crux of the matter concerns the word 'kawanatanga', used by Williams in the translation, which did not convey to Māori a precise definition of sovereignty, and indeed translated literally means 'governance'; had the word 'mana' been used, no Māori would have had any doubt of what was being ceded (ibid., p. 91).

Walker further notes that in the Māori translation of the second article, the chiefs were guaranteed 'tino rangatiratanga' – that is, the absolute chieftainship over their lands, homes, and treasured possessions; in the English translation, the word 'possession' is used instead, which conveys much less in the way of chiefly authority. Because of this, Walker argues that the chiefs were likely to have understood themselves to be retaining their own sovereign rights in exchange for 'a limited concession of power in kawanatanga' (ibid., p. 93).

Of course, the Māori chiefs were not unanimous in their reaction to the Treaty, and in fact debated the signing of it at some length. Walker notes that the chiefs were divided in their response to the treaty:

> Chiefs like Te Kēmara, Rewa, and Moka opposed the Governor's presence if it meant that their status would be relegated to below that of the Governor. Rewa told the Governor bluntly to return to his own country… [In addition,] the influential Ngāti Hine chief Kawiti suspected that something more than kawanatanga was at stake. Since the missionaries had not expressed any desire for temporal power, he invited them to stay, while telling the Governor to return to his own country (ibid., p. 94).

While some chiefs opposed the Treaty, others such as Hōne Heke, who were under missionary tutelage, spoke in favour, likening the Treaty to the word of God. But the most persuasive supporter of the Treaty was Tāmati Wāka Nene, who, in the rhetorical style of the orator on the marae, addressed his fellow chiefs, saying:

> Friends! Whose potatoes do we eat? Whose were our blankets? These spears (holding up his taiaha) are laid aside. What has the Ngāpuhi now? The Pakeha's gun, his shot, his powder. Many of his children are our children (ibid., p. 95).

It would seem from Walker's analysis that the debate between the chiefs was between those who valued undisturbed Māori sovereignty and those who valued the British presence and the access to advances in technology and living standards they provided.

Claudia Orange (2017) provides another account of the debates prior to the signing of the Treaty, similarly noting that Rewa and Moka, and also Hākiro, Tāreha, Kawiti, Whai, and 'another chief from the Waikare arm of the Bay of Islands' spoke against the Treaty, and challenging the land sales that had already taken place. At this point in the proceedings, the Māori speakers generally expressed a preference for, effectively, retaining the status quo: a missionary presence, supplemented by the efforts of Busby in his capacity as British Resident. Orange argues that it was the oratory of chiefs such as Tāmati Wāka Nene, quoted above by Walker, and Hōne Heke, who were 'long-time associates of the English missionaries', that turned the general opinion in favour of the Treaty. Heke, for example, advanced the argument that without a British governor, Māori 'might be subjected to the influence of the French and other unscrupulous Pākehā' (*Te Tiriti O Waitangi: The Treaty of Waitangi 1840*, 2017, p. 16). Heke was to go on to be a notable figure in the northern war between Māori and the British, famously cutting down the flagstaff at Kororāreka multiple times.

The debates about the Treaty on the fifth of February concluded with an interjection by Te Kēmara, a senior chief and tohunga (priest). In reply to the speech by Tāmati Wāka Nene, Orange writes that:

> …he leapt up and cried out, 'No! Go back to your own land. It would be all right if we were going to be equal in rank and power, but if you are going to be above us, I say no. Will we end up like this?' And he crossed his hands as if handcuffed. Then suddenly he seized Hobson's hand, shaking it over and over, and roaring out in English, 'How d'ye do, eh, Governor? How d'ye do, eh, Mister Governor?'
>
> Everyone – Māori and Pākehā – was convulsed with laughter, and Hobson decided that it was a good time to adjourn the meeting. They would meet again on the Friday (Orange, 2013, pp. 25 - 26).

In actual fact – whether because of shortages of food, or because of suggestions from missionaries afraid that chiefs would leave early – the next meeting was to occur the next day, on Thursday (ibid., p. 28).

An important source of information regarding events at the signing of the Treaty is the account given by William Colenso, a missionary printer who in 1840 lived in Paihia and was and something of a conscientious dissenter. Colenso's biographer, Peter Wells, writes that:

> [He] had become fluent in te reo within fifteenth months of arriving in New Zealand – his personal notebooks are littered with Māori words translated into their English equivalents. He performs a useful service to us sitting here in the present. Not only did he translate the words of the Māori orators, he also included in the 1890 document [his account of the signing of the Treaty] an English and a Māori version

of the 1840 treaty. This of itself highlighted the possibility of te reo Treaty having different concepts, a complex understanding that needs to be given due respect.

Colenso appears to have had a sympathy for Māori interests, and his account of the signing of the Treaty is in some ways a critique of the elements of the colonial discourse, even if he did not use that term – that is, he argues that what the Māori chiefs understood of the Treaty, and what the British understood were different. Further, both at the time of the signing of the Treaty, and in the publication of his pamphlet, he made this argument public.

This is how Colenso recorded his exchange with Hobson. This exchange happened on the 6th of February in 1840, prior to the first signatures being imprinted on the Treaty:

> …I, addressing the Governor, said –
>
> 'Will Your Excellency allow me to make a remark or two before that chief signs the treaty?'
>
> The Governor (Hobson): 'Certainly, sir.'
>
> Mr. Colenso: 'May I ask your Excellency whether it is your opinion that these Natives understand the articles of the treaty which they are now called upon to sign? I this morning' –
>
> The Governor: 'If the Native chiefs do not know the contents of this treaty it is no fault of mine. I wish them fully to understand it. I have done all that I could do to make them understand the same, and I really don't know how I shall be enabled to get them to do so. They have heard the treaty read by Mr. Williams.'
>
> Mr. Colenso: 'True, your Excellency; but the Natives are quite children in their ideas. It is no easy matter, I well know, to get them to understand – fully to comprehend a document of this kind; still I think they ought to know somewhat of it to constitute its legality. I speak under correction, your Excellency. I have spoken to some chiefs concerning it, who had no idea whatever as to the purport of the treaty.
>
> Mr Busby here said: 'The best answer that could be given to that observation would be found in the speech made yesterday by the very chief about to sign, Hōne Heke, who said, "The Native mind could not comprehend these things: they must trust to the advice of their missionaries."'
>
> Mr. Colenso: 'Yes; and this is the very thing to which I was going to allude. The missionaries should do so; but at the same time the missionaries should explain the thing in all its bearings to the Natives, so that it should be their own very act and deed. Then in case of a reaction taking place, the Natives could not turn round on the missionary and say, "You advised me to sign that paper, but never told me what were the contents thereof."'
>
> The Governor: 'I am in hopes that no such reaction will take place. I think that the people under your care will be peaceable enough: I'm sure you will endeavour to make them so. We must endeavour to do the best we can with them.' (2016, pp. 32 - 34)

In light of the various debates about the meaning of the Treaty that have occurred since the signing, Colenso's warning that Māori might protest that they did not know the meaning of what they were signing was a prescient one.

The process of signing the Treaty at Waitangi was not the conclusion of the process, as the chiefs gathered in the Bay of Islands did not represent all Māori. Signing ceremonies took place all over the country, and it was not a foregone conclusion that all chiefs would sign. At the mission station at Māngungu, on the Hokianga Harbour – an overland journey from Waitangi and the Bay of Islands – some eight hours of debate took place as to whether or not to sign. The missionary John Hobbs believed that the chiefs at Māngungu were persuaded to sign by the promise that the Queen was not interested in outright possession of the land (Orange, 2013, p. 33). Elsewhere, there was no unanimous agreement on the part of Māori: consider Te Wherowhero, Taraia, Tupaea, chiefs who were offered the chance to sign but refused. Some chiefs were not offered the chance to sign; there were no signings from Whanganui to Mokau in the Taranaki area, and most of the chiefs of the Hawke's Bay and Wairarapa area were not asked to sign. The iwi of Te Arawa of Rotorua and Ngāti Tūwharetoa, for their part, refused to sign; Mananui Te Heuheu of Ngāti Tūwharetoa returned a gift of blankets given to his brother Iwikau, who had signed at the Bay of Islands (p. 37). This did not stop Hobson from proclaiming British sovereignty over the entirety of New Zealand – demonstrating that the niceties of the diplomatic process gave way to the colonial imperative in the face of indigenous resistance.

To conclude, the documentary record shows that Māori were able to discuss and debate the Treaty, but their discussions had no bearing on the text. Indeed, it appears that whether or not they agreed to the Treaty had little impact on whether or not they were considered to have agreed to the text, as shown by the eventual proclamation of British sovereignty despite lack of complete Māori agreement. The British were in the enviable position of being able to dictate the terms of the text in both English and in te reo Māori, but the finer points of the translation were likely lost on those like Hobson, who did not speak Māori; perhaps it was only Colenso, who being a lowly missionary printer occupied only a relatively insignificant position in the hierarchy of the British present, who appreciated the differences between, for example, 'sovereignty' and 'kawanatanga'. And finally, it is worth noting that the British had additional power in another way: they were more informed about the likely impacts of colonisation on the country. One wonders whether quite so many chiefs would have signed the Treaty if they had known of the later impacts that European civilisation in New Zealand would have on Māori, such as the loss of Māori land, the widespread loss of the ability to speak te reo Māori, and the military conflicts between British and Māori that were to come. If the Treaty is understood as creating a country 'united heart and hand', to return to the words of *Te Harinui*, it is a markedly British unity that the Treaty must be understood as having created.

The archival history of the Treaty – that is, how the document itself has been handled – provides a telling glimpse of Pākehā and Crown attitudes to the Treaty and to Māori. For all that Māori dissent to the Treaty was effectively ignored in some cases, the Crown initially took great pains to record Māori assent to the Treaty, and took great care of the document. After some decades, the document fell victim to neglect – just as had the very terms of the agreement, arguably; and finally, in the present day, the Treaty has been resurrected as a foundational document of Aotearoa New Zealand, and the Treaty documents have been accorded new respect as the subject of conservation efforts and public displays. There are obvious parallels in the Pākehā reception of the Treaty and the way in which the Crown treated the document, which will be explored here.

An account of the archival record of the Treaty is related by Stephanie Lash, the lead curator of the permanent *He Tohu* exhibition controlled by Archives New Zealand, in which the Treaty documents are displayed to the public. At the end of 1840, nine sheets bearing the signatures of Māori chiefs were registered by the Colonial Secretary, Willoughby Shortland, and they were kept in an iron chest along with other public records at then-capital of Okiato, 7 km south of Russell. In 1841 the capital was moved to Auckland, and with it, the Treaty. The government buildings of the period were wooden cottages in Official Bay, which were destroyed by fire in 1842; clerk George Eliot Eliott ran into the burning building containing the Treaty documents and retrieved it and the seal of the colony. The Treaty moved again, this time to Wellington, when that city became the capital in 1845. One might consider that this attention to the Treaty – taking the care to move it when moving capitals, to say nothing of running into burning buildings to retrieve it – shows respect and consideration for the document from the Crown in this period (*Te Tiriti O Waitangi: The Treaty of Waitangi 1840*, 2017, p. 119).

This degree of consideration was to change. There was a brief increase in public interest in government documents in 1877, leading the government of the day to produce photolithographic reproductions of eight of the nine sheets, excluding a printed sheet which survives in original form. It is fortunate that the government did so, for the original Treaty documents were effectively lost after this period. They were rediscovered in about 1908 by Dr. Thomas Hocken, who found them in the lower levels of the Government Buildings; as not much thought had been given to their long-term storage, some sheets were severely damaged. As Lash describes:

> All eight of the large documents show some damage, mainly in the top left-hand corners, from nibbling by rats or mice, but the two parchments – the Waitangi sheet and the Harold-Bunbury sheet – show the greatest losses, including some signatures and annotations…. The Waitangi sheet in particular, with its distinctive silhouette, shows signs of having been on the outside of the rolled-up sheets because of the repeating pattern of losses at the edges. The sheets also show signs of water damage, perhaps from flooding in the 'dungeon' (ibid.).

Following the Napier earthquake in 1931, it was suggested by Guy Scholefield – the Controller of Dominion Archives – that government documents such as the Treaty be stored away from the earthquake fault line to minimise the danger of being lost as a result of earthquake damage or associated fires. In the words of Lash, 'Cabinet were disinclined to agree', but the documents were placed in a tin box. This 'middle period', from approximately 1877 (if not before) until 1940, would appear to be one in which the Treaty documents were essentially disregarded. As I will argue, Pākehā attitudes to Māori in this time show a corresponding indifference.

Following this period, the Treaty appears to have occupied a more prominent place in society, and it received more attention and the documents received more care. One hundred years after the signing of the Treaty, in 1940, the Treaty documents were displayed at the centennial celebrations at Waitangi. During the Second World War, they were moved for safekeeping to Masterton amidst fears that Wellington might come under Japanese attack – a far cry from earthquake-proofing the documents by placing them in a tin box. The Treaty was placed again on public display in 1961; when it was noticed that exposure to light was causing the ink to fade, conservation measures were put in place, but the documents were taken off display completely in 1978 and placed in the Reserve Bank's vault. In 1991, they were exhibited in the Constitution Room, a new facility that housed the Treaty and other important documents such as the Declaration of Independence, and the *He Tohu* exhibition was opened in 2017 (ibid., pp. 120 – 121). However, despite this public interest in and new-found respect for the Treaty, there is considerable debate and disagreement about the meaning of the Treaty and how it relates to matters of government in the present day.

It could be said that Pākehā have historically been less concerned with the meaning of the words on the page, so to speak, as much as with the fact that there was indeed an agreement at all. That is, the guarantees made to Māori about sovereignty and the ability to retain undisturbed possession of their lands, etc., were less important than the fact that a document had been signed that legitimised the Pākehā presence in the country. The historical neglect for the documents on the part of the Pākehā government, as related by Lash, was reflected in a neglect for what the documents actually said. This was acknowledged by Prime Minister Richard Seddon in 1899, during the period in which the Treaty documents were still tasty fodder for the mice and rats underneath the Government Buildings. In a meeting with Waikato chiefs, Seddon said:

> It was through the Treaty of Waitangi that the Native chiefs, on behalf of their people, marked their confidence in the Queen, and placed their lands – which means life to them – under the care of the Government. They called upon the Queen their mother to succour them, and relied upon her to do justice to her children of the Native race. Your ancestors were far-seeing men. They foresaw that in this colony there would be a large European population; that the Europeans would be as numerous as the trees of the forest. They also foresaw that those of their race whom they loved so well, unless they had the protection of our gracious Queen, their lands and lives would be in danger. It is with regret that I have to admit that that treaty, which at the time was so well considered, and which was drawn in such a manner as

> had it been maintained in its entirety the interests of both races would have been safeguarded, has been departed from. I regret there has been a serious departure from it (O'Malley et al., 2010, p. 216).

Despite this acknowledgement and expression of regret for the serious departures from the Treaty, Seddon and his government did little to correct the Treaty breaches.

For Pākehā, the Treaty has been useful as a nation-building document – that is, a rallying-point around which the idea of 'New Zealand' can be formed. In this, it in some ways serves a similar role to that which is played by the Magna Carta in Britain and the Constitution in the United States of America. An important way in which the Treaty of Waitangi is celebrated in present-day New Zealand society is through the Waitangi Day national holiday, which occurs on the 6th of February, the date on which the Treaty was signed in 1840. The modern practice of commemorating the signing of the Treaty is one that has historical precedent dating back to time of the Second World War. O'Malley et al. write:

> In 1934 the Treaty of Waitangi was officially commemorated at Waitangi for the first time since its signing. This followed the purchase of the land at Waitangi by Governor-General Bledisloe in 1932, and his gifting of the site to the people of New Zealand in trust. The gift led to extensive discussion about the meaning and history of the Treaty. Work soon began on restoring the dilapidated house of James Busby, the British Resident of the 1830s, who lived at Waitangi in 1840. The house was restored in time for the first Treaty commemoration in 1934, when a large gathering of Māori affirmed that they would build a whare rūnanga (meeting house) at Waitangi, with a view to completing it in time for the 1940 centenary of the signing of the Treaty (2010, p. 246).

This day has been the focus of Pākehā efforts to create a national identity based on the signing of the Treaty:

> The 6th day of February emerged as a focus for Māori protest from the 1970s, but only after it became a hub for emerging Pākehā ideas about nationhood. Following on from the big commemorative events of the 1930s and the 1940 centenary at Waitangi, formal annual commemorations grew in popularity after the Queen's visit there in 1953. The Labour Party's 1957 election manifesto undertook to transform the date into a public holiday but in 1960 it instead made it a 'national day of thanksgiving', not a holiday. In 1963 the National government made Waitangi Day a holiday for the Northland region (removing Auckland Anniversary Day). In 1974 the Labour government made 6 February a national holiday but renamed it New Zealand Day, with a focus on building nationhood. The National Government promptly reversed the name change in 1976. All the while, Māori protest grew and debate over the treaty intensified (ibid., p. 303).

The importance of Waitangi as a site for celebration was recognised and perhaps heightened by the visit to Waitangi of Queen Elizabeth II in 1953. As the Queen is a descendant of Queen Victoria, on whose behalf the Treaty was signed, her visit was a material enactment of Pākehā discourses relating to the Treaty: having legitimised British government in the

colony of New Zealand, a reigning British monarch now visited the site of the Treaty's signing. However, nothing is quite so revealing of the nationalistic impulses behind the Pākehā treatment of Waitangi as the fact that Waitangi Day was briefly formally called New Zealand Day. Although this was the case for only a short time before it reverted to being called Waitangi Day, there is an ongoing debate about changing the name: suggestions have included Dominion Day and Peter Dunne's suggestion in 2004 of Aotearoa New Zealand Day; others have claimed instead that ANZAC Day is the 'real' national day (McAllister, 2007, p. 159).

I acknowledge that there have been many Pākehā individuals who do not hold the general views that I have noted in the preceding paragraphs. However, as a matter of discourse, there is a pattern that is replicated through successive generations of Pākehā and through successive governments that has only been challenged relatively recently. The Treaty has been used as a colonising instrument by Pākehā with spectacular success, as seen by the growth of the colony of New Zealand into the present-day nation. The question that faces present generations is how to address the structural advantages and disadvantages that now exist within society in Aotearoa New Zealand as a result. Perhaps the biggest reminder of Pākehā attitudes towards the Treaty are found in the physical condition of the original document, which should prompt critical consideration of the place of the Treaty in society, and the way in which we understand colonial relations of power. If the Treaty is akin to the Magna Carta and similar documents in its importance to our nation, then it is a Magna Carta gnawed by rats.

The Māori Response: Protest and Resistance

Whereas Pākehā were largely content to ignore the Treaty for decades at a time, Māori remembered the document that they had signed and, in general, have resented the relative disregard with which it has generally been held. One effect of the signing of the Treaty was to create an identity of Māori as being a collective body of people: prior to the signing, Māori society was fragmented into different iwi and hapu, as evidenced by the need to collect signatures from the various chiefs spread throughout the country. These tribal affiliations still exist today, but the concept of 'Māori' as being the indigenous people of New Zealand in contradistinction to 'Pākehā' has come to be an enduring one.

I have spent some time considering the Pākehā treatment of Waitangi Day, and now turn to considering Māori responses, for Māori have traditions relating to Waitangi Day that are different to those of Pākehā. This distinction extends to the site of Waitangi Day celebrations, as there are in fact two sites where the celebration has been held: at the Treaty House, the former residence of James Busby, and at the nearby Te Tii Waitangi Marae. Patrick McAllister has argued that one represents the Crown, and Pākehā by extension, and that the other represents Māori (2007, p. 157). Recent events have changed this slightly: in June of 2017, it was decided that Te Tii should no longer be a venue for the commemoration of the Treaty. An extract from a news article gives an account of the politics of the decision:

> Chairman of the Waitangi National Trust, Pita Paraone, says those ceremonies will instead be held at Te Whare Rūnanga, the upper marae at the Treaty grounds.
>
> "I think there will be some resistance… so I just wanted to have the opportunity of speaking to them face to face," he said.
>
> Tensions at Te Tii Marae came to a head earlier this year when Prime Minister Bill English refused to attend celebrations after protocol conflicts with marae organisers.
>
> Media were also denied access onto the marae having refused to pay a fee of between $1200 and $10,000.
>
> Mr Paraone says although he received repeated requests in recent years to move the celebrations up to the Treaty grounds, the latest problems were the last straw.
>
> "I've been reluctant to act on that request, but I think this year has brought it to the conclusion that we perhaps need to move the powhiri away from Te Tii Marae and allow them to just settle down and reflect on the consequences of what they chose to do this year." (Sherman, 2017)

Regardless of its future status as a site for Treaty celebrations, one rather suspects that Te Tii will remain a significant site for Māori, given its long history as a site for discussions regarding the Treaty; it was the site where Māori camped while discussing the Treaty, and has since the 1870s been an important site for Māori gatherings regarding the Treaty (Orange, 2015).

Indeed, Waitangi Day has become known as a visible focal point for Māori protest regarding the Treaty and contemporary issues. One aspect of this protest on Waitangi Day is a hikoi, or march. In 2008, for example, this march included prominent representatives of the Tūhoe tribe, which in 2007 had been the subject of controversial police raids. McAllister writes:

> The hikoi over the bridge is virtually an annual event at Waitangi, occurring at around 4 pm on 6 February, taking protestors from Te Tii over to the Treaty grounds, where the protest group gathers in front of the whare rūnanga and leaders address them on issues of the day, the failure of the Crown to live up to its Treaty obligations, and so on. Protestors carry flags that proclaim their allegiance to various political groups and banners that express what they feel about the Treaty or about recent events affecting Māori-Pākehā relations. Groups of activists have in the past attempted to raise the flag of the United Tribes (the 'sovereignty' flag) on the flagstaff, succeeding in this some years (e.g. in 1997), but this has often been accompanied by confrontations and violent clashes with the police, who stand guard around the flagstaff, followed by arrests. The nature of the hikoi… changes from year to year and is an index of the state of Māori-Pākehā relations (2007, p. 167).

McAllister further notes the events of 2004, in which controversy over the Government's legislation regarding the foreshore and seabed saw the Prime Minister the subject of verbal abuse and jostling, and delivers the following analysis:

> In criticising the Crown for its failure to heed the Māori voice on the foreshore and seabed legislation, and for going ahead with the Act despite widespread Māori rejection of it, Māori at Te Tii acted on the basis of a critical assessment of this process in the context of their understanding of the principles of the Treaty. In doing so they presented an alternative order of things, one where the Crown (in the form of members of the Labour government) was subject to an alternative reality, one where Māori were in charge and the state subordinate, a reversal that balanced the power relationship for a brief moment in time. In so reprimanding their Treaty partner they provided a forceful reminder of the nature of the Treaty as one that ideally involved partnership and negotiation rather than unilateral action (pp. 170 – 171).

In short, Waitangi Day and the celebrations at Waitangi Day are perhaps the clearest indication of the way in which Māori protest regarding the Treaty of Waitangi is aired.[15] Further, as McAllister argues, the act of protest at Waitangi is a means for Māori to act on the basis of a critical assessment of the relationship between Māori and the Crown. In his analysis, in protesting the Crown's actions, the relationship between the two treaty partners was transformed, even if only a little, and even if only temporarily. In this way, protest at Waitangi may be understood as transformative praxis.

Māori protest has a long history that extends well beyond the institution of Waitangi Day, and has been expressed in many ways, both violent and non-violent. Following the Treaty's signing, it did not take long for Māori to express unease. In April of 1840, mere months after the signing at Waitangi, chiefs from Kaikohe, Waimate, and Waitangi laid complaints with Hobson, expressing the fear that their land would be forcibly taken and also expressing disquiet at the British treatment of native peoples in other countries, particularly in Australia. (Orange, 2015, p. 93). More protest followed, both violent and non-violent, and although a detailed account of it is outside the scope of the present study, accounts of this activity are provided by writers such as Orange (2015), James Belich (for example 1986), Tim Ryan (2002), and Ranginui Walker (1990), amongst others. In any event, as a result of the Māori perception that the Crown was placing the interests of settlers above those of Māori, or otherwise not acting in good faith, there were multiple armed conflicts between 1845 and 1872. These conflicts included those in the far north, where the flagstaff at Kororāreka suffered multiple fellings, in the Waikato, in the Taranaki, on the East Coast, and the campaigns led by Tītokowaru and by Te Kooti. Following these conflicts, known collectively as the New Zealand Wars, the nineteenth-century Māori settlement of Parihaka was a notable site of non-violent Māori resistance against British, but its residents were dispersed and its buildings destroyed by an invasion of some 2,000 troops in 1881 (Scott, 2015).

---

[15] It is important to note that Waitangi Day is not primarily a means of airing grievances. As anybody who has been to recent Waitangi Day celebrations may relate, there is a festival atmosphere throughout the Treaty Grounds and the local region, and people – primarily Māori – travel from throughout Northland and the greater country in an effort to be there. I recall travelling with students from Taipa to attend the celebrations: prior to the event they would ask teachers and each other, 'Are you going to Waitangi? Oh, can I get a lift?' Afterwards they would ask, 'Did you go to Waitangi? *Did you go to Waitangi?'*

For the student of colonial discourse and politics, it is pertinent to consider the response to these episodes by the colonial government, which was limited in the resources it could mobilise to respond to Māori military campaigns. For example, Orange records an incident in 1842, as follows:

> … an issue involving Taraia in June 1842… raised the question of the effectiveness of government authority. Taraia attacked the Ngāi Te Rangi of Tauranga over a boundary dispute, killed several and committed acts of cannibalism. The government felt obliged to act since Ngāi Te Rangi had requested government protection. Taraia, however, argued that 'the Governor was no Governor for him or his people and that he had never signed the Treaty nor would he acknowledge his authority'. More explicitly he told Hobson: 'With the Governor is the adjustment of European affairs and with us the adjustment of the natives.' The government was at first inclined to deal forcibly with this blunt rejection of British sovereignty, but with insufficient troops to ensure success, it was decided to resolve the matter through negotiation which, fortunately, was accepted (2015, pp. 107 - 108).

Even later, when the British presence in New Zealand was better established, the government was constrained in its ability to take military action against Māori. Notably, Māori resistance in the first Taranaki war, which was brought about by a controversial land sale, proved too much for the colonial military to overcome, and peace terms were offered after a year of fighting produced no tangible success for the government. James Belich notes that this conflict was seen at the time as a humiliating failure for the British, and that if the Māori war aim was simply to thwart the British, then their campaign must be understood as a success (1986, p. 116). These incidents – along with other acts of resistance – are revealing of the extent to which the Treaty was not unanimously accepted as legitimising British power and sovereignty over the entirety of New Zealand, and of the extent to which Māori were willing to hold the colonial government to account, and the success with which they did so for quite some period of time.

Māori protest did not only take the form of military campaigns. A notable assertion of Māori agency and identity was the formation of the Māori King movement, which remains relevant in the present day. In Walker's analysis, this Kīngitanga movement was part of an early vision of a bicultural New Zealand:

> When Wiremu Tamihana realised that Māori were not going to be admitted into Parliament, he turned his talents and political skills to the election of a Māori king. Tamihana did not see this move as being in conflict with the Crown. He envisaged a conjoint administration, with the King presiding over Māori land and the Queen over Crown lands. Tamihana's model of two sticks in the ground, one representing the Māori King, and the other the Governor, with a third stick across them representing the law of God and the Queen, was a succinct model of his vision of a bicultural nation under a conjoint administration. That vision, though denied by the Governor, was doggedly pursued by Māori leaders over the next century into the modern era (R. Walker, 1990, p. 148).

It is striking to compare this conception of a truly parallel system of government with modern-day biculturalism, which is entirely under the control of the New Zealand government, and to consider the way in which these different means of government might allow for expressions of tino rangatiratanga on the part of Māori.

Another movement to create a parallel government for Māori was the creation of the Māori Parliament, or the Kotahitanga mo Te Tiriti o Waitangi, 'the unification of the tribes under the Treaty,' which first met in June of 1892 (ibid., p. 165). King Tāwhiao created the Kauhanganui, a House of Assembly, in the same year, and the two Māori assemblies met independently 'well into the turn of the century' (ibid., pp. 169 – 171). The term Kotahitanga was revived when the Te Aute College student association was renamed from the Association for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Māori Race to the Kotahitanga mo Te Aute, of which Āpirana Ngata was a member; Ngata's work with this new Kotahitanga saw him move into public life (ibid., p. 173). He would go on to become one of the great advocates for Māori.

From the accounts given so far, one may conclude that to be Māori was not only to be a Treaty partner, but it was also to be engaged in a struggle for survival. This struggle for survival could take the form of a literal fight for life, as in the various nineteenth-century military campaigns, or in the form of a fight to retain cultural identity in the face of British assimilationist tactics and increasing cultural hegemony in New Zealand. The latter struggle continues into the present day, as illustrated by the infamous case of engineering students at the University of Auckland and what had become a graduation-day tradition for them of parodying the haka.

In 1979, a 'raiding party' comprised of some members of the Waitangi Action Committee (WAC) and others visited the University of Auckland's Engineering School with the goal of stopping the students from engaging in their parody. Walker notes that as early as 1971, the Auckland University Students' Association had been requested to ensure that the 'haka party be disowned' (1990, p. 221). The plan to parody the haka continued regardless in 1979 even after a request from the president of the AUSA to the president of the Engineering Society. I return to Walker's account to relate this story:

> The raiding party, which after the event assumed the name of He Taua, the avengers, confronted the engineering students early in the morning while they were practising their stunt. A fracas ensued, the students were assaulted, and their grass skirts torn off them. In less than five minutes of direct action, the gross insult of the haka party was stopped where years of negotiation had failed (ibid., p. 222).

The use of physical violence was controversial, and led to members of the raiding party being charged with rioting. This led to an extraordinary session in court:

> During the court hearing, which began on 6 July, Māori elders, the presidents of the Māori Council, Māori Women's Welfare League and the Auckland District Māori Council were present. The parents of the defendants and Māori university students were also in attendance, and a contingent of students from Waikato University travelled to Auckland to attend the trial. This show of Māori solidarity effectively

> transformed the court by giving it a social context that exemplified the clash between two cultures. Although the dominating mana in the court was that of the judge, the countervailing mana of the Māori people was equally as palpable. When the first witness, a tall, confident male engineering student walked in, the enormity of what he had done hit him when he turned to face the court and was confronted by a sea of serious brown faces (p. 223 – 224).

The trial was used by the raiding party as a means of publicising their cause:

> In response to the charges, the leaders of the group, Hone Harawira and Ben Dalton, conducted their own defence for the express purpose of claiming cultural insult as the cause of their actions against the engineers. The claim was made not in the hope of having it accepted as a defence, or even mitigating factor, because they had been advised it was inadmissible, but to promulgate the political nature of their act. The court was stunned when Dalton challenged a policeman face to face in the witness box whether he saw Dalton's nose bleeding after he had been assaulted in the police station by a policeman. The witness, who up to that point was able to recall events with considerable detail, responded to each question put to him by Dalton with a standard 'I don't recall' reply. The general impression given to the people in court was that this prevaricating reply was an evasion of the truth. It was an awkward moment for the court for the policeman to be accused of wrong-doing, and for the judge, who by the conventions of the judicial system was bound to accept the word of a policeman ahead of that of an accused person (p. 224).

The judge eventually sentenced the defendants to periodic detention instead of to imprisonment. Walker notes that the entire haka party incident 'effectively exposed the raw nerve of racism in New Zealand society, which for so long had been concealed by the ideology of Māori and Pākehā as one people living in harmony (p. 224 – 225). This, then, was another example of transformative praxis, one in which demeaning attitudes held by certain Pākehā were not addressed directly by Pākehā, necessitating Māori intervention. It is noteworthy that when the state apparatus of the courts and police system were summoned to intervene, they did so on the side of the Pākehā, prosecuting their Māori assailants. However, whereas it can be envisaged that once this would have resulted in severe punishment for the Māori, the judge chose lighter sentences; this can be understood as being the result of the transformative praxis on the part of the Māori who packed the courtroom and who, in so doing, laid bare the politics of racism and colonialism.

Partisanship and Principles

When it comes to the Treaty of Waitangi, it is apparent that Māori and Pākehā have acted with a certain degree of self-interest, and continue to do so, despite the overt claims of biculturalism that are often part of the public narrative. This self-interest takes different forms. Speaking in broad terms, the Māori interest in the Treaty relates to demanding the rights they are entitled to under the Treaty, and to receiving compensation for the

infringement of those rights by colonists and the Government. Pākehā and the Crown are in the position of making restitution, and the self-interest of Pākehā can come in the form of either ensuring that restitution is as small as possible, or alternatively, in the satisfaction or absolution that comes from 'doing the right thing' in achieving justice for Māori. It is tempting to assume that partisanship is less desirable than a selfless partnership, which implies an idealistic spirit of working together. However, the desire to work together is balanced by the desire amongst Māori to resist assimilation, and to retain a separate identity: a degree of factionalism must be therefore understood as being an enduring aspect of the politics of biculturalism.

I will not seek to go into great detail in regards to the way in which Māori have acted to preserve their interests, as this entire chapter has in fact considered ways in which Māori have done so. However, it is interesting to consider the reception of recent innovations in the discourse relating to the Treaty of Waitangi, these being the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal and the associated development of Treaty 'principles' that stand alongside the Treaty. These innovations date back to the passage of the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 by the New Zealand Parliament, which established the Waitangi Tribunal to hear claims resulting from actions 'inconsistent with the principles of the Treaty'. Exactly what these principles were remained a moot point until 1987, when as a result of a legal case, *New Zealand Maori Council v Attorney-General*, explicit principles began to be developed. More principles have since been developed or reinterpreted (Hayward, 2012). Wells and Dale (2005) give substantial lists of principles, which they summarise: they argue that those arrived at by the Waitangi Tribunal can be understood in summary as stressing 'partnership, good faith, active protection, the need for compromise and the duty to consult', while those from the Courts discuss 'Treaty partnership, the Crown's fiduciary duty and of the need to adhere to the principles of the Treaty, rather than any literal reading of the text.' Although the establishment and work of the Tribunal has generally been viewed positively, the Treaty principles have drawn criticism from Māori who have said, for example, that they are 'an attempt by Pākehā to negotiate around the relationship between Māori and Pākehā' as defined in the Treaty (Johnston, 1992, p. 13). Johnston further notes that whereas the Waitangi Tribunal arrived at ten principles, the Crown identified five, arguing that 'these types of discrepancies clearly show that when it comes to making decisions, Māori interpretations are subjected to reinterpretation by Pākehā' (p. 13). Johnston's comments also remind us of the importance of thinking critically about the hegemonic power of Pākehā: for all that the Treaty principles are now accepted as a useful way of understanding the Treaty, that understanding is not necessarily that of Māori.

At times, Pākehā have acted in obviously partisan ways, the popular reception to Don Brash's Orewa speech in 2004 (see pages 15 and 16 of this present document) being only one example. For example, the process of arriving at settlements resulting from breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi has been contested by Pākehā. One argument made against this process rests on grounds of pragmatism: that is, although the process of arriving at settlements might be right and even just, it is not necessarily practical. Douglas Graham in *Trick or Treaty* wrote in 1997 that there was concern that the Treaty settlements would be

simply unaffordable, or impractical for other reasons. For example, there was resistance from environmental groups to the idea of returning conservation estates to Māori, as they feared that the land could be turned to other purposes. There were also problems stemming from the actions of previous governments which had assumed the right to, for example, use rivers and geothermal steam to generate electricity:

> If a river passed through land returned to Māori, and on that river was a hydro power station, would the Māori be able to claim that the station was using *their* water to generate power? And if so, would Māori be able to claim a royalty each time the turbine went round? (Graham, 1997, p. 62)

As the phenomenon of Don Brash's speech shows, there can be controversy when Pākehā determine that Māori have received unfair advantage and favourable treatment, especially when this results in disadvantage or unfairness for Pākehā. As Erich Kolig notes, when English artist Tania Kovats' sculpture 'Virgin in a Condom' was shown at the national museum, Te Papa, there was outrage on the part of Catholic and some other Christian New Zealanders who argued that the artwork constituted intolerable disrespect of one of their most important religious concepts – the Virgin Mary – and that similar disrespect of Māori cultural artefacts would not be tolerated, as indeed a controversial work by Pākehā artist Dick Frizzell was cancelled in response to protests from Tainui (Kolig, 2000, p. 235).[16]

Sometimes, Māori are simply shouted down, sometimes with racist statements, as happened very recently when a 'Māori' Santa, called Hana Koko, took part in the Nelson Christmas Parade: as reported in *The Guardian*, one observer said that 'Santa is not, has never been and will never be a bloody Māori!' (Roy, 2018). While I have argued that there is an enduring place for factionalism of a certain type in biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand, I do not make similar arguments for the place of racism of this nature.

Conclusion

I began this chapter by raising the idea that the bicultural partnership arising from the Treaty of Waitangi might be better characterised as a bicultural partisanship. This partisanship is manifested in the factionalism that may be observed by, for example, those who worked for self-advantage, as in those Pākehā who worked to obtain the rights to as much land as possible, and those who worked for self-preservation, as in the case of Māori who sought to resist the increasing Pākehā hegemony in Aotearoa New Zealand. I also asked what benefits there may be to Māori in insisting on the Treaty in the present day, even if it is in practice so little relevant to the current circumstances of life and government in New Zealand that the Treaty of Waitangi principles have had to be developed in order to approach it. It would seem that the Treaty has become more than a simple agreement about the governance of forests and fisheries, of lands and rivers, of sovereignty and governorship,

[16] Tainui is an iwi (tribe) based in the Waikato region.

and perhaps, of foreshores; rather, viewed in light of a history of breaches of the agreement and of bad-faith actions on the part of Pākehā, the Treaty has become a rallying banner for Māori interested in preserving the rights agreed to by their ancestors, for those interested in holding the Crown to account, and for those wishing to see a return to negotiations and actions made in good faith. Seen in this light, the Treaty can in fact be understood as a way forward – a way to bridge the gap between partisan interests.

Nevertheless, the way in which the Treaty of Waitangi has been utilised by Pākehā in the service of establishing and maintaining Pākehā dominance in New Zealand society is of key importance to the critical study of education in this country. An idea of central importance here is that of Bonilla-Silva's 'racism without racists': that is, that although people may not set out to be intentionally racist, they perpetuate structural racism in the society in which they operate. So too may one have a partisanship without partisans, or a colonialism without colonists: that is, a New Zealand in which New Zealanders may not intend to promote the interest of one group over another, of Pākehā over Māori, but they may nevertheless do so. At times, this might be cast in a positive light, as in the idea popular in Ngata's time of 'smoothing the pillow of a dying race', or as Bonilla-Silva points out, in the light of liberal theories which suggest that Māori ought to be able to compete with Pākehā, and that their failure to do so is in fact not the fault of Pākehā – which of course is to ignore the Pākehā contributions to the marginalisation of Māori over the course of the history of Aotearoa New Zealand. This variety of partisanship, of modern colonialism, can be insidious: as Johnston has pointed out, even seemingly benign innovations such as the Treaty of Waitangi principles have the potential to marginalise Māori interests.

The study of the Treaty has broad implications across Aotearoa New Zealand, and these are not limited to the study of music education. Educators who desire to work with the goals of bicultural partnership rather than partisanship must therefore be able to critically reflect on their work and on the context in which they operate so as to consider the way in which they in their teaching practice work towards or against the maintenance of colonial structures of power in Aotearoa New Zealand. The study of biculturalism is the study of the politics of colonialism, anti-colonialism, racism, anti-racism, domination, protest, and resistance. It is the study of these themes in music and practices of music-making, and the way in which they are present in and outside of the classroom, that I argue constitutes bicultural music education. In the following chapters, I work towards a critical understanding of biculturalism, in and outside of music education, that seeks to deconstruct the partisanship and biases inherent in present-day attitudes towards biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Chapter Two: Examples of Biculturalisms

> Arahina, e Ihowa,
> to pononga i te ao:
> whakakitea mai tou kaha
> puritia ra au e koe.
> A whangainga
> ki te kai e ora ai.

Being an organist in a church is always something of a negotiation, and I was reminded of this fact when playing for a service in 2018 in which the Anglican clergy of the north of New Zealand assembled in Whangarei to renew their vows. The final hymn was 'Arahina, e Ihowa', the first verse of which is given in the epigraph above; the words are a translation into Māori of the hymn 'Guide Me, O Thou Great Redeemer.' When it came time to play the hymn, I placed the booklet with the Māori words alongside the English setting, and began the introduction. I played at the sort of pace we would normally sing the English words to in that church: not too slowly, so as to avoid dragging, and out of consideration for what is a predominantly elderly congregation that does not like to hold notes for too long. This congregation was not the usual one, however, and included many Māori clergy from all over Northland. As we proceeded with the hymn, I was quickly reminded that there is a characteristic means of singing hymns associated with Māori: sung powerfully, with the melody line often placed in the middle of the texture and harmony parts sung above it, and – importantly – sung quite slowly. This particular congregation responded to my tempo with one much slower, and I found myself slowing down as a result, verse after verse. The priest in charge, who was not a musician, was pleased with what he understood as a rousing conclusion to the service, and indeed, the singing was excellent. I was less happy with myself, as I would have preferred to set the proper tempo for the occasion at the outset – as indeed I did when I played the same hymn at the same priest's induction service when he moved to Whangamata. Such is biculturalism in music – albeit only one, rather niche, example of it.

Earlier, when quoting Homi Bhabha's critique of hybridity as promoting a 'homogenising pluralism' I noted my own scepticism of the means and ends of biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate other ways of understanding biculturalism: ways of understanding that are independent of government policy, of schools, even of music, and to show that such biculturalisms – for they are so distinct that they can be characterised as such – may present the critic with quite different understandings of Māori and Pākehā relationships. In other words, this chapter explores *unhomogenised* biculturalisms, and indeed, I argue that any attempt to homogenise biculturalism is ultimately futile. Although I give some consideration to the 'institutionalised' or 'official' biculturalism that developed in the 1980s and 1990s, my aim here is to go some way towards demonstrating that the study of biculturalism is in fact the

study of humanity in Aotearoa New Zealand, in all its imperfection: it is the study of politics, on a micro and on a macro level, inasmuch as it involves the study of who holds power; it is the study of knowledge, inasmuch as it involves the study of how the peoples of one culture understand the peoples and products of the other. Further, it is the study of discrete understandings – the biculturalism of, say, Āpirana Ngata is not the biculturalism of a modern government representative such as Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern. I do not seek to reconcile these different conceptions of biculturalism, but rather observe their discontinuous nature, and consider that the very differences apparent in these biculturalisms in fact speaks to the different constructions of identity created by those who are the subject of consideration here. It is in the study – indeed, the celebration – of such difference that the study of biculturalism avoids becoming the study of a homogenised plurality.

I have chosen four examples to consider, each which contributes something different to the understanding of biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand. Firstly, the example of Āpirana Ngata allows the consideration of biculturalism as advocated from a relatively early Māori perspective. The example of Alfred Hill, New Zealand's first great composer, gives the opportunity to consider Pākehā mimicry of Māori music. The example of the church in Aotearoa New Zealand (the church being perhaps the single oldest colonial presence in this country, predating the establishment of Her Majesty's Government in New Zealand by a margin of some decades) shows how European-dominated institutions can evolve in their views towards colonialism, and presents an opportunity for one to consider why these views might change. Finally, I consider the example of the 'bicultural turn', the recent shift in academic and government policy that was particularly notable in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Although these four examples do not purport to represent the full spectrum of possible ways of being bicultural in Aotearoa New Zealand – such an endeavour could be a life's work – the critical consideration and analysis of the examples given below offer opportunities to become conscious of ways in which colonial and hegemonic power structures in Aotearoa New Zealand have been enforced, challenged, and transformed.

Āpirana Ngata

Āpirana Ngata (1874 – 1950) was a great Māori politician and advocate who did much for the Māori people at a time when their political fortunes had fallen. His advocacy for his people included advocacy for their music and art, as demonstrated by *Ngā Mōteatea,* a collection of waiata texts that he published from 1920 onwards (see for example Ngata, 2004). I will begin my consideration of Ngata's work with a consideration of this collection, for Ngata himself saw that Māori culture was in danger of being lost in the face of Pākehā hegemony, and describes this danger in terms that are relevant to the present study. In a preface written in 1949 to *Ngā Mōteatea*, he argues that the West has come to dominate in Māori musical knowledge and practice:

> More and more the economic circumstances of the day demand mastery of Pākehā knowledge; more reading of books, more dependence on the eye, less on the ear to transmit information to the mind. And so the ear of the Māori has become less and less receptive to the notes of his native music, less discerning of its scale of quarter tones and more inclined, if that were possible, to be satisfied with the songs and the music, which the races of the world, except his own, serve out to him *ad nauseum* (p. xxxvi).

Ngata writes that the publication of his collection of Māori songs is intended to elevate the Māori musical tradition to the same level as 'the art, the crafts, the music and the literature of the Pākehā', and concludes with the statement that 'it is possible to be bicultural, just as bilingualism is a feature of the Māori life today' (p. xxxvii).

Interestingly, and in contradistinction to the intended audience of the present study, Ngata's words are not primarily directed at a Pākehā audience: instead, he makes it clear that his collection is intended for 'the bilingual and bicultural Māori…' (p. xxxvii). There is also perhaps an irony in Ngata associating reading with Pākehā knowledge, given that the complete *Ngā Mōteatea* are a multi-volume set on one's bookshelf, but there is an enduring truth here: in comparison to Māori musicians and Māori music, Pākehā musicians are more likely to read music, and it is Pākehā music that is more likely to be represented in notation, a fact that has an enduring legacy in New Zealand music classrooms. Ngata's collection ensures that his collected waiata have an enduring physical presence that is the equal of collections of other musics.

Ngata was one of the most important Māori figures of the early twentieth century. Ranginui Walker writes that, being born in 1874, he was born at a critical period:

> In those years Māori New Zealand was transformed irrevocably by the forces of Christianity, capitalism and British imperialism. The integrity of Māori culture was undermined by conversion to Christianity. Introduced pathogens and necrotic inter-tribal musket wars triggered a 40 percent collapse of population. Māori were outnumbered by Pākehā in their own land. In this debilitated state, their energies were sapped further by a protracted war of resistance to British imperialism over twelve years. More devastating than war was political marginalisation of Māori people, and alienation of their land by aggressive crown purchasing, confiscating, and the legal artifice of the Native Land Court, of all but five million of the sixty-six million acres of land Māori once owned *in toto*. Humanitarians were moved enough by the plight of the Māori to ease their passing by 'smoothing the pillow of the dying race' (2001, p. 11).

Ngata did much to try and reverse this marginalisation, alienation and debilitation of Māori, and the way in which he made use of Pākehā knowledge to greater or lesser extents presents an interesting study. Consider the activities of the Te Aute College Students Association, of which Ngata 'was the driving force' (Walker, 2001, p. 74). The Association aimed to reform Māori society as it existed then through the adoption of certain Pākehā customs and technologies. Thus a 'model pā' was envisaged, with European-style weatherboard houses,

fenced stock, and proper drainage and sanitation arrangements; tohungaism (tohunga being priests in the old Māori tradition) was to be suppressed in favour of Christianity; and restrictions were to be placed on the consumption of alcohol (ibid., pp. 82 – 83). Walker notes that the assimilationist agenda of the Association generated tensions, but that Ngata generally argued for the retention of Māori customs such as haka (ibid., p. 88). Thus, Ngata was an advocate for the adoption of aspects of Pākehā culture inasmuch as he saw them as providing a benefit to Māori in terms of housing, healthcare, and religion. Considering the 'debilitated state' of Māori, to use Walker's words, this assimilationist agenda must be understood as a response to the circumstances facing the Māori people, but it stands in contrast to the anti-assimilationist stance held by many Māori scholars and activists today.

Consider also the case of education, which was another assimilating force. The 1867 Native Schools Act required that tuition be provided in English where practicable (Simon & Smith, 2001, p. 161), a policy which, although variably expressed and enforced over the years, led to traumatic experiences for pupils who were physically disciplined for speaking Māori in the school grounds. By the early twentieth century, the use of Māori was frowned upon by officialdom even as a means of transitioning young Māori children in to the schools (ibid., p. 165), and it would appear that it was not uncommon for students to be punished for speaking te reo Māori even if they had little command of English (ibid., p. 142). Again, the stance of Māori in this period contrasts with that of today: there is evidence that some local Māori communities and whānau members supported the learning of English and even encouraged its exclusive use in school at times (ibid., pp. 146 – 147); and indeed, Āpirana Ngata was initially opposed to the teaching of Māori language in schools, changing his position by 1939 (ibid., p. 168). In understanding this attitude towards instruction in te reo Māori on the part of Māori, it must be remembered that when compared to the present day, the Māori language was spoken by a relatively high number of people, so that even as late as 1949, Ngata was able to speak of bilingualism among Māori as being normal. There were also clear benefits to Māori in being able to speak English, including the increased access to technology and economic opportunities in the form of trade and jobs that the language afforded, and this explains the eagerness of Māori of the time – who no doubt did not foresee the present marginalised state of te reo Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand – to have their children taught in English.

Another aspect of Ngata's attitude to biculturalism can be seen in James Ritchie's account of a haka practice in his book, *Becoming Bicultural:*

> [He] swung around and saw me sitting watchfully aside. He directed me to get in line with the rest. 'Don't think,' he shot at the troupe, 'that just because you are Māori you have some natural gift of getting these things right! I would take this young Pākehā lad here and make him better than you in two weeks.' I shrank in embarrassment, cringed into the line, and ever after worked very hard to try to reach the standards Api set (Ritchie, 1992, pp. 18 - 19).

The attitude towards biculturalism he displays is one of inclusiveness towards Pākehā – that is, inviting (or instructing) Ritchie to join in the practice, and furthermore, asserting to the gathered Māori participants that Ritchie could reach higher standards than them with work.

Of course, this assertion was intended to spur the group on to reach a higher standard of performance, but it speaks to the degree of openness of Ngata towards non-Māori in terms of allowing access to Māori music.

Viewed at a historical distance, Ngata's particularly advocacy for the Māori cause may seem peculiar. His at times assimilationist agenda contrasts with modern views, according to which assimilation is an idea that has fallen out of fashion. However, one cannot argue that his agenda was one that sought Māori integration into the Pākehā culture; rather, in responding to the needs he perceived in Māori society, he can be understood as advocating assimilation to the extent that he understood it as providing a benefit to his people. Perhaps this might be termed a Māori-centric assimilation. Ngata's biculturalism in general society, then, was primarily a way for Māori to gain advantage through access to Pākehā culture. Ngata's biculturalism in music and music education was one driven by an agenda of equity for Māori, such that he worked to place Māori music on an equal footing with works of Pākehā music and literature through the publication of the collected volumes of *Ngā Mōteatea.* As Ritchie's story of Ngata shows, this was not a jealous equity, but an inclusive one that saw a place for Pākehā in the making of Māori music.

The Church in New Zealand and Paulo Freire

The role of the Church – particularly the Anglican and Catholic denominations, but also others – in colonising New Zealand is well-known, but less well-known is the role of the church in developing the modern conception of biculturalism.[17] It is possible that the modern church's activism in this area was simply part of the global 'ethnic revival', but it seems likely that the work of figures such as Martin Luther King, Jr., who was a preacher and whose famous work in the civil rights work was regarded as part of his ministry (see, for example, T. F. Jackson, 2007, p. 2) was particularly influential; in this light, the church's concern with issues of biculturalism in New Zealand can be understood as a response to the civil rights movement and an attempt to address the issues such as racism and injustice as they were to be found in Aotearoa New Zealand, which became particularly obvious after the Springbok Tour.

Of course, the position of the church in New Zealand in this work is somewhat different to that which was held by Martin Luther King, Jr., in that whereas King was a member of the class he worked to liberate, the church in New Zealand has been a largely Pākehā-dominated institution throughout its history, with only recent changes being made to be more inclusive of Māori and other ethnicities. Indeed, in the early days of Pākehā settlement, the church was a source of authority that was lacking elsewhere, and in many cases, the values promoted by the church promoted the values that were to be adopted by

[17] For clarity, though I recognise the different denominations of Christianity that are practiced in New Zealand, I use the word 'church' in the singular as a means of referring to the combined New Zealand Christian churches.

the new colonial government. Such scepticism of churchly biculturalism notwithstanding, I will argue here that the combined churches of New Zealand became a vital part of the conversation about modern biculturalism in New Zealand. The importance of their contribution to this conversation is demonstrated by the fact that it was at a conference organised by the combined churches of New Zealand that Paulo Freire, that beacon of transformational praxis, became involved in our national conversation.

The term 'civilising mission' has been used to describe the work of missionaries, in New Zealand and elsewhere. This civilising mission was of considerable interest in the British Empire, as Alison Twells writes: in nineteenth-century England, 'sermons and speeches by returned missionaries, often accompanied by testimonies from native converts, drew sizeable crowds, while the spectacular and vast meetings at Exeter Hall from 1842 captured the jubilant mood of the missionary public'. Further, '…the civilising mission was popularised beyond the church and the chapel. In these years, missionary contributions to natural science, ethnography and theorising about the relationship between commerce and civilisation were embraced by a wider audience, as representations of English men and women as agents of global civilisation became matters of local civic pride and national virtue' (2009, p. 178).[18] The early stages of the civilising mission were carried out in New Zealand by missionaries such as Samuel Marsden.

As demonstrated by the song *Te Harinui*, discussed in the previous chapter, Marsden's arrival at the Bay of Islands in 1814 has become a crucial part of the national narrative of colonisation. In another account, Marsden was held to be positively heroic: he arrived in time to throw himself 'between two tribes just about to fight, and persuaded them to make peace', astonished them with the horse, the bull, and the cows he had brought with him, and on Christmas day held a service in which he sang the Old Hundredth Psalm and preached from Luke's gospel. All told, this was 'one of the really great scenes in the history of the British Empire' (Stock, 1935, pp. 1 - 15). Kuni Jenkins, on the other hand, is sceptical of such a narrative, finding it inconceivable that Marsden would not have been welcomed by a pōwhiri, a formal ceremony of welcome by Māori. Even though Marsden's own record of his visit in 1814 offer no such account of such, she notes that the passenger list of Marsden's ship included three rangatira, Māori dignitaries, who would have indicated to the local Māori population that Marsden and the missionaries were 'people of rank, people to be listened to, people who should be befriended,' and further, that they 'would have spoken in reply for the manuhiri [Marsden et al.] during their pōwhiri (Jenkins, 2000, pp. 96 – 97). In this way, the Māori who received Marsden can be understood as actively welcoming the missionary, a narrative which contrasts with the popular view of their being simply a dumbly admiring audience.

---

[18] In New Zealand, the term 'civilising mission' has come to carry a particular weight, with an emphasis on the 'civilising' aspect of the mission, and in particular, the implications of the colonial practice involved. In this regard it has of late been carried into educational scholarship by Linda Tuhiwai Smith and Judith Simon (Simon & Smith, 2001) in their study of the New Zealand native schools system, which set out to instruct Māori in the ways of British culture.

For Marsden, the work of conversion went hand-in-hand with the work of introducing British civilisation to Māori. Indeed, the two concepts were nearly inseparable to him:

> As an evangelical missionary, Marsden was motivated by the desire to see Māori redeemed by the grace of God, through faith in Christ. There can be no question that that the spiritual salvation of Māori was his paramount aim.
>
> But aspects of what Marsden said and did raise questions about how he saw the relationship of Christian conversion to the benefits of western civilization. For one thing, Marsden often referred to Christian truth and western civilization in almost the same breath. For instance, in 1808 he wrote to the Church Missionary Society (CMS) expressing the longing that Māori might "enjoy the Sweets of Civilization and the more inestimable Blessings of divine Revelation". While Marsden privileged the blessings brought by divine revelation, he clearly saw them as closely linked with the blessings of "civilization". On the morning of Christmas Day 1814, he saw Ruatara's hoisted British flag as a signal of "the dawn of civilization, liberty and religion"; later that day, after the church service, he wrote that "In this manner the Gospel has been introduced into New Zealand… " The next month, he reflected on the promising prospects of "civilizing this part of the globe" (Lange, 2014, p. 8).

The spiritual nature of civilisation was carried over even to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. Claudia Orange writes that at least some missionaries explained the Treaty to Māori in spiritual terms:

> Missionaries, at least at Waitangi, had also presented the Treaty as a covenant between Māori and the Queen, as head of the English church and state. So, many Māori would look on the Treaty as a bond similar to the covenants of the Bible. This was very important to them for, by 1840, nearly half the Māori population was following Christian beliefs and ways (Orange, 2013, p. 41).

In nineteenth-century New Zealand, colonisation, as the act of establishing the foundations of English culture in New Zealand, was a moral and spiritual imperative. In that respect, the early church in New Zealand was a highly successful colonising agent, that played an important role in ensuring the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi.

In the latter part of the twentieth century, the church in New Zealand had conversations of quite a different nature about the relationship of Māori and Pākehā in New Zealand, such that it must be recognised as an important voice in the movement of government policy (and public sentiment) from an assimilationist agenda to one that embraced biculturalism, even if only on its own terms. Some within the church recognised the role of the church in perpetrating the injustices of colonialism, and sought to rectify this through advocacy of a more enlightened Pākehā approach to the Treaty. In particular, the National Council of Churches called for 'a clear emphasis on repentance and hope in our approach to the whole matter'. Crucially for the purposes of the present research, this message was aimed at Pākehā: 'We can take responsibility for our collective colonial

inheritance as a group and move on to more constructive responses in a collective Pākehā commitment to work for a better future' (Church and Society Commission of the National Council of Churches in New Zealand, 1986, p. 5).

Indeed, the Pākehā turn towards biculturalism was presented as a spiritual act in and of itself. The Catholic Archbishop of Wellington, Cardinal T. S. Williams, quoted scripture (Acts 1:8) in endorsing biculturalism, urged Catholics to ensure that their personal and spiritual lives were not 'compartmentalised', and called for a 'Gospel-based relationship between Māori and non-Māori' (Smithies, 1990, p. 5).[19] Accordingly, biculturalism was incorporated into church teachings. The Anglican Church, for example, taught that there were certain principles implied by the Treaty:

> One principle is the principle of bicultural development, which is defined as the process whereby two cultures grow and develop within one nation in a spirit of mutual respect and responsibility. The other principle is the principle of partnership which is defined as involving co-operation and interdependence between distinct cultural or ethnic groups within one nation. The Anglican Church has accepted these principles as Christian principles and is in the process of making changes in its structures and practices (Towle, 1986, p. 17).

The reader will note the similarity between these Anglican principles of biculturalism and partnership and the policies of biculturalism and treaty partnership adopted by the government in recent decades; I argue that the adoption of such principles is a key as part of the 'bicultural turn', which will be considered further in this chapter.

Various writers have written of biculturalism and the church, noting actions ranging from the impotent fretting of ministers disappointed in the colonial government's attitude towards the Treaty of Waitangi, to the appointment of Māori priests and bishops, to the constitutional rearrangements of entire churches (such as the Anglican Church) so as to give Māori status within the church. Such works include *Pakeha and the Treaty: Signposts* (Church and Society Commission of the National Council of Churches in New Zealand, 1986), an edited collection of essays and personal reflections of varying degrees of formality and which includes a brief history by Allan Davidson (pp. 31 – 37), and *Wai Karekare / Turbulent Waters: The Anglican Bicultural Journey 1814 – 2014* (Bluck, 2012).

Perhaps the most significant contribution by the churches of New Zealand to the present study is the 1974 seminar held in Auckland and attended by Paulo Freire, who was already by then known for his theories of educational praxis: 'Paulo came, as a member of the staff of the World Council of Churches in Geneva, at the invitation of the Church and Society Commission of the National Council of Churches, assisted by the New Zealand Government's Department of Education' (Armstrong, 1999, p. 23). According to Armstrong,

---

[19] Acts 1:8, as given by the Cardinal, reads:

> But when the Holy Spirit comes upon you
> you will be filled with power
> and you will be witnesses for me…

in the 1970s the Church was addressing social issues with a vigour that drew the bemused appreciation of university academics, but it was not only academics at the Auckland Seminar, as it was known: no fewer than 188 participants from 40 organisations, from 'Ngā Tamatoa to the Employers' Federation', were to attend. Armstrong writes of the seminar that:

> Freire had marvelled at how his books, especially when banned in oppressive situations, had found their way via unauthorised translations and illegal street sales into all sorts of visionary and liberation movement hands. It was clear that his name and work was known and respected in activist Māori and Samoan circles also. They were expecting to be able to press and explore their concerns with such a teacher at the helm. But the mixed nature of the audience and the fact that we Pākehā were entirely new to face-to-face bi-cultural and cross-cultural exchanges frustrated these expectations (p. 27).

In other words, the Pākehā participants were displaying symptoms of white fragility – brittle attitudes in response to the challenge to white supremacy. However, it seems Freire was not interested in dealing with Pākehā fragility; Armstrong recounts that Freire voiced 'deep concern about the racism he detected in New Zealand', and that he was 'sick and tired of being lionised by a white Western liberal academia only too eager to receive and operationalise his pedagogy as a prime item in its well stocked academic repertoire' (pp. 28 – 29). Indeed, according to the account of Hone Kaa, Freire said:

> It's obvious that you have come here expecting me to teach you something. Well, I'm not going to. I'm interested more in hearing what you're doing. I operate on the understanding that you have knowledge. If you came here thinking that I was going to share knowledge with you, you've got the wrong idea about who Paulo Freire is. And what's more, I look around this room and I have to say to myself that you are all the wrong people that I want to talk to! None of you represent the dispossessed, none of you represent the poor of this country. You are your own problem (1998 interview, cited in Jenkins & Martin, 1999, p. 48).

From Armstrong's account, the 1974 was a frustrating one for all participants. Whereas Armstrong speaks with some delicacy of the situation, Kaa puts matters more baldly; he explains that 'Pākehā participants tried to dominate the discussion and monopolise Freire's attention' (p. 48). This no doubt accounts for the testiness of Freire's address.

A reading of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* allows one to begin to understand Freire's response to what he encountered in New Zealand in 1974. In the third chapter, he depicts an educational method whereby learners investigate their society, and are guided by their teacher so that they ask penetrating questions, explain their relevance, and arrive at a greater understanding. This is placed in opposition to the 'banking concept' according to which a teacher explains his understanding to the students. One suspects that Freire was interested in hearing what the marginalised and oppressed of New Zealand had to say about their experiences, and was frustrated at the lack of self-awareness demonstrated by Pākehā who attempted to control the discussion. This also explains his refusal to act as a teacher in the

conventional sense and to simply explain to the gathered participants what they needed to do; this would contradict his philosophy, his praxis in action.

The church is a complex institution and understanding biculturalism in relation to the church is an equally complex affair, for any such understanding must acknowledge both the colonising role that it played in the nineteenth century and the decolonising stance that it adopted in the twentieth. It is easy, perhaps, to criticise the colonising, imperialist, and assimilationist agenda of the early missionaries, and to consider that perhaps the modern stance of the church is 'too little, too late', an inadequate response that has to date done little to work against the now-established colonial relations of power in Aotearoa New Zealand. This inadequacy is summed up in Kaa's story of Freire's response to the white liberal cognoscenti that attended his 1974 seminar: 'none of you represent the dispossessed, none of you represent the poor of this country'. The desire by the powerful to reform the power structures that benefit them was of little interest to Freire, for as he explains in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, it is only the oppressed that can effectively work against hegemony, and the 'attempt to "soften" the power of the oppressor in deference to the weakness of the oppressed almost always manifests itself in the form of false generosity' (P. Freire, 1996, p. 26). This might suggest that in matters of biculturalism, the church – as a predominantly Pākehā institution – is in the position of the rich man who in the biblical story is told that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of needle than for him to enter the Kingdom of Heaven.

On the other hand, the actions of the church can be understood as engaging in the sort of self-reflection and criticism that I argue that Pākehā in Aotearoa New Zealand must engage in, and the efforts by New Zealand churches to ordain Māori ministers and bishops can be regarded as genuine attempts to share power. The actions of the church also must be understood in relation to the greater discourses of colonialism and anti-colonialism; even though it was a significant participant in both of these movements, it was not the primary driver of either. The study of the biculturalisms of the church, then, are in fact a study of the biculturalisms of various aspects of New Zealand society, and provides as much scope for reflection on one's own place in the politics of biculturalism as it does reflection on the place of the church.

Alfred Hill: Music in Maoriland

In 'Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse' (1984), Homi Bhabha describes the way in which colonised peoples take on some of the characteristics of their colonisers, but retain their difference, so that they do not become unified as one. Thus, they may be interested in the Bible, for example, so that they can sell it or use it as waste paper, as a missionary in Bengal wrote in 1817 (ibid., p. 133). But Bhabha also describes mimicry in terms of the difference perceived by the colonisers: thus he describes it as 'the difference between being English and being Anglicized' (ibid., 130), or more starkly, 'not quite/not white' (ibid., p. 132), and describes the judgements of British colonisers of the people they

govern. The process of mimicry can also occur in reverse, when colonisers mimic the colonised (Brantlinger, 2011; Musselman, 2003). It is worth considering how the processes of mimicry and associated ways in which difference is perceived can be understood in relation to music in Aotearoa New Zealand. I proceed through the study of the music of Alfred Hill (1869 – 1960), New Zealand's first great composer and a Pākehā. The study of Hill's music involves the study of reverse mimicry, as he purported to write 'Māori' music; the study of his music is also the study of the perception of difference, in that it involves the analysis of the way in which difference is judged and portrayed by colonisers. I argue that in mimicking Māori, Hill was engaged in a colonial project in which the terms of the difference between colonists and Māori was made clear, so that Māori were (and, I would argue, remain) understood as being something different and something exotic in relation to European norms of music and society.

The term *Maoriland* came about in the *fin de siècle* period as a way of referring to New Zealand at a time when European colonists sought to retain their identity as members of the British empire and yet needed to find a way to differentiate their experiences from that of other colonies in the Empire. They did so in New Zealand with reference to Māori culture, and in appropriating this culture created a new identity for themselves. In New Zealand, Alfred Hill became known for his 'Māori' music, and Melissa Cross has elsewhere written in depth about Hill's music in the Maoriland context (Cross, 2015a, 2015b). Here, I consider the implications of this musical Maoriland for the study of biculturalism in music education: in particular, how has Hill represented Māori difference musically, and what are the implications of Maoriland New Zealand for present-day music teachers?

The phenomenon of Maoriland is an extreme expression of colonialist cultural appropriation, involving the use of representations of Māori culture in the construction of white settler identity. Stafford and Williams describe Maoriland as follows (2008):

> … the central feature of Maoriland was the use of Māori sources to provide the descendants of the settlers with a history peculiar to themselves. While drawing on the conventions of romanticism, this material is also filtered through colonial ethnology to give it an air of authenticity and of ownership. Maoriland writing is able to be both fantastic and encyclopedic, to simultaneously invent and record (p. 11).

The construction of a romanticised 'history' is in some ways reminiscent of Herbert Gans' concept of symbolic ethnicity, which is

> …characterized by a nostalgic allegiance to the culture of the immigrant generation, or that of the old country; a love for and a pride in a tradition that can be felt without having to be incorporated in everyday behaviour… People may even sincerely desire to 'return' to these imagined pasts, which are conveniently cleansed of the complexities that accompanied them in the real past, but while they may soon realize that they cannot go back, they may not surrender the wish (Gans, 1979, p. 9).

In the case of Maoriland, of course, the settler population of New Zealand created a nostalgia for an imagined New Zealand, one conveniently free of actual Māori people,

though retaining enough 'Māori-ness' to give distinctive cultural flavour. As Walker has written, Māori in this period were at a low point, and it would seem that this ebb in Māori fortunes enabled such settler conceptions of Māori to take hold in the popular imagination.

From the viewpoint of today, it is perhaps difficult to imagine Alfred Hill's contribution to Maoriland New Zealand culture, as he and his music are little known in New Zealand today – a state of affairs some would say is deliberate (Maconie, 2006). The much more famous figure of Douglas Lilburn looms over the memory of Hill; consider, for example, the foreword by Lilburn of John Mansfield Thomson's biography of Hill (1980):

> …It is sad for me that he took his training from the mandarins at Leipzig as the final revelation of musical wisdom, whether there or in quite new circumstances 12,000 miles away. His musical language hardly developed along with new and extraordinary developments in his allied antipodean fields of arts. Perhaps he lacked a self-questioning gift, or lacked percipient friends and critics? … Patently, he was in no sense the musical ancestor that once I'd been seeking. Nor was he really a nationalistic composer in the older meaning of the term – his interest in Māori music seems to have been transient, not deeply rooted in the psyche nor basically fruitful in his output. He used these sources just as he later used Australian aboriginal musical sources, as grist to his mill.

These criticisms are extraordinary in the context of a biography, but can be understood as an argument for Lilburn's own place as the true founder of the New Zealand art music tradition. However, Hill was successful in the short period in which he was active in New Zealand, and in fact in his heyday may be considered to have achieved relatively more popularity and fame than Lilburn: consider, for example, the song *Waiata Poi*, which was so wildly successful that it was reprinted at least twenty-six times (Thomson, 1980, p. 82). In *Waiata Poi*, a passage of Māori song is used as a refrain; that such a song saw such commercial success shows that Hill's treatment of Māori music reflected a broader interest in Māori culture on the part of Westerners.

Self-serving though Lilburn's comments about Hill may have been, his criticism of Hill's use of Māori music is worth noting: that he was simply an old-fashioned nationalist composer, as seen in his use of Māori music as 'grist to his mill'. Another criticism of Hill's music and treatment of his Māori source material is given by Sarah Shieff, who has written (1994, pp. 28 - 29):

> While no doubt sincere, Hill's interest in Maori music was also expedient and opportunistic. His introduction to Maori music had come via Wellington journalist E. D. Hoben who had 'lived among the Maoris all his life and he sang me a song, and I said "By Jove! Here's something novel. If I can't make a success any other way I might make it by this idea of developing Maori music."'
>
> … Although fascinated by Maori music, the implications of attempting to combine two entirely remote musical traditions did not appear to occupy Hill unduly. While he may have drawn on isolated elements from indigenous musics such as rhythm or language fragments, Hill's colouristic, exotic additions left

> Western forms intact. For Hill, the indigenous served as a thin veneer over familiar Western forms. As late as 1950 he could still ignore the ramifications of grafting Western music onto an aboriginal tradition – or rather, attempting to assimilate the later into the former.

Shieff here notes that Hill's usage of Māori music was in the form of 'colouristic, exotic additions', and comments that he did so in manner uncritical of his part in the assimilation of indigenous culture. That Hill indeed took part in the colonial enterprise is not something that I argue against here: however, I argue that what is of considerable interest is the way in which Hill represented Māori as being exotic, as in so doing he can be understood as commenting on Māori culture. In analysing Hill's music, we may understand the relationship between Māori and Pakeha as it existed in Maoriland New Zealand.

Henry H. H. Remak writes that for Europeans, the exotic denoted 'a foreign culture with which there has been little or no authentic contact and which presents features extraordinarily different from the vantage point of a particular majority culture of Western Europe,' and provided a form of escapism for the 'inhabitants of colder, drabber climates' (Remak, 1978, p. 53). In musical terms, exoticism has been defined as being 'the process of evoking in or through music – whether that music is "exotic-sounding" or not – a place, people, or social milieu that is not entirely imaginary and that differs profoundly from the home country in attitudes, customs, and morals' (Locke, 2009, p. 49). The exotic went hand-in-hand with another abiding characteristic of the Romantic period, nationalism. There are many well-known examples of Romantic nationalism: Chopin's Polishness, Tchaikovsky's Russianness, and Grieg's Norwegianness. Some composers even displayed nationalist zeal for nations other than their own, as in the case of Liszt and Hungary (Leerssen, 2014). I argue that Hill's portrayal of Māori as being exotic was in fact entirely within the norms of the European Romantic musical tradition, the only novelty being that it was Māori who were being represented rather than some other culture; further, in Hill's construction of musical Maoriland, his music can be understood as being, in one sense, nationalist.

Exoticism and nationalism are in some senses similar, but have some important differences in their treatment of their subject. They are similar in that both attempt to represent some form of the 'other': in the case of exoticism, *that* culture as distinct from ours, and in the case of nationalism, *this* country as distinct from others. Exoticism and nationalism have different ends, for to depict the exotic is to depict the uncivilised: the most famous example of this, perhaps, is Stravinsky's *Rite of Spring* (1913), which depicts a primitive and savage ceremony. The opposite is true of nationalist music: Leerssen has used the phrase 'cultivation of culture' to describe the aims of the various nationalist movements, which are generally characterised by the act of synthesising new intellectual traditions from folk traditions and histories (Leerssen, 2006). However, it is important to note that exoticism and nationalism were not necessarily incompatible: Locke, for example, has argued that there is not necessarily a distinct boundary between the two concepts, and notes that for Chopin, 'the rural villages of Poland must have seemed exotic indeed' (2009, p. 75). It is therefore not surprising that similar musical techniques have been used to evoke both

exoticism and nationalism by composers.[20] In the case of Hill's Maoriland music, I argue that exoticism is used in service of nationalism: it represents both a celebration and a taming of primitivism and savagery in which supposedly 'Māori' elements are presented within the conventions of European forms. In this way, even as Hill portrays the exotic, he works towards the cultivation of a new culture – the construction of a Maoriland New Zealand, where Māori culture contributes to a European sense of self.

Figure 1: Grieg, String Quartet No. 1 in G Minor, Op. 27, Mvt. 1, bars 1 – 8.

Alfred Hill was certainly exposed to nationalist and exotic works in the course of his musical studies at Leipzig. In his diary, for example, he made the following entries (2008, pp. 39 – 49):

> *December 10th, 1887:* Attended the 4th Kammermusik Concert and I never have heard such Heavenly music before. We saw the Composer of the well known Grieg Sonata but I don't like his last Sonata like I do the first one.
>
> *February 18th, 1888:* The 8th Kammermusik was a treat. The quartett by Grieg was wonderful and its weird style quite took my fancy.

[20] For clarity, when speaking of musical techniques used by composers to evoke exoticism or nationalism, or both, I will henceforth refer to all of these musical techniques as being 'exotic'. This is because in practice, it is difficult to attach a specific nationalist identity to any particular musical technique or even to any particular set of musical techniques. Carl Dahlhaus has written: 'if a composer intended a piece of music to be national in character and the hearers believe it to be so, that is something which the historian must accept as an aesthetic fact, even if stylistic analysis – the attempt to "verify" the aesthetic premise by reference to musical features – fails to produce any evidence' (1980, pp. 86 - 87).

These short references to the work of Edvard Grieg show that Hill both heard and approved of Grieg's String Quartet No. 1 in G Minor, Op. 27, and recognised in it a 'weird style'. There are certainly obvious exotic musical features in this piece, the first eight bars of the first movement of which are shown in Figure 1. Grieg's Norwegian nationalism as portrayed in this music was obvious to contemporary listeners: for example, Robert Heckmann, the famous violinist, wrote the following to Grieg upon rehearsing and performing the quartet: 'How wonderful it would be if you, with your northern poetry, could give us violinists a work in the field of concert literature; with its individuality it would figure as a gem of rare beauty' (Kortsen, 1968, p. 28). Not only is it obvious from Heckmann's use of the words 'northern poetry' that the northern quality of Grieg's music was understood, but in Heckmann's letter it can be seen that Grieg's musical 'northern poetry' was elevated to an exalted quality in itself. Some have attempted to identify the specific musical techniques used by Grieg in the composition of such 'northern poetry'. Brian Schlotel argues that Grieg incorporated aspects of Norwegian folk music in his music, and summarises Grieg's handling of this repertoire as follows: the use of an $\hat{8} - \hat{7} - \hat{5}$ melodic progression (as in the opening of the String Quartet No. 1), melodies that focus on the dominant of the scale, the use of modal scales, changes in the course of a melody between modes and tonal scales, and 'characteristic uses of ornament like the upper mordent' (1986, p. 8).[21] John Horton finds different characteristics: a 'boldness in the use of dissonance', which is particularly characteristic of hardanger-fiddle tunes; and the use of 'direct and inverted pedal tones, the scale with a sharpened fourth degree, much use of the intervals of the second, seventh, and perfect and augmented fourths and fifths, final cadences falling on to the dominant, suggestions of pre-classical modes, elaborate ornamentation, and frequent dotted rhythms and irregularities of accent' (1974, p. 20).

Carl Dahlhaus's comparison of nationalist music with programme music (1980, pp. 86 – 87) is useful to bear in mind, for it suggests that the composer's intention to evoke a nationalist image is more important than any actual use of a systematic series of techniques or quotations from folk song. Thus it is possible for Horton to identify nationalist stylistic characteristics in Grieg's early work, such as the *Humoresques*, Op. 6 (1974, p. 20), even though Grieg's familiarity with Norwegian folksong was not as great as some critics of his day suspected when they accused him of simply copying folk melodies: when writing the *Humoresques* Grieg had 'practically no first-hand acquaintance with his native folksong', and he at one point remarked that folk-music had only a remote influence on his work in the first part of his life (pp. 119 – 120). Therefore, it was possible for Grieg to evoke the idea of Norway in his String Quartet through the means of exotic-sounding musical techniques even without specifically making use of any elements of Norwegian folksong.

---

[21] For the reader unfamiliar with the theory and representation of musical voice-leading, the use of number with a carat sign above it indicates particular notes in the musical scale – in this case, the eighth, seventh, and fifth notes – or, to use musicological jargon, degrees of the scale. The term 'melodic progression' refers to the abstraction of this concept, such that one can consider the relationship between musical pitches independently of their utility in forming part of any given musical theme.

Similarly, Alfred Hill was to write supposedly 'Māori' music that likewise was devoid of Māori musical content. Hill was a devotee of Wagner's music, as demonstrated by numerous passages in his diaries from Leipzig, and so it is perhaps only natural that one of his first major works was the cantata *Hinemoa*, which is based on the Māori story of Hinemoa and Tutanekai (Thomson, 1980, p. 61); such story-telling in music owes much to Wagner. *Hinemoa* was premiered in 1896. In the same year, he published a String Quartet in B flat major, which bears the title 'The Maori' (Hill, 2009). It is possible that Hill was directly inspired by the performance of Grieg's quartet in Leipzig, and was moved to write a quartet in a 'weird' (exotic) style himself. It is worth considering Hill's string quartet in some depth. It is in four movements. The outer two do not make obvious use of exotic stylistic techniques, except that a prominent theme in the fourth movement is the Māori theme used by Hill in *Hinemoa*; still, there is nothing about this theme that would indicate to a listener unfamiliar with its provenance that it is not European. The second and third movements are the most obviously 'Māori', and do make use of exotic devices. The second movement is entitled 'Waiata (Songs accompanying the Dance)', and the third 'Tangi (Lament)'. The second movement is in the form of a scherzo and trio, each with their own subtitles. The first section bears the indication 'Haka Dance (Barbaric)', and the trio the indication 'Poi Dance (Graceful)'. The third movement has a conventional tempo marking, being marked 'Lento'.

There are two notable techniques used by Hill in the Haka section (see Figure 2) that appear to be intended to be 'barbaric' in effect. The first is the use of metrical shifts, and the second is the use of modally inflected harmony. The use of modally inflected harmony is relatively discreet, and is manifested in the use of the lowered seventh scale degree. The movement is written in D minor, but the quoted theme is given a modal inflection in the first bars of the extract by the use of C natural instead of C sharp. The C natural is given melodic emphasis as it is the opening note of the theme. The C natural is also used as a functionally significant note in the bass line, forming the foundation of a C major chord in bar 18. Hill returns to tonal harmony with the use of a dominant triad in bar 20, with the note C sharp in the viola part. By convention, in a dominant triad the seventh scale degree must be raised so that a major chord is formed; it would appear that the strength of this convention, to Hill, was such that the desire to create a barbaric effect through the use of modal harmony had to be balanced in this case against the demands against good (European) taste.

Hill seems to have experienced no such qualms in his use of metre. The shifting sense of metre is clearly apparent in bars 17 – 20, which alternate between triple and quadruple metre. Hill highlights these shifts by also alternating his instrumentation: he writes only for the violins in bars 17 and 19, which are in triple meter. The movement's metrical shifts are further demarcated by accenting the violin parts in the bars in triple time and the viola and violoncello parts in quadruple time. In bars 21 and 22 Hill makes use of a hemiola in which the written two bars of three beats each are heard as three groups of two beats, thus further avoiding any steady sense of metre. This movement is designed to clash with nineteenth-century European conceptions of what a dance should be: even though this is ostensibly a 'song to accompany the dance', it is the antithesis of elegant European dance forms, and thus the barbaric effect is clear.

Figure 2: Hill, String Quartet No. 1 "The Maori", Mvt. 2, bars 17 – 24.

The opening of the Poi Dance section is shown in Figure 3. One may infer that Hill wished to create an extreme contrast between the two sections of this movement from the indications he gave: where the Haka was barbaric, the Poi Dance is graceful. Indeed, the contrast in the music cannot be clearer, as the Haka is loud and forceful in its use of accents and unexpected rhythms, and the Poi Dance is ethereal and almost insubstantial by comparison. That said, the use of meter and harmony is still of note in this section. The melody in the second violin is free in its rhythms, and any overarching metrical framework is not obvious. The use of harmony is also exotic: Hill moves chromatically from the prevailing D major harmony to the C sharp major chords in the last two bars of the extract.

Just as the Haka is exotic in its barbarism, the Poi Dance is exotic in its grace: it too is ostensibly a dance, and yet it in its ametrical fluidity is just as far from established European conventions of dance music as the Haka is. There is another ironic similarity that unites the two otherwise disparate parts of this movement: just as Hill's haka for strings is entirely unlike the haka as performed by Māori, so too is the Poi Dance entirely unlike any Māori poi performance. Mervyn McLean gives examples of poi songs from the period that are chant-like and generally bear no musical resemblance to the movement by Hill (1996, pp. 137 - 142). It is therefore impossible to make the case that this movement directly draws on songs sung by the Māori. A better understanding of this movement is as a programmatic

representation of Māori musical practices intended for European consumption in an age when Europeans had almost no familiarity with Māori culture.

Figure 3: Hill, String Quartet No. 1 "The Maori", Mvt. 2, bars 25 – 32.

The Tangi – the third movement – is programmatic in nature. It must first be noted that there is no musical genre called 'tangi': a tangi is a ceremony of farewell for the dead. In its solemnity, this movement is certainly funereal. The Tangi opens with a statement of a mournful theme in G minor in the first violin. With its limited compass, this theme is similar to some Māori chants and it may well be that its provenance is Māori, or at least that it is intended to imitate Māori chants. The theme is strongly metrical, though, and the overall idiom of the movement is strongly Western. In Figure 4, the ending of the Tangi movement is shown. It is characteristic of much of the movement: the melodic material in the opening bars of the first violin and viola parts is a quotation of a small part of the opening theme, and the material in the first violin from bar 72 – 78 is obviously derived from this. Hill treats his material contrapuntally at climactic points in the piece, as he does here: in bar 78, the four parts move independently to create the dominant triad.

Hill's musical language in this movement is exotic in several respects. In the final two bars in the cello part, the cello plays open fifths, as it does throughout the movement, and – as here – they are used to create a drone; drones were, of course, a characteristic marker of the exotic in nineteenth-century music. The limited melodic range of the theme is also exotic, in that it defies the tendency of Western themes to use a wider melodic compass and to move from tonic to dominant or to other significant notes of the scale. In addition, one cannot help but take note of the descending chromatic tremolo effect found in the second violin and violoncello parts from bar 68 – 74. In this passage the tremolo notes create unusual dissonances with the material played by the first violin and the viola, and these dissonances resolve in unusual ways. The entire passage is a spectacular special effect and one in which the traditional use of descending chromatic material to portray sadness or mourning is carried out by Hill in an innovative manner.

Figure 4: Hill, String Quartet No. 1 "The Maori", Mvt. 3, bars 68 – 80.

As stated previously, the fourth movement appears to be entirely within the common-practice idiom of nineteenth-century music, and bears no obvious markers of exoticism in its writing. However, Hill makes use of a theme that was used by the Māori as part of a hymn. The theme was also used in Hill's cantata *Hinemoa,* and Hill explains its provenance in a foreword to that work:

Composers Note:-

The Maori air which runs through this work, was obtained many years ago from a white man, Mr. E. D. Hoban.

Years later a half-caste Maori, Wi Duncan, asserted that it was a Raratongan melody. Others claimed that the Rev. Williams of Hawkes Bay wrote the words and a Maori friend the tune.

Finally, Hari Hongi, a Government Interpreter and author of the well-known Maori Grammar etc, verified Wi Duncan's assertion that the air came from Raratonga. It appears that a Chief who came from Raratonga in 1868 to visit the Maori Chief Tawhio, first brought the air to New Zealand. The Maoris quickly appropriated it and turned it into a Hymn.

Maori version

It will be observed that this is a variant of the melody used in this work.

ALFRED HILL

Figure 5: Hill, Hinemoa, composer's note (1935).

As *Hinemoa* was premiered in November of the year that this quartet was composed, it seems likely that this theme to Hill, at that time, came to signify 'Māoriness', and in that respect its prominent use in the fourth movement of the String Quartet No. 1 is significant.

To modern ears, that Hill's compositions could be considered to be 'Māori music' is puzzling, and examples such as that of the 'haka' movement of the string quartet, which appear to have little connection to the haka as usually performed by Māori, may seem to be bumbling examples of reverse mimicry. But when one considers Hill's stature as a respected composer, the colonising power of mimicry – the coloniser's desire 'for a reformed, recognisable Other' (Bhabha, 1984, p. 126) – becomes apparent: whatever Māori people understand Māori music to be becomes irrelevant, as the coloniser – Hill, in this case – reforms Māori music to suit colonising sensibilities. A similar phenomenon is found in the case of the 'Hindostannie air', a genre in which Indian musics were adapted by European musicians and which became popular in the late eighteenth century amongst the population of the English residents of Calcutta (Woodfield, 1994, p. 189). In the words of Nicholas Cook, the 'most mystifying feature' of the Hindostannie air was the ability of Europeans to convince themselves that these works were authentic depictions of Indian music:

> …the documentation of the Hindostannie air is full of assertions of authenticity. When Margaret Fowke sent some Hindostannie airs to her father she wrote 'You may be assured they are exact', and when she sent them to Sophia Plowden, the latter replied 'how you could note them down so correctly I cannot conceive'. Fowke also sent a book of Hindostannie airs to Warren Hastings, who replied, 'I have had the Pleasure to hear them all played by a very able performer, and can attest that they are genuine Transcripts of the original music, of which I have a perfect

> Remembrance'; what makes this assertion of authenticity the more striking is Hasting's statement in the same letter that 'I have always protested against every Interpolation of European Taste in the Recital of the Music of Hindustan' (2007, p. 24).

The phenomenon of such mimicry by European musicians, then, relies on a certain critical blindness, deliberate or otherwise, and in the case of the appropriation of indigenous music, relies on the belief that indigenous musics – Indian, Māori, or otherwise – can be rendered, and rendered authentically, by European musicians notating it with Western techniques of notation and playing with Western instruments. In both cases, though, I would argue that there remains a difference: just as there is a difference between being English and being Anglicised, there remains a difference between the 'normal' and the exotic 'other'; between Wagner's operas and between Hill's 'Māori' cantata; and for that matter, between the Hindostannie airs and, say, a Haydn minuet. Musical mimicry, even as it imitates an 'other', articulates difference, and does so to serve the interests of colonising musicians.

It is important for proponents of a critical biculturalism to be aware of Maoriland and of bicultural mimicry. As Stafford and Williams write, the discourse of Maoriland remains present in New Zealand society today, as in the widespread use of songs such as *Pōkarekare Ana* and the performance of the haka by the All Blacks before rugby matches (2008, pp. 269 – 270). The case of Alfred Hill presents an example of ways in which the use of Māori music is not acceptable, according to modern ears, as articulated by Lilburn and Shieff, but that is not to say that it is never acceptable for non-Māori to engage with Māori music. How, then can music teachers seek to include Māori and Māori music in their classrooms without falling into the swampy traps of Maoriland? I argue here, as I do in later chapters, that what is necessary is a critical approach to biculturalism in this regard: if the inclusion of Māori in the classroom results in nothing more than an expression of exoticism, a colouristic, thin veneer, to borrow Shieff's words, over the traditions of Western music education, then perhaps one can conclude that such 'Maoriland' biculturalism is designed less with Māori interests in mind than those of Pākehā. If on the other hand teachers find ways of incorporating Māori culture in the classroom in ways that preserve Māori ownership of their music rather than reforming it in the service of other ends, mutually beneficial ways forward may be found.

The Bicultural Turn

I wish now to consider the concept of biculturalism as developed in (mainly Pākehā) academic writing and government policy of the late twentieth century, which can be termed 'official biculturalism', to borrow the words of Mane-Wheoki (2003, p. 84). This turn to biculturalism occurred at a time of revisionist politics, policy development, and scholarship that developed in response to events including the civil rights movement in the United States, the ethnic revival and the Maori Renaissance, and the Springbok Tour; an overview of this context is given earlier in this thesis, on page 13. The policies and scholarship that

comprise the bicultural turn are earnest in developing and promoting the concept of biculturalism in mainstream New Zealand society. The wholesale institutional movement towards biculturalism in such a short time is what I have called here the 'bicultural turn'. Even though the relevant literature was published in this short time period, and some decades ago at that, I would argue that the conditions in society which prompted the widespread interest in biculturalism are still present, and the following literature is worthy of consideration in light of that context and also in that of the present day.

An appropriate starting point for the idea of a 'bicultural turn' in government is seen in the creation of the Waitangi Tribunal. Wilson Isaac has written of the Tribunal's creation and powers:

> At its start in 1975, it had a membership of just three, including the Chairperson. The Tribunal could only hear claims dating since its foundation on 10 October 1975. The extension in late 1985 of the Tribunal's jurisdiction back to the first signing of the Treaty on 6 February 1840 opened the entire record of the Crown's conduct with Māori to scrutiny… (Isaac, 2016, p. 5)

In the words of Sir Hirini Moko Mead, 'we…need to recognise a debt of gratitude to the Honourable Matiu Rata and the Government of the day' for initial creation of the Tribunal (Mead, 2016, p. 19), Matiu Rata being the politician most associated with the passage of the necessary legislation. However, it was not until 1985, when the Tribunal's jurisdiction was extended, that significant changes as a result of the Tribunal's findings began to occur. Joe Williams has said in an interview that, after 1985:

> 'What went on in the street moved into the forums of civil debate, starting with the Waitangi Tribunal itself and then getting into the courts generally' (Boast, 2016, p. 12)

This was part of a 'Māori tide, on quite a broad front, sweeping through the structures of formal legal power in the second half of the 1980s' (ibid.). Whether considered as a bicultural turn or, as Williams does, a 'Māori tide', I will consider some of the results here.

Most significant, I argue, was the creation of the institutionalised approach to biculturalism that Mane-Wheoki called 'official biculturalism'. This is considered further in the context of education in Chapter Three. The makings of this approach are clearly present in the documents *He Tirohanga Rangapu* in April of 1988, which contained proposals for comment, and *Te Urupare Rangapū*, of November of that year, which was a response to public submissions. This mainstreaming of biculturalism, this biculturalism of officialdom, is characterised in policy documents by an aspirational tone and the concern for inclusiveness of and equity for Māori in matters of government.

As summarised in *Te Urupare Rangapū*, which is published in Māori and English, *He Tirohanga Rangapu* proposed the following objectives (New Zealand Public Service Association, 1988, p. 4):

- to establish a Ministry of Māori Policy;
- to establish a practical partnership with iwi organisations in the development and operation of policies;

- to improve the responsiveness of government departments to Māori issues;
- to transfer Māori programmes to other departments; and
- to phase out the Department of Māori Affairs and the Board of Māori Affairs.

These objectives amount to a proposal to instructing government departments to better accommodate Māori needs; the Ministry of Māori Policy simply replaced the outgoing Department and Board of Māori Affairs. The government summarised its proposals to achieve the objectives listed above as follows (p.5):

- measures to restore and strengthen the operational base of iwi;
- a Ministry of Māori Affairs to provide a Māori perspective in policy making;
- the transfer of the Māori Land Court's servicing to the Department of Justice;
- ways of improving the responsiveness of government agencies;
- an Iwi Transition Agency (for a five year period) to help iwi develop their operational base;
- an independent review of the Māori Trust Office;
- disbanding of the Board of Māori Affairs;
- options for Pacific Island communities.

The remainder of *Te Urupare Rangapū* is a fairly prosaic outline of steps that the government and iwi should follow to implement the government's agenda. A deadline of 1994 was set as the date by which all government agencies would be 'fully responsive' to Māori concerns (p. 8). Notably, this deadline was positioned as a sort of climax to a prospective 'development decade' that, at least according to the authors of *Te Urupare Rangapū*, began with the Hui Taumata – the first Māori Economic Summit (Ellison, 2010) – and the Te Māori exhibition in 1984 (New Zealand Public Service Association, 1988).

Curiously, this supposed 'decade of development' as set out in *Te Urupare Rangapū* made no mention of the significant body of work carried out by the Royal Commission on Social Policy, which was established by the government in 1986. This may be because the Commission's report provoked controversy: it attracted criticism 'for its uneven quality and lack of over-arching framework' and because it was 'seen by some as prime minister David Lange's attempt to protect the welfare state' in the context of the radical economic reforms of the time (Clayworth, 2017). The treatment of the Royal Commission's *April Report* of 1988 (New Zealand, 1988), which includes the results of significant public meetings with Māori throughout the country and makes several critical comments that are worth considering, shows what may be considered the perverse complexity of the politics in this country. Although, broadly considered, one might consider the goals of *Te Urupare Rangapū* and the *April Report* to be similar, they were associated with the respective political leanings of the governments that commissioned them, and this meant that the official project of biculturalism itself became a football in the partisan political field of Wellington.

As part of their methodology in gathering public submissions that made up the *April Report*, the Commissioners visited marae and heard oral testimony from those meeting there. Various perspectives are given: for example, the Combined Churches in Northland 'wanted social policy based on christian [*sic*] principles and biculturalism, with changes in social

attitudes as well as policies and the time for us to evolve together'. In other submissions, opposition to the policies of the government of the day is apparent: as stated in the New Zealand Federation of Labour and Combined State Unions' oral submission:

> …the responsibility of Government is to intervene to ensure that there's an adequate disbursement as of right to all of the people that make up our society, in all regions of the country, that people do have fundamental rights that arise from and directly out of the contribution made by previous generations in building and developing our society as a whole, and that brings us quite strongly into a point of opposition to some of these sorts of vague concepts about free marketism, and the user pays, and these sorts of principles that appear to be gaining some favour, both within Government circles and wider public circles.

From such submissions the Commissioners concluded that the removal of inequities in areas such as health, education, social welfare, and housing were clearly top priorities in most of the oral submissions (1988, p, 231).

The report considers Māori concerns in some depth. The Commissioners noted a deep respect for the Treaty of Waitangi: 'A commonly expressed view was that the Treaty provides 'a creative mandate for bicultural partnership and an initiative for initiating better human relationships' (ibid., p. 232). They also noted that Māori resented situations in which they were forced to conform to Pākehā cultural norms, as often occurred when dealing with government officials: 'An example of the negligence of the Maori cultural perspective by government bodies was given by one speaker in the area of fostering and subsequent adoption of Maori babies by Pakeha families. Departmental policy is based on the concept of the nuclear family, and little or no regard is paid to the Maori concepts of whanau, hapu, or iwi, so the extended Maori family is not usually consulted in the adoption process, nor does it have legal status comparable to that of the adoptive parents. This exemplifies a strong concern in the oral submissions about social policy, that monoculturalism in our social institutions and processes tends to favour one group in the community over others' (ibid, p. 232).

Specific Māori concerns about the education system in New Zealand were also reported. Some of these concerns were due to concerns about employment prospects: 'The development of marae based training programmes such as Maori Access revealed that many trainees had low levels of literacy to the extent that, except for the most menial jobs, work would always be hard to find. The relationship of education and labour policies was often raised with recommendation that they be more closely integrated so that young people would be better equipped to face a technological world. Other submissions were concerned about poor Maori performance in the education system generally and were critical of the increasing disparities and apparent inability to reverse negative trends. For many, poor achievement was linked to a minimal Maori presence among teaching or counselling staff as well as inadequate Maori studies programmes that included language (ibid., pp. 253 – 263). Other concerns about the education system were motivated by a concern for the survival of Māori culture: the establishment of Kōhanga Reo (Maori-language kindergartens) was generally lauded but one submitter, Godfrey Pohatu, regretted the lack of opportunities for

adults to learn the language and was concerned that this would in turn inhibit the uptake of language amongst children (ibid., p. 268).

The Commissioners identified some 'directions for tomorrow' (ibid., p. 288). These included the right to be Maori, particularly in regards to land, education (e.g. the advantages of bilingual schools), health, justice, and the general place of Maori values and skills. Rakaumanga School's submission was cited in support of bilingual education in te reo Māori and in English:

> 'We're bringing mana to our children, mana tuturu. We talk about history, our own history, about cultural and ethnic identity and the three R's. Is the Maori language capable of transmitting knowledge, mathematics, reading, science? I give you an unequivocal, unqualified yes. It does do that.' (p. 290)

In addition, Commissioners suggested an elevation of the place of the Treaty of Waitangi in government consideration, as on all marae it was seen as 'central to policy-making, policy implementation and the delivery of all social services and, at another level, to the establishment of trust and confidence between New Zealanders. It was regarded as something more than a guideline for ethnic and cultural harmony. Most submissions saw it as an agreement binding the Government and Māori people in a relationship characterised by loyalty, protection, and partnership' (ibid., p. 290). The Commissioners also recommended a policy of Māori self-determination: 'Enthusiasm for Maori values and Maori management and delivery systems was considerable during marae hearings. Self determination was the term used to signify greater control over Maori human and physical resources, a partnership with central and sometimes local government. Many speakers, in voicing dissatisfaction with present methods and systems, were uneasy about arrangements which would depend only on occasional Maori advice to Government, fearing that particular (for example, tribal) concerns would not be adequately reflected. There was, however, strong support for real power sharing with a transfer (to the community) of resources, decision making and accountability' (ibid., p. 292).

In the context of the present research, the *April Report* may not seem radical, but in 1988, the Commission's report was the process of an unprecedented level of concern (outside of the specific jurisdiction of the Waitangi Tribunal, at least) by the government for Māori views and opinions. Like *Te Urupare Rangapū*, the *April Report* steers the reader towards the conclusion that an official bicultural response is necessary by government. At the time, such official biculturalism was controversial; perhaps it is a mark of progress that concepts such as the sharing of power and means of allowing Māori self-determination are no longer controversial aspects of government. (Then again, this could also be a concerning sign that the bicultural message has become domesticated and tamed.)

The official turn towards biculturalism gave rise to a host of literature aiming to consider the nature, theory, and implications of biculturalism in government and in society. Richard Mulgan (1989) offers a definition of biculturalism as being 'a public policy giving official recognition to two peoples, Māori and Pākehā, and their cultures within the public institutions of a multicultural society' (p. 10). He calls for a bicultural New Zealand that

remains unified legally and politically: he explicitly rejects 'separate Māori legal and political institutions' that would affect a unified structure of governance, such as a separate Māori parliament, but supports the creation of institutions and procedures to deal with Māori interests, such as the Māori electoral roll and the Ministry of Māori Affairs (p. 133).

Tom O'Reilly and David Wood, noting Mulgan's work, offered a competing definition (1991):

> We define biculturalism as the co-existence of two distinct cultures, Māori and Pākehā, within New Zealand society with the values and traditions of both cultures reflected in society's customs, laws, practices, and institutional arrangements, and with both cultures sharing control over resources and decision making. While this definition is deliberately silent about where the balance of power should lie, we reject the simplistic and inflexible maxim that a partnership demands a fifty-fifty sharing of resources' (1991, p. 321).

O'Reilly and Wood go further than Mulgan, in that Mulgan was concerned most with official recognition of both Māori and Pākehā and accommodating them within public institutions; in contrast, O'Reilly and Wood speak first of society as a whole. They seem to imply that any successful implementation of bicultural policy cannot be 'simplistic and inflexible', and in this, they echo the criticism of reductionist binary conceptions of colonial politics. For O'Reilly and Wood, this means that power sharing may in practice not mean a fifty-fifty sharing of resources; I would suggest that the idea of a two-way split is a problematic notion that needs reconsidering in a bicultural arrangement where there are not two opposing sides, Māori and Pākehā, but instead many ways of being Māori and Pākehā that do not necessitate exclusive adherence to one culture or the other.

Raj Vasil (2000, first published 1988) is more measured in his approach to introducing biculturalism in his writing, and gives some consideration to the experience of other colonised countries. He argues that the process of anti-colonial reform can lead to outcomes that are equally as oppressive as colonialism itself, citing the case of Sukarno, the Indonesian reformer, who 'condemned Western democracy as divisive and ill-conceived (a view not dissimilar to that of the Māori) and established 'Guided Democracy' based on the traditional Indonesian concepts of *musjawarah* (discussion and debate) and *mufakat* (consensus)', but who in his indiscriminate quest to remove of all Dutch influence from Indonesian society effectively began to oppress his people in another way, as he became increasingly autocratic in his leadership (ibid., pp. 5 – 6). In citing this example, he echoes the warning of Freire that the oppressed, once liberated, must ensure that they do not become oppressors themselves (P. Freire, 1996, p. 39). Further, Vasil argues that biculturalism must not lead to a complete rejection of Pākehā culture by Māori who would rather keep to their own. He cites the case of India, where Hindi and other regional languages were promoted at the expense of English: 'As a consequence, the use of English has largely remained restricted to the élites and the urban affluent who have continued to send their children to English-medium schools and universities… As a result, the common masses have come to suffer from a serious disability. Their lack of access to English has kept

them down and acted as a major barrier to their personal progress and upward mobility' (2000, p. 6).

With these examples in mind, Vasil argues that Māori must not fully reject Pākehā culture and Western knowledge:

> Surrounded by an affluent community of Pākehā and others, Māori cannot seriously think of an existence that does not give them the good things of life, even in Pākehā material terms... One does not have to be a Marxist to acknowledge that large and visible disparities in living standards and economic wealth and power inevitably, in the long run, will lend ethnic contradictions a dangerous and explosive dimension.

It is important, therefore, not only for Māori, but also for Pākehā, that the tangata whenua are not left behind other ethnic components of the New Zealand population and that they are enabled to develop the social, cultural, educational and linguistic wherewithal necessary for them to play their full role in a modern society of science and technology. Of course, in this Māori have to be allowed to relate this process to their own distinctive culture and way of life rather than be willing to be turned into brown versions of Pākehā (ibid., p. 7).

In short, then, Vasil argues that people in a bicultural society should take advantage of opportunities afforded them by having access to the other culture, rather than attempting to remove or ignore that other culture altogether. He gives equal attention to Pākehā, whom he argues must be made aware of the desire by Māori to change the oppressive politics of colonialism, and that a sort of pedagogy of the oppressor be enacted in which Pākehā learn of the Crown's obligations, the functioning of the Waitangi Tribunal, the basis of Māori views, and the need to avoid the democratic tyranny of the majority. He concludes this argument by stating that:

> Unless serious attempts are made in these directions, it is likely that the so-called 'silent majority' of Pākehā (still acting as Rob's Mob) is going to be increasingly more fearful and angry, and not even willing to listen to Māori and to consider any of their demands (p. 37 – 38).[22]

Vasil makes it clear later that he does not seek a reduction in rights for Pākehā New Zealanders, but merely wants to see improvements in the Māori condition (p. 60).

Perhaps the most striking aspect of Vasil's work is not the inspiring visions of what biculturalism could or should be, but rather the stark warnings of what could cause the bicultural project to fail – through the oppressed becoming the oppressors, as in Indonesia; through the oppressed rejecting the benefits of the West, as in Indonesia and India; through the potentially fearful and angry responses to bicultural reform by the oppressed, as he imagined in the New Zealand of 1988 was possible by 'Rob's Mob', the followers of the former Prime Minister, Rob Muldoon. The common thread running through the examples that he gives is a breakdown in dialogue between peoples of different cultures; there are

[22] Note that the phrase 'Rob's Mob' refers to the former Prime Minister Robert Muldoon.

advantages to be had in sharing power and cultural capital, and there are grave dangers to be had in refusing to work with the 'other' group.

Richard Mulgan (1989) develops a series of theoretical ideas to describe what a bicultural democracy could look like. He argues that the modern implementation of bicultural policy must stem from the modern interpretation of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, and spends some time considering what these are, placing particular emphasis on the principle of partnership: this in the modern day, he argues, cannot be held to be a partnership between Māori and the Crown, since now the Crown represents Māori as well as non-Māori; therefore, partnership must refer to a partnership between Māori and Pākehā peoples in general (pp. 110 – 112). He goes on to theorise the existence of shared and separate social spaces and social behaviour:

> Shared social institutions are those in which members of both peoples will participate and interact. These will include the main institutions of Parliament, government departments, local bodies, schools, hospitals, libraries, and so on – all the publicly funded institutions which provide public services for both Māori and Pākehā. In addition, there will also be all the privately owned economic and social institutions, such as factories, shops, banks, hotels and so on, which cater for the needs of both peoples and employ members of both peoples. To be bicultural, such institutions will need to be adapted to the values and conventions of both cultures so that both Māori and Pākehā can feel at home in them.
>
> On the other hand, there will be separate institutions in which the members of each people will maintain their own culture and values. These will include families and other kinship groups as well as voluntary associations and recreational groups with a cultural focus. In such groups there will be no need to accommodate the sensitivities of both cultures. Indeed, to fulfil their function properly, they will need to be monocultural rather than bicultural. Instances of such monoculturally Māori institutions are the whanau, hapū and iwi, the marae, Māori churches, kōhanga reo (Māori 'language nests' or pre-school groups), Māori clubs, and so on (pp. 122 – 123).

Mulgan goes on to note that Pākehā tend to be uneasy about claiming a monoculturally Pākehā identity for a social space, an unease that stems in part from the fact that Pākehā culture is not easily defined; Mulgan goes on to argue that many social spaces in New Zealand are in fact monoculturally Pākehā by default due to the Pākehā status as the majority in the population (p. 123). Mulgan's categories of space and behaviour are not meant to exclude one culture from the other's space, but to describe what goes on within them: a group of Pākehā persons being welcomed onto a marae should expect to find themselves operating according to Māori cultural protocols, for example. The implication of Mulgan's theories is that Pākehā must deliberately work to ensure that their institutions and spaces are inclusive of Māori, because else due to the hegemonic nature of Pākehā culture in Aotearoa New Zealand, they will default to being Pākehā-controlled spaces.

Critiquing the Bicultural Turn

The bicultural turn was not well received by all people in Aotearoa New Zealand. The multiplicity of viewpoints from both Māori and Pākehā perspectives is illustrated by the publication two parallel volumes titled *Maori Sovereignty: The Maori Perspective*, edited by Hineani Melbourne (1995), and *Maori Sovereignty: The Pakeha Perspective*, edited by Carol Archie (1995). The range of perspectives include those of Pākehā supportive of Māori efforts to assert their rights under the Treaty to sovereignty, such as Bishop John Paterson and Dr. Jane Kelsey; and those of Pākehā who are somewhat wary, such as Doug Graham, then Minister in Charge of Treaty Negotiations, who professes the belief that the position of Māori in society and their customary rights deserve respect, but also states that:

> I'm happy to talk about self-management and tino rangatiratanga and what it means, and kawanatanga, all that sort of thing, until the cows come home. But we are not going to waste time on something which isn't going to happen in a country like New Zealand (Archie, 1995, p. 119).

There are also views from Pākehā opposed to assertions of Māori sovereignty altogether, such as Glyn Clayton, then editor of the Christchurch Mail, who states: 'In my early days, being a South Islander of course, Māori didn't exist. We were just New Zealanders' (ibid., 34), and questions the practicality of Māori sovereignty on racial grounds in coarse terms:

> On assimilation, Glyn asks, 'How can you make laws for Māori and Pakeha with the amount of bonking that's likely to continue even if you don't take into account the amount of mixed blood now? Three hundred years out from now – I mean I haven't got Māori in me but my grandchild has, my nephews and nieces have. You can't separate them out' (ibid., pp. 36 – 37).

This type of argument is an appeal to the idea of New Zealand as 'one nation', which talk of Maori sovereignty threatens; Archie notes that George Chambers, then president of the One Nation New Zealand Foundation, viewed the Waitangi Tribunal and its associated legislation as 'the biggest single barrier to harmonious race relations' (ibid., p. 168).

Māori perspectives presented by Hineani Melbourne encompass a narrower range of ideas, in that all are broadly in favour of Māori asserting sovereignty and retaining Māori identities. Some, like Ranginui Walker, expressed the long-enduring nature of their task, and expresses a disgust for the views of Doug Graham and those who agree with him; Melbourne notes that he sums up these views as 'We stole your sovereignty fair and square!' (Melbourne, 1995, pp. 31 - 32). Hekia Parata, later to become the Minister for Education, resists essentialist or homogenous expressions of 'Māori', and expresses a commitment to the term 'iwi' (tribe) over 'Māori':

> 'I believe I'm a dinosaur because I'm so strongly committed to 'iwi' as opposed to 'Māori'. 'Māori' is a nonsense anyway, because whenever you are talking about a Māori – no matter who that person is – that individual Māori is practising his or her own iwitanga. He or she is not bringing something generic called 'Māori' if they are

> giving Māori policy advice. I may be a lone voice in this regard but, to repeat myself, it's not 'Māori sovereignty' I want. Māori already have sovereignty as citizens of New Zealand' (ibid., 40).

Sir Tipene O'Regan expressed suspicion of the whole affair:

> '…I am suspicious of the 'power culture's' operations towards Māori in this society and suspicious of pan-Māori operations because they invariably collectivise the majority to tyrannise the minority. They always override Treaty rights' (ibid., 156).

Further, as Melbourne notes:

> Just as 'Māori' in an ethnic sense is a Pākehā concept, so is 'sovereignty', according to Tipene. He prefers to use the word tino rangatiratanga to describe Māori sovereignty. Tino rangatiratanga he describes as an iwi in control of themselves and their assets in their own rohe (ibid., 158).[23]

From this range of perspectives, many critiques of the bicultural turn emerge: that of the Pākehā who believe in 'one New Zealand' and see Māori sovereignty as a threat to that ideal, and that of Māori who perceive of Māori identity differently to Pākehā – as iwi rather than as a single 'Treaty partner', for example – and, as with O'Regan, are dubious of Pākehā efforts to be 'bicultural'. These perspectives illustrate the impossibility of a binary understanding of biculturalism, and the complexity involved in understanding the politics of biculturalism.

A sharp critique is given by Elizabeth Rata, who also identifies biculturalism as arising from Pākehā. Rata has been a prolific critic of bicultural reforms and related initiatives in education, and I will address other, more well-known arguments that she has made elsewhere. However, writing in 1997, she argues that the movement that I have here called the 'bicultural turn' is, essentially, an outlet for post-colonial Pākehā angst:

> The historical repositioning of Māori to Pākehā during the bicultural period of the 1970s and 1980s and the understanding of this repositioning, was another expression of the self-conscious construction of post-settler cultural identity that had already begun emerging in literature, the arts and the more affluent life-style made possible by the prosperity of the post-war period. Biculturalism became part of the new middle class's narrative as it set about constructing itself through establishing 'place'. Through the practical and idealistic representations of biculturalism (amongst other narratives such as literary identification) an imaginative construction of cultural identity grounded the new middle class in the time and place needed for the structuring of a reflective self-identity.
>
> Despite its shortlived life, the bicultural project … provided opportunities for both the resolution of the new class's antinomic guilt and for a self-reflective (and guilt free) narrative identity construction… (Rata, 1997, p. 2)

[23] Rohe means region associated with a tribe.

More explicitly, Rata states elsewhere that the 'bicultural project was rooted in and shaped by liberal guilt which characterises the politically radical section of the new middle class in postwar New Zealand' (Rata, 2000, p. 111). Of relevance to the present study is Rata's contention that biculturalism was able to be developed as a social policy due to the ideology of the post-war generation, which was notably more affluent and more highly educated than previous generations, and which was able to reflect on New Zealand's colonial past at a greater historical distance than was previously possible. It is worth reflecting that the late 1980s in New Zealand was indeed a time of liberalisation and radical change: it was the Labour Government of 1984 – 1990 that was in power during much of this period in which the 'bicultural turn' occurred, and which instituted the famously (or infamously) neoliberal economic reforms of 'Rogernomics' (see for example Easton, 1989 and S. Walker, 1989). Also of note is Rata's argument that biculturalism operates as a means of assuaging post-colonial feelings of guilt.

In 1997, Rata was able to write of biculturalism's 'shortlived life', and perhaps the bicultural project did indeed appear from that vantage point to be at an ebb. However, it is clear in the present day that the bicultural project remains very much alive, and so too does Rata's work in critiquing it: as of 2018, Rata has continued to publish research critical of biculturalism, for example characterising is as 'a new ideological hegemony' (Lynch & Rata, 2018, p. 4). I will return to Rata and those scholars who join her in her views later in the present thesis. In any case, if indeed there was a lull in Pākehā interest in biculturalism in the period in which Rata was writing, by 2005 it appears that it was revived thanks to the speech given by Don Brash in Orewa, which had the effect of bringing the bicultural relationship back into prominence in the public eye (Snedden, 2005, p. 182). It is interesting to note, though, that the term biculturalism is increasingly little used; the title of Snedden's book is *Pakeha and the Treaty: why it's our Treaty too*, and as demonstrated in (for example) the Education Council document entitled *Our Code, Our Standards*, which describes a commitment to 'Te Tiriti o Waitangi partnership' (2017, p. 10). There are some appealing aspects of the use of terms such as 'Treaty Partnership', and chief of these is the fact it is undeniably more specific to the particular circumstances operating in New Zealand. Perhaps this is why the term is finding favour.

Moana Jackson (1987) has gone further than Rata, in that not only does he argue that biculturalism serves Pākehā interests – he argues that the implementation of the principles of bicultural change in the governance of New Zealand 'has hitherto been confined by Pākehā concepts of their appropriateness' (p. 205), and that 'the process of bicultural change has actually been defined from a monocultural perspective' (p. 206) – but he argues that Pākehā have in some cases actually been harmful to Māori:

> Indeed, the belief that knowledge of the language necessarily makes one more sympathetic is disputed by Māori people aware of our shared history. They point with often bitter sadness to the fact that many of the most effective proponents of cultural assimilation were people fluent in the Māori language and apparently comfortable in Māori settings. That fluency and comfort did not alter the fundamental Pākehā perspectives they brought to Māori issues… (p. 208)

One wonders if the Pākehā that Jackson mentions in his critique – those who showed fluency in Māori settings and yet advanced an agenda of assimilation – were conscious of the 'bitter sadness' that they were to cause. Jackson's is a trenchant critique in light of the modern move to increase the knowledge of te reo Māori amongst teachers in New Zealand: certainly this is a worthy initiative, but being fluent in te reo does not necessarily make one sympathetic to Māori causes, and it will not guarantee a successful implementation of biculturalism by itself.

It is worth noting that biculturalism as such is not a *cause célèbre* of Kaupapa Māori advocates, who argue in support of Kaupapa Māori philosophy and theories of change as ends in and of themselves. Indeed, Pākehā interest in theorising about Māori is not always welcome at all, as demonstrated by the following commentary about the work of feminist scholars of education:

> …feminists and other concerned Pākehā educators run the risk of conceptualising Māori (and Pacific Island) girls simply as 'doubly disadvantaged / oppressed girls', and suggesting that the solutions to the 'problem' of Māori girls' education lies within the domain of a (Pākehā) non-sexists or feminist pedagogy, rather than in such educational models such as kura kaupapa Māori (Jones, McCulloch, Marshall, Smith, & Smith, 1995, p. 117).

How then can non-Māori seek to work with Māori people in an ethical way? Linda Tuhiwai Smith gives an indication of one way forward when discussing indigenous research paradigms. She defines such research strictly, as being necessarily carried out by indigenous researchers, but, she addresses the matter of non-indigenous researchers working with indigenous research subjects as follows:

> On the positive side, in the New Zealand context, work is being carried out in terms of bicultural research, partnership research and multi-disciplinary research. Other researchers have had to clarify their research aims and think more seriously about effective and ethical ways of carrying out their research with indigenous peoples. Still others have developed ways of working with indigenous peoples on a variety of projects in an ongoing and mutually beneficial way… (L. T. Smith, 2012, pp. 17 - 18).

The key aspects of Smith's definition involve researchers thinking seriously about the way they work with indigenous peoples – what is effective, and what is ethical; such reflection will help to ensure that one remains sensitive to the needs and concerns of the other party to the research. Also of import is the phrase 'mutually beneficial' – that is, the research must not be simply of benefit to the researcher, but also to the subject.

An interesting example to consider is the case of Alison Jones, who is a well-known Pākehā academic who nevertheless worked with Māori academic Te Kawehau Hoskins to edit a special edition of the *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* that focused on issues relating to Kaupapa Māori. In her introduction, Hoskins noted that her choice of Alison Jones as a co-editor was a controversial one that saw two unnamed colleagues decline to contribute to the journal:

> While stressing that they do not adhere to essentialist views of ethnic and cultural identity, my colleagues challenged Alison's role as co-editor on the basis of her being non-Māori. They argued that the struggle for Māori control over Māori writing and scholarship had been hard won, and that Māori should have decision-making authority over any kaupapa Māori project (Hoskins & Jones, 2012a, p. 4).

As Hoskins goes on to state, she considered Jones to be a suitable co-editor for her long history of 'political commitment to Kaupapa Māori aspirations' and positive relationships with Māori academic colleagues, such that she is to be considered part of the 'whakapapa' of Kaupapa Māori (p. 5).

Conclusion

What is clear from the work that I have carried out is that there has been no one single idea of biculturalism shared by New Zealanders throughout our nation's shared history. In the early part of the nineteenth century, Āpirana Ngata saw the benefit to Māori of adopting elements of Pākehā knowledge, and that to him was biculturalism; in the latter part of the century, Pākehā saw the benefit in terms of mitigating feelings of postcolonial guilt and in terms of being perceived to repudiate racism by deliberately including Māori, and that to them was biculturalism. The church in the early years of colonial settlement, being a colonial institution in and of itself, saw the benefit in supporting the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi and the teaching of British culture and values to Māori, and I would argue that this must be considered biculturalism; more latterly, it has rejected colonialism and embraced that hero of the decolonisation movement, Paulo Freire, and espoused the virtues of a different, inclusive, and post-colonial mode of biculturalism. Recently, Māori have taken a position that is distinctly different to that taken by Ngata: considering their children to be entirely proficient in and able to access the various arts and means of Pākehā knowledge, they have developed the system of Kaupapa Māori schooling so as to reinforce the teaching of and support the survival of Māori knowledge. Inasmuch as Pākehā knowledge is taught in kura, such as in the teaching of pāngarau (mathematics), pūtaiao (science), and te reo Pākehā, this teaching too is bicultural.

I noted in my introduction that any attempt to homogenise biculturalism may ultimately be futile: that is, efforts to reform policy, institutions, and society in general may result in little success if they are based on homogenised conceptions of what biculturalism is. The 'bicultural turn' can be understood as a homogenisation of biculturalism, a singular model of biculturalism adapted to the purpose of government policies and institutions. However, as demonstrated by the critical reaction to this bicultural turn, there is suspicion on the part of both Māori and Pākehā about the agenda of this new biculturalism. Such suspicions are driven by questions that are rooted in the analysis of discourse: who is doing the homogenising, and to what end? Who benefits from the homogenisation of biculturalism, and how? As I go on to argue, it is largely Pākehā, in fact, who benefit from the bicultural turn. This is not to say that Māori do not benefit, but to briefly return to

Patricia Johnston's critique of biculturalism, we may not have yet arrived at a biculturalism that centres Māori interests. If the stated goal of bicultural policy is to benefit Māori, it must be asked how well it is achieving this goal.

Chapter Three: The 'Official Biculturalism' and Educational Policy

In Chapter Two, I suggested that the 'bicultural turn' in the 1980s and 1990s in Aotearoa New Zealand resulted in the rise of an institutional biculturalism, called 'official biculturalism' by Mane-Wheoki (2003, p. 84). In this chapter, I will consider the manifestation of this official biculturalism in schools and educational policy. I proceed through the examination of documents such as the New Zealand Curriculum and NCEA achievement standards, and through a consideration of various policies and initiatives put in place to support Māori inclusion in mainstream schools. These documents, inasmuch as they are targeted towards institutions that cater to the mainstream – that is, the population at large – promote a particular and homogenous form of biculturalism that, for all that it purports to take the moral high ground, is problematic when given consideration. It is in fact this form of biculturalism, encountered in a reading of NCEA music achievement standards, which formed the initial seed of inquiry for the present research, and it is this form of biculturalism that I suggest here is in most need of critical reform.

Introduction to the Curricula

Presently, two curricula exist in parallel in Aotearoa New Zealand: *The New Zealand Curriculum*, intended for English-medium schools, and *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa,* which caters to Māori-medium schools and offers a Māori worldview for teachers and students. I will primarily consider the content of the first document here for several reasons: music education practice in New Zealand, inasmuch as there is a distinction to be drawn between music education and Māori Performing Arts education, is largely conducted according to *The New Zealand Curriculum's* guidance; many of the general comments to be made about the theory and practice of curriculum development and implementation can be understood to apply to both documents in at least a general sense; and last but not insignificantly, my command of te reo Māori is not sufficient to allow me to conduct a competent close reading of *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa*. Before proceeding, I will note that there is a significant gap in the music education literature regarding the place of music education in Kura Kaupapa Māori, one that when filled would have significant implications for the understanding of biculturalism in music education in Aotearoa New Zealand.

The New Zealand Curriculum has two major parts: a lengthy preamble concerning many different aspects of education in New Zealand, and a set of achievement objectives organised by learning area. These are presented as a series of eight charts and constitute the explication to teachers of what it is they should teach. The preamble notes an overall vision for students, gives underlying principles to be followed in developing curriculum, values that students should be encouraged to uphold, and key competencies that students should develop. It goes on to describe the official languages of New Zealand – which, in addition to English, are Te Reo Māori and New Zealand Sign Language – and to explain the thinking behind the eight broad learning areas of the curriculum, which are English, the arts, health

and physical education, learning languages, mathematics and statistics, science, social sciences, and technology. There follows a section devoted to effective pedagogy, and another that explains the application of the curriculum document to the programme of learning offered by individual schools. The achievement objectives describe the programme of learning appropriate to students from years one to thirteen of their educational careers, which span the time from when they enter primary school until when they leave secondary school. This is expressed in terms of the type of task that students are expected to be able to complete or the understanding that they are to be able to demonstrate at any given stage in any given subject. Although there are thirteen years of schooling, there are only eight levels of the curriculum; as a result, students are expected to work towards achieving some achievement objectives over the course of more than one year.[24]

In order to give some indication of the text, I will briefly give examples of achievement objectives, giving examples from the 'Developing Practical Knowledge' strand of the music curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007; see foldout pages, unnumbered). At level one, students should be able to demonstrate that they can:

> Explore how sound is made, as they listen and respond to the elements of music: beat, rhythm, pitch, tempo, dynamics, and tone colour.

At level two:

> Explore and identify how sound is made and changed, as they listen and respond to the elements of music and structural devices.

The objective at level two is more complex than that at level one, with the question of what constitutes 'elements of music' left undefined and 'structural devices' added. This gradual scaffolding of complexity increases until the eighth and final level, which is as follows:

> Analyse, apply, and evaluate significant expressive features and stylistic conventions and technologies in a range of music, using aural perception and practical and theoretical skills.

The precise delivery of this curriculum is left to the discretion of individual schools and teachers: in other words, it is a deliberately permissive curriculum. It does not define what is meant by 'respond to the elements of music', for example, and any number of musical activities might seem to suit, including those that involve musical responses, such as perhaps the imitation of a given melody, or those that involve analytical responses, such as the verbal discussion of or the notation of said melody. Just as there is no indication of the nature of the evidence required, there is no indication of the substance of the programme – what music is to be listened to, or how, or when. This aspect of the curriculum has been viewed as both a strength and a weakness; Jane Abbiss has written that it places the burden

[24] The levels of the curriculum do not correspond to the levels of the National Certificate of Educational Achievement, or NCEA: NCEA Level One is a qualification usually attempted by students who are in Year 11, whereas Level One of the curriculum is expected to be undertaken by students who are beginning primary school.

of making important decisions about course design on teachers' shoulders, and that teachers will inevitably vary in their responses.

> Permissiveness in curriculum is seen by educators as a strength because of the flexibility it provides to shape learning in ways that are meaningful for students. With a permissive curriculum, though, go interpretation issues relating to concepts, content and teaching, and learning approaches. What should be learnt and how should students engage with different ideas? The responses to this question will depend on the understanding that teachers have of the theoretical foundations and ideological tensions in the curriculum, and their personal commitments to traditional, transformative or other educational agendas (Abbiss, 2011, p. 133).

For music teachers, the permissiveness of the curriculum, to use Abbiss' words, allows the provision of a wide number of music programmes in different schools that cater for the needs and interests of many students, and allows for the development of both 'traditional' programmes of Western music education and innovative cross-curricula learning programmes in which, for example, students might combine their practical knowledge of music with elements of the technology curriculum in developing an electronic music installation or a musical theatre production.

It is possible to offer a critique from a bicultural perspective of *The New Zealand Curriculum.* The carefully neutral language of the achievement objectives appear to offer little opinion on whether the music that is studied should be Māori, or Western, or from other cultures. However, one may gather from a reading of *The New Zealand Curriculum* that it is in fact Western knowledge which is privileged: in the *Curriculum's* very restrained support of cultural diversity, it in fact tacitly supports the dominance of mainstream culture. In reaching this conclusion, I echo the critique of Mane-Wheoki of the earlier *Arts Curriculum* document, which he said was a 'very Pākehā, Eurocentric document' (p. 88). The way in which such cultural dominance is maintained and supported should be revealed and critiqued, and argue that *The New Zealand Curriculum* falls down as a curriculum document in that it is a document that makes no apparent attempt to respond to the politics of cultural hegemony in which it operates. If the goal of biculturalism is to remedy the wrongs of colonialism in Aotearoa New Zealand, then *The New Zealand Curriculum* is not up to the task, and I will demonstrate its insufficiencies in this regard here.

Biculturalism and The New Zealand Curriculum

In the previous paragraph I noted what I called the 'very restrained support of cultural diversity' in *The New Zealand Curriculum*. In order to contextualise this attitude towards cultural diversity, it is worth noting the relatively sudden shift which has occurred in government policy as a result of the bicultural turn. The government has long sponsored parallel systems of education in order to cater to both Māori and non-Māori, first with the now-defunct system of Native Schools and later with the Kura Kaupapa Māori. However, these systems must be understood as differing in their origins and intent: the Native Schools

were established according to government policy with the purpose of furthering Europeanisation – that is, they were to instil their Māori students with European cultural values and skills, and that to this end they followed a curriculum designed with European ends in mind (Simon & Smith, 2001). In contrast, present-day Māori-medium schooling is a modern movement originating in the Māori desire to promote and nurture Māori language and culture. To support this goal, the government has released *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa* specifically for use in Māori-medium schools to support the Māori kaupapa. The mainstream curriculum used in public schools, then, which formerly did not make explicit allowance for Māori culture at all, has now been ostensibly adapted so that it is at once inclusive of Māori and other cultures and yet still allows the teaching of 'mainstream' knowledge and skills. Thus, there has been a shift from the past practice of having a 'mainstream' curriculum specialising in the transmission of Western knowledge and taught in public schools and an adapted curriculum in native schools to the present practice of having a specialist curriculum that supports Māori means and goals and a 'mainstream' curriculum that aims to be broadly inclusive of many cultures and types of knowledge. This reflects the pervasive nature of the 'bicultural turn': biculturalism has become mainstream, captured to serve normative policies and practices.

The nature of this 'official biculturalism' is of particular interest to the scholar of critical pedagogy, especially as *The New Zealand Curriculum* upon closer examination in fact makes little effort to be inclusive of Māori. A survey of the document with a view to recording references to bicultural policy and Māori culture, shows that the document makes only limited reference to matters of biculturalism or even of Māori education:

- The cover art includes kowhaiwhai patterning and a heavily posterised photo of flax leaves, thus referencing visual ideas that are significant within Māori culture;
- The foreword includes salutations in Māori – 'tēnā koutou katoa', and 'nāku noa' (p. 4) – but is otherwise entirely in English. It describes the development of the present *New Zealand Curriculum* document but makes no mention of *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa*; the distinction between the two curricula is explained instead in a succinct series of paragraphs on page 6. *Te Whāriki*, the early education curriculum, is mentioned on page 41 and briefly on page 42;
- Explaining the curriculum's 'vision' on page 8, the authors describe young people 'who will work to create an Aotearoa New Zealand in which Māori and Pākehā recognise each other as full Treaty partners, and in which all cultures are valued for the contributions they bring', and the 'Treaty of Waitangi' principle is explained with the words that the 'curriculum acknowledges the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the bicultural foundations of Aotearoa New Zealand. All students have the opportunity to acquire knowledge of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga' (pp. 7 and 9).

- The values and key competencies promoted by the curriculum are explained on pages 10 – 13. 'Manaakitanga'[25] is mentioned alongside 'peace' and 'citizenship' as part of the meaning of the value of 'community and participation for the common good' (p. 10); the word 'whānau' is mentioned as an example of community on page 13;
- The language of te reo Māori is introduced and the benefits of learning it are given half of page 14, placed opposite similar information concerning New Zealand Sign Language.
- The subject areas are described from pages 16 – 32, with brief references to biculturalism, the Treaty, to Māori people, or to aspects of Māori culture, but not in a comprehensive or systematic way across all subject areas. As examples: in describing the subject area of 'Music – Sound Arts', it is explained that 'value is placed on the musical heritages of New Zealand's diverse cultures, including traditional and contemporary Māori musical arts' (p. 21); the concept of hauora, translated as 'a Māori philosophy of well-being' is explained as a key concept in the study of health and physical education (p. 22) and explained further, albeit briefly, in a note printed on the inside back cover; and the example of 'taonga'[26] is given as a context for the study of technology (p. 32);
- A whakataukī[27] prefaces each of the descriptions of the eight learning areas, with English translations given in a glossary printed on the inside back cover;
- On page 44, it is noted that in addition to other requirements, Boards of Trustees are required, 'in consultation with the school's Māori community, to develop and make known its plans and targets for improving the achievement of Māori students'.

The above list is a concise but representative survey of references to Māori, deliberate usage of Māori language, and bicultural policy in the curriculum document. The nature of these references, being brief and at times cursory, is such that I would argue that Māori are not so much included in *The New Zealand Curriculum* as tokenised; if more proof of this were needed, a note on page 16 emphasises the importance of literacy in English but does not mention te reo Māori at all.

One can therefore understand the criticism given by Georgina Stewart of the document:

> In June 2007, late in the production of the final mainstream curriculum document, several people including me were contacted by email with a request for help from the Science curriculum manager. It had been decided that each mainstream learning area would open with a whakataukī. The most plausible explanation for such a move at this late stage, nine months after the draft for consultation was released, was that

[25] Manaakitanga is a caring, generous, or hospitable attitude.
[26] Taonga are treasured objects or concepts.
[27] Whakataukī are proverbs.

> widespread concern had been expressed by the school sector over the lack of reflection of Māori culture, language, or perspectives in the mainstream document. In this case I felt whakataukī would be more appropriate placed in the front, generic part of the document, which covered matters relating to students, not subjects… (2011, pp. 1176 – 1177).

She goes on to note that they recommended the same whakataukī that had been used in *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa* for Pūtaiao, but that it was overridden over concerns that references to the atua were not appropriate to mainstream science classes. She then poses some incisive questions: who stands to benefit, and how, from the inclusion of whakataukī in the mainstream curriculum document? If Māori advice is not taken, can the resulting choice of whakataukī be considered 'Māori', or even a 'whakataukī' at all? And why should the suggested whakataukī be considered appropriate for use in *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa* but not *The New Zealand Curriculum*? (p. 1177). Stewart's testimony that the explicit reference to Māori was a late addition to the document reinforces the argument that Māori are represented in *The New Zealand Curriculum* in only a tokenistic way.

In light of this argument, it is interesting to consider the production process of the mainstream curriculum document further. The production of *The New Zealand Curriculum* occurred roughly in parallel with that of *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa*, and has in fact been relatively well documented. For example, Sandra Cubitt, of the Ministry of Education, writes:

> The current curriculum framework was introduced in 1992, following the curriculum reviews of the 1980s. This resulted in a busy period of curriculum development in the 1990s… Seven national curriculum statements were produced from 1992 to 2000: Mathematics (1992); English (1994); Science (1993); a new subject: Technology (1995); Social Studies (1997); Health and Physical Education (1999); and the most recent, the Arts (2000). (3) The curriculum was regulated through the National Education Guidelines (the NEGs), first introduced in 1989 as part of the educational reforms that swept through New Zealand at that time (Cubitt, 2006).

From 2000 – 2002, a review known as the 'curriculum stocktake' was conducted, which resulted in a number of recommendations as to the nature and content of the New Zealand Curriculum document. The report made several recommendations concerning the curriculum statements. Its terms of reference were narrowly defined and did not include a commentary on the politics of ethnicity in New Zealand education, but in the executive summary at the beginning of the report, the following was stated:

> While the document [the curriculum framework] quite properly refers to the need to be inclusive of all students there are very few references to Māori, Pacific Islander and non-British Pākehā. Nor is there specific advice about dealing with gifted and talented students or students are [*sic.*] the lower end of the achievement range. Inclusions of this nature would greatly enhance the document (Ferguson, 2002, p. 4).

It would therefore seem that as early as 2002 – and it could be reiterated that the present curriculum document was published in 2007 – that the lack of reflection on Māori culture,

language, or perspectives, to borrow the phrasing of Georgina Stewart, was noted by reviewers of the curriculum development process.

From May 2003, the Curriculum Project was established to revise the curriculum in English and Māori. Cubitt wrote in 2006 that:

> Using the evidence from the curriculum stocktake, the project was conceptualised around four major goals that both support the Government's education goals and align with the Ministry's work:
>
> > 1. Refine and clarify outcomes. The revised curriculum will be more coherent, and reduced in volume, and will clarify the essence of each essential learning area…
> >
> > 2. Focus on effective teaching. The development of materials, hard copy and online, to support effective teaching practices, will be based on research and school-based projects currently focused on improving the quality of teaching in New Zealand schools, including Best Evidence Syntheses, Te Kotahitanga, and the Literacy and Numeracy Projects. The daily and complex challenge for teachers is their need for strategies to teach a diverse group of learners effectively and simultaneously in all areas of the curriculum.
> >
> > 3. Strengthen school ownership of curriculum. The involvement of school and curriculum leaders will be critical in developing exemplars and other tools that demonstrate the flexibility of the national curriculum, and how it can be implemented effectively as school curriculum…
> >
> > 4. Support communication and strengthen partnerships with parents and communities. Research shows that the engagement of parents and communities, in what children learn and do in schools, is essential for successful learning outcomes. This aspect of the national curriculum was neglected in the developments of the 1990s.

Cubitt's writing articulates a clear statement of government priorities with regards to the curriculum document. One will note that Te Kotahitanga is mentioned as a source of effective teaching practices. Te Kotahitanga was well-suited for this purpose, given its emphasis on what it called an Effective Teaching Profile (see, for example, Bishop & Berryman, 2009), that sought to incorporate principles of kaupapa Māori into mainstream schooling. Of course, given the apparent lack of consideration given to Māori culture and perspectives in the 2007 curriculum document, one might wonder how exactly those behind the Curriculum Project intended the curriculum document it produced to be understood as drawing on the principles of Te Kotahitanga.

Notably, in light of Cubitt's writing above, it was in 2006 that a draft version of The New Zealand Curriculum was published. This draft did not strongly express a desire to include Māori culture in mainstream education. For example, where the 2007 document has 'Treaty of Waitangi' listed as a principle of the curriculum alongside 'Cultural Diversity', the draft document has only one principle, that of 'Cultural Heritage', which is explained as

meaning that 'all students experience a curriculum that reflects New Zealand's bicultural heritage and its multicultural society. Students who identify as Māori have the opportunity to experience a curriculum that reflects and values te ao Māori,' (Ministry of Education, p. 9). Presumably, the idea that only students who identify as Māori should receive an education that 'reflects and values te ao Māori' was not received favourably by those who reviewed the draft, for in the 2007 document, the Treaty of Waitangi principle is explained as meaning that 'The curriculum acknowledges the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the bicultural foundations of Aotearoa New Zealand. All students have the opportunity to acquire knowledge of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga' (Ministry of Education, p. 9).

There was another criticism of the curriculum development process, which is worth noting for the oblique glimpse it gives of the importance of biculturalism to those charged with reviewing the curriculum. John Clark, a professor of education at Massey University issued a paper that criticised the Ministry of Education for avoiding certain issues of philosophy and epistemology with the production of the curriculum document as part of the stocktake process. Clark was critical of what he sees as the embrace of subjectivity and relativism by the writers of the stocktake report, and found the philosophical basis of the curriculum review wanting (2004). A response to Clark was written by Clive McGee, who in a passage that is particularly relevant to the present study wrote that:

> …the reality of a contemporary multicultural democracy like New Zealand is that there are many groups competing for their perceived rights to be recognised in the school curriculum. There <u>are</u> elements of relativism and subjectivity. Applying 'objective' criteria to make judgments about the validity and worth of competing demands is not impossible, but it is extremely difficult. That is why any national curriculum has been arrived at through compromises. Curriculum is always problematic (2004, p. 82).

Of particular interest to the scholar of biculturalism is McGee's reference here to multiculturalism in New Zealand society. One might ask whether he intends 'multiculturalism' to encompass Māori and Pākehā cultures in addition to other cultures in New Zealand, but this does not square up with his comment about people 'competing for their perceived rights to be recognised in the school curriculum'; as signatories to the Treaty of Waitangi, surely any rights Māori have to being recognised in the curriculum are actual, not merely perceived, and one wonders why they should compete for their right to be recognised in the curriculum. This particular line of thought is further evidence that indicates that biculturalism, for the stocktake group, was not a significant focus in the production of *The New Zealand Curriculum*.

An ethics of biculturalism – one that is centred on the idea of partnership and good faith inclusion – requires that the New Zealand education system work to be inclusive of Māori in 'mainstream' contexts, as to do otherwise is to surrender the mainstream to the dominant culture. A good faith effort in this regard requires a sustained critical engagement, and it is this which appears to have been absent from the *Curriculum* planning process and from the document itself. Perhaps the late and insubstantial 'Māori' additions to the *Curriculum* can be understood as being 'better than nothing', but they can also be

understood as actively contributing to the marginalisation and tokenisation of Māori in the education system. I will acknowledge at this point that the task of creating a bicultural curriculum is by no means easy: there are epistemological issues relating to the way in which Māori and Pākehā knowledge may be combined or taught alongside each other, and these must be dealt with alongside the political issues relating to which knowledge is deemed worthy of inclusion in the curriculum, and how such knowledge is identified. I must also acknowledge that *The New Zealand Curriculum* does not make it impossible to teach in a way that is critically bicultural in one's classroom, owing to the permissive nature of the curriculum structure; however, to make this statement is to damn the *Curriculum* with faint praise, as the *Curriculum* does little to encourage teachers in this regard, either. If this is mainstream biculturalism, or official biculturalism, then it would seem that such an approach to biculturalism is not critical, and is not designed with Māori interests in mind.

Assessment and the National Certificate of Educational Achievement

I turn now to consider biculturalism in relation to the assessment of students in secondary school music education. Of particular interest is NCEA, or the National Certificate of Educational Achievement. This system has been described as follows:

> The NCEA is a modular, standards-based, criterion-referenced, national qualification where students study a number of courses or subjects. For assessment purposes, individuals are not compared with each other but with the Assessment Criteria of a specific Achievement Standard. In each NCEA subject, skills and knowledge are assessed against a number of Achievement Standards, each with a set of written criteria. Some of these Standards are externally assessed, mainly by written examination, while others are internally assessed by the classroom teacher and subject to external moderation by NZQA. When a student achieves a Standard, he or she gains a number of credits that count towards an NCEA certificate. There are three levels of certificate. In general, students work through Levels 1 to 3 during their last three years of school. High achievement for each Standard is recognised by grades of Merit or Excellence. A student does not 'pass' a subject but rather achieves a series of Standards within that subject. However, a high level of Merit or Excellence grades within a subject qualifies a student to receive a 'subject endorsement' certificate. All NCEA Achievement Standards are stand-alone, leaving both teachers and students to choose which assessments to complete within subjects (McPhail, Thorpe, & Wise, 2018b, p. 7).

The modular nature of NCEA, comprising stand-alone achievement standards, has been criticised by scholars of music education. Lynne Wenden has noted that this modularity 'can result in teachers avoiding teaching and assessing in those areas that their students may find less relevant or more difficult' (Wenden, 2018, p. 64). McPhail has argued that there is little agreement about what teachers consider to be important features of a music education programme, even to the extent of considering whether skills in music notation are important

to teach, and has called for a discussion 'concerning agreed fundamental concepts' (McPhail, 2018a, p. 140).

So, what of biculturalism in relation to the NCEA – and in particular, to the NCEA music standards? At the outset, a brief survey of the NCEA music standards shows that none make explicit reference to Māori culture in their titles, but that some do make reference to it in the explanatory notes that accompany the Standards. In the table overleaf, I include such notes as they appear in the music achievement standards available at Level One.[28] Some of the explanatory notes are very similar; for AS91090 and AS91091, the two performance standards, it is explained that traditional forms of Māori music may be used for the purpose of assessment. This is a simple and obvious way in which Māori music may be found in a classroom, and indeed, I have had students choose to perform waiata for both of these standards in my own music classes. AS91093 similarly notes that traditional forms of Māori music may be used in the assessment of the standard, but adds that contemporary forms may be as well. This is a distinction that perhaps becomes more puzzling the more one thinks about it: what is meant to be the difference between traditional and contemporary Māori music? Is contemporary Māori music perhaps not suitable for assessment against the performance achievement standards, or is a difference in meaning not intended? In the notes for AS91095, a possible definition for 'traditional' is given – 'music of the tangata whenua' – but this does little to clarify the distinction between traditional and contemporary that is made in the notes for AS91093.

Number	Title	Version	Note
AS91090	Perform two pieces of music as a featured soloist	3	Explanatory note 4: Traditional forms of Māori music may be used for assessment against this standard.
AS91091	Demonstrate ensemble skills through performing a piece of music as a member of a group	3	Explanatory note 3: Traditional forms of Maori music may be used for assessment against this standard.
AS91092	Compose two original pieces of music	3	Explanatory note 3: (extract)

[28] For reference, I include the Achievement Standard number, title, and version number. All are to be assessed internally by the teacher, which means that the teacher sets the exact terms of assessment, including the assessment task, except for AS91093, 'Demonstrate aural and theoretical skills through transcription', which is assessed as an external exam administered by NZQA.

			Development refers to the way that musical ideas are manipulated using timbre, textures, and compositional devices e.g. repetition, sequence, layering, te mita o te reo Māori. Structure refers to the ways in which musical ideas are organised e.g. verse/chorus, ABA, whakapapa (genealogical narrative).
AS91093	Demonstrate aural and theoretical skills through transcription	3	Explanatory note 4: Traditional and contemporary forms of Maori music may be used for assessment against this standard.
AS91095	Demonstrate knowledge of two music works from contrasting contexts	3	Explanatory note 2: (extract) Contrasting contexts refer to the: • historical, social and/or cultural contexts in which the work was composed and/or performed e.g. medieval, renaissance, baroque, classical, romantic, twentieth or twenty-first century 'art' music, popular, rock, jazz, musical theatre, music for film, music of the tangata whenua (traditional), music of other cultures • composer(s) and/or performer(s) associated with the works • purpose and/or function (e.g. commissioned works, film music, whakapapa (genealogical narrative)). Explanatory note 3: Musical elements and features refer to: • elements (e.g. timbre, texture, form)

			• compositional devices (e.g. motif, riff, repetition, sequence) • performance practices (e.g. articulation, call and response, improvisation) • sound production technologies (e.g. delay, EQ, sound properties of acoustic instruments/taonga pūoro) • notation/transmission conventions (e.g. graphic score, figured bass, jazz/rock chord symbols, oral narrative).

Table 1: Survey of references to Māori culture in music Level One Achievement Standards.

It is clear that these standards are designed to operate in both bicultural and multicultural contexts. This is demonstrated by the example of AS91095, in which Explanatory Note 2 makes mention of both the 'music of the tangata whenua' – tangata whenua meaning 'people of the land', a reference to Māori that can be understood as referring particularly to the *local* Māori community – and 'music of other cultures'. These contexts, those of tangata whenua and those of other cultures, are given as examples of contexts that students might demonstrate knowledge of for the purpose of the standard. However, it must be noted that the standard as a whole privileges a Eurocentric understanding of music and the way in which it is situated in context, as the elements of knowledge that it describes – timbre, texture, form, motif, riff, etc. – are described in terms drawn from the Western musical tradition; the Māori terms given in the notes for AS91095 by contrast are small and optional considerations, positioned as afterthoughts. It must also be considered that whereas in a society where the dominant culture is Pākehā, it is fair to assume that all music teachers will have a shared understanding of what the Western musical analysis entails, it is not fair to assume that all music teachers have an understanding of Māori musical techniques and understandings. The terse approach of the standard, which does not define the techniques it mentions, ensures that these aspects of the standards will be avoided by the majority of teachers in practice.

In addition, the marginalisation of Māori by music in the standard is obvious: whereas Māori music is summed up as 'music of the tangata whenua', Western concepts are finely differentiated: namely medieval, renaissance, baroque, classical, romantic, twentieth or twenty-first century 'art' music, popular, rock, jazz, musical theatre, and music for film. If Western music were to be treated in the same way in this standard that Māori music is, all Western musical concepts would be summarily listed as 'music of the Pākehā'.

In considering bicultural or culturally responsive means of assessment, it is interesting to consider the work on such assessment practices in the context of early childhood education, which does not appear to have direct parallels in the literature relating to primary and secondary schools. Early childhood centres, perhaps unsurprisingly, adopt quite different approaches to culturally-responsive assessment to those found in secondary

schools using the system of NCEA. One such centre, Ngā Kākano o te Kaihanga – a self-described 'christian, kaupapa Māori centre', described the principles behind their approach to assessment, which I consider here. In so doing I give some excerpts below to indicate the relevant points to secondary school education (most points are truncated and one, about the transition to primary school, is omitted altogether):

> Whānau/whanaungatanga – the whānau is the key to our framework development.
>
> Whānau/child assessment – Assessment must acknowledge and make visible the relationship between whānau and child. Whānau do not merely contribute to the assessment of their children. They are central to it.
>
> Leadership and commitment – Openness to new ideas and practices, and upskilling educators and whānau have been crucial to the development of our assessment understandings. Strong consistent leadership not only guides and supports the growth and development of the educators, but is crucial in maintaining enthusiasm and commitment for the project.
>
> Te reo – Participating in the project has supported the reo development of educators. We began with kaimahi writing assessments in English and accessing the support of fluent speakers in the centre to translate into Māori. Over time kaimahi were encouraged to attempt to translate the stories themselves before accessing the support of others. Some kaimahi are now able to write assessments in Māori, accessing support from fluent speakers only when required. A marked improvement in te reo has occurred over a period of time (Ministry of Education, 2009, p. 17).

There are marked differences between the reported philosophy of assessment at Ngā Kākano o te Kaihanga and that which is apparent through the examination of NCEA achievement standards; at Ngā Kākano, emphasis is placed on the importance of whānau and on the connection the child has with their whānau. They also place great emphasis on the development of assessment resources in te reo Māori, and have accordingly worked to increase the levels of te reo Māori literacy in their centre.

Although there is also a commitment to the families of students on the part of secondary school teachers, as becomes apparent from the professional standards of the profession, the NCEA documents themselves do not consider this and are instead directly focused on documenting evidence of achievement outcomes produced by students. One can also say that teachers are committed professionally to developing greater proficiency in te reo Māori, and that students are able to submit work written in English or in te reo as they choose (provided that a competent marker can be found), but whereas Ngā Kākano o te Kaihanga provides assessment material in te reo, the practical reality is that most secondary school teachers lack the required proficiency to write internal assessments in that language for their students.

The above principles from Ngā Kākano o te Kaihanga are just one contribution to the 2009 Ministry of Education pamphlet, *Te Whatu Pōkeka*, in which issues of culturally-responsive assessment in early childhood education are considered. The entire document is aimed 'to stimulate debate and to encourage people to share their experiences and views' (p.

47). Lesley Rameka, perhaps the most prominent scholar in the field of kaupapa Māori assessment in early childhood learning, has written that a contributor to *Te Whatu Pōkeka*, Ruth, a supervisor at the Best of Both Worlds Bilingual Preschool, found that participating in the project 'made them realise that they were, in fact, not "the norm" and that it was important to express and reflect this difference in their assessment practices' (Rameka, 2013, p. 13). For my part, I would submit that while *Te Whatu Pōkeka* is interesting, it is light on the theoretical aspects of what might constitute assessment practice: there is much discussion of values and even of ways in which students might demonstrate these values, but there is little discussion of the very nature of assessment – for example, what the nature and purposes of assessment are, what precisely is being assessed, and how and why teachers might design and employ any given assessment practice in any given area of the curriculum. In this regard, *Te Whatu Pōkeka* more closely resembles an extension of the curriculum rather than a coherent philosophy of assessment according to kaupapa Māori principles.

There is certainly a need for assessment practices in New Zealand music education (to say nothing of education more generally) to become more inclusive of kaupapa Māori principles and practices. For all that the NCEA music standards purport to be inclusive of Māori knowledge and skills, in practice this is not always evident. I will give an example, drawn from my own experience as a teacher, of a way in which NCEA music standards are not suited to the task of assessing Māori musical practices: I once taught a young man who was a very talented singer and was enthusiastic about his kapa haka even as he found other aspects of his schooling challenging, as was reflected in his attendance and overall academic grades. I recorded a twenty-minute performance of the school kapa haka group given in front of the gathered whānau of the students involved in which he took an obvious and sustained leadership role featuring some solo singing, and submitted that as evidence for the group performance achievement standard at Level 3, considering his contribution to have been excellent. The mark was reviewed by an external moderator who returned a mark of not achieved, considering that his individual contribution to the performance had not been substantial enough to achieve the standard with any passing mark at all. I would argue that this is an example of a non-Māori worldview being used to control what kinds of Māori skills and knowledge are acceptable, and that when this results in skilful pieces of work being rejected it is an injustice.[29]

Biculturalism and Teacher Understandings

Curriculum content is one thing, but curriculum delivery is another, and since New Zealand teachers and schools have considerable freedom to determine the precise content of their classroom lesson and unit plans, it is useful to consider the understandings that teachers

[29] A common way that music teachers try to get around the restrictions of the standard is to have one person sing each part in a given group performance situation. This meets the standard but is clearly at odds with the tradition of massed performance in kapa haka.

have of the curriculum and how they implement it. Literature on this topic is sparse, particularly in relation to the topic of biculturalism in music classrooms, but there does exist a range of perspectives that allows one to perceive what is likely to be the broad shape of understanding amongst teachers.

Although *The New Zealand Curriculum* is generalist in its approach, there are unspoken limits placed on teachers in their implementation of the curriculum in their classrooms. These limits are constructed by teachers and policy-makers and are not made explicit in the document. In the case of the values and principles in the *Curriculum* that are found in the preamble, although the way they are described allows room for a variety of implementations and practices in schools, it is important that there is common ground in how teachers and schools approach these matters. Ross Notman has argued that it is important for teachers to hold or 'live' a particular value for them to effectively teach or model it (Notman, 2012, p. 47); for the national curriculum to be applied in a coherent manner across New Zealand, this would imply that all teachers must hold or 'live' the curriculum values in ways that are congruous and sympathetic with each other.

In the case of biculturalism, there is not a common understanding of the issues at hand and the perspectives held by all parties. Notman has found that teachers are in fact not confident in their understandings of the curriculum value of diversity:

> It will be important for school leaders to support teachers (and students) to increase their knowledge base and practical applications of values-based teaching and learning, particularly in areas in which they feel least confident. Teachers felt less confident when working with values of diversity and ecological sustainability. Similarly, students suggested that they found values of equity and ecological sustainability the most challenging to identify with (the latter value being commonly associated with "picking up rubbish") (Notman, 2012, p. 47).

Diversity, of course, is a key consideration that is directly relevant to issues of bicultural music education. Interestingly, although Notman found that teachers were generally less confident working with the values of diversity and ecological sustainability than others, a survey by Bailey et al. of student teachers found that the participants surveyed had positive attitudes towards the ideal of diversity.

> …over 80% of students expressed positive attitudes towards high expectations, cultural diversity, inclusion and learning to learn as central principles they would be applying in their curriculum decision-making. Many of the student teachers identified the principles as aligning with their own beliefs, and so felt it would be easy to implement them (Bailey et al., 2011, p. 128).

However, Bailey et al. found that the Treaty of Waitangi principle itself was viewed less positively than the values of diversity or inclusion:

> …there were neutral or negative attitudes by 36% of students towards the Treaty of Waitangi principle which serves to acknowledge the place of Maori and the bicultural foundations of New Zealand. However, these same student teachers

> reported their attitudes towards the principles of high expectations, cultural diversity and inclusion as positive or very positive (Bailey et al., 2011, p. 129).

The relatively high proportion of student teachers in this cohort who were neutral or negative towards the Treaty of Waitangi principle gave the authors of this study pause for thought, and it seems that they found reassurance in the fact that the surveyed teachers were broadly supportive of inclusive teaching practices:

> The Treaty of Waitangi principle is not easy to understand with respect to its role in curriculum decision-making. When considering this principle it is important to see that it is embedded in, and interacts with, each of the other principles… Although a number of student teachers in this study described their attitudes towards the Treaty of Waitangi principle negatively, these same student teachers were positive about high expectations, cultural diversity and inclusion. They are therefore likely to produce actions that align with Treaty principles. This is reassuring as their espoused beliefs include the Treaty of Waitangi tenets of participation, partnership and protection. Making the links between curriculum principles explicit may be a way of helping future students more deeply understand the nature of the Treaty of Waitangi principle. (Bailey et al., 2011, p. 130).

For my part, I wonder if these findings in fact reflect a wider suspicion in New Zealand society on the part of Pākehā and non-Maori about the idea of Māori sovereignty. The degree of ambivalence is demonstrated by the perspectives presented by Carol Archie (1995) and considered in the previous chapter. This presents further evidence for the idea of a 'colonialism without colonists', a notion which I first mentioned in Chapter One. This colonialism without colonists is manifested in the fact that the idea of embracing diversity is viewed favourably by teachers and the fact that a sizeable proportion of these teachers nevertheless reject the Treaty of Waitangi. Diversity, it seems, is not controversial, except when it involves the Treaty.

Another source of information about teacher understandings of biculturalism comes in the form of the literature relating to Te Kotahitanga, which was an educational initiative supported by the Ministry of Education and led by Russell Bishop, a scholar of education who supports Kaupapa Māori philosophies. The researchers involved with Te Kotahitanga 'sought to investigate, by talking with Māori students (and other participants in their education), what was involved in improving their educational achievement' (Bishop, 2003, p. 1). The literature relating to Te Kotahitanga is unusual in a sense, given that much of it is written by Bishop and his colleagues in support of their project, and that most of the remainder comes in the form of reports generated by the Ministry of Education.

The essence of Te Kotahitanga was the Effective Teacher Profile, which promoted the view that a teacher who embraced and implemented values drawn from Māori culture would be able to better engage Māori students and succeed in improving educational outcomes for those students, and provided the means for professional reflection and development. As described by Bishop et al. (Bishop, Berryman, Wearmouth, Peter, & Clapham, 2011), the profile was essentially a professional development tool for teachers to

ensure effective teaching of Māori students. This included two important aspects: that they 'reject deficit theorising as a means of explaining Māori students' educational achievement levels', and that they 'know and understand how to bring about change in Māori students' educational achievement and are professionally committed to doing so'. They considered that there were five observable ways in which teachers could demonstrate these understandings:

1) Manaakitanga – they care for the students as culturally-located human beings above all else.
2) Mana motuhake: They care for the performance of their students.
3) Whakapiringatanga: They are able to create a secure, well-managed learning environment by incorporating routine pedagogical knowledge with pedagogical imagination.
4) Wānanga: They are able to engage in effective teaching interactions with Māori students as Māori.
5) Ako: They can use a range of strategies that promote effective teaching interactions and relationships with their learners.
6) Kotahitanga: They promote, monitor and reflect on outcomes that in turn lead to improvements in educational achievement for Māori students (ibid., p. 12).

Bishop writes elsewhere that the Effective Teacher Profile was intended to promote 'discursive (re)positioning by teachers so that they can see themselves as being agents of change, rather than being frustrated in their attempts to address the learning of Māori students through deficit theorising, or blaming the students and their communities.' He further notes that teachers and school leaders were 'supported to engage in professional learning activities by means of the Te Kotahitanga professional development process', which for teachers initially consisted of 'a cycle of observations and feedback sessions,' to which later were added 'co-construction meetings and follow-up shadow coaching sessions that use evidence of student performance to actively identify how teachers might change their practice, so as to improve outcomes.' He further notes of an awareness of the danger of reforms such as Te Kotahitanga foundering once external support and funding are withdrawn, and writes of how he and his partners aimed to introduce not just the practical element of Te Kotahitanga but also the theory, in ways that promoted the self-determination of participating teachers and school leaders (Bishop, 2012, p. 41).

The Effective Teaching Profile was the basis of an observation tool to assist teachers to reflect on and develop their teaching practices in regards to the competencies and understandings demanded by Te Kotahitanga. In recent times, Te Kotahitanga is no longer an active project and other government initiatives have taken its place; it is of interest mainly for its pioneering work in making culturally-responsive pedagogy both systematic and a normal part of mainstream schooling. Te Kotahitanga was to influence Kia Eke Panuku, an evolution of the observational tool and reflective practices of Te Kotahitanga, and the present Communities of Learning initiative ("Kia Eke Panuku: building on success," 2018).

It is interesting to note that Bishop and his colleagues who implemented Te Kotahitanga were by no means the first to develop the idea that non-Māori could better engage with Māori by working to embrace Māori values.[30] James Ritchie wrote from a Pākehā perspective in *Becoming Bicultural* (1992), beginning by noting that as a Pākehā he is an outsider in the Māori world, but arguing that he has experienced success in working with Māori communities through developing an understanding of Māori culture. He gives a list of values for his readers to consider, but as this list is notably long and comprehensive, I will in the interest of brevity give in the following table the three of Ritchie's definitions for terms also given by Bishop and Berryman in their 2009 'Effective Teaching Profile':

1) Manaakitanga: In everything you do care for the people; 'the concerns of the whānau or the hapū, the tribe or Māori people generally, must be put before anything else' (ibid., p. 60).
2) Mana motuhake: The independence and sense of sovereignty of the iwi is of paramount concern. Status is always acknowledged by humility, deference, and respect (ibid., p. 54).
3) Kotahitanga: The ideal of Māori political process is achieved through consensual discussion. By this everyone is brought together, all personal differences of opinion are aired and, even if they cannot all be incorporated in the final decision, given respect (ibid., p. 57).

He notes in conclusion that these values may at times be in conflict with each other and that in various situations he has himself applied them imperfectly. Moreover, they 'do not derive entirely from the ethical guidelines of my own cultural heritage, nor from that of Māori'; nevertheless, they 'constitute an essentially New Zealand bicultural awareness' (p. 65). Ritchie's definitions are interesting to compare to that of Bishop and Berryman's, as they are sometimes difficult to reconcile. Perhaps some of the differences in understandings demonstrated in the case of the values of mana motuhake and kotahitanga come down to the fact that the authors are working in different contexts, and that Bishop and his colleagues intentionally derived specific meanings for these words in the educational context.

When considering what teachers understand by biculturalism, particularly non-Māori teachers, one can understand how the overlapping and sometimes contradictory policy documents and initiatives may cause confusion. Te Kotahitanga, and its successor Kia Eke Panuku, for example, existed alongside government guidance on Māori education in the form of *Tātaiako: Cultural Competencies for Teachers of Māori Learners*, a document written by the Ministry of Education which also gives a list of Māori values for teachers to understand and uphold in their classroom interactions with Māori students, and *Ka Hikitia*, the over-arching governmental strategy for educating Māori. In a critique of *Tātaiako*, Georgina Stewart (2016) makes note of the use of lists of values. Indeed, she says of the entire

[30] It is also worth acknowledging that Bishop et al. reference the work of Smith in building 'a picture of culturally effective Māori-medium schooling by identifying some of its constituent metaphors and their meanings in these settings' (Bishop, 2003, p. 12).

document that there is little prose text, and that the document 'consists largely of lists of bullet points under brief stem statements. The apparent simplicity and brevity of the text seems inadequate to capture the complexities of Māori education…' She summarises the text as follows:

> Reading Tātaiako does not take long and consists of reading variations of a handful of statements arranged in sets of bullets points, and all of which express and expand on the view that teachers are responsible for the educational outcomes of Maori learners, slightly rephrased and refocused many times…
>
> The bullet-point nature of the Tātaiako text is perhaps inevitable as it is based on five 'competencies' to be used for the purpose of assessing the cultural competence of teachers who teach Māori learners.

The 'competencies' are as follows (Ministry of Education, 2011, p. 4):

Wānanga	Participating with learners and communities in robust dialogue for the benefit of Māori learners' achievement.
Whanaungatanga	Actively engaging in respectful working relationships with Māori learners, parents and whānau, hapū, iwi and the Māori community.
Manaakitanga	Showing integrity, sincerity and respect towards Māori beliefs, language and culture.
Tangata Whenuatanga	Affirming Māori learners as Māori. Providing contexts for learning where the language, identity and culture of Māori learners and their whānau is affirmed.
Ako	Taking responsibility for their own learning and that of Māori learners.

Table 2: Competencies from Tātaiako.

The reader will note that Tātaiako's list of competencies is similar in some ways to that of Bishop and Berryman. There are still major differences: the definitions given for *ako* and *wananga* are similar only in that they concern teaching and learning practices. Tātaiako finds room for 'tangata whenuatanga', but omits mana motuhake altogether. One might question the value of such lists of definitions, as Stewart (2016) does:

> To base national education policy on Māori traditional terms is innovative, and can be interpreted as respecting and incorporating Māori language, knowledge and culture. But the result is that these five words have been cut from their cultural, linguistic and discursive roots… Each of the five words has been patched onto phrases and values couched in the institutional language of Western schooling. Knowledge of Māori language and culture makes apparent the extent to which the Tātaiako definitions distort the traditional meanings of these five key terms.

The argument that biculturalism is defined in Pākehā terms, rather than in terms that work to the benefit of Māori, is clearly relevant in this case: as Stewart argues, the 'Māori' competencies in Tātaiako are 'couched in the institutional language of Western schooling', thereby limiting their Māori-ness, and outright distorting their traditional meanings. It should therefore be no surprise that arguments have been advanced that such simplified definitions are in fact damaging to minority interests: 'desire for accessibility to the other can be simply another colonizing gesture' (Jones, 1999, p. 315). In other words, in reducing the important values of Māori culture to a list of principles or values or competencies, one is forcing Māori culture to conform to the demands of the mainstream: the biculturalism that exists in modern educational settings exists at the convenience of Pākehā.

Against Biculturalism and Cultural Responsiveness

There exists a school of thought in education scholarship that is critical of initiatives such as *Te Kotahitanga* and *Kia Eke Panuku,* and of the bicultural project in general. This criticism is not made along the lines that I have so far pursued: whereas I argue that the 'official' biculturalism privileges Pākehā interests rather than those of Māori, thus perpetuating colonial structures of power even as it professes to do otherwise, it has also been argued that biculturalism is variously an ineffective, incoherent, and even a prejudiced educational policy. Such arguments echo wider critiques of multiculturalism that exist in the international literature that are summarised as follows by David Gillborn:

> For the conservative critics, it (multicultural education) represents an attempt to politicise education in order to pander to minority demands… (Gillborn, 2005, p. 114)

Such critiques tend to be founded in the idea that students are capable of being taught without teachers needing to pay attention to issues of ethnicity, gender, sexuality, or the like: that is, they are founded on the fundamentally liberal perspective that everybody is equal, that affirmative action is not desirable, and that everybody should be understood as operating on a 'level playing field' in education and elsewhere. I will explore here how this critique has been made in relation to music education in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Elizabeth Rata is perhaps the most notable critic of initiatives such as Te Kotahitanga, Kia Eke Panuku, biculturalism, and Kaupapa Māori scholarship. For Rata, problems such as defining biculturalism and Treaty partnership – the controversy regarding Māori

sovereignty, the problem of Treaty partnership as involving essentialised views of Māori and Pākehā identity and relations, and the lack of public agreement in the present day about the place of the Treaty in respect to Government mean that biculturalism – or 'culturalism', as she usually refers to ideas including biculturalism – is a critically flawed concept and one that in its current form does not deserve its place in academia and government (Openshaw & Rata, 2007). There are common themes that appear in Rata's arguments. For example, in a paper in which she was a co-author, she notes that *Kia Eke Panuku* makes claims that suggest

> …that there is a causal link between Māori students attaining a cultural identity and their educational achievement. This link is assumed in a number of policy documents; however, it is without justified argument or evidence (Lynch & Rata, 2018, pp. 3 – 4).

In a chapter co-written with Graham McPhail and Alexis Siteine, she makes a similar argument in respect to music education:

> …in some contexts, notably New Zealand, there has been a transition from a discourse concerned with multicultural education, which is to recognise the rich contribution of music from many different parts of the world, to a culturalist approach. This approach goes further than recognising and including a diverse range of music in the curriculum. It takes two further steps. Firstly, a causal relationship is claimed to exist between the music and the students who are connected to the cultural or ethnic group from which the music comes. This means that the music is regarded as 'belonging' to students from a specific ethnic group. Secondly, the claim extends to arguing that recognising the culture of the student by recognising his or her cultural background or ethnicity will lead to increased academic achievement (McPhail, Rata, & Siteine, 2018, p. 74).

I therefore understand Rata's work not as rejecting the idea of inclusion in education but rather as involving the attempt to debunk what she sees as an casual link made by advocates of inclusive education between culturally responsive education and student academic achievement.

For Rata and Lynch, student academic achievement should be understood as the foremost goal of education systems, and they are critical of systems of education that compromise this. Therefore, for example, they argue against those who 'advocate for a cultural knowledge-based curriculum', arguing that those who do so effectively deny access to academic knowledge to indigenous students. They note a Canadian study suggesting that the children of academics and activists who receive an academic education 'outperform their reservation counterparts engaged within a sociocultural knowledge-based curriculum' (2018, p. 14), and imply that there is a degree of hypocrisy or self-denial on the part of those who are themselves beneficiaries of an academic education who advocate for what they see as an inferior cultural knowledge-based curriculum (ibid.). Similarly, in the case of music education, McPhail, Rata and Siteine have argued:

> While there has been a necessary process of shifting the centre of epistemological gravity from knowledge to knower, the shift has resulted in students engaging in

> pockets of music knowledge development often at the expense of access to knowledge about music's generative concepts and systems of meaning (McPhail, Rata, et al., 2018, p. 87).

In other words, they argue that in attempting to create culturally-responsive means of music education, teachers are not allowing students a satisfactory music education. In bald terms, this criticism can be taken to mean that a bicultural music education improperly implemented can result in students – particularly Māori students, who are key stakeholders in bicultural policies – being taught music badly.

Such a statement invites further consideration: are teachers in fact delivering a substandard education, in that they are not engaging students and not preparing students for the world of music-making outside of school, or are teachers simply considered to be teaching badly because they do not deliver the type of music education desired by Rata and McPhail? Is it possible to deliver the type of music education desired by these authors and yet teach in a way that is culturally responsive? When McPhail writes of music's 'generative concepts and systems of meaning', what are they, and who decides what they are?

This latter question – *who decides?* – is of key importance to the debate over the aims and value of culturally responsive pedagogy, for it invites a consideration of the place of tino rangatiratanga in education. When tino rangatiratanga is considered, the right of Māori to have a voice in determining their educational processes is included as a goal in education systems alongside that of academic success, and in this regard the debate between McPhail and Rata and Kaupapa Māori scholars can be understood as a contest of epistemes: one in which student academic progress is valued above all else, and one in which the decolonisation of the education system is also a key goal. In wider contexts, Graham Hingangaroa Smith describes the fact that Māori have been able to make 'decisions ourselves' as a 'big difference' in the present day:

> There has been some criticism of Māori positioning in the post-Treaty settlement period. More and more iwi are coming into settlement monies. They have developed a range of strategies to build their iwi economic sustainability. Some simply copy dominant capitalist formations to create wealth, yet others are trying new and innovative approaches. The big difference is that Māori/iwi are making those decisions ourselves, as opposed to others who hold power over us making those decisions for us (Hoskins & Jones, 2012c, p. 17).

Russell Bishop also confronts what he calls the 'confusion about the culture of the Māori child', noting that whereas some perceive the notion of culture in the classroom to be a fixed and static object that is in fact enforced by the teacher – 'a teacher's initial reaction is to see culture in terms of the teacher's own needs to incorporate cultural iconography, to learn to pronounce Māori words and names correctly, and/or to incorporate Māori examples into their lessons…' (Bishop, 2012, p. 43) – that he and the Te Kotahitanga project endorse a student-centred model of culture, such that 'what students know, who they are, and how they know what they know or make sense of the world, forms the foundation of learning relationships and interaction patterns – what counts as culture – in the classroom'. Thus, the

teacher's role is to 'create contexts where children can safely bring what they know and who they are into the learning relationship' (ibid., pp. 43 – 44), and essentialised perceptions of Māori students are rejected.

This epistemological debate goes beyond a question of academic success (in the sense advocated by McPhail and Rata) vs consideration of tino rangatiratanga, however, but extent to a question of what knowledge is deemed as normal and legitimate. As Bishop et al. have described, a key application of Kaupapa Māori philosophy in education is the message

> …that Māori language, knowledge, culture and values are normal, valid and legitimate, [and] indeed are a valid guide to classroom interactions (Bishop, 2003, p. 12)

This passage explains a fundamental principle of Kaupapa Māori education that those who argue against 'culturalism' appear to reject. According to the Kaupapa Māori worldview, being Māori and using Māori language and incorporating Māori culture into the classroom is normal. This sense of normality is missing from the argument against 'culturalism', in which 'specific ethnic groups' are recognised as being distinct from the implied mainstream.

Rata and Openshaw in 2007 described reference to the Nuremburg rallies as being hyperbolic, but it would seem that Rata is not above making use of such hyperbolic references herself, at least in the capacity of being a co-author, when they suit her argument: this is seen in the examination of the words of a teacher who described a particular policy of grouping students by ethnicity in a school as a 'Star of David thing' – a reference to the symbol used to identify Jews in the Holocaust (McPhail, Rata, et al., 2018, p. 82). In reference to this type of issue, Bishop et al. concede that there:

> is a danger in stereotyping Māori students if teachers deny students' self-determination. Instead of subscribing to dominant perceptions about Māori children, we need to create classroom contexts whereby Māori students can determine their own diverse personalities in classrooms. This often ignored factor means that images teachers hold of classroom relationships must allow for the many realities within which children might live and grow up…
>
> …In short, we need a pedagogy that is holistic, flexible and complex, which will allow children to present their multiplicities and their individual and collective diversities, rather than a pedagogy that perpetuates teacher images (20003, p. 13).

Thus, the Kaupapa Māori worldview as outlined by Bishop does not argue that teachers should treat all Māori students as homogenous products of their culture and rather argues the opposite: that Māori students have diverse personalities. Further, in arguing that the tapu and mana of each individual child should be recognised, Bishop shows that the Kaupapa Māori philosophy is able to recognise this diversity and indeed that it is an essential part of this particular worldview.

Although it is important to be aware of the debate regarding biculturalism, culturalism, culturally-responsive pedagogy, and the like, it is difficult to arrive at a succinct response from the perspective of a critically bicultural music teacher to this debate, because

of the entrenched divisions on an epistemological level. In calling for a critical approach to biculturalism that necessarily avoids reductionist and binary conceptions of what biculturalism has to be, my stance in the present research appears to agree and contradict the positions held at various points by different parties quoted above.

Conclusion

The 'official biculturalism' presently found in the educational system is unsatisfactory as a means of working against Pākehā hegemony in Aotearoa New Zealand. This 'official biculturalism' is one which nods to Māori culture and people, and which says some of the right words in some of the right ways, but in fact co-opts Māori in the service of meeting Pākehā goals. This is not always mutually agreeable: consider the example of Georgina Stewart, who reported that along with her colleagues, she found that her knowledge and expertise as Māori was co-opted to serve Pākehā ends in the development of *The New Zealand Curriculum.* The 'official biculturalism', understood in these terms, is in fact a hypocritical endeavour.

How, then, is biculturalism a benefit to Pākehā? The benefit that biculturalism offers is that it enables one to demonstrate that one is virtuous in the modern sense: that is, not racist, not colonialist, and making an effort to 'do the right thing'. Biculturalism also offers the prospect of reassurance or absolution, as Alison Jones' suggests:

> Through being good, open, loveable partners in the liberal social economy *we* seek liberation, through hearing you, through 'your' dialogue with us. Touched by your attention, *we are included with you*, and therefore cleaned from the taint of colonization and power that excludes (Jones, 1999, p. 314).

'Official biculturalism' privileges the goal of achieving these benefits for non-Māori, and makes what amounts to only minimal or tokenistic efforts to be inclusive of Māori, or to work towards Māori interests as well. In this way, it co-opts Māori to serve Pākehā ends, and in this way, is exploitive.

The inadequacies of music education in this area have been recognised as well. For example, Tracy Rohan has recognised that efforts to be culturally responsive in Aotearoa New Zealand, a term used to encompass both bicultural and multicultural efforts, are lacking:

> 'I think we still have a long way to go yet to develop truly culturally responsive practice in music education. It is great when music education is an opportunity for students to learn about the many ways that music is created, learned, and understood, focusing less on 'product' and more on 'process'…' (Thorpe et al., 2018, p. 171)

Indeed, there is little that is systematic about the implementation of bicultural principles in education, or of multicultural principles, or of the principles of culturally responsive

pedagogy. For all that NCEA achievement standards purport to allow Māori musical practices to be assessed, the way in which they do so is vague and sometimes at odds with the realities of Māori musical performance. For all that the Ministry of Education has developed initiatives to support Māori students, to make the education system more inclusive, and to reduce inequality of educational outcomes, there is no simple, coherent message in this regard that teachers can receive; instead, they are subjected to various documents of various quality intended for various purposes. A teacher might look to *The New Zealand Curriculum* for guidance, and find very little to do with Māori education or biculturalism, or that teacher might look at Tātaiako and find bullet points describing Māori values that, as Stewart has argued, arguably reflect a Western interpretation of Māori knowledge, or that teacher might look at the vast amounts of literature relating to the now defunct Te Kotahitanga project, or they might look at the professional standards required by the Education Council, to say nothing of the various policies that might be put in place by individual schools; all of these various documents present teachers with different obligations. This is likely to result in the development of *ad hoc* understandings and practices on the part of teachers, who in reality, are more likely to be required to spend their time in the service of preparing for and teaching classes and running departments than addressing the finer points of educational philosophy in their spare time.

When the philosopher Michel Foucault investigated the institution of the asylum, he noted that the treatment of mental illness has transformed from the relatively barbaric practices of centuries past to one influenced by scientific and medical thought, and asked: 'why was the Classical Age so ready to inflict the most inhumane treatment on the mad without any hesitation? And what, then, was the change which, at the end of the 18th century, led to the perception and condemnation of such treatment as inhumane?' (Cousins & Hussain, 1984, p. 123). Cousins and Hussain remark that:

> A story built around the humane feelings of the reformers masks not only the disparateness of the changes that led to the emergence of the modern asylum, but also the fact that those changes were not principally concerned with the treatment of interned madmen (supposedly the object of those humane feelings) (ibid., p. 129).

Rather, Foucault notes, there was a self-serving agenda on the part of the reformists to introduce ideal moral values and restraint to those housed in the asylum (ibid., p. 133), a narrative which is somewhat at odds with the general history of psychiatry and the general claim that it has always been principally and nobly concerned with the scientific study and medical treatment of madness (ibid., pp. 139 – 140).

Schools in New Zealand may not be asylums, but it is not facetious to compare the two institutions: schools and asylums are both institutions that seek to manage or control the bodies and minds of those they cater to, both have client bases that are willing or unwilling to varying extents to be subject to the processes of mental health treatment or to education, and both institutions act in accordance with the wishes of state guidelines regarding health

or education.[31] In addition, just as Foucault's asylum was reformed with a moralistic agenda in mind, so too has been the New Zealand school system reformed with a bicultural agenda in mind; and just as the agenda of Foucault's reformers served their own interests, the 'official' bicultural reforms in New Zealand served the needs of the state.

Therefore, the biculturalism of the mainstream that is the dominant biculturalism at present is not fit for purpose, if that purpose is to counteract the harms of colonialism and racism and institutionalised discrimination and inequality, and I advocate a systematic and critical evaluation of what it is to be bicultural in the education system in Aotearoa New Zealand. As in the present system it is teachers who are charged with developing curriculum and assessment tasks, it is teachers who would most profitably engage in this task in service of transforming power structures in Aotearoa New Zealand. One way of doing this would be the provision of professional development in schools works towards improving teachers' understandings of Māori kaupapa and tikanga – that is, cultural values and rules, of the Treaty of Waitangi, and of Kaupapa Māori scholarship and principles. This could be done in a series of reflective sessions in small groups, much as was done as part of Te Kotahitanga, and which was positively received by teachers as allowing them a safe space to reflect on their practice. Schools should also provide teachers with professional development in learning te reo Māori. This is not to say that all schools should become bastions of Kaupapa Māori philosophy, teaching curricula based on Māori knowledge and in the medium of te reo, but it is through these means – a pedagogy of the pedagogues – that a critical evaluation of biculturalism becomes possible.

[31] A comparison to prisons is also appropriate: a teacher at Pukekohe High School once told me, 'if you're a prison guard, it's better to be one that the prisoners like.'

Chapter Four: Perspectives on Difference in Music Education

In this chapter, I review recent music education and Kaupapa Māori scholarship with a particular focus on considering the implications of this literature for the development of a critical approach to biculturalism within the context of Aotearoa New Zealand. A key challenge for bicultural music education is the way in which the difference inherent in the concept of biculturalism – whether conceptualised as Māori and non-Māori, Pākehā and non-Pākehā, powerful and powerless, or included and excluded by the mainstream – is handled. The different music educational scholars that I consider – David Elliott and those who share his views of praxial music education, Randall Allsup, and Graham McPhail – offer different arguments about the way in which difference in the music education classroom should be understood and addressed. The Kaupapa Māori scholars whom I consider here advocate for Māori interests in education, but also offer insights for non-Māori who wish to understand and work with Kaupapa Māori perspectives, and their work assists in the development of a critically bicultural approach to music education.

Music Matters, Elliott, and Praxialists

A seminal work in the field of music education is *Music Matters: a new philosophy of music education* by David J. Elliott, which was first released in 1995 (Elliott, 1995). In this book Elliott develops an approach to music education which he calls a praxial approach. This was quite different to previous and more traditional methods, such that, as Graham McPhail puts it, *Music Matters* was a 'schismatic break' in the field:

> Elliott's critique of music education at that time was far reaching and resulted in much debate. He argued for a new approach to music education, in particular what he described as an "overhaul" of a number of nineteenth-century ideas that had become hegemonic, such as the concept of musical autonomy and the related ideas of 'the work' and aesthetic experience. His book encouraged much needed changes in thinking and practice and was a distillation of ideas from many disciplines for the music education context (McPhail, 2018b, p. 178).

The import of Elliott's work is such that his work is referenced by most modern scholars of music education today. It has not remained universally acclaimed, and I will mention critiques of *Music Matters* by scholars such as McPhail, Douglas Nyce, and Randall Allsup. In particular, as will become clear, the praxial approach of Elliott enables educators to prioritise a locally-focused music education, one focused on the processes of music-making that is important to particular students and communities over the concerns of 'traditional' music educators. Perhaps it is because much of the policy and literature regarding biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand was also a product of the 1990s and both reflected globalised discourses such as the rise of multiculturalism and 'ethnic revival'. As Allsup notes:

> …music education writers from the 1990s would grow tired of the elitism attached to the word form, preferring to locate musical meaning within ideas of bound and multiple cultures as well as psychological domains. I see their preoccupation as a gesture to the identity politics that defined their time: an era's assertion of difference that was decidedly antiassimilationist. In their multicultural moment (so unlike ours today), new canons were called for and marginalized voices brought definable differences to our attention (Allsup, 2016, p. 22).

One can read Music Matters as having a clear anti-assimilationist perspective in its approach to understanding music and music education, and it is this aspect in particular that makes it sympathetic to the project of considering what a bicultural music education should be.

As a means of explaining the relevance of Elliot's music educational praxis to a bicultural music educator, I turn to the definition of praxis provided by Elliott and Silverman in the second edition of Music Matters (Elliott & Silverman, 2015). In their explanation, praxis is 'multidimensional':

> It includes active reflection and critically reflective action for the development of (1) personal and community flourishing and well-being, (2) the ethical care of others, and (3) the positive transformation of people and their everyday lives.

They go on to say:

> …praxial music education conceives musical actions in three related ways as
>
> (1) critically reflective and informed actions that are
> (2) embedded in and creatively responsive to both traditional and ever-changing musical/cultural/social values and
> (3) understood, taught, guided, and applied ethically and *democratically* for the positive improvement of students' personal and musical-social-community lives (2015, p. 17, emphasis added).

Elliott and Silverman's definition of multidimensional praxis needs little adaptation to make it suitable for the purpose of considering what a critically bicultural praxis might be. Here I have inserted my additions to their text in italics: a bicultural praxis is one that involves active reflection and critically reflective action for the development of (1) personal and community flourishing and well-being *in bicultural contexts*, (2) the ethical care of others *that bears in mind differing understandings of what constitutes ethical care*, and (3) the positive transformation of people and their everyday lives. It is also possible to adapt Eliott & Silverman's conception of musical actions within a critically bicultural framework. Here, also, I indicate my amendments with italics: a critically bicultural praxis will conceive musical actions as being (1) critically reflective and informed *by the knowledge and conventions of Māori and non-Māori cultures*, that are (2) embedded in and creatively responsive to traditional and ever-changing musical/cultural/social values *in Māori and non-Māori cultures*, and (3) understood, taught, guided, and applied ethically for the positive improvement of students' personal and musical-social-community lives.

The careful reader might have made note that in my adaptation of Elliott and Silverman's definitions I have removed their reference to democracy, quoted above, which for the sake of clarity I have emphasised with italic font. While being supportive of democratic processes, I am cognisant of concerns such as the tyranny of the majority which can silence minority voices. For example, Graham Smith has written:

> Clearly, the fact that Māori only constitute approximately 15% of the total New Zealand population puts them in a very vulnerable position when the political system in which they are located is organised around the Westminster system of democracy. The basic contradiction here is that Māori are structurally disadvantaged as a numerical minority within a political system organised on the taken for granted, 'fair and neutral' principles of 'one person, one vote' and 'majority rule' (G. Smith, 1997, p. 132)

In some classrooms, Māori are the majority; in other classrooms, they are not; and in some, they may even make up approximately 15% of the student body. In all, I suggest that it is possible to be ethical and inclusive of all learners, and that a simple appeal to democracy is not necessarily, in and of itself, transformational in purpose.

A major concern of Elliott and Silverman is that praxial music educators must act in accordance with professional ethics. They define ethical thinking as concerning 'what and how each of us decides we *ought* to live and act in relation to the daily challenges we face in our personal and interpersonal lives', and say that 'it follows from this that ethics is central to the formation and reformulation of our musical identities and ideals, our education identities and ideals, and our educative teacher-student encounters. Conceived as practice, there's an ethical dimension to almost every decision we make and act on as school music educators…' (2015, p. 20). This concern with ethics is echoed by Wayne Bowman in his own conception of praxis, for which he prefers the term 'practice' instead. For Bowman, a practice 'is a fundamentally *social, cooperative* mode of human *action* that takes its guidance from distinctly *ethical* dispositions – from understandings, in other words, of what kinds of activities and personal attributes support or undermine the human benefits the practice exists to deliver' (Bowman, 2017, p. 20, emphasis original). Moreover, there are

> …multiple musical practices, each with distinctive sets of provisional convictions as to what constitutes musicality, and each with distinctive ethical guidance systems. Musical practices differ in terms of the norms they embrace, and also in terms of the degree of latitude deemed musically (ethnically) appropriate for deviation from these norms (p. 21).

In the case of bicultural musical education practice, teachers must make ethical decisions about how to incorporate both Māori and non-Māori traditions in their classrooms. I suggest that the Treaty of Waitangi provides an ethical foundation for bicultural policies, initiatives, and actions in this regard, even if – as I argue in Chapter One – the exact nature of this foundation remains contested.

The philosophy of music education developed in *Music Matters* is one that purports to be inclusive of all musics and all music-making by all people. Elliott and Silverman's

theory of musical praxis attempt to achieve this through understanding music as being procedural, the product of socially-situated musical processes carried out by people situated in various cultures. In this way, one might think of this theory as being a 'bottom-up' approach to determining what music is relevant to include in the classroom, as teachers are invited to consider the way in which music is already present in the lives of their students and in the wider community. This may be understood as contrasting with approaches where inclusion is achieved through the study of the 'music itself' rather than as the study of music as social process, and through the study of a pre-selected range of musics drawn from different cultures. Such 'top-down' approaches do not privilege an understanding of music as being contextually situated. The approach to music taken by Elliott and Silverman is exemplified by the following passage:

> Every piece of music that's ever been created or will be created results from and reflects, to various degrees, each and all of the following interactive dimensions:
>
> - People (of all kinds in all locations) who choose to engage in
> - Musical processes – any and all forms of music making and listening – to create
> - Musical products of various kinds (e.g., vocal and instrumental improvisations; compositions and arrangements; musical-spiritual rituals; music-dance performances; music-film productions, etc.), in and for
> - People (infants, children, teens, adults, seniors) who live and make music in particular *contexts* (e.g., specific historical, cultural, geographic, economic, political, technological, religious, and other contexts) for
> - A variety of human "goods" or values, as determined by and for the people who are involved (to various degrees as music makers or listeners) in specific *musics*, or what we might also call "*musical-style communities*" (e.g., Irish traditional fiddle music, bebop jazz, etc., ad infinitum), or musical-social practices (p. 51, emphasis original).

The attractive feature of this 'bottom-up' means of understanding music is that it can be used with equal validity to understand Māori and non-Māori musics in ways that are sympathetic to the values and conventions associated with each culture. This avoids problems associated with 'universalist' philosophies of music education, which inevitably end up forcing the consideration of the music of one culture through conventions associated with more dominant cultures. This is not to argue that the musics of particular cultures must be understood in isolation, and indeed, considering the connections between traditions can provide scope for the development of critically bicultural music education: for example, when studying Western harmony in connection with Māori waiata, one may engage in the critical consideration of the colonial relations of power that have resulted in Western harmony being relevant to this repertoire of Māori music – for example, the influence of missionary hymns on Māori. I will consider universalism in more depth at points elsewhere in the present chapter.

Elliott's work has influenced many, including Thomas Regelski, who echoes the call for a music curriculum that is relevant to local concerns, one that incorporates 'actual, real-life musical pursuits that are widespread and easily available and accessible in society (at least regionally or locally)' (Regelski, 2016, p. 69). Regelski also emphasises pragmatism in his writing, as demonstrated by the following list of what he considers to be requirements for a praxial music education:

> (a) that music teachers be competent in the musicianship and other relevant criteria (e.g. interpersonal, technical requirements) of the musicking in which they engage their students;
> (b) that they take pedagogical steps to ensure that formal musical learning can be applied *independently* by students and graduates in the everyday conditions of musicking in society; and
> (c) that they employ appropriate and effective evaluative criteria regarding musical quality and progress (p. 70).

How might Regelski's writing influence the concept of a critically bicultural music teacher? His first point would suggest that a non-Māori teacher should be competent in Māori music conventions should they wish to teach it; his second emphasises the pragmatic aspect of his writing, demanding that it be useful for students to the extent that it can be used in their every-day music-making; and his third refers to 'appropriate and effective evaluative criteria'. I would suggest that what constitutes appropriate and effective evaluation in Māori and non-Māori cultures may vary, and that this has particularly high stakes in regards to the evaluation of Māori music with NCEA music achievement standards, which prioritise Western ways of knowing. Regelski's first point is a challenging one for teachers wishing to include aspects of Māori music into the 'mainstream' music classroom, and raises questions of who may teach music, especially if they are not of the culture from which the music originates.

This last problem can be considered in light of an account from Patricia O'Toole, who describes the way in which she included gospel music in a children's choir:

> For two years I conducted an inner-city children's choir. One spring I decided to feature gospel music because a number of the students sing in gospel choirs, and I wanted to validate their musical background and introduce this music to the other choristers… We sang four songs; two of these were Kirk Franklin tunes (Franklin is extremely popular among kids who listen to gospel music). When I first played the Kirk Franklin tunes for the ensembles, all of the students were excited, but it was clear that there was a subtle shift in emphasis on who was important in our music making. Most of the students who were experienced gospel singers did not come from schools with music programs. Consequently, where they may have felt like slow learners of conventional choral skills, they now moved into more comfortable positions as hosts in their familiar musical world (2005, p. 305).

There are two salient points worth mentioning here: first, the value of including music that is relevant to learners, as seen here through O'Toole's inclusion of gospel music in her

programme, and which gave students who were experienced in that style a chance to shine. In so doing, she shifted the balance of power in her choir, allowing students who were experienced gospel singers to become authority figures. She also writes of hiring an R&B band and an expert musician, whom she identifies simply as Ken, to work with the choir for the gospel numbers, and thus can be understood as having shared power in a different respect. Accordingly, I suggest that an important attribute in a teacher working within a bicultural framework is the ability to share power within the classroom, whether with other teachers, with expert musicians from the community, or even with skilled students.

The importance of the local in music education praxis is emphasised by Sandra L. Stauffer (2009), who draws on place-based philosophy in order to develop a theory of music education praxis that is specifically grounded in the needs and practices of the local community. According to Stauffer:

> Place-conscious education should embody questions of practice in the present: What practices occur here, in this community? Who is 'practicing'? Who is participant, onlooker, and absentee? What do the practices communicate about self, community, and context? What narratives, counternarratives, and subnarratives are embodied in these practices? Whose are they? What do they mean? Which practices dominate here? Why? These questions and others could create a 'starting place' for building place-conscious music curricula (p. 178).

Stauffer writes of teaching practices in which teachers and schools implement programmes of teaching and learning that respond to the specific needs of students and the local community, and describes teachers who work not through adopting the status of an 'expert musician' – though their expertise in particular musics is never in question – but rather by negotiating more co-operative statuses in their classroom, such as by learning a different musical style alongside their students or by working with outside experts.

For example, Stauffer gives the case of a teacher named Keith Preston at a school in Arizona who noted that the ensembles in his school were comprised primarily of Caucasian students, whereas the school as a whole had a roll with 55% minority ethnic students. To cater for these students, he started a mariachi band which became very popular in the local community. Stauffer notes that he enlisted expert community musicians to help teach this group initially, and that he placed himself as 'learner and co-learner' alongside his students (pp. 179 – 180). This example of praxis is clearly anti-racist in that the teacher recognised that racial minorities were not being served by the music programme being offered at his school, as indicated by their lack of participation (or their exclusion, depending on one's perspective), and he worked to address this by offering a musical programme that met the needs of those students. One will note that it is not enough to adapt his curriculum to do so: Preston also adapted his pedagogy to place himself in the position of learning alongside the students so as to be able to offer the mariachi programme successfully. In so doing he altered the balance of power in his classroom, as by bringing in outside experts and minimising his own status as a source of knowledge in this regard, he increased the status of Latino (and Latina) culture and reduced the 'whiteness' of his classroom.

A key characteristic of praxial music education thought is the rejection of so-called 'aesthetic' understandings of music, which in the Western tradition treat music as an object worthy of study for its own sake. This theme is taken up enthusiastically by Thomas A. Regelski, who is at pains to reject theories of aesthetic appreciation of music in favour of a more socially-grounded theory of appreciation. In *A Brief Introduction to a Philosophy of Music and Music Education as Social Praxis* (2016) he specifically addresses aesthetic philosophies of music that are in conflict with praxial philosophies of music, notably the tradition that draws on Kant's notions of 'free beauty' and the 'sublime', according to which music possesses a beauty independent of other considerations and should be appreciated 'for its own sake'; when one appreciates music according to this aesthetic tradition, one should disdain 'mere sensory delight, visceral pleasures, or praxial benefits', as one should seek to contemplate music on a higher plane of thought (pp. 30 – 32). Regelski calls such theorising a 'dubious relic' of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries (p. 46), and criticises the work of aestheticians such as Kant for obscuring the enjoyment of music: 'Music is simply more vital, more important, more valued, and in more and more ways, than aestheticians can describe… Consider young children, for example, who decidedly do not contemplate it aesthetically and who yet enjoy it immensely' (Regelski, 2016, p. 39). In this rejection of longstanding traditions of thought that have informed our understandings of music and our approach to teaching it, praxial music educators in this tradition can be thought of as being decidedly radical in their approach.

For some music education scholars, the anti-aesthetic approach goes too far. For example, Douglas Nyce has written that the 'effort to break free from philosophical and methodological procedures of the aesthetic movement is certainly an admirable one. However, it appears to me that Elliott may take this in the extreme opposite direction in redefining music as object out of existence' (Nyce, 2012, p. 183). Nyce also comments that Elliott 'seems to take the form and content of public school music education in the United States as a given, and as a model for his writings' (p. 190), and comments that he is unsure if '…the Elliott approach is likely to be fully effective if adapted to the New Zealand situation, except among those who have already been taught music skills and knowledge through other philosophical approaches and methods' (p. 192). It is certainly a fair assertion that there is a North American bias in Elliott's work, and it is also fair to say that he is not definitive on *how* or *what* should be taught, meaning that teachers may indeed draw on the work of other scholars in teaching students the basics of music.

Nyce is not alone in critiquing Elliott: for example, in keeping with Elizabeth Ellsworth's assertion that the literature on critical pedagogy assumes a white, male, Christian, heterosexual (and other normative categories) viewpoint, Patricia O'Toole critiqued the first edition of *Music Matters* (1995) because it did not provide adequate attention to issues of female, non-heterosexual, and ethnic identity in music education (O'Toole, 2005). For the purpose of the present study, I would note that – just as O'Toole developed a feminist music education praxis by purposefully discussing feminist topics with a men's choir she advised (2005, p. 303), one way to be a critical educator in the classroom is to explicitly teach music in critical terms, such that it is not left to the teacher to

consider issues of inclusion in the classroom. The critical approach then becomes a part of the curriculum.

In a review of the second edition of *Music Matters,* Deborah Bradley – who notes her admiration of the work carried out by Elliott in his first edition – critiques the notions of multiculturalism advocated by Elliott and Silverman in the second edition. She notes that Elliott and Silverman endorse the concept of 'dynamic multiculturalism', which 'emphasizes the need to convert subgroup affiliation into a community of concern through a shared commitment to a common purpose' (Elliott & Silverman, 2015, p. 449). Bradley raises the following questions about the idea of converting subgroup affiliation, noting that they remain unanswered in the text: 'to what should they be converted, and for what purpose? Who has the power to decide what affiliations need converting, and which may remain intact?' (Bradley, 2015, p. 17), and further questions what precise implications for identity are meant by the notion of 'subgroup affiliation' (p. 18). She further critiques Elliott and Silverman for stating a preference for the term 'interculturalism' over 'multiculturalism', noting that there is little meaningful difference between the two terms in the wider literature, and that if there is a distinction it is that 'interculturalism offers little to no challenge to the oppression of minority groups by the majority culture' (p. 21).

I do agree with Nyce that Elliott's work is in need of adapting to the New Zealand context to be effective in this country, as much of the text of *Music Matters* assumes a North American perspective. I also acknowledge Bradley's view that music educators should acknowledge race and provide the means to challenge the oppression of minority groups. However, in service of the development of a critical approach to biculturalism, Elliott & Silverman's work provides valuable conceptual grounding as to the topics of how music making may be understood in communities and in classrooms, how students may be understood as musicians, how teachers may approach matters of curriculum, and how music teachers may approach the ethical component of their tasks.

Randall Allsup and Remixing the Classroom

In *Remixing the Classroom* (Allsup, 2016), Randall Allsup offers a theory of music education that both draws heavily on the philosophy of critical pedagogy and critiques various aspects of *Music Matters*. Allsup positions himself as an advocate for 'open forms' of music and music education, open to innovation and a diversity of influences and outcomes. He begins by critiquing the traditional pedagogical model of teachers as 'masters' and students as 'apprentices'. He reflects that teachers in such situations are in fact 'gatekeepers' akin to those described in the Kafka parable 'Before the Law', in which a man is, after a lifetime of waiting and repeated attempts, denied permission to pass through a gate. In Allsup's words:

> …when authenticity or authority is 'discovered,' the Law gets made. Its codes become grammar. Context is poured like wet cement. Poetry becomes prose. Language is explained away and communication trumps the search for new meaning. A science of learning is created. The well-positioned determine value. This

> logic forms the caste system on which the modern university music programme is built… (Allsup, 2016, pp. 10 – 11)

Allsup characterises such an education system as oppressive, involving the 'love of overwhelming control' and the 'effort to silence alternative voices', and draws on the philosophy of Paulo Friere to argue that the conventional master-apprentice style of learning is oppressive (ibid.). Further, he critiques Elliott for adhering to the model of teacher as master:

> …Elliott writes about student growth and the appropriation of values, but for him, quality is measured and directed by the Master-performer and his earned expertise (p. 23).

Later, he returns to this critique, noting that Elliott's argument that music learning depends on students' being inducted into music cultures in authentic teaching and learning situations. This, for Allsup, implies the continuation of the Master-apprentice model, and in this model and in closed forms of education, a student's communication, inquiry, construction, and expression are fully controlled by the Master-teacher. In contrast:

> In an open form, the totality of a teaching event can never be limited by subject matter alone; rather, subject matter puts into motion an 'overflow' of production. This overflow is unstoppable, full of problems to investigate, opinions to share, questions to ponder, norms and standards to debate, and disclosures to reveal (p. 97).

It is easy to imagine in this account a classroom of engaged music students discussing and constructing knowledge in a way that is compatible with the requirements of critical pedagogy.

Allsup calls for a music education in which knowledge is constructed by students and knowledge construction is facilitated, rather than being taught directly, and one that embraces complexity and diversity. Indeed, he advocates a move away from the singular 'Law', so that the music education profession faces the challenge of deciding 'what to do with the plurality of principles (not Laws) available to us – the ones we make up, the ones we follow, the ones we repair, the ones we put aside' (p. 24). Allsup's arguments here are interesting, as they indicate that there are times when the teacher need not be the expert musician, or the Master, in the classroom; this is of key importance to a critically bicultural music education, where most music educators in secondary schools will have been the recipients of a music education in the Western tradition, and in which students may well be the possessors of knowledge, local and otherwise, that they may wish to take the lead in sharing.

If the teacher is not to be the Master, then what does Allsup think that a teacher should be? In something of an answer to this question, he presents what he considers to be 'An Evolving Vision of Music Teacher Quality and Expertise', which has five propositions:

1. Public-school music teachers are never outside the forces of replication and transformation.

2. It is the music teacher's mandate, as entrusted by her community, to know the forms of her tradition while preparing for change.
3. The music teacher grows in knowledge, skill, and disposition as she operates willingly within and across these forces and forms.
4. Quality can be measured by the degree to which a music educator can move fluidly among the forces and forms of tradition and change.
5. This manner of plasticity can be taught and thus enlarged (p. 46).

I consider that Allsup's first three propositions here are appropriate guidelines for a teacher in Aotearoa New Zealand wishing to adopt a critically bicultural outlook. The first proposition situates teachers within the field of critical pedagogy and suggests that they have a role to play in shaping the relations of power in their classrooms and students' lives; the second argues that teachers should be knowledgeable but not inflexible in regards to their musical expertise; and the third would appear to suggest that a teacher should be able to work 'across' different traditions. I am more cautious about the appeal for 'fluidity' and 'plasticity' of tradition; as I will later explain, talk of 'fluidity' in relation to indigenous cultures often results in outcomes that have no benefits for those cultures. Although contemporary musicians in Aotearoa New Zealand do often blend elements of Māori and Western cultures, this blending is not as fluid or plastic as it might seem at first glance. There are issues of the right to cultural heritage, of authenticity, of ownership, and of anti-assimilation, and of course there is the longstanding legacy of Maoriland New Zealand to remember; all of which is to suggest that a fluid and plastic biculturalism in which Māori and non-Māori freely share cultural ideas is not necessarily possible in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Wayne Bowman has taken issue with Allsup's 'failure to define terms and use them consistently; his gross misrepresentations of "praxial" philosophy…; the chasm created by his rigidly binary, "open"/"closed" framework; his contention that expertise, excellence, and musicianship are elitist and oppressive; and his insistence that all musical instruction should be devoted to serving democratic ideals (of one particular kind, in one particular way)' (Bowman, 2017, pp. 12 – 13), and suggests that Allsup's characterisation of the 'closed' forms of music instruction that he argues against constitute a straw man argument (p. 14). Bowman suggests that Allsup may indeed be advocating a view that is sympathetic to praxialist views if he means to argue that 'music is not a single practice, unified and uniform' (p. 32).

In contrast, Ann Marie Stanley found Allsup's work nuanced and inspiring:

> With his take on the 'beautiful failure of language' (and music) to be reducible to code or grammar, he brings nuance to the discussion of aesthetic philosophy. Allsup explains his uncertainties in complex yet refreshingly sturdy language. This works to reassure the reader that the mixing up of ideas and concepts into an 'unholy muddle'… is really the beautiful thing Allsup describes in the book's closing (Stanley, 2018, p. 2).

I share Bowman's desire for clarity in writing and philosophy, but on the other hand, it remains true that school music teaching is not a perfect world, and can indeed be a 'muddle', holy or otherwise, of student and teacher identities, expectations, and values. I am reminded of the words of bell hooks regarding multicultural education:

> The movement toward a multicultural pedagogy was really, to me, tantamount to a revolution; and like revolutions on all levels in culture, there are times of chaos (hooks, 1994a, p. 8).

Is the chaos of hooks' multicultural revolution analogous to Allsup's music educational muddle? If so, perhaps critical educators should attempt to embrace the possibilities of imperfection and ambiguity generated by the 'muddle' of biculturalism in New Zealand classrooms.

Graham McPhail and Conceptualisation

Another philosophy of music education of critical interest to the present study is that of Graham McPhail, a scholar of music education based in Aotearoa New Zealand. As I have noted elsewhere, McPhail and his colleagues argue for a music education that focuses on 'powerful knowledge': abstract, or context-independent knowledge that is relevant to various degrees across the music of various cultures. Such knowledge is held to be 'universal', at least to an extent, and to be a means of students developing the ability to understand musical devices in a range of different musics – such as the use of harmony in Māori and Western music (Scanlen, 2018). I will note here that in seeking to incorporate theories of the universal in music education, McPhail takes a position that is opposite to that advanced by praxialist music educators. In the words of Wayne Bowman:

> Among the primary concerns of those who have sought to advance 'praxial' accounts of music and music education has been the articulation of a pluralistic vision that counters the mistakes of universalism (read: aesthetic education) on the one hand while avoiding the irresponsible excesses of relativism on the other (Bowman, 2017, pp. 26 – 27).

A significant influence on McPhail's concept of music education is the concept of 'global music theory' advanced by Mark Hijleh (Hijleh, 2012), in which Hijleh goes about the task of framing an approach to musical understanding that is appropriate for a world in which, as he argues, one must acknowledge that 'the cross-pollenization of global musical materials and practices has accelerated precipitously, due in large part to advances in higher-speed communication and travel' (p. 2). Hijleh is not entirely sympathetic to those who seek to preserve difference:

> …any attempt to call attention to sounds, patterns, or principles that appear similar between musics is too often met with a resistance that seems borne out of a fear that vital distinctions (not to mention whole products) might be lost. At the same time, this championing of difference has also too often been used to make deeply

> problematic and frankly parochial musical judgements that seem to stem from cultural bias (pp. 7 – 8).

Hijleh begins from the precept that there are certain physical characteristics that humans share, and searches for what he terms 'qualified universals' in areas such as rhythm, melody, and harmony, and draws from a wide range of sources in order to construct his global music theory.

It is worth noting that Hijleh's work has met with a generally positive reaction from reviewers; for example, Denis Collins criticises it only for a certain modesty in the arguments that it makes, and for not engaging with the wider musicological repertoire – such as in the case of Hijleh's analysis of Bach's Invention in C Major (Collins, 2016). From my speaking position, with a background in musicology and music analysis, it would appear there is little critical value in analysing such a wide range of musics from so many different cultures in this way. It seems a task rather similar in scope to that engaged in by Edwin Tregear in *The Aryan Maori* (Tregear, 1984), who in 1885 drew linguistic comparisons between Māori and European languages. M. P. K. Sorrenson in a terse review of the centennial reprint notes that Tregear makes the case that 'the Maoris [*sic*] were an eastern branch of the Aryans who had somehow migrated from India through South-east Asia into the Pacific', and further comments that even in Tregear's day, this argument was subject to ridicule (Sorrenson, 1985). Just as I do not adopt Tregear's theory of Māori origins, I do not adopt Hijleh's theory of music. Instead, I argue for the adoption of ways of understanding music as a socially and contextually-situated practice, as then one may understand the importance of music to those who make it.

McPhail has, at the time of writing the present research, developed his theory of music of education in various sources, including articles in *Educational Change and the Secondary School Music Curriculum in Aotearoa New Zealand* (McPhail, Thorpe, & Wise, 2018a), some of which have already been mentioned in the present research. In 'Too Much Noise in the Classroom?: Towards a Praxis of Conceptualization', published separately, he responds to Allsup's *Remixing the Classroom* and notes that whereas Allsup critiqued norms of North American music education such as large ensembles in the classroom, and whereas he argued for open forms of knowledge construction and a resistance to the 'Law' of music education, such critiques are not immediately applicable to Aotearoa New Zealand:

> …while Allsup laments a lack of constructivism to counter what he identifies as 'the Law' of music education in the USA, in New Zealand constructivism has become the law; ideological and a 'ruler of consciousness.' We need to be careful what we wish for (McPhail, 2018b, p. 177).

He also positions his theory as a response to the work of David Elliott in *Music Matters* and to Lucy Green's theories of informal music learning in schools. Writing of the views of Elliott and Regelski, et al., he asks rhetorically:

> …the new discourse tends to take the moral high ground and may also create an over-inflated target for its arguments that may not be entirely accurate. Was music

> education before Elliott as outmoded and untruthful to music's essence as he and others like Thomas Regelski paint it to be? (p. 179).

His answer to this question would seem to be yes and no, but mainly no: although he states that he can see the value of the work of those whom he characterises as the 'progressive left', he argues that that 'moral and political agendas (such as identity politics and culturalism), as important as they are, can overtake or become conflated with matters of epistemology. When this occurs, we can lose sight of powerful knowledge…and the goal of providing access to it for all students' (p. 180).

McPhail goes on to explore his idea of *conceptualisation* (or, as it is spelt in that article, *conceptualization)*, which for him 'acts as an integrating mechanism as it links concepts within a system of meaning and contains a generalizing capacity. The challenge is to conceptualize the importance of concepts within a pedagogical framework that is engaging, relevant, inclusive, and challenging for students in the twenty-first century' (p. 179). McPhail also elaborates upon his theory of universal music knowledge. As he writes:

> …it has become commonplace in music education to assume that music does not have a universal episteme that is independent of the musicians' cultural context. In contrast, I suggest that music does contain universal or context-independent concepts, an epistemic structure, and that this should provide the underlying framework for approaches to music education (ibid, pp. 180 – 181).

McPhail hastens to note that this is not a call for a return to conservativism and older styles of pedagogies in music education; rather, it is based in a broader sociological project that he terms 'social realism', which is based around the belief that social justice in education involves giving students access to 'powerful knowledge' (p. 178).

He concludes by noting that his work is still in progress, and questions whether it is in fact possible for teachers to agree on answers to the questions that he poses:

> What are the systems of meaning that might comprise the basis for an education in music in the twenty-first century and how can we make them meaningful and engaging for students? I described an argument for accepting powerful knowledge as the concept for a redefinition of knowledge, but can music educators agree on what this powerful knowledge might be? Are we now a discipline so diverse and so localized that it is not possible for an agreement between stakeholders concerning what music education is for and what it should consist of [*sic*]? (ibid., p. 193).

As I go on to argue in Chapter Five, it is important that music teachers continue to offer their students a satisfactory education in the Western tradition, amongst others. Where I differ with McPhail is in the way I approach the knowledge contained in the Western tradition; I do not believe it to be universal or context-independent, and in fact argue that the context of Western cultural hegemony is an important topic of reflection for bicultural music teachers. If when McPhail asks whether teachers might agree on what constitutes powerful knowledge, he wishes for teachers to agree on the universality of musical concepts, he would find limited agreement on that basis from this writer.

Kaupapa Māori Scholarship

It is important for a critically bicultural teacher to have an understanding of the perspectives of both Māori and non-Māori peoples. I make the assumption here, as elsewhere, that all teachers in New Zealand will have a greater or lesser degree of familiarity with the dominant Pākehā culture, given its hegemonic status, but I make no such assumptions about Māori culture, given its relatively more marginalised status. A key application of critical theory in Aotearoa New Zealand is in the area of Kaupapa Māori scholarship (Hoskins & Jones, 2012c, p. 11), and for non-Māori the work of such scholars represents a useful articulation of Māori perspectives and concerns, and the critical pedagogies developed by these scholars can be of use in informing a critical bicultural pedagogy. I will consider how this may be done in the following section, and give a survey of ideas within Kaupapa Māori here.

Perhaps the most important single expression of Kaupapa Māori thought is that given in Graham Hingangaroa Smith's PhD thesis. In this work Smith reflected on what might be considered his life's work to that point as a teacher, in which he established the first Kura Kaupapa Māori school in response to the need to educate children who had been educated in Kōhanga Reo (Māori-medium early childhood centres) (G. Smith, 1997, p. 21), and developed a rigorous theoretical framework to support his philosophy. In his words:

> Kaupapa Māori theory is primarily an educational strategy, which has evolved out of Māori communities as a deliberate means to comprehend, resist and transform the crises related to the dual concerns of schooling underachievement of Māori students and the ongoing erosion of Māori language, knowledge and culture as a result of colonisation (p. 27).

In Smith's usage, the terms 'comprehend, resist, and transform' quoted here correspond to the terms 'conscientisation, resistance, and transformative praxis', which he goes on to explore in detail.

For Smith, the development of Kaupapa Māori schools was a necessary step in working to transform the oppressive realities of life as a Māori person in Aotearoa New Zealand. Smith relates these realities in an account of his childhood:

> Schooling policies and the curriculum were almost totally mono-cultural and Māori teachers were very few (certainly, I did not know of any). Māori schooling difficulties were explained as problems with the Māori kids, their homes, their life-style and their culture. These attitudes weren't benignly positioned in policy - they were played out in the everyday interactions that we experienced (and which other Māori experienced) when going to school in Masterton (p. 6).

Smith recalls the feeling of being different from the 'normal' Pākehā students at primary school, the fighting that used to occur between groups of Pākehā and Māori students, and the derogatory language that was used by each ethnic group to refer to the other. As a result of the systematic racism he experienced in his primary education, he writes that there was 'a

powerful influence to be like Pākehā people, certainly if we could not be physically, then to 'want to be' ideologically' (p. 10). At intermediate school, he was placed in the top class, but would often be singled out for a public dressing down for uniform violations, some of which – the handkerchief made from a piece of an old sheet, or the hand-me-down shoes – were a sign of being poorer than his classmates. Even his lunch made him different: his grandmother would make fried bread with butter and golden syrup, wrap it in newspaper, and place it in a flax kit for him; this was all in marked contrast to the sandwiches wrapped in wax paper and placed in a plastic lunchbox that his classmates had.

Smith also recalls experiences in which his Māori identity was affirmed rather than devalued, as in the paragraph above. For instance, he recalls being asked by the principal to welcome the visiting 'Miss New Zealand' of the period, Maureen Kingi, for whom he gave a short speech and a waiata in Māori, to which she replied in Māori as well; he recalls the pride he felt in this episode and the conflict he felt at suddenly being asked to demonstrate his Māori-ness as opposed to trying to be like Pākehā. As he puts it, '[the] quandary here was that our parents (and a whole generation of Māori parents trapped within dominant Pākehā cultural hegemony) had encouraged us to 'seek' the Pākehā knowledge – someone had forgotten to tell us that Māori was important as well.' (pp. 12 – 14). He won a scholarship to attend a Māori boarding school, and was sent to St. Stephen's School in Auckland to be near his father. The school role was predominantly Māori, and he was able to learn the Māori language and to progress academically, to participate in sports like cricket, rugby, and swimming, and to take part in Māori cultural performances (p. 15 – 16).

At the outset he identifies the concept of the hidden curriculum as a target of Kaupapa Māori strategies:

> The "hidden curriculum" … maintains social and cultural divisions within society through subtle controls exerted in the way in which the every-day "taken for granted" values, norms and beliefs are inscribed in students through the rules, routines and class-room practices of schooling… The effect of the "hidden curriculum" on Māori, has been the maintenance of existing inequalities and therefore the preservation of the multiple interests of dominant Pākehā society (p. 27).

Smith therefore concludes that 'an important part of developing change involves a critical de-construction of the existing barriers and constraints of the hidden curriculum', and further notes that course content in schools from 'the subordinate(d) Māori perspective, it is often seen as a particular representation of dominant Pākehā culture' (p. 28).

Smith goes on to describe further what he describes as the three components of Kaupapa Māori as a 'theory of change', which are conscientisation, resistance, and praxis. Conscientisation is 'the concern to critically analyse and de-construct existing hegemonies and practices which entrench Pākehā-dominant social, economic, gender, cultural and political privilege'. Resistance is 'the forming of shared understandings and experiences to derive a sense of a "collective" politics', which tend to either fall into the category of 'reactive activities', characterised by 'collectively responding and reacting to the dominant

structures of oppression, exploitation, manipulation and containment', or the category of 'proactive activities', characterised by 'collectively resolving and acting to transform existing conditions.' Praxis is 'the undertaking of transformative action to evolve change', is 'both reflective and reflexive with respect to theory and practice', is motivated by the thought of emancipation and the desire to 'develop meaningful change by intervening and making a difference' (pp. 37 – 38).

Although it is not possible to do full justice to Smith's ideas in this brief summary, I will note in his thesis he listed some 'intervention elements', also called 'principles', that Kaupapa Māori theory embraces, and give a much-abridged quote of his words here:

1. **Tino Rangatiratanga** (the 'self-determination' principle)

   Tino rangatiratanga comes out of the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) discourse, and has been variously translated as 'sovereignty', 'autonomy', 'self-determination' and 'independence'… A key understanding here is that when Māori [make] choices for themselves Māori are more likely to be fully committed to ensuring that they work successfully…

   This is in fact what is going on in the Kaupapa Māori and schooling initiatives; Māori are reasserting more control over their schooling and education…

2. **Taonga Tuku Iho** (the 'cultural aspirations' principle)

   In a Kaupapa Māori framework, to be Māori is taken for granted: one's identity is not being subtly undermined by a 'hidden curriculum'.

3. **Ako Māori** (the 'culturally preferred pedagogy' principle)

   This principle reinforces the need for culturally appropriate teaching and learning strategies. Teaching and learning settings and practices ought to closely and effectively connect with the cultural backgrounds and life circumstances (socio-economic) of Māori communities and individuals…

4. **Kia Piki ake i nga Raruraru o te Kainga** (the 'socio-economic' mediation principle)

   This principle speaks to the need to alleviate the negative pressures of the marginal socio-economic positioning of many Māori families which impacts on learning…

5. **Whānau** (the 'extended family structure' principle)

> The 'whānau' is considered an important cultural structure which allows for Māori cultural practice, values, and thinking (whānaungatanga).
>
> …in this cultural view, difficulties are not located within individuals or in individual homes but in the total whānau: the whānau takes collective responsibility to assist and intervene. While the whānau structure implies a support network for individual members there is also a reciprocal obligation on individual members to 'belong' and 'contribute' to the whānau group… (pp. 465 – 471, emphases original).

Smith brings up some ideas in this list of principles that are not explicitly addressed in other, similar lists as found in Te Kotahitanga or Tātaiako, such as the emphasis placed on socio-economic mediation. At the same time, many of the ideas on this list have proved influential and lasting, such as the emphasis on Māori sovereignty and on normalising Māori experience.

Some twenty years after the development of Kaupapa Māori in the educational context, Alison Jones and Te Kawehau Hoskins edited a special issue of the *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* and included a range of contemporary views on Kaupapa Māori. I will briefly review some of these here.

Graham Smith, in an interview with Hoskins, speaks of the importance of the radical basis of Kaupapa Māori, and of the need to 'guard against the domestication, or the taming and assimilation, of Kaupapa Māori ideas'. For Smith, the political work of Kaupapa Māori is of utmost importance:

> …I find it hard to say anything positive about the ways Kaupapa Māori has been used in the academy. Often it has been written up in texts outside the notion of enactment. And I think that the co-option of Kaupapa Māori into theoretical or metaphorical models has reduced its credibility. You can't write in the third person about it, you cannot write from a distance. The prior question is, if you are going to write about Kaupapa Māori, what can you show you have done for Māori in the real world? Show me the blisters on your hands to gain a more authoritative right to talk or write authentically about Kaupapa Māori (Hoskins & Jones, 2012c, p. 13).

I will leave the implication of this statement for Kaupapa Māori scholarship for Kaupapa Māori scholars to determine, but will note that it also poses a challenge for non-Māori teachers looking to operate in a bicultural context: who should benefit from the bicultural project? Is it for the benefit of teachers and non-Māori so that they can feel that they have met whatever obligations they feel they have in relation to the Treaty of Waitangi, and so that they can gain some interest and satisfaction from interacting with Māori music and culture? Or is it for the benefit of Māori students and communities dealing with the legacy of colonial oppression? I would argue that it should be the latter, and that there is plenty of opportunity for non-Māori teachers to get 'blisters on their hands' in order to work for the benefit of Māori even outside Kaupapa Māori contexts.

Mason Durie comments that it is in fact acceptable for teachers and other government employees not to be competent in Kaupapa Māori, as long as they are knowledgeable enough to recognise when they are out of their depth:

> One of the difficulties I think – and Māori have discovered this over the last 20 years – is that the kaupapa Māori approach needs time, energy, and understanding. And the question is can you turn everyone into kaupapa Māori experts, or are you really better to get a small but solid base of experts? Because one of the downsides of the kaupapa Māori approach has been to empower a lot of people with a veneer of Māori understanding. The best you could hope for really is not that teachers or doctors or social workers all become kaupapa Māori experts, but that they know when they are out of their depth and say "hey I've got a problem here, I don't know what it's about, but I've got a friend down the road who is really good with this and I'm going to see if he can help me with this problem'… And you would expect also that Pākehā teachers who are dealing with Māori kids will know when they are out of their depth. Not just because the kid is naughty, but because there is something that they can't tune in with. Well, you might say that they should be able to tune in with it, but more fundamentally they should know when they are out of their depth (Hoskins & Jones, 2012b, p. 29).

This speaks to two important aspects for teachers: that of non-deficit thinking – so that problems in educating Māori students are viewed as a teacher's responsibility to sort out, rather than the students' fault, for example – and that of a non-expert in kaupapa Māori being able to work collaboratively with Māori for the benefit of Māori students and communities. Durie's words provide support for the idea of sharing power within the classroom with those who are expert in Māori music when this is appropriate, if the teacher is not competent to teach such music.

The topic of music in Kaupapa Māori scholarship is not generally addressed in ways similar to the way in which music is addressed in non-Māori scholarship, and this reflects the different roles and understandings of music practiced in Kaupapa Māori contexts. I turn to Kuni Jenkins for a demonstration of this: Jenkins describes the singing of a waiata at Hukarere Girls' school, one line of which was altered so as to avoid references to sex, changing *Me ai to ure ki te tamahine,* 'to turn towards the daughter (in order to marry her) to *Me awhi o ringa ki te tamahine*, 'Extend helping hands to the daughter'. Jenkins argues that in so doing, the European ethics of the Church were imposed on the waiata, and argues that such waiata helps to remind those who sing them of their 'kinship ties', and 'helps to reaffirm beliefs and practices which might otherwise lapse through lack of talking about and remembering the events and people' (Jenkins, 2000, pp. 61 – 63). This points to a wider epistemological issue to be dealt with by critically bicultural music teachers: the different roles of music within Māori and Western culture, and the need to acknowledge or accommodate this difference in the classroom.

Some questions of philosophy and approach present themselves at this juncture. I will address one here: how should a critically bicultural teacher approach Kaupapa Māori scholarship? This question is not necessarily easy because, in some respects, the goals of biculturalism and Kaupapa Māori are similar, in that in both concepts there is a sense of seeking social justice and fair terms of participation in New Zealand society for Māori, especially in the face of the hegemonic presence of Pākehā culture in New Zealand. In others, the ends being sought are different: as I have argued elsewhere, biculturalism came about due to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, and inasmuch as it is a project of Pākehā-dominated institutions in government and in the education sector, reflects Pākehā participation in the Treaty. That is, the goal of biculturalism, generally, is to achieve 'Treaty of Waitangi partnership'. In contrast, as is evident from the list of principles presented by Graham Smith, the foremost goal of Kaupapa Māori is to further the cause of tino rangatiratanga – sovereignty, or self-determination, or autonomy, etc. – for Māori. Tino rangatiratanga remains, of course, a concept with a long history of contestation and misunderstanding, dating back to the 1840 use of the word 'kawanatanga' in the Māori translation of the Treaty, and so it is difficult to arrive at easy answers to the problem presented here. Biculturalism and Kaupapa Māori, however sympathetic, are fundamentally different.

Even though the philosophical bases of biculturalism and Kaupapa Māori are different, there is ample scope within the education system for bicultural and Kaupapa Māori educators to work together in pursuit of common goals, inasmuch as these goals reflect a common desire to see Māori students succeed in education. I regard the identification of such goals and the working towards them as common sense and pragmatic and well within the capabilities of professional educators. However, I argue here that teachers must always be aware of difference and to consider their actions in relation to the expression of difference that they encounter, and the boundary between Māori and non-Māori cultures is of particular interest here. The intersection point between biculturalism and Kaupapa Māori can be seen as fluid, in that the way Māori may choose to define their difference can differ, and so can the way in which this difference is understood by others. Understanding these expressions of difference is a key challenge for critically bicultural teachers to deal with in their practice.

This problem is particularly important for teachers and scholars of education in Aotearoa New Zealand, for in colonial societies, the power to determine the nature of the fluidity of cultural difference tends to rest with the coloniser. Sandy Marie Anglás Grande writes of fluidity in this way in relation to the experience of American Indians, even extending the critique to theorists of critical pedagogy:

> The forces of identity appropriation, cultural encroachment, and corporate commodification pressure American Indian communities to employ essentialist tactics and construct relatively fixed notions of identity, and to render the concepts of

> fluidity and transgression highly problematic … the notion of fluid boundaries has never worked for the advantage of Indigenous peoples: federal agencies have invoked the language of fluid or unstable identities as the rationale for dismantling the structures of tribal life and creating greater dependency on the U.S. government; Whitestream America has seized its message to declare open season on Indians, thereby appropriating Native lands, culture, spiritual practices, history, and literature; and Whitestream academics have now employed the language of postmodern fluidity to unwittingly transmute centuries of war between Indigenous peoples and their respective nation-states into a "genetic and cultural dialogue"… (Grande, 2017, p. 227).

In other words: the notion of fluid boundaries is problematic in that it allows non-indigenous people and agencies to impose their conceptions of identity on others. The notion of boundaries is given further consideration in the New Zealand context by Alison Jones, who writes:

> To those Pākehā researchers who would collapse the Māori-Pākehā hyphen into 'us', there is one, harshly pragmatic response: it does not work… However much Pākehā might assert, desire, or assume the 'us' in modern life, Māori usually insist on a difference; the hyphen is un-negotiable. (Understandably. To negate the difference in a society dominated by European assumptions is to sign the death warrant for Māori knowledges, language and identity.) (Jones, 2012, p. 105)

Thus, the difference between Māori and Pākehā is important and, in the eyes of Māori, desirable. Critically bicultural teachers must therefore respect the constructions of difference and fluidity developed by Māori – returning to the principles of tino rangatiratanga and mana motuhake, according to which Māori are able to determine their own affairs.

The language of writers such as Grande (2017) is uncompromising in its defence of indigenous means of self-definition. The study of such positions is useful, for if a teacher's practice can effectively adapt to be respectful of such views in the classroom and in society, then it can adapt in effective ways to less strongly-stated positions. Such success may be in short supply, however: Grande is critical of writers who, for example, have reduced the American Indian resistance to that of a 'genetic and cultural dialogue' between the indigenous and non-indigenous peoples of the U.S. The American Indian resistance may be compared to Māori resistance to colonial oppression in Aotearoa New Zealand, and to refer to Māori and Pākehā as being in dialogue may be similarly offensive to some. This presents a difficulty for the present study, for I would argue that critically bicultural teachers must engage with the dialogue between – if not Māori and Pākehā cultures as a whole, then between theories of biculturalism and Kaupapa Māori, which respectively prioritise 'Treaty of Waitangi partnership' and tino rangatiratanga, for it is in the identification of commonalities and differences that one may understand the position of another. It is my hope that a biculturalism that acknowledges and aims to right colonial wrongs may be considered to be less problematic in the construction of this dialogue than one that blithely aims for inclusion for inclusivity's sake.

In the jargon of critical pedagogy, the *dialectical* is found in dialogue between two opposing ideas. How should teachers cope with the dialectic between biculturalism and Kaupapa Māori in their practice? I return to the words of Elizabeth Ellsworth in suggesting an approach for teachers. Ellsworth herself draws on the work of Mary C. Gentile in explaining that for her next class:

> …we are engaging with each other and working against oppressive social formations on campus in ways that try to 'find a commonality in the experience of difference without compromising its distinctive realities and effects'.
>
> Right now, the classroom practice that seems most capable of accomplishing this is one that facilitates a kind of communication across differences that is best represented by this statement: 'If you can talk to me in ways that show you understand that your knowledge of me, the world, and "the Right thing to do" will always be partial, interested, and potentially oppressive to others, and if I can do the same, then we can work together on shaping and reshaping alliances for constructing circumstances in which students of difference can thrive' (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 324).

It is this spirit of embracing the process of dialogue between opposing ideas, of constantly seeking understanding, of shaping and reshaping alliances – or partnerships, one might say – that bicultural teachers must develop. Ellsworth's words also include the possibility of error – that the right thing to do in some cases might not be the right thing to do in others. This should be as much a reassurance to teachers as it is a warning: even if one does make a mistake in working within this dialectical framework of biculturalism and Kaupapa Māori, it is the way in which one recovers from mistakes and works to set things right that is ultimately of importance. Paulo Freire once said:

> I think that even though we need to have some outline, I am sure that we make the road by walking (M. Horton & Freire, 1990, p. 6).

The next chapter will consider approaches that teachers should have when they engage in this process – when they make the road by walking.

Chapter Five: Critical Biculturalism in Music Education

This chapter develops the concept of critical biculturalism – that is, what it is to be conscious of and to work towards the transformation of colonial power structures in music education. A reader seeking to find an answer to the question of 'what is bicultural music education?', certainly in terms of concrete teaching strategies and tools, may well be disappointed, as this chapter is more an indication of the types of answers that one may develop to answer that question than a definitive answer. The primary purpose of this chapter is instead the development of the concept of a critical biculturalism in music education: that is, one influenced by critical pedagogy, and one which works against the problems of colonialism and white hegemony in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Why is a critically bicultural music education needed – that is, what problem or crisis needs solving, and how does it relate to wider issues considered by scholars of critical pedagogy? In its most essential form, the problem I consider here is this: how should music teachers approach the relationship of Māori and Western cultures? When one considers that music education is a peculiarly Westernised field, as the study of music draws on literature and theory and traditions that are predominantly Western in origin, the place of Māori culture in music education is far from clear. The problem facing bicultural music educators is that the music of the West – the classical 'canon' and the enduring legacy and continued influence of the popular music industry – is the music of the culture that occupies the dominant and hegemonic position in New Zealand. In considering the place of cultural dominance and hegemony in education, this is a problem squarely within the field of critical pedagogy, and a critical bicultural music education will therefore work to find ways in which music teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand can work against white hegemony while at the same time providing a satisfactory education.

There are of course compelling arguments for the teaching of Western music. It is the music of the culture of power: to give students access to this music is to grant access within this culture. The study of notation, for example, allows students access to the vast notated repertoire of classical and popular musics, and a student who seeks further opportunities in music – whether in tertiary education or in the music industry – who has not learned to read music may be at a disadvantage. There are broader concerns, as well, regarding the preservation of musical genres. As Jill Warzer writes of urban music education in the U.S., which caters to often disadvantaged students:

> Often I receive calls from pastors or parishioners who are looking for a piano accompanist who can play hymns. By this they mean they are looking for someone who can read music, because many young musicians playing in churches today cannot. To me, these queries are warning signs that musical genres and performance styles may be lost because city students are not receiving a comprehensive music education (Warzer, 2006, p. 11)

There is also the fact that students may well sign up to music class expecting to learn Western music in one form or another, and to be taught something else is to do them a

disservice, and further, the fact that most music teachers are experts in Western musical traditions and would struggle to offer a quality education of the musics of other cultures.

The conundrum – one that can be understood as what curriculum content to include, and how much – is similar in nature to the problems raised by Vicki Thorpe et al., in regards to music education in New Zealand:

> 'What really counts as curriculum content and how are we to teach it?' [and] 'How do we teach "what counts" in a way that is responsive to the needs of our students without it becoming so localised it cuts off access to knowledge they cannot find by themselves? (Thorpe et al., 2018, p. 179).

It also has parallels in the wider multicultural literature. For example, Terese M. Volk has written the following:

> For many music teachers, the issue of unity versus diversity is at the heart of discussions about multiculturalism today. The question often asked is 'How do I reconcile the Western art tradition with world musics in the curriculum?' (Volk, 1998, p. 188).

Indeed, what and how are we to teach? I argue here for a model of teaching in New Zealand that is aware of the nature of Western knowledge and of colonial power structures in New Zealand, and actively examines the problems associated with Western knowledge even as it is learned in the classroom, and simultaneously one that is inclusive of Māori culture even as it acknowledges the difference that those people may wish to enact. Western musical culture and traditions can and should be taught in this critically bicultural model, but curricular space should be made for Māori and, indeed, for others.

Teaching for Critical Pedagogy

In Chapter Four (see page 146), I quoted Thomas Regelski's pragmatic conception of praxial music education, according to which students should be able to independently apply their musical learning without needing teacher intervention. From a similarly pragmatic viewpoint, I argue that students receiving a critically bicultural education should develop an independent critical perspective. I do not argue that such critical reflection should be the predominant part of the curriculum, or even that it need be anything close to it, depending on the needs and interests of the students concerned; but I argue that it is necessary for teachers to give students the tools to think critically, and for the subject of education itself to be one of the subjects of critical consideration in the classroom. In this way, students and teachers can enter into a dialectical relationship, and the classroom can become a place for the co-construction of educational goals. In colloquial terms, that is, whereas teachers may 'talk the talk' about inclusivity and biculturalism in planning documents and in staff meetings, I suggest that to 'walk the walk', teachers must involve their students.

This point is underscored by Tracy Rohan, who has found in a survey of music teachers and students that even though teachers claim to believe in the value of principles such as cultural responsivity, the perception of their students of their classroom practice is not the same as that of the teachers:

> Most teachers said that they do not believe that they teach music in a hierarchical manner through privileging Western ways of knowing above others. Most teachers expressed belief that culturally inclusive, responsive messages are embedded in their philosophy and practice and are therefore available to the students. However, despite the inclusive values expressed by the teachers, it is clear that many students 'read' their music education somewhat differently and are not necessarily picking up on these messages. Most students perceived music education to be prescribed, teacher-and competition-driven, and not open to student-led negotiation with regard to content or pedagogical approach. Most students felt that some musics, due to their perceived seriousness and sophistication, were more likely candidates for school music study than others. (Rohan, 2018, p. 45).

This finding by Rohan – that students do not always recognise teachers' attempts to be inclusive or to work outside western hierarchies of knowledge – is important. I suggest that to address this problem, teachers must be explicit in the classroom about their goal of inclusivity and responsiveness, and involve students in the task of working towards creating an inclusive classroom. The last point raised by Rohan is also of interest – that some musics are perceived as more likely for study in schools. It is worth pausing to consider what musics might be perceived as worthy of serious study in schools in Aotearoa New Zealand, and teachers may reflect on how the music that is studied in their classrooms works to create a 'hidden curriculum' – an unspoken message about what is considered to be of importance. There may be systematic issues at play when considering this hidden curriculum, as well: if external exams privilege knowledge of Western music, does that mean that the music classroom must as well? What implications would this have for students more interested in more marginalised music – would they receive a 'hidden' message that it is not as valuable? A critical pedagogy at least offers students and teachers the chance to become aware of such operations of power in music education and in society, and in so doing, to work against it.

My argument here, that critical pedagogy should be a part of the curriculum matter of a class, is not new. bell hooks, for example, has written that:

> Teaching in a traditional discipline from the perspective of critical pedagogy means that I often encounter students who make complaints like, 'I thought this was supposed to be an English class, why are we talking so much about feminism?' (Or, they might add, race or class.) In the transformed classroom there is often a much greater need to explain philosophy, strategy, intent than in the 'norm' setting (hooks, 1994b, p. 42).

Sometimes, there is resistance to including a critical agenda in the curriculum. Carol Archie relates the sentiment of George Chambers, who in 1994 was president of the One Nation New Zealand Foundation, who relates his thoughts on a nursing course in 1994:

> He feels so strongly about cultural safety programmes for nurse training that he warns his comments are unprintable. 'It's not cultural safety, it's not patient sensitivity, it's Māori radicalism! Call it what it is!' In the Waikato nursing curriculum, he says there was a 40-minute lecture on the Sealord deal. 'What relevance has that?' (Archie, 1995, p. 166)

From the little information given in the story, one may surmise that the lecturer of the so-called Sealord deal, a major issue of the day relating to Māori fishing rights under the Treaty of Waitangi. This would seem to indicate that the lecturer was using the contemporary issue of the Sealord deal to discuss themes relating to the Treaty of Waitangi and Māori, which is surely a topic of import to health professionals to just as great an extent as it is for teachers.

For hooks, learning to accept such feedback from students and to continue with the task of critical education was a part of professional development as a teacher:

> The exciting aspect of creating a classroom community where there is respect for individual voices is that there is indefinitely more feedback because students do feel free to talk – and talk back. And yes, often this feedback is critical. Moving away from the need for immediate affirmation was crucial to my growth as a teacher. I learned to respect that shifting paradigms or sharing knowledge in new ways challenges; it takes time for students to experience the challenge as positive (hooks, 1994, p. 42).

hooks writes further of her techniques for dealing with the discomfort that students might feel about challenging non-progressive or even racist thinking. I will note here simply that for a critically bicultural educator, it is important to create an environment of the sort that hooks describes – one in which there is respect for individual voices, and in which students feel free to talk, and in which students participate in a shared effort to be critically bicultural. This work may not be easy and may not provide immediate affirmation, but is an important part of the bicultural project.

The Politics of Biculturalism

As noted in the literature survey, today some hold the notion that politics should not be discussed in the classroom (Bradley, 2012). I argue here that a critically bicultural education, in music or otherwise, is one that is political. This is an important point to note, because biculturalism is a contested concept in Aotearoa New Zealand, and it will therefore be a contested subject in music education classrooms in Aotearoa New Zealand; teachers, whether they wish to or not, must be understood as working within this political field. I argue here that a critically bicultural teacher will reflect and act to work in regards to the politics of biculturalism in a way that is meaningful and grounded in professional ethics.

What might a critically bicultural agenda look like? I would consider it to be one that is supportive of Māori autonomy, one that deconstructs colonial power structures, one that works against white hegemony. Some might argue that this agenda is 'political' in that it

touches upon wider debates of politics about the governance of Aotearoa New Zealand, and that such politics should not have a place in the music education classroom (see, for example, the vituperative response to the Sealord deal quoted in the previous section of this chapter). In return, one might question how a bicultural agenda could not but support Māori autonomy, given the treatment of Māori sovereignty in the Treaty of Waitangi; how a bicultural agenda could not but work against colonial power structures, given that colonial power structures support colonial institutions, not Māori ones; and how a bicultural agenda could not but work against white hegemony, given that Māori culture occupies an obviously marginalised place in Aotearoa New Zealand compared to that of the dominant culture.

I have argued that teachers cannot help but participate in the politics of biculturalism in one way or another, even if they attempt to ignore these politics. It is not only teaching that is political, however: the very act of knowing has in fact been conceptualised in political terms by scholars of pedagogy, for knowing can lead to conscientisation, which can lead to transformation. Freire wrote that humans, 'because they are aware of themselves and thus of the world – because they are *conscious beings* – exist in a dialectical relationship between the determination of limits and their own freedom' (P. Freire, 1996, p. 80). It is in this contest between one's understanding of one's limits and one's freedom that the political nature of knowledge can be found, as the concept of limitation and of freedom involve control and the exercise of power. Peter McLaren has said that 'the conditions of knowledge production in the "act of knowing" always involve political relationships of subordination and domination' (McLaren, 2005, p. 95). Thus, the knowledge that students learn, and the way in which they learn in the classroom is of political import. It is for the critically bicultural educator to consider how the knowledge and the means of knowledge production in their classroom support or work against a bicultural agenda.

The link between knowledge and politics – particularly as summed up in the aphorism that 'knowledge is power' – is one that has long usage. In a story published in 1916, Freeman Tilden wrote of Mr. Coppins, a man who purchased a dictionary from a traveling encyclopaedia salesman and proceeded to terrorise the inhabitants of his village with his new-found knowledge. In the words of Mr. Coppins:

> …little by little I'm accumulating a fund of knowledge. Knowledge is power! I tell you what, it makes a man feel like a real man (Tilden, 1994, p. 654).

Freeman Tilden is by no means the origin of the phrase 'knowledge is power' – it is commonly attributed, for example, to Sir Francis Bacon, for example, and has Old Testament parallels in the phrase 'A wise man is strong; yea, a man of knowledge increaseth strength' (Proverbs 24:5, King James Version). However, his story is an attractive one for the purpose of the present study, for Coppins' knowledge is proven to be the product of simple memorisation of facts from his new encyclopaedia, and he finds his comeuppance when he loses a bet due to stubbornly insisting that the composer Richard Wagner died at Bayreuth, an erratum in his encyclopaedia.[32] Though it is a light story intended to be comical, there is a

[32] Wagner is buried at Bayreuth but died in Venice.

lesson to be drawn here, for it invites us to consider the value of a critical perspective: Mr. Coppins' knowledge was revealed to be shallow and, ultimately uncritical, for he merely memorising his text. A critical music teacher might suggest, perhaps, that he consider the editorial process of his text, and might further consider that there are deeper and more critical conversations to be had about Wagner and his music besides.[33]

In more recent times, of course, the connection between knowledge and power has been considered by scholars in the Foucauldian tradition. Nico Stehr and Marian T. Adolf have argued that in this sense,

> The phrase "knowledge is power" … holds a quite distinctive meaning; rather than supposing that those who wield power do so by their privileged knowledge of the truth, this relation is inversed, rendering knowledge a deeply social category: those who have the capacity to claim what is true (knowledge), have a claim to power (Stehr & Adolf, 2018, p. 197).

According to this understanding, Mr. Coppins may be considered wrong on another count, for knowledge in the Foucauldian sense is not itself power: rather, power is held by those who can determine what knowledge is powerful. Teachers in their classrooms are in this position by default, and therefore their decisions in this regard – even, perhaps, the decision to involve students in determining which knowledge is true, or important, or useful – must be understood as political in nature, with implications both in the classroom and beyond.

This understanding of knowledge as political, as powerful, and involving relations of subordination and domination allows one to re-examine the notion of 'powerful knowledge', which Graham McPhail argues that music teachers should ensure that they teach (see, for example, page 153 of the present document). As he noted, there may be disagreement about what constitutes powerful knowledge. In their consideration of the similarly-termed 'useful knowledge', Henry Giroux and Roger Simon explore this theme further:

> Many teachers want to help students identify, comprehend, and produce useful knowledge – but what constitutes useful knowledge? Is it the same for all students no matter what their gender, class, race, ethnicity, age, or geographic region? … What if the teacher's view of useful knowledge differs from what students and their families think? (Giroux & Simon, 1989, pp. 250 - 251)

Giroux and Simon leave these – and others – as unanswered questions for the reader to consider. I will do the same, as they can only be usefully answered in the context of a teacher's practice, and so there will be as many answers as there are teachers. However, I

---

[33] A critical teacher could also question Mr. Coppins' assertion that knowledge and the power therewith 'makes a man feel like a real man', prompting discussion of the role of women in regards to the relationship between knowledge and power. Is Freeman Tilden in fact using this phrase, with its clumsy connection of masculinity to power and knowledge, to paint Mr. Coppins as a comic figure? Does such mockery still, in its exclusion of female perspectives, further patriarchal and heteronormative understandings of power?

will note that questions along these lines can be posed in the New Zealand context. For example, what constitutes useful knowledge in a bicultural classroom, and to what extent are Māori and Western musics seen as 'equal'? Is it the same for all students, Māori and Pākehā, and in all schools? To what extent is differentiation on this basis desirable or, indeed, ethical? How should teachers respond to hybrid assertions of Māori and non-Māori identity? How might decisions made in this regard work within or against colonial structures of oppression?

Student Voice and Polyphony

Here I will take up the problem of how teachers and students may incorporate musical concepts from both Western and Māori musical traditions in the classroom. I suggest that it is important for teachers to offer students access to a Western musical education, but also that it is important for teachers and students to allow space in the classroom for Māori and indeed other non-Western traditions, and that teachers must listen to student voice and to some degree, construct the content of their curriculum and classroom with their students. I refer to the work of bell hooks in constructing my argument here: hooks writes that teachers who wish to 'initiate students into the discursive practices of dominant culture', but face the problem of 'often asking students from non-privileged backgrounds to reject their own cultural identities and discourses' in so doing, should encourage their students to be 'polyvocal and polyphonic' (hooks, 1994a, p. 9), terms which with their musical implications are attractive for the present study. hooks speaks with reference to multicultural education, but we might equally use these terms in a bicultural situation, such that the problem is not one of whether Western or Māori music should be taught, but how one might value both. The pluralistic conception of musical knowledge promoted by Elliott and Silverman in *Music Matters* is useful in this regard, as it allows teachers to understand the musical practices of students and communities as being grounded in different cultural backgrounds and as having different meanings and expressive means attached to them.

If students are to be polyvocal and polyphonic, teachers must consider student voice carefully. Student voice in the music classroom may expressed in many ways, including in linguistic and musical mediums. I will consider here the problem of understanding the latter category of student voice: that is, how should a music teacher understand 'polyvocal' or 'polyphonic' student voice when it is expressed in musical terms? In answering this question I will draw upon the work of two New Zealand-based academics. The first of these is Christopher Small, whose famous theory of 'musicking' – so spelt by Small – proved influential to the praxial school of music educational thought, and the second is Simone Drichel and her examination of the nature of hybridity in relation to New Zealand's politics of ethnicity.

Small's term 'musicking' serves as the gerund form of the verb 'to music' (consider that one might speak of 'dancing' or 'painting', and that the word 'music' otherwise is something of an odd one out among the grammatical treatment of art forms). Small's

conception of 'musicking' has broad sympathies with the work of Elliott et al.; he suggests, for example, that his theory 'is a political matter in the widest sense' (Small, 1998, p. 13), which is in sympathy with musical theories of praxis, which speak of societal transformation. Another commonality between the theories of the praxialists and Small's theories is the sheer broadness and the holistic nature of musical practice they consider. As Small says:

> Human beings have been musicking for as long as there have been humans (p. 21).

The broad embrace of various types of musical practice in *Music Matters* means that musical praxis is conceptualised as including all of present-day musicking, including performing, improvising, composing, arranging, conducting, listening, recording and producing, and moving and dancing (Elliott & Silverman, 2015, p. 15).

Small argues that musicking involves the relationship between people, and that it is in these relationships that musical meaning is found (in addition to the 'conventional' musical analysis of notes). The human relationships involved in musicking involve 'the people who are taking part, in whatever capacity, in the performance; and they model, or stand as metaphor for, ideal relationships as the participants in the performance imagine them to be: relationships between person and person, between individual and society, between humanity and the natural world and even perhaps the supernatural world' (Small, 1998, p. 13). This concern for the supernatural world is indeed relevant such as in contexts such as powhiri, where deceased ancestors are acknowledged in a karanga, which is indeed a form of musicking in this analysis.

The concept of musicking is an important one to note in the context of considering student voice, because as Small argues, musicking serves as the expression of difference, of 'social definition and self-definition':

> Each musical performance articulates the values of a specific social group, large or small, powerful or powerless, rich or poor, at a specific point in its history, and no kind of performance is any more universal or absolute than any other (ibid., p. 133).

Student musicking, therefore, understood as student voice, can be understood as the articulation of difference and of identity.

The concept of musicking is important also because the term, used as a present participle, implies an ongoing process. For Randall Allsup, this ongoing nature of musicking is the site of meaning:

> I agree with Small that it is in the gerund form of the word 'music' that we can locate music's iterant quality – its unfinishedness – and this, I believe, is where a surplus of meaning lies (Allsup, 2016, p. 22).

This concept of iterability in music in relation to the construction of meaning is a useful one worth considering in more depth. I go further than Allsup here: not only is the iterant nature of music the site of a 'surplus of meaning', but the site of the construction of meaning (although it is possible that this is what Allsup meant).

The sense of iteration that I draw on here owes much to the work of Jacques Derrida, who in his essay *Signature Event Context* (Derrida & Weber, 1990), argues that writing can be understood independently of the context in which it was written – that it can be iterated, or repeated even by those who are not the original author – and that in fact, all writing when so repeated must be understood in its new context(s). The application of Derrida's theory of iterability to music has been considered by Jon Eisenberg, who argues that the two types of iterability developed by Derrida, syntactical – structurally-based, in Eisenberg's language – and semantical, or meaning-based, can be applied to music, and that inasmuch as music notation includes elements that can be precisely stated, 'there can be no question of its syntactical iterability' (Eisenberg, 1995, p. 43). On the other hand, the question of the iteration of meaning is more complex:

> Performing a score necessarily involves the absence of the sender – that is, the composer. That this is case [*sic*] is obvious when one considers the case where Anne Sophie Mutter, a violin virtuoso, performs a piece by Paganini. However, even if Paganini were to perform his own piece the composer would still be absent. Although he performs his own work, it is Paganini qua performer that reproduces it on the violin whereas it was Paganini qua composer that initially recorded the signs…. the 'ideal' performance would seem to be eternally elusive (ibid., pp. 46 – 47).

For Eisenberg, the ideal performance would be a perfect iteration of the work's contextual meaning, such that one can know the intention of the composer – which is likewise impossible from a simple analysis of the structural elements of the score. Eisenberg is not discouraged by the impossibility of knowing the composer's intention, however, agreeing with Edward T. Cone's sentiment that the variations in performance give interest to repeated performances of works of Beethoven and Mozart or, I might add, Paganini.

The relationship between iterability and the construction of meaning and identity has been considered by Judith Butler in *Gender Trouble* (1990), who considers iteration in relation to feminist theory: she notes, for example, that 'the action of gender requires a performance that is *repeated'* (p. 178, emphasis original). For Butler, the temporality of gender is of great importance:

> Gender ought not to be construed as a stable identity or locus of agency from which various acts follow; rather, gender is an identity tenuously constituted in time, instituted in an exterior space through a *stylized repetition of acts* (p. 179, emphasis original).

Further,

> The possibilities of gender transformation are to be found precisely in the arbitrary relation between such acts, in the possibility of a failure to repeat, a de-formity, or a parodic repetition that exposes the phantasmic effect of abiding identity as a politically tenuous construction (ibid.)

For Butler, the performative nature of gender is a means of avoiding essentialist ideals of male and female expression, as it enables the construction of 'gender configurations outside

the restricting frames of masculinist domination and compulsory heterosexuality' (p. 180). This sense of identity as being constructed through the repetition of performative acts, rather than in reference to a stable ideal, is an important one to understanding student identity in the context of the present study, which is concerned with the apparent binary nature of biculturalism and the relationship between Māori and Pākehā. As I have argued elsewhere, a simple binary understanding of biculturalism is flawed in that it rests on essentialised conceptions of Māori and Pākehā identity; rather, we should understand ethnic identity as being continuously constructed and reconstructed and allow for the construction of identities that exist outside of restrictive conceptions of the colonial binary framework.

Simone Drichel challenges what she characterises as the logocentrism of representation in the West, according to which the 'most perfect representation is that which re-presents the original presence with the least degree of distortion' (Drichel, 2008, p. 600). She argues that the concept of iterability can be used to challenge stereotypes, which depend on 'absolute ideality' (ibid.), for iterability 'captures the strange double logic whereby identity is both self-identical and forever different from itself; identity emerges from (identical) repetition, but in that repetition identity is no longer self-identical' (p. 601). She draws on the work of Judith Butler and Homi Bhabha, noting that Bhabha finds political potential in the temporal space between iterations as enabling 'new and hybrid agencies and articulations' and revisions (Bhabha, 1992, p. 457). Drichel goes on to this to the context of New Zealand, in which Māori occupy the position of 'other', and suggests that rather than merely perpetuating stereotypes, iterability allows the partial assumption of stereotypes, which Bhabha refers to as 'hybrid agency'. For Drichel, if Māori otherness is conceptualised as a hybrid otherness rather than as a stereotypical otherness then it can serve to enable distinct expressions of Māori culture (Drichel, 2008, p. 590), and that although the New Zealand government's embrace of bicultural policies would seem to reinforce colonial stereotypes, 'postcolonial Aotearoa/New Zealand manages to negotiate a more enabling sense of otherness' (p. 606), which I take to refer to initiatives such as Kaupapa Māori.

Student musicking, when understood in the iterative sense, can be understood as the construction of meaning in music, and their choices in this regard as being 'student voice'. Consider the different ways in which a student may engage with music in a bicultural classroom, and the way in which a teacher may influence the construction of meaning:

1. A student sings a waiata in the classroom. She produces a pair of poi and performs with them as well.
2. A school choir sings a selection of songs in Māori and in English, including some Western songs translated into Māori.
3. A student plays a drum solo in a jazz ensemble. Around his neck he wears a carved greenstone.

One may understand each of these examples as being iterative, as even if it is the first time a student has attempted a particular song or musical activity, he or she is drawing on and repeating forms of music that exist in one tradition or another. I would note that a teacher, through responding positively or negatively, or in ways that otherwise convey permission or repression, may influence further iterations of such examples and the further construction

of identity and meaning. The first student might continue to sing waiata and to practise with poi, or may gain the impression that the song, the poi, or both are somehow inappropriate or unwelcome, depending on the reaction of the teacher and other students; the choir's membership may fluctuate as students leave or join and practise their combined programme of music over successive rehearsals. I would also characterise each of these examples of student musicking as being examples of polyvocal and polyphonic student identity in the sense used by hooks. In the case of the drummer, for example, the choice to wear the greenstone may be interpreted as a statement along the lines of saying 'yes, I can do this, but I remain Māori.'

This is not to suggest that the interpretation of student voice is necessarily simple. I note the words of Elizabeth Ellsworth when she notes that she, as a white middle-class professor, 'could not unproblematically "help" a student of color to find her/his authentic voice as a student of color' (p. 309). Similarly, I would argue that a non-Māori teacher cannot unproblematically 'help' a Māori student to find his or her 'authentic' voice as a Māori person. This points to a deeper problem for non-Māori teachers: is it possible for them to unproblematically teach 'Māori' musical practices, or even wider topics relating to Māori culture? I would suggest that perhaps it is not always possible to do so, but also that *not* to teach 'Māori music' to some degree in the classroom is also problematic. I argue that teachers must approach such matters in a way that is critically aware and which fosters such critical awareness in their students as well, and in so doing, that teachers and students may together arrive at an understanding of what knowledge is useful, and why.

Student voice therefore an essential element of constructing useful knowledge in the classroom. I do not argue for a wholly constructivist music education setting in which 'anything goes', but rather one in which student voice is treated as an essential aspect of classroom planning. In this I again turn to the words of bell hooks, who summarised her approach to students and the bringing of 'other' knowledges into the classroom as follows:

> 'I would be disempowering you if I did not encourage you to acquire the ways of knowing and the forms of writing that will help you succeed in society as a whole; but to honor and cherish those other ways of speaking and writing, we can do things simultaneously so that you can acquire all of these skills and not be forced to leave the other behind' (hooks, 1994a, p. 9).

Similar sentiments have been expressed by music educators such as Terese M. Volk, who has written that:

> Today it is generally agreed that students should have both a solid grounding in the music of their own culture and a general knowledge of the musics of other cultures (Volk, 1998, pp. 189 – 190).

Volk's writing appears to contain the curious assumption that music students will be of the dominant Western culture, which is not an assumption that music teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand can make. However, the sentiment applies: there is a confirmed place in the 'mainstream' music education classroom for the teaching of Western music traditions. To paraphrase hooks' words, I would argue that in bicultural music classrooms in Aotearoa

New Zealand, there is certainly a need for students to acquire the ways of knowing and the literacies of music that will help students succeed in (Western) society, but that other ways of musicking – Māori ways of musicking, for example – must not be left behind.

In summary, the concepts of musicking, iterability, and hybridity offers a theoretical basis for music educators to use in understanding student identity in relation to the musical processes they engage in, and thereby to understand student voice in this regard in the classroom. The concept of musicking as developed by Small and praxial scholars such as Elliott and Silverman encourages teachers to take a holistic view of music that is grounded in the social reality of the student and the classroom and the relationships that students have with each other, with the teacher, and with the community. The concept of iterability when applied to music suggests that a piece of music will never perfectly reproduce its original meaning; thus, for example, Māori music reproduced in a 'mainstream' music classroom must be understood as being quite different in nature to that produced in, for example, a Māori Performing Arts classroom, and different again to that which might be sung on a marae. Teachers must be sensitive to such meanings, and to the production of new meanings in this way. Finally, the concept of 'hybrid otherness' offers the possibility of empowering students who may choose to identify as Māori musicians in the mainstream context, as they may choose to negotiate the extent to which they engage in musical ideas from each culture – that is, they may choose the extent to which they 'work the hyphen', to borrow the language of Alison Jones. It is in this way that musical knowledge may be understood as being constructed in the bicultural music classroom and used in the continuous process of understanding the respective places of Māori and Western cultures in bicultural music education.

Considering Universals, Diversity, and Difference

The idea that there can be universal understandings of music would appear to be a perennial topic of the literature in musicology, ethnomusicology, and in music education. The use of the word 'universal' (or the less sweeping term, 'qualified universal') would seem to imply that there are underlying musical processes common to all (or most) musical repertoires, and that these processes can be learned or discerned through the study of music in the mainstream classroom. I take the position here that such 'universals' are in fact observed when musicians perceive that in one musical repertoire there are patterns of meaning common to another, and further, that such patterns of meaning are not necessarily universal at all but merely reflect the understanding of the observers. The finding of 'universals' in music may be considered to occur in situations where music teachers promote diversity in the classroom and encourage the comparison of musical practices.

At this point I wish to note here the work of Elizabeth Grierson, who has written sceptically of appeals to cultural pluralism and diversity that on the face of it are inclusive but in truth do nothing to interrogate underlying cultural dominance. Drawing on the work of Homi Bhabha, she calls instead for the exercise of *difference* in the classroom, and states:

> When *difference* is accounted for in the way curriculum is developed and implemented, then 'otherness' may be rescued from its binary separation and negative connotations (Grierson, 2003, p. 109, emphasis original).

For Grierson, as it is for Bhabha,

> The aim of cultural difference is to rearticulate the sum of knowledge from the perspective of the signifying position of the minority that resists totalization … where adding *to* does not add up but serves to disturb the calculation of power and knowledge, producing other spaces of subaltern signification (Bhabha, 1994, p. 162, emphasis original).

I shall turn to the following discussion of universalisms in music and music education with Grierson's scepticism of the uncritical pursuit of diversity in mind; it is my argument that inasmuch as such 'universal' knowledge music allows students to operate as musicians in the musical circles of the dominant culture it is useful, but that a critically bicultural teacher will find ways to enable expressions of difference as well.

There is in fact a wider debate about humankind and the universality of meaning, and it is interesting to consider another recent debate about universality. In the field of psychology, for example, Nicole L. Nelson and James A. Russell have considered what they term the 'universality thesis', which is the claim that:

> certain human facial expressions are signals of specific basic emotions – such as happiness, surprise, fear, anger, disgust, and sadness – signals universally recognized by human beings whatever their cultural background or spoken language (Nelson & Russell, 2013, p. 8).

In a review of 57 relevant studies, Nelson and Russell conclude that in fact 'evidence does not support the claim that facial expressions are preinterpreted signals for specific basic emotions universally recognized by human beings', although they also find that humans do not merely assign random meanings to a facial expression (p. 13). Gendron, Crivelli, and Barrett argue that 'emotion perception is as much a product of meaning making by a perceiver as it is driven by the physical movements of a face (Gendron, Crivelli, & Barrett, 2018, p. 217). I make no claim to contribute here to the psychological literature on the meaning of facial expressions, nor do I wish to broadly apply the conclusions of these researchers to the music education literature, but I would ask this: if the mere perception of emotion in facial expressions is not universal, then how can musical devices and processes – which are surely far more abstract and complicated to interpret – be considered to be universal?

I have suggested that the universal in music education is a recurring topic in the literature and have commented elsewhere on the modern philosophies of Graham McPhail, who has argued that music has a universal episteme that must be taught. But McPhail is far from alone, as suggested by Terese M. Volk, who writes that:

> Since about 1980, there appears to be a return to the idea of balance. All musics are now acceptable for study, since the overriding concept of music as a human

> expression unifies them all. It is through the diversity of individual musics that teachers can provide access to universal musical concepts (Volk, 1998, p. 189).

I would have no issue if, instead of advocating the teaching of a 'universal' music episteme, writers such as McPhail advocate for the teaching of the Western music episteme, as there is certainly a place for the teaching of Western knowledge and, in my understanding, 'universal knowledge' and 'Western knowledge' may as well be synonymous terms. However, if the teacher's aim in teaching a diverse range of musics is solely to provide access to universal music concepts, then this risks leaving no room for the expression of difference in the classroom. For a teacher pursuing a critical biculturalism, this risks not allowing expressions of Māori culture.

Is it fair to argue that universal knowledge is in fact Western knowledge? This point has in fact been made by others: for example, Georgina Stewart has noted that universalism is a product of Enlightenment thinking that emphasised the rationality of human thought, noting also that Enlightenment philosophers thought that 'the world can be explained; that humanity is capable of progressing towards perfection; and that all humans, despite cultural and other differences, are fundamentally alike.' She notes that 'the universalism inherent in Enlightenment thinking acts to suppress local knowledge and customs, and aspects of human nature deemed irrational, including morals and ethics' (Stewart, 2012, p. 53). In other words, universalism works to promote the views of the dominant culture over minority cultures. It also has implications for the analysis of colonialism: Simone Drichel has noted that whereas Western ideas are presumed to be universal, indigenous or 'local' cultures are not. She suggests that 'whereas Europeans 'do not have' an ethnic or cultural identity because they are – *qua* their rationality – representatives of a universal human nature, colonized peoples remain outside that universal realm due to their localized culture' (Drichel, 2008, p. 593). I would argue that in promoting the view of universal culture as Western culture, one is able to take a critical view of the knowledge and politics of Western cultural hegemony, and critically interrogate such knowledge in the classroom.

Interestingly, there is also much literature that is sceptical of the idea of universalism in music. In 1956, Leonard B. Meyer wrote:

> Music is not a 'universal language.' The languages and dialects of music are many. They vary from culture to culture, from epoch to epoch within the same culture, and even within a single epoch and culture (Meyer, 1961, p. 62).

The search for universality can have methodological implications for researchers, as Kenneth A. Gourlay in 1984 noted. He argues that there can be a circularity to such research, giving the following simple example:

> …since definitions should be all-embracing, we define 'music' in terms that are *prima facie* universal and fall victims to circularity of argument by eventually listing as 'universals' the characteristics with which we started. The old-fashioned dictionary definition of 'music' as 'the art of expressing or stirring emotion by melodious and harmonious combinations of sound' enables one not only to limit the field of research by excluding all activity that fails to conform to this definition, e.g., percussive or

> timbral effects, but, having limited our field, to reach the not entirely surprising conclusion that, among musical universals, are melody, harmony and the power of sounds to express or stir emotion (Gourlay, 1984, pp. 26 – 28).

Gourlay goes on to note that the concept of the universal, when approached by Western scholars, tends to have a Western bias, noting that Western scholars of African music have described 'African' music even when the African people in question come from a culture where the term 'music' is unknown, and in which the practices that Westerners understand as 'music' are understood in other ways (p. 28).

Ronald Radano and Philip V. Bohlman have written of race in relation to music, strikingly characterising it in these terms:

> A spectre lurks in the house of music, and it goes by the name of race (Radano & Bohlman, 2000, p. 1).

They present an argument that echoes Drichel's claims that European rationality exists outside of culture: for Radano and Bohlman, this spectre is 'the commonsense opinion that what distinguishes the musically racial from the not-racial is as simple as telling the difference between black and white' (ibid.). One might talk of the racial and the not-racial in similar terms to the way in which one may speak of local cultures and the universal.

That universalism promotes not just a Western episteme but a specifically rational one therefore presents challenges for those wishing to deal with other cultures in the classroom. Stewart argues that the rational nature of Western universalised knowledge presents a challenge for the teaching of pūtaiao, or Māori-medium science. Western science, of course, is a field that prizes positivistic and universally-true outcomes; and in this, the field of music is similar, as it has historically prized positivistic understandings of music. As Susan McClary writes, prior to 1985, when Joseph Kerman published *Contemplating Music*, which envisioned a 'new musicology' and prompted debate that upended the field, musicology was a field characterised by a focus on activities such as the editing of sources, the examination of archives, and the formal analysis of music, an environment which fostered the 'domination of positivism and…the absence of most of the lines of inquiry then crucial to other areas of the humanities' (McClary, 2002, p. xiv).

Stewart argues that postmodern understandings of epistemology challenge the belief that objectively true knowledge can be found, and that 'this development tempered the previous modernist faith that science could answer all questions and solve all humanity's problems, and it helped promote the idea of other forms of science, including Māori science' (Stewart, 2012, p. 55). She further notes the following:

> …the most coherent meaning of Māori science is as a form of protest against the influence of the Eurocentric and incoherent notion of "Western science", which is a political meaning, as distinct from an epistemic meaning. The call for the Pūtaiao curriculum to be based on Māori science thus confuses two different pedagogical aims: firstly, teaching science better to Māori students; and secondly, teaching traditional Māori knowledge (often called 'mātauranga Māori') instead of science (p. 53).

Stewart's words suggest here that a key goal for a critically bicultural music teacher must to work towards better ways of teaching music to Māori students, and that the teaching of traditional Māori music is a separate concern. I would argue that although the teaching of traditional Māori music is often located outside of the mainstream music classroom in Māori Performing Arts classes or kapa haka ensembles by specialist teachers, this does not mean that traditional Māori music has no place in the mainstream music classroom. I would further suggest that although the political and epistemic orientations of Māori and non-Māori music have been little considered by music education scholars in New Zealand, critically bicultural teachers might certainly engage their students in discussions about what makes music 'Māori', for example, in an effort to bring these questions into the classroom.

There is a further challenge to teachers seeking to teach Western music in Māori medium settings. Stewart also notes that a challenge for teachers of pūtaiao is that of language:

> Language presents severe challenges in Pūtaiao, understood as Māori-medium Science, particularly at wharekura (high school) levels. The number and nature of specialised Pūtaiao words result in a never-ending struggle to locate all the curriculum terms needed to teach entirely through the medium of te reo Māori.

She argues that a 'Māori-only policy in Pūtaiao, therefore, becomes self-defeating after a certain point around Years 6 – 8', and that inevitably, one must use bilingual means of instruction in regard to the language of pūtaiao/science (pp. 55 – 56). The complex jargon used in Western music includes words and theoretical terms in many languages including French, German, and Italian – so that, for example, a student must understand that 'violon', 'Geige', and 'violino' are all words to refer to the instrument called 'violin' in English – as well as in two distinct varieties of English (the 'English' English semibreve and American-English whole note, for example, are the same concept) and presents similar challenges to a teacher hoping to implement Māori-medium music instruction.

To summarise my argument here, I suggest that a teacher of music in Aotearoa New Zealand has the responsibility to ensure access to Western knowledge for their students; just as Freire, for example, was concerned with the development of literacy amongst adults in Brazil, so too can teachers in New Zealand be concerned with the development of music literacy in their students, with a range of potentially transformative outcomes, such as in a single student's becoming able to move on to a musical career, or a school class being able to produce musical works such as musical theatre productions or to perform and record works featuring styles or viewpoints marginalised in the popular music market. However, I would caution teachers against the view that there are fundamentally universal concepts underlying all music, and encourage them to consider carefully how they may enact expressions of cultural difference. Although it might be interesting in the classroom to find and investigate apparent universals in the musics of various cultures, a more interesting topic still might involve the deconstruction of such universals, thereby revealing the Western bias of such universals and showing the different ways in which music is understood and used by different peoples. A critically bicultural music teacher must allow

space in their classrooms for other musics – *different* musics – and other understandings of music.

I will conclude this discussion by quoting the work of Nomi Dave (Dave, 2015), who has provided an extensive literature survey showing that scholars are in fact divided on the question of universality in music, with arguments being levied for and against, and with various degrees of qualification. Dave argues for an approach to music that is centred on human capabilities rather than on universals:

> The 'universal language' approach celebrates music for its own sake without asking what it can do in practical ways to improve people's lives. Thinking instead of music in terms of human capabilities shifts the focus to what music can achieve, rather than to contemplation and celebration of its apparently inherent traits (p. 15).

Dave's words here return the consideration of musical universals to the language of music education praxis and critical education: is the purpose of music education to celebrate music as object, or to engage with music as a social activity that can transform lives and communities? As should be clear, the argument of this thesis points to the latter view.

Addressing Tokenism

At present, in mainstream settings in New Zealand, we tend to take a tokenistic attitude to bicultural and multicultural inclusion, and I argue here that a critically bicultural music teacher must work to ensure that they work against such attitudes in their classroom practice. Tokenism is the superficial and limited gesture towards an obligation, of the type characterised by Tyson Yunkaporta when he writes that tokenistic attitudes to Aboriginal culture in Australia is the 'phenomenon whereby Aboriginal knowledge merely becomes 'exotic bookends for mainstream content' (Yunkaporta, 2009, p. 62). That music education in Aotearoa New Zealand takes what is in fact a systematically tokenistic approach to biculturalism is attested to by Trevor Thwaites when he writes that teachers

> …have tended to become more technicist as they tick off the demands of curriculum documents, their school boards, the Education Council of Aotearoa New Zealand, modes of assessment, as well as various numeracy, literacy (both text-based and financial), and cultural competency add-ons (Thwaites, 2018, p. 25).

Thus, not only is 'cultural competency' merely something to tick off, but it also suffers the indignity of being an 'add-on', and therefore tokenistic in and of itself – so teachers are responding in tokenistic ways to tokenistic policies! Surely a sensible strategy to address this problem would be to remove the technicist demands on teachers, so that rather than spending time ticking policy boxes they can devote themselves to the task of transformational teaching. This is a challenge for government, schools, and for school departments to undertake.

Tokenism is a theme that has been raised with some frequency in the critical literature. In the music education context, Juliet Hess has written about tokenism in Canadian music education, noting that commonly, 'other' musics – 'other' than Western classical music, that is – are treated as out-of-context tokens. She gives the example of a teacher choosing to include a standalone unit on 'African Drumming'. Tokenism can also be manifested in the hidden curriculum – in the choices that teachers make about how to present knowledge and in the knowledge that is not presented. Hess asks:

> Why, for example, do the African drums come out in February in Canadian classrooms for 'Black History Month'? When we, as educators, give black history a tiny moment in the year as an interruption to our Western classical program, we tokenize and temporally marginalize it (Hess, 2015a, p. 339).

Tokenism, in other words, is a means of defending the status quo rather than of transforming teaching practices or learning environments. bell hooks has observed similar outcomes:

> In Women's Studies, for example, individuals will often focus on women of color at the very end of the semester or lump everything about race and difference together in one section. This kind of tokenism is not multicultural transformation, but it is familiar to us as the change individuals are most likely to make (hooks, 1994b, p. 38).

A standalone unit or lesson on 'diverse musics' is thus not inclusive, and in fact, as Hess points out, the very standalone nature of such lessons only serves to highlight and participate in processes of marginalisation.

The way in which tokenism can still perpetuate oppressive relations of power is made clear in an account by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., who wrote in the *New York Times* that

> …in the tradition of old guards, who would rather die rather than surrender, a new and hastily constructed roadblock has appeared in the form of planned and institutionalized tokenism. Many areas of the South are retreating to a position where they will permit a handful of Negroes to attend all-white schools or allow the employment in lily-white factories of one Negro to a thousand whites.

The conditions that face Māori in New Zealand are not those that faced African Americans in the United States in the 1960s. Indeed, the problems that King Jr. describes are on a different order to those facing teachers attempting to be bicultural in their classrooms. The point remains, though, that tokenism can be understood as the exercise of power by the dominant culture; it is the merest acknowledgement of minority culture, whether begrudging or done in perceived good faith, and its effects are felt keenly by those who feel them.

George Yancy also makes comments about black students' experiences that are worthy of reflection on here:

> For too long, I have had black students say to me that they feel unsafe at PWIs (predominantly white institutions). I must believe them. And while they may not

> have been called a nigger to their faces, such white spaces position them as inconsequential, deny their blackness through superficial concerns for "diversity," and take their complaints as instances of individual problems of institutional adjustment. I insist on bearing witness to black pain and suffering at PWIs because the deniers are out there. We are told that what we know in our very bodies to be true isn't credible. This is a different kind of violence, the epistemic kind.

The argument that superficial concerns for diversity – tokenism, in other words – are in fact an epistemic form of violence must surely be a wake-up call to teachers, who are responsible for ensuring that their classrooms are not sites of trauma for their students.

How then, can a critically bicultural teacher avoid tokenism? If tokenism is understood as the exercise of power, then to counter it, power must be shared in the classroom. To some extent, teachers must engage in sustained discussions with their students about curriculum content and, as previously argued, the relationship of power to knowledge in the classroom and society. This is not to suggest that the burden to avoid tokenism in the classroom should be placed on students, for it is ultimately the teacher's responsibility to manage their classroom. Ellsworth, for example, states that

> White students/professor should [share] the burden of educating themselves about the consequences of their White-skin privilege…so that the students of color involved in the class would not always be looked to as the "experts" in racism… (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 317).

I therefore return to the idea of praxis as involving action and reflection, and suggest that the matter of tokenism is one that teachers may use as a reflective tool to address the way in which they work towards the inclusion of students in their classrooms.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have argued that a critically bicultural music teacher is one who supports a bicultural political agenda in the classroom, who creates space for music of Māori and other cultures – and I will emphasise here that I do not envision biculturalism as excluding consideration of multiculturalism in the classroom – and understands expression of music by Māori students and others as being complex hybrid statements to some degree or another. A critically bicultural teacher will reflect on the means of inclusion of students in their classroom, and work to ensure that bicultural policy is implemented in ways that are genuine and sustained rather than the tokenistic norm that tends to exist today.

Of course, one might retort that such a vision of teaching is more easily described on paper than achieved in practice. Walking the walk can be more difficult than talking the talk, and as a secondary teacher, I would be the first to admit that teaching is not always easy, and that one can encounter resistance in one form or another from students for any manner of reasons that complicate the work of teaching. I will return once more to the words of Elizabeth Ellsworth, who developed the following outlook on dealing with difference in the

classroom: ‘If you can talk to me in ways that show you understand that your knowledge of me, the world, and “the Right thing to do” will always be partial, interested, and potentially oppressive to others, and if I can do the same, then we can work together on shaping and reshaping alliances for constructing circumstances in which students of difference can thrive’ (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 324). Perhaps the most important principle of critically bicultural music education is that teachers, students, and community members can work together to ensure that Māori and Pākehā students can thrive.

Conclusion: What is Bicultural Music Education?

Throughout this research, I have considered themes and problems in the fields of critical pedagogy, music education, and Kaupapa Māori scholarship in the service of arriving at a considered understanding of biculturalism in music education in Aotearoa New Zealand. There are some key arguments that I have made throughout. First, I have argued that biculturalism cannot be understood in simplistic, reductionist terms, as Māori and Pākehā peoples are not homogenous groups; moreover, rigid binary frameworks such as Māori and Pākehā, colonised and coloniser, or oppressed and oppressor can be starting points to an analysis but under scrutiny must give way to more complex understandings of the way in which people construct their identities and interact. Second, I have argued for an understanding of biculturalism that is critical and anti-colonial: that is, which seeks to identify injustices resulting from colonial relations of power that have existed and which continue to exist in Aotearoa New Zealand, to understand one's position in regards to these relations of power, and to work towards their transformation. In this sense, the analysis of biculturalism is the analysis of colonialism and indigeneity, and the analysis of related fields such as racism and ethnicity, and all New Zealanders can understand themselves and their interactions with others in these terms. A key priority in the analysis of biculturalism is to analyse the way in which tino rangatiratanga, Māori self-determination, is treated. Third, I have argued that music education should be praxial: that is, that it should be based on an understanding of music as a process carried out by musicians who must be understood as being situated within a community and acting in response to the values they hold and the challenges they face. A praxial music teacher will seek to respond to their students and their social context, and the praxial philosophy of music education is easily adapted to the bicultural social context of Aotearoa New Zealand.

Bicultural music education in Aotearoa New Zealand, therefore, involves the politics of colonialism, anti-colonialism, racism, anti-racism, domination, protest, and resistance as they are present in or otherwise relevant to the workings of a music classroom and the lives of those who teach and learn music. In thus critiquing the workings of colonialism and racism, it seeks to identify and work against oppressive power relations as they become apparent. It recognises the various ways of being Māori, Pākehā, and otherwise non-Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand, and in rejecting simple and essentialised notions of Māori and Pākehā culture seeks to respond to individual needs. To use Freirean terms, the work of a bicultural music teacher is the work of conscientisation – being critically aware of the way in which one and one's students are positioned in relation to the politics and material reality of oppression – and, where possible, transformation – that is working to create change. In making this argument, I am arguing for a critical perspective: that is, a critically bicultural music education.

Non-Binary Biculturalism

A non-binary biculturalism may seem like an oxymoron: after all, the prefix *bi-* would appear to imply that is strictly dual in nature. However, a simple binary biculturalism is impossible, as an examination of the many expressions of Māori and Pākehā identity shows: if there is more than one way of being Māori, and more than one way of being Pākehā, then theories of biculturalism must allow for the expression of difference by people who participate in the bicultural discourse. In arguing against rigid and simplistic definitions of biculturalism that promote reductionist views of Māori and Pākehā identity, I am in fact arguing for a biculturalism that is in fact not binary. This deconstruction of biculturalism allows for critical perspectives on the colonial politics of Aotearoa New Zealand, in and out of the music classroom.

The very terms *Māori* and *Pākehā* are problematic, as they obscure this diversity of identities. I have used the word Māori throughout this document as a convenient collective term, but it must be recognised that this term implies a collective agreement among Māori that is not always in evidence. Māori society is divided into tribal and familial groupings according to iwi, hapu, and whanau, and different people within this society have different interests. A contemporary example of this is the ongoing Treaty settlement negotiations with Ngāpuhi, a northern iwi with multiple constituent sub-groupings, and shifting dynamics relating to who may negotiate and what terms are desired. Without going into detail, the very process of arriving at terms to begin negotiating has been contested, with the Waitangi Tribunal at one point urgently conducting an inquiry into the matter of whether the Crown had allowed Ngāpuhi hapū to negotiate on their own terms (Waitangi Tribunal, 2015), and the process remains ongoing. Therefore, Māori cannot be understood as collectively occupying one end of a binary framework. In this regard, the term 'Treaty of Waitangi partnership' is in some ways a useful one, because those engaged in the process of signing understood that there was no single Māori agreement to the document, and as a result, pages of signatures from the chiefs of iwi around the country were collected. The term 'Treaty of Waitangi partnership' to some extent avoids the problem of homogenising Māori. On the other hand, it still implies a degree of agreement that might not exist, as if the proper meaning of the Treaty in the present day is a *fait accompli.* The meaning of the Treaty in the present day remains contested, and bicultural policies and perspectives should account for this.

Pākehā are also not a homogenous group with an easily definable and shared identity. Again, for convenience, I have used the word Pākehā throughout to refer, in general, to the group now called New Zealand Europeans, but the term is more slippery than that: without question, the Europeans who came to Aotearoa New Zealand in the early nineteenth century were Europeans, but they were also Pākehā. The Europeans in Australia, for that matter, were also Pākehā, and are identified as such by Kuni Jenkins when she relates the story of Ruatara's stay in New South Wales, during which he was able to study the colonial way of life (Jenkins, 2000, p. 87). The term Pākehā therefore includes white people from various European cultures, and white culture, for all its hegemonic force,

encompasses and includes variance to a degree that is obscured by the use of 'Pākehā' as a collective term.

Of course, there is also the fact that biculturalism and multiculturalism co-exist in education policy in Aotearoa New Zealand. If viewed in strict binary terms, biculturalism becomes something of a poor cousin to multiculturalism, dealing with only two groups when multiculturalism purports to consider and include all. In fact, in *not* considering the interests of other groups, and in considering only those groups which I have problematically called Māori and Pākehā, biculturalism appears to be exclusionary in its outlook, and therefore hypocritical in its calls for inclusion of Māori: according to this view, why should Māori be privileged in this inclusion above others? But if one understands biculturalism as being concerned with matters of colonialism and anti-assimilation, and as involving all New Zealanders, and as allowing space for Māori claims to separatism when desired, then it becomes an infinitely richer field of study, with concerns quite distinct to the anti-racist, inclusionary, and assimilationist concerns that are the stuff of the multicultural discourse and which are relevant to all who seek to participate in New Zealand society. Bicultural and multicultural considerations in fact work together, as the experience of Māori and Pākehā people who also identify with other cultures such as (but of course not limited to) Pacific Island, Asian, or Indian cultures attests.

Who is Biculturalism in Music Education For?

Biculturalism is a contested term. The process of negotiating Treaty settlements remains unfinished, and the process of reaching these settlements reveals different understandings about the place of the Treaty in New Zealand society on the part of both Māori and Pākehā. Even when understood narrowly as referring to the policies of governance and the institutional reforms that were put in place as a result of the 'bicultural turn' in the 1980s and 1990s, there is little agreement as to how, why, and to what ends bicultural policies are implemented. I have noted discursive theories of power and knowledge in the course of conducing this research, and asked: who decides what knowledge is important, and who decides what can be known? For that matter, who benefits from these decisions, and how?

Such questions have deep implications in regard to the study of music education, for bicultural policy has had the effect of unsettling the conventional curriculum of music education in Aotearoa New Zealand. I have argued that music education necessarily privileges western musical knowledge, in much the same way that science education must teach the knowledge important to the western tradition of science: this is the knowledge that students and communities expect to be taught and made available to students, and it should be made available. However, this is not the same as arguing that music education should exclude non-western musics. As I have argued, music teachers who draw on praxial philosophies of music education can find in biculturalism an ethical obligation to take into account bicultural perspectives, and in this way may seek to include Māori music in the classroom, or otherwise work to teach music to Māori students in effective ways.

There is no simple means of understanding who decides what music is important, for music in Aotearoa New Zealand meets the needs of a wide variety of communities. There is the 'élite' group, the symphony orchestras and opera companies and schools of music that prepare their students for careers as 'classical' musicians; there is the non- élite, the bands and DJs and radio stations that cater to the masses, and tertiary institutions offering courses that provide instruction in such 'contemporary' or 'popular' music. There are divisions within these categories according to genre and ethnicity – even in western classical music, where one speaks of French or German or Polish musical traditions, etc. Schools may have communities that have their own expectations of a music programme: to prepare a concert band to take part in a festival, or to put on a musical theatre show, or to engage in other community events. Making such decisions in the context of biculturalism is not merely a simple matter of ensuring that 'Māori culture' is represented in the curriculum in one way or another: it also means ensuring that one's students have access to and are engaged in the school's music programme. I have further argued here that one must teach for a critical understanding of biculturalism in music: in the context of curriculum, this can mean engaging students in critical discussions of what music is chosen for inclusion, and why, and how such choices might relate to the political legacy of colonialism in this country.

In particular, it is the often Pākehā-centric implementation of biculturalism that must be constantly subjected to critique and examination. If biculturalism indeed serves only Pākehā ends, then bicultural policies and initiatives can be adopted and discarded as needed; what results is a biculturalism of convenience, one in which power remains concentrated with Pākehā interests. Biculturalism in this regard becomes a means of retaining control, rather than sharing it. Addressing this problem will be an ongoing challenge for me, professionally, and for other white researchers and music teachers. For me, and others like me, biculturalism is a choice. The adoption of a critically bicultural perspective disrupts the dominant paradigm, and this disruption can sometimes be uncomfortable. How far should one go, for example, to confront deliberate or unthinking examples of racist or colonial attitudes in everyday life?

For others without such easy access to Western cultural capital, biculturalism is not a choice: for Māori students, the act of attending school and participating in society where the dominant culture is not Māori requires a 'working of the hyphen', a negotiation of identity, and a shift between Māori and non-Māori worlds according to context. It is in the service of these people that I argue that music teachers must adopt bicultural praxes in their classrooms – that is, for music teachers in a professional capacity, biculturalism must not be optional. Even in the case of classrooms where many or all students are not Māori, and for whom – like me – biculturalism might be seen as optional, or even irrelevant, I would argue that music teachers have a duty to work against the hegemonic workings of whiteness in New Zealand society, and to teach a curriculum influenced by critical biculturalism.

Another way of approaching the question of 'who is biculturalism for?' is by considering another point of contestation in the concept of biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand is that of assimilation vs separation, or of deliberate inclusion vs deliberate otherness. I return here to the words I have already cited earlier of Alison Jones, who has

pointed out that a key failing of critical pedagogy is that it assumes that all stakeholders, oppressed and oppressors alike, desire inclusion and a breaking-down of barriers:

> What if 'togetherness' and dialogue-across-difference fail to hold a compellingly positive meaning for subordinate ethnic groups? What if the 'other' fails to find interesting the idea of their empathetic understanding of the powerful, which is theoretically demanded by dialogic encounters? What happens when the other refuses to join in the 'multiple voices for mutually empowering conversation' in the progressive classroom? (Jones, 1999, p. 299)

Jones' questions reveal that critical pedagogy, when used as a tool of the powerful, is not necessarily a liberating tool. Thus, in Aotearoa New Zealand, inclusion and assimilation for their own sake are not necessarily virtues in the eyes of Māori, who have consistently promoted an agenda that includes self-determination and sovereignty. Perhaps then, the dialectical of biculturalism is not the 'dialogue-across-difference' that Jones mentions, in this case the dialogue of Māori and Pākehā, but rather a dialogue that seeks to identify the goals and concerns of all parties in a given scenario. I would argue that non-Māori teachers of music can find ways to allow a Māori agenda in the classroom to flourish through strategic sharing of power when this is appropriate.

An Argument for A Critical Biculturalism

My aim and hope in completing this research is that biculturalism in music education, and in the education sector more broadly, will be understood as a rich and broad means of interacting with students and of engaging critically with the knowledge that comprises the subject, as opposed to the bureaucratic and tokenistic approach that would appear to dominate the present discourse – the so-called 'cultural competency add-ons' that Thwaites has described. In choosing to understand the making and reception of music – indeed, 'musicking' in general – as social interactions, as articulations of identity, and as assertions of and responses to relationships of power, the field of music becomes a fertile site for the critique of the hegemony of Western knowledge and of colonialism in New Zealand.

Though the primary concern of this research has been to consider the question of 'what is bicultural music education?', my prevailing goal throughout has not been to arrive at a narrowly focused answer to this question, as if the problem of bicultural music education is one that stands alone and can be considered in isolation. Rather, it is to characterise bicultural music education as a political field that involves and affects all music teachers and students, in Aotearoa New Zealand, be they Māori, Pākehā, or otherwise non-Māori, and to invite critical reflection within this field. Thus, a major point in the methodology of the present research has been to consider myself as a researcher and as a teacher in relation to this subject matter, and to use the tools of social critique and critical pedagogy to consider other bicultural interactions, and in setting this example it is my hope that others who aspire to a bicultural outlook will engage in similar critique. Though I have arrived at the perspectives I discuss here through a consideration of music and music

education in Aotearoa New Zealand, I have made many arguments regarding the study and analysis of biculturalism in general that warrant further consideration.

First, the notion of biculturalism that I promote is an inclusive one, and stands in counterpoint to the common view that biculturalism is mainly a Māori concern, and that it is simply a way of promoting Māori interests and inclusion in mainstream society. I argue that biculturalism is a concern that all New Zealanders must engage with, and in promoting biculturalism as a process of critical reflection on the colonialism and related issues of discrimination in Aotearoa New Zealand seek to involve all New Zealanders in the processes of conscientisation and transformation. I would have New Zealanders consider themselves in relation to colonial politics and ask, 'who is powerful in this situation? Who is not? What is the right thing for me and for others to do?' I suspect that there will be as many answers to these questions as there are New Zealanders, and that as a result, biculturalism will continue to be a contested topic. However, this does not mean that biculturalism ought to be a controversial topic: if the motives of all involved in the discussion are understood as being motivated by ethical concerns, then different perspectives can be understood as coming from people acting in good faith. In this, I hope to see a change from the present approach to biculturalism, where biculturalism is indeed a site of controversy. The acrimonious nature of the present discussion of cultural politics is seen in the contributions by Elizabeth Rata and co-authors, in which allusions to the oppressive practices of Nazi Germany are made by those arguing for and against.

I have noted the concern by Kaupapa Māori scholars that Kaupapa Māori is in danger of being domesticated: that is, that it is in danger of losing its radical nature, its power to effect changes in oppressive conditions. I would similarly argue against domesticated notions of biculturalism. Early conceptions of biculturalism by Wiremu Tamihana, who saw the potential for coexisting Māori and Pākehā governance, and Āpirana Ngata, who among other positions saw the potential for Māori arts to be understood as being of equal value to that of Western arts, were radical in their challenge to Western dominance. Biculturalism in the present day has lost this radical edge: the dominant biculturalism today is that which followed the 'bicultural turn', that which was adopted by the government, and which ultimately serves the ends of government. In the classroom, this biculturalism is seen as a tool for effective management and control of one's Māori students to support government targets; if one is culturally competent enough, if one is properly bicultural in the government-approved manner, then perhaps one will be able to meet the Ministry of Education's targets for the educational achievement of Māori students! In this way, biculturalism can be used as an end to support education along the lines of the 'banking model' that Freire argues is oppressive.

To be clear, this thesis is not arguing that the government should not be bicultural in its policies, or that teachers should not aim to see their students, Māori or otherwise, achieve highly. To the contrary: biculturalism in government and high student achievement are appropriate goals for policy-makers and teachers. However, I would question: who benefits? Is educational achievement the sole benefit that Māori students derive from biculturalism in education? If education has the potential to be emancipatory, to create opportunities for

students and to work against oppression, then how can biculturalism be understood as playing a part in this emancipation?

A domesticated biculturalism runs the danger of being itself oppressive, one that rests on essentialised conceptions of what it is to be Māori, what it is to be Pākehā, and on formulaic conceptions of what is right to do in given situations. This form of biculturalism obliges one to be Māori, or indeed to be Pākehā, in certain ways, so as to live up to the ideal that it promotes, and thus domesticated biculturalisms in fact reinforce colonial power relations rather than transforming them. My finding is this: to be bicultural, one must avoid being 'bicultural' in a way that is oppressive: teachers must be critically reflexive, and bicultural teachers will foster this ability to think critically in their students. Though I invite teachers and students to reflect on their own positions in the bicultural discourse and in bicultural politics, such reflection need not be limited only to the roles of teachers and students, but ultimately must involve a consideration of the very nature of biculturalism itself. It is in this way that bicultural policies and practices can avoid becoming oppressive or domesticated, and it is in this way that teachers, students, and communities can approach the transformative and emancipatory potential of biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand.

References

Abbiss, J. (2011). Social sciences in the New Zealand curriculum: mixed messages. *Curriculum Matters, 7*, 118.

Adorno, T. W., & Daniel, J. O. (1989 - 90). On Jazz. *Discourse, 12*(1), 45 - 69.

Alexander, H. A. (2018). What is critical about critical pedagogy? Conflicting conceptions of criticism in the curriculum. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 50*(10), 903-916. doi:10.1080/00131857.2016.1228519

Allen, G. (2011). *Intertextuality* (2nd ed.). Abingdon, Oxon & New York: Routledge.

Allen, R. L. (2005). Whiteness and Critical Pedagogy. In Z. Leonardo (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Race* (pp. 53 - 68). Malden, MA, Oxford, UK, & Carlton, Victoria, Australia: Blackwell.

Allsup, R. E. (2016). *Remixing the classroom : toward an open philosophy of music education*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Archie, C. (Ed.) (1995). *Maori Sovereignty: The Pakeha Perspective*. Auckland, New Zealand: Hodder Moa Beckett.

Armstrong, G. A. W. (1999). After 25 Years: Paulo Freire in New Zealand, 1974. In P. Roberts (Ed.), *Paulo Freire, Politics and Pedagogy: Reflections from Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 23 - 33). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Bailey, J., Blakeney-Williams, M., Carrss, W., Edwards, F., Hāwera, N., & Taylor, M. (2011). Grappling with the complexity of the New Zealand Curriculum: next steps in exploring the NZC in initial teacher education. *Waikato Journal of Education, 16*(3), 125 - 142.

Barrington, J. M. (2008). *Separate but equal? : Māori schools and the Crown, 1867-1969*. Wellington, N.Z.: Wellington, N.Z. : Victoria University Press 2008.

Belich, J. (1986). *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Bhabha, H. (1984). Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse. *October, 28*, 125-133. doi:10.2307/778467

Bhabha, H. (1992). Postcolonial Criticism. In S. Greenblatt & G. Gunn (Eds.), *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies* (pp. 437 - 465). New York: Modern Language Association of America.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London ; New York: London ; New York : Routledge 2004.

Bishop, R. (2003). *Te kotahitanga : the experiences of year 9 and 10 Māori students in mainstream classrooms*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

Bishop, R. (2012). Pretty difficult: Implementing kaupapa Māori theory in English-medium secondary schools. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 47*(2), 38 - 50.

Bishop, R., & Berryman, M. (2009). The Te Kotahitanga Effective Teaching Profile. *Set: Research Information for Teachers, 2*, 27-34.

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Wearmouth, J., Peter, M., & Clapham, S. (2011). *Te Kotahitanga: Maintaining, replicating and sustaining change in phase 3 and phase 4 schools, 2007-2010*. Wellington, N.Z.: Ministry of Education 2011.

Bluck, J. (2012). *Wai Karekare = Turbulent Waters: the Anglican Bicultural Journey 1814 - 2014*. Auckland, New Zealand: Anglican Church in Aotearoa New Zealand and Polynesia.

Boast, R. (2016). Working in the Waitangi Tribunal: a practitioner's perspective. *Manutukutuku (Online)*, 40-41.
Bodkin, S. (2004). *Being musical: teachers, music, and identity in early childhood education in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Otago. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10523/3451
Bonilla-Silva, E. (2010). *Racism without racists: color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States* (3rd ed.). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
Bowman, W. (2017). "Open" Philosophy or Down the Rabbit Hole? *Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education, 16*(1), 10 - 37. doi:10.22176/act16.1.10
Bradley, D. (2006). Music Education, Multiculturalism, and Anti-Racism -- Can We Talk? *Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education, 5*(2), 2-30.
Bradley, D. (2012). Avoiding the “P” Word: Political Contexts and Multicultural Music Education. *Theory Into Practice, 51*(3), 188-195. doi:10.1080/00405841.2012.690296
Bradley, D. (2015). The Dynamics of Multiculturalism in Music Matters: A Philosophy of Music Education. *Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education, 14*(3), 10-26.
Brantlinger, P. (2011). *Taming Cannibals: Race and the Victorians*. Ithaca, NY: Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP.
Brash, D. (2004). Nationhood. Retrieved from http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PA0401/S00220.htm
Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
Cattermole, J. (2011). 'Oh, reggae but different!' The localisation of roots reggae in Aotearoa. In T. Mitchell & G. Keam (Eds.), *Home, Land and Sea: Situating music in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Rosedale: Pearson.
Church and Society Commission of the National Council of Churches in New Zealand. (1986). *The Pakeha and the Treaty: Signposts*. Auckland: Church and Society Commission of the National Council of Churches in New Zealand.
Clark, J. (2004). The Curriculum Stocktake Report: A Philosophical Critique. *Teachers and Curriculum, 7*.
Claussen, D., & Livingstone, R. (2008). *Theodor W. Adorno: one last genius*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
Clayworth, P. (2017). Social sciences - Social science in the community *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*.
Colenso, W. (2016). *The authentic and genuine history of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, New Zealand, February 5 and 6, 1840: being a faithful and circumstantial, though brief, narration of events which happened on that memorable occasion; with copies of the Treaty in English and Māori and of the three early proclamations respecting the founding of the colony*. Wellington: Colenso Society.
Collins, D. (2016). Towards a Global Music Theory: Practical Concepts and Methods for the Analysis of Music across Human Cultures. *Musicology Australia, 38*(2), 194-197. doi:10.1080/08145857.2016.1239244
Cook, N. (2007). Encountering the Other, Redefining the Self: Hindostannie Airs, Haydn's Folksong Settings and the 'Common Practice' Style. In M. Clayton & B. Zon (Eds.), *Music and Orientalism in the British Empire, 1780s-1940s : portrayal of the East*. Aldershot, England & Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
Cousins, M., & Hussain, A. (1984). *Michel Foucault*. London: Macmillan.

Cross, M. (2015a). *The forgotten soundtrack of Maoriland: imagining the nation through Alfred Hill's songs for Rewi's Last Stand.* (Master of Music in Musicology), Massey University. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10179/6339#sthash.edjHGl36.dpuf
Cross, M. (2015b). Locating Alfred Hill: a musicologist's first experience of archival research. *Crescendo*(97), 6-15.
Cubitt, S. (2006). The draft New Zealand curriculum. *Curriculum Matters, 2*, 195+.
Dahlhaus, C. (1980). *Between romanticism and modernism: four studies in the music of the later nineteenth century*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Daniel, J. O. (1989). Introduction to Adorno's "On Jazz". *Discourse, 12*(1), 39-44.
Dave, N. (2015). Music and the Myth of Universality: Sounding Human Rights and Capabilities. *Journal of Human Rights Practice, 7*(1), 1-17. doi:10.1093/jhuman/huu025
Dei, G. J. S. (2006). Introduction: Mapping the Terrain - Towards a New Politics of Resistance. In G. J. S. Dei & A. Kemf (Eds.), *Anti-Colonialism and Education: The Politics of Resistance* (pp. 1 - 24). Rotterdam & Taipei: Sense.
Dei, G. J. S. (2014). A Prism of Educational Research and Policy: Anti-Racism and Multiplex Oppressions. In G. J. S. Dei & M. McDermott (Eds.), *Politics of Anti-Racism Education: In Search of Strategies for Transformative Learning* (pp. 15 - 28). Dordrecht; New York: Springer.
Derrida, J., & Weber, E. (1990). *Limited Inc*. Paris: Paris : Galilée c1990.
Diamond, B., Corn, A., Fjellheim, F., L'Hirondelle, C., Maniapoto, M., Marett, A., . . . Stålka, P. N. (2018). Performing Protocol: Indigenous Traditional Knowledge as/and Intellectual Property. In J. C. Post (Ed.), *Ethnomusicology: A Contemporary Reader, Volume II* (pp. 17 - 34). New York & London: Routledge.
DiAngelo, R. J. (2018). *White fragility: why it's so hard for White people to talk about racism*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Dickinson, P. (2013). *Music Education in Crisis: the Bernarr Rainbow Lectures and Other Assessments*. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer.
Drichel, S. (2008). The time of hybridity. *Philosophy & Social Criticism, 34*(6), 587-615. doi:10.1177/0191453708090330
Easton, B. H. (1989). *The Making of Rogernomics*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
Education Council. (2017). *Our code our standards : code of professional responsibility and standards for the teaching profession = Nga̅ tikanga matatika nga̅ paerewa : nga̅ tikanga matatika mo̅ te haepapa ngaiotanga me nga̅ paerewa mo̅ te umanga whakaakoranga*. Wellington: Education Council.
Eisenberg, J. (1995). The Iterability of Music: An Analysis of Derrida's Linguistic Theory As it Applies to Music. *Lehigh Review, 3*, 39 - 49.
Elliott, D. J. (1995). *Music matters: a new philosophy of music education*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Elliott, D. J., & Silverman, M. (2015). *Music matters: a philosophy of music education* (Second edition.. ed.). New York & Oxford Oxford University Press.
Ellison, E. (2010). Ngā haumi a iwi – Māori investment - Māori economy. *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*.
Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 59*(3), 297-324.
Fairclough, N., Graham, P., Lemke, J., & Wodak, R. (2004). Introduction. *Critical Discourse Studies, 1*(1), 1-7. doi:10.1080/17405900410001674489

Ferguson, S. (2002). *Curriculum stocktake: report on the New Zealand national curriculum, 2002*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
Fishman, J. A. (1985). *The rise and fall of the ethnic revival: perspectives on language and ethnicity*. Berlin & New York Mouton.
Foucault, M. (1994). *The Order of Things*. New York: Random House.
Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline & Punish* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
Foucault, M. (2010). *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (A. M. S. Smith, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
Franks, J. (2018). Clothes, beds, rent money: What teachers give their students. Retrieved from https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/education/107039307/clothes-beds-rent-money-what-teachers-give-their-students
Freire, A. M. A., & Macedo, D. P. (Eds.). (2000). *The Paulo Freire reader*. New York: New York : Continuum 2001, ©1998.
Freire, P. (1974). "Conscientisation". *CrossCurrents, 24*(1), 23-31.
Freire, P. (1996). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New revised ed.). London & New York: Penguin Books.
Frierson-Campbell, C. (2006). Introduction: Perspectives on Music in Urban Schools. In B. Welburn (Ed.), *Teaching Music in the Urban Classroom*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
Gans, H. J. (1979). Symbolic ethnicity: The future of ethnic groups and cultures in America. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 2*(1), 1-20. doi:10.1080/01419870.1979.9993248
Gans, H. J. (2017). Another look at symbolic ethnicity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 40*(9), 1410-1417. doi:10.1080/01419870.2017.1308527
Gendron, M., Crivelli, C., & Barrett, L. F. (2018). Universality Reconsidered: Diversity in Making Meaning of Facial Expressions. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 27*(4), 211-219. doi:10.1177/0963721417746794
Gillborn, D. (2005). Anti-racism: From policy to praxis. In Z. Leonardo (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Race* (pp. 111 - 126). Malden, MA; Oxford, UK; and Carlton, Victoria, Australia: Blackwell.
Giroux, H. A. (2017). Critical Theory and Educational Practice. In A. Darder, R. D. Torres, & M. P. Baltodano (Eds.), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (Third ed., pp. 31 - 55). New York and London: Routledge.
Giroux, H. A., & Simon, R. (1989). Popular Culture and Critical Pedagogy: Everyday Life as a Basis for Curriculum Knowledge In P. L. McLaren & H. A. Giroux (Eds.), *Critical Pedagogy, The State, and Cultural Struggle* (pp. 236 - 252). Albany, N.Y. : State University of New York Press.
Gourlay, K. A. (1984). The Non-Universality of Music and the Universality of Non-Music. *The World of Music, 26*(2), 25-39.
Graham, D. (1997). *Trick or Treaty?* Wellington, New Zealand: The Printing Press.
Grainger, A. D., Falcous, M., & Newman, J. I. (2012). Postcolonial Anxieties and the Browning of New Zealand Rugby. *The Contemporary Pacific, 24*(2), 267-295. doi:10.1353/cp.2012.0029
Grande, S. M. A. (2017). American Indian Geographies of Identity and Power: At the Crossroads of Indígena and Mestizaje. In A. Darder, R. D. Torres, & M. P. Baltodano (Eds.), *The Critical Pedagogy Reader* (Third ed., pp. 216 - 240). New York, N. Y., and Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
Greenberg, C. (1939). Avant-Garde and Kitsch. *Partisan Review, 6*(5), 34.

Grierson, E. (2003). Framing the Arts in Education: What is Really at Stake? In J. E. Mansfield & E. M. Grierson (Eds.), *The Arts in Education: Critical Perspectives from Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 93 - 117). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Guilherme, A. (2017). What is critical about critical pedagogy? *Policy Futures in Education, 15*(1), 3-5. doi:10.1177/1478210317696357

Hayward, J. (2012). Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi – ngā mātāpono o te tiriti - Treaty principles developed by courts *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*.

Hess, J. (2015a). Decolonizing music education: Moving beyond tokenism. *International journal of music education, 33*(3), 336-347.

Hess, J. (2015b). Upping the "Anti-": The Value of an Anti-Racist Theoretical Framework in Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 14*(1), 66-92.

Hess, J. (2018a). Hip hop and music education: Where is race?(Essay). *Journal of Popular Music Education, 2*(1-2), 7. doi:10.1386/jpme.2.1-2.7_1

Hess, J. (2018b). Troubling Whiteness: Music education and the "messiness" of equity work. *International journal of music education, 36*(2), 128-144. doi:10.1177/0255761417703781

Hijleh, M. (2012). *Towards a global music theory: practical concepts and methods for the analysis of music across human cultures*. Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate.

Hill, A. (1935). *Vocal score of Hinemoa: an epic of New Zealand*. Melbourne: Allan & Company.

Hill, A. (2007). String Quartets Vol. 1 [CD]. Hong Kong: Naxos.

Hill, A. (2008). *The Leipzig diary: Alfred Hill* (1st ed.). Wollongong, N.S.W.: Wirripang.

Hill, A. (2009). Quartet no. 1 for two violins, viola & violoncello, 1896: 'The Maori'. Riverwoods, Ill.: Silvertrust.

hooks, b. (1994a). bell hooks and the Politics of Literacy: A Conversation. *Journal of Advanced Composition, 14*(1), 1 - 19.

hooks, b. (1994b). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York and London: Routledge.

Horton, J. (1974). *Grieg*. London: London, Dent 1974.

Horton, M., & Freire, P. (1990). *We make the road by walking: conversations on education and social change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hoskins, T. K. (2012). A fine risk: Ethics in Kaupapa Maori politics. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 47*(2), 85-99.

Hoskins, T. K., & Jones, A. (2012a). Introduction. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 47*(2), 3 - 9.

Hoskins, T. K., & Jones, A. (2012b). Kaupapa Māori: Shifting the social (Professor Mason Durie) (Interview). *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 47*(2), 21 - 29.

Hoskins, T. K., & Jones, A. (2012c). Kaupapa Maori: the dangers of domestication. (Professor Graham Hingangaroa Smith) (Interview). *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 47*(2), 10-20.

Isaac, W. (2016). From the Chairperson. *Te Manutukutuku*(69), 5 - 6.

Jackson, M. (1987). *The Maori and the criminal justice system: a new perspective = He whaipaanga hou*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Justice.

Jackson, T. F. (2007). *From Civil Rights to Human Rights: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Struggle for Economic Justice*. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press.

Jenkins, K. (2000). *Haere tahi tāua: an account of aitanga in Maori struggle for schooling.* (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Auckland.

Jenkins, K., & Martin, B. (1999). Tidal Waves of Change: Divine Work with Paulo Freire. In P. Roberts (Ed.), *Paulo Freire, Politics and Pedagogy: Reflections from Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 43 - 60). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Johnston, P. M. G. (1992). *From Picot to school boards of trustees: "catering for Maori interests"?* Auckland. New Zealand: Research Unit for Maori Education, University of Auckland.

Johnston, P. M. G. (1998). *He ao rereke: education policy and Maori under-achievement: mechanisms of power and difference.* (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Auckland.

Johnston, P. M. G. (1999). Introduction of educational markets in New Zealand: questions & consequences. In M. Thrupp (Ed.), *A decade of reform in New Zealand education: where to now?* . Hamilton, New Zealand: School of Education, University of Waikato.

Jones, A. (1999). The limits of cross-cultural dialogue: Pedagogy, desire, and absolution in the classroom. *Educational Theory, 49*(3), 299-316. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5446.1999.00299.x

Jones, A. (2012). Dangerous Liaisons: Pākehā, kaupapa Māori, and educational research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 47*(2), 100 - 112.

Jones, A., McCulloch, G., Marshall, J., Smith, G. H., & Smith, L. T. (1995). *Myths and realities: schooling in New Zealand* (2nd ed.. ed.). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

Kendall, G., & Wickham, G. (1999). *Using Foucault's Methods*. London: London : SAGE 1999.

Kia Eke Panuku: building on success. (2018). Retrieved from https://kep.org.nz/

King, M. (1991). Being Pakeha. In M. King (Ed.), *Pakeha: The Quest for Identity in New Zealand* (pp. 9 - 22).

King, M. (2004). *The Penguin history of New Zealand* ([Rev. ed.]. ed.). Auckland, N.Z.: Auckland, N.Z. : Penguin Books 2004.

Kodat, C. G. (2003). Conversing with Ourselves: Canon, Freedom, Jazz. *American Quarterly, 55*(1), 1-28. doi:10.1353/aq.2003.0004

Kolig, E. (2000). Of Condoms, Biculturalism, and Political Correctness: The Maori Renaissance and Cultural Politics in New Zealand. *Paideuma: Mitteilungen zur Kulturkunde, 46*, 231-252.

Kortsen, B. (1968). Grieg's String Quartet and Robert Heckmann. *Music & Letters, 49*(1), 21-28.

Koza, J. E. (2008). Listening for Whiteness: Hearing Racial Politics in Undergraduate School Music. *Philosophy of music education review, 16*(2), 145-155.

Lange, S. (2014). Christian beginnings in New Zealand: some historiographical issues. *Stimulus, 21*(2), 4-13.

Lê, T., & Lê, Q. (2009). Critical Discourse Analysis: An Overview. In T. Lê, Q. Lê, & M. Short (Eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis: An Interdisciplinary Perspective* (pp. 3 - 15). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Leerssen, J. (2006). Nationalism and the cultivation of culture. *Nations and Nationalism, 12*(4), 559-578. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8129.2006.00253.x

Leerssen, J. (2014). Romanticism, music, nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism, 20*(4), 606-627. doi:10.1111/nana.12087

Lees, S. (2018). 'What a fantastic model!' Secondary school links to 'real-world' music communities. In G. McPhail, V. Thorpe, & S. Wise (Eds.), *Educational Change and the Secondary School Music Curriculum in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 148 - 164). London and New York: Routledge.

Lilburn, D. (1984). *A search for tradition*. Wellington, New Zealand: Alexander Turnbull Library Endowment Trust.
Locke, R. P. (2009). *Musical exoticism: images and reflections*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lynch, C., & Rata, E. (2018). Culturally responsive pedagogy: A New Zealand case study. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 1-18. doi:10.1080/09620214.2018.1468274
Maconie, R. (2006). finding alfred: the search for a lost heritage. *Canzona, 26*(48), 32-45.
Malott, C. S. (2011). Introduction: From Toussaint L'Overture to Paulo Freire: Complexity and Critical Pedagogy in the Twenty-First Century: A New Generation of Scholars. In C. S. Malott & B. Porfilio (Eds.), *Critical Pedagogy in the Twenty-First Century: A New Generation of Scholars* (pp. xxiii - lxviii). Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing.
Mane-Wheoki, J. (2003). Culturalisms and the Arts Curriculum. In E. M. Grierson & J. E. Mansfield (Eds.), *The Arts in Education: Critical Perspectives from Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 81 - 92). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
Maniapoto, M. (2017). Why We're Reo Refugees. In T. Misa & G. Wilson (Eds.), *The Best of e-Tangata* (pp. 196 - 202). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
McAllister, P. (2007). Waitangi Day : an annual enactment of the treaty? *Sites, 4*(2), 155-180.
McClary, S. (2002). *Feminine endings : music, gender, and sexuality*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
McGee, C. (2004). Commentary: Curriculum Revision Critique: A Response to Clark. *Teachers and Curriculum, 7*.
McKoy, C. L. (2017). On the 50th Anniversary of the Tanglewood Symposium. *Journal of music teacher education, 27*(1), 3-6. doi:10.1177/1057083717719073
McLaren, P. (2005). Revolutionary Pedagogy in Postrevolutionary Times: Rethinking the Political Economy of Critical Education. In P. McLaren (Ed.), *Capitalists & Conquerors: A Critical Pedagogy Against Empire* (pp. 75 - 112). United States of America: Rowman & Littlefield.
McLean, M. (1996). *Māori music*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
McPhail, G. (2018a). Music teachers talking: views on secondary school curriculum content. In G. McPhail, V. Thorpe, & S. Wise (Eds.), *Education Change and the Secondary School Music Curriculum in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 131 - 147). London & New York: Routledge.
McPhail, G. (2018b). Too Much Noise in the Classroom? Towards a Praxis of Conceptualization. *Philosophy of music education review, 26*(2), 176-198. doi:10.2979/philmusieducrevi.26.2.05
McPhail, G., Rata, E., & Siteine, A. (2018). The changing nature of music education. In G. McPhail, V. Thorpe, & S. Wise (Eds.), *Educational Change and the Secondary School Music Curriculum in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 74 - 91). Abingdon; New York: Routledge.
McPhail, G., Thorpe, V., & Wise, S. (2018a). *Educational change and the secondary school music curriculum in Aotearoa New Zealand*. London & New York Routlege.
McPhail, G., Thorpe, V., & Wise, S. (2018b). Mapping the field. In G. McPhail, V. Thorpe, & S. Wise (Eds.), *Educational Change and the Secondary School Music Curriculum in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 3 - 11). London & New York: Routledge.
Mead, H. M. (2016). The Waitangi Tribunal: An Interesting Journey. *Te Manutukutuku*(69), 18 - 19.

Melbourne, H. (Ed.) (1995). *Maori Sovereignty: The Maori Perspective*. Auckland, New Zealand: Hodder Moa Beckett.
Meyer, L. B. (1961). *Emotion and meaning in music*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Ministry of Education. (2006). *The New Zealand curriculum : draft for consultation 2006*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
Ministry of Education. (2009). *Te Whatu Pōkeka: Kaupapa Māori Assessment for Learning: Early Childhood Exemplars*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
Ministry of Education. (2011). Tātaiako: Cultural Competencies for Teachers of Māori Learners.
Mitchell, T., & Waipara, T. (2011). Kaupapa and whakapapa in contemporary Māori music. In G. Keam & T. Mitchell (Eds.), *Home, land and sea: situating music in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Rosedale, New Zealand: Pearson.
Moore, W. L. (2008). *Reproducing racism : white space, elite law schools, and racial inequality*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
Moser, C. (2013). Music and Education: Towards a Non-Philistine Society. In P. Dickinson (Ed.), Music Education in Crisis: the Barnarr Rainbow Lectures and Other Assessments (pp. 19 - 36). Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer.
Mulgan, R. G. (1989). *Māori, pākehā and democracy*. Auckland, N.Z.: Auckland, N.Z. : Oxford University Press 1989.
Musselman, K. S. (2003). The Other I: Questions of Identity in Une Vie de Boy. In K. Salhi (Ed.), *Francophone post-colonial cultures: critical essays* (pp. 126). Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.
Nelson, N. L., & Russell, J. A. (2013). Universality Revisited. *Emotion Review, 5*(1), 8-15. doi:10.1177/1754073912457227
New Zealand. (1988). *The April Report*. Wellington, New Zealand: The Royal Commission on Social Policy.
New Zealand Public Service Association. (1988). *Response of the New Zealand Public Service Association to Partnership perspectives: a discussion paper = He Tirohanga Rangapu: he whakawhitiwhiti whakaaro*. Wellington, New Zealand: The Service.
Newnham, T. (2003). *By Batons and Barbed Wire* (3rd ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Graphic Publications.
Ngata, A. T. (2004). *Ngā mōteatea: he maramara rere nō ngā waka maha*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
Notman, R. (2012). Implementing values in the New Zealand curriculum: Four years on. *Set: Research Information for Teachers*(3), 41-49.
Nyce, D. L. (2012). *New Zealand primary music education: a promise broken: a comparison of the de jure and de facto philosophies of music education of New Zealand primary, intermediate and middle schools.* (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Auckland.
O'Malley, V., Stirling, B., & Penetito, W. (2010). *The Treaty of Waitangi companion: Māori and Pākehā from Tasman to today*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
O'Reilly, T., & Wood, D. (1991). Reshaping the state: New Zealand's bureaucratic revolution. In J. Boston, J. Martin, J. Pallot, & P. Walsh (Eds.). Auckland, N.Z.: Auckland, N.Z. : Oxford University Press 1991.
O'Toole, P. (2005). Why Don't I Feel Included in These Musics, or Matters. In D. J. Elliott (Ed.), *Praxial Music Education* (pp. 297 - 307). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Openshaw, R., & Rata, E. (2007). The weight of inquiry: conflicting cultures in New Zealand's tertiary institutions. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 17*(4), 407-425. doi:10.1080/09620210701667079

Orange, C. (2013). *The story of a treaty* (2nd ed.). Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget William Books.

Orange, C. (2015). *The Treaty of Waitangi* (Ebook ed.). Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.

Piquemal, N. (2006). Hear the Silenced Voices and Make that Relationship: Issues of Relational Ethics in Aboriginal Contexts. In I. Abu-Saad & D. Champagne (Eds.), *Indigenous Education and Empowerment* (pp. 113 - 126). Oxford: AltaMira Press.

Pitsoe, V., & Letseka, M. (2013). Foucault's Discourse and Power: Implications for Instructionist Classroom Management. *Scientific Research, 3*(1), 23-28.

Poll puts National ahead of Labour. (2004, 15 February 2004). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=3549317

Pollock, M. (2004). *Colormute: race talk dilemmas in an American school*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Prescott, M. P. (1981). An Overveiw: The Crisis in Music Education. *Music educators journal, 68*(3), 35-38. doi:10.2307/3395889

Radano, R., & Bohlman, P. V. (2000). Introduction: Music and Race, Their Past, Their Presence. In R. Radano & P. V. Bohlman (Eds.), *Music and the Racial Imagination* (pp. 1 - 53). Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Rains, F. V. (1999). Indigenous Knowledge, Historical Amnesia and Intellectual Authority: Deconstructing Hegemony and the Social and Political Implications of the Curricular 'Other'. In L. M. Semali & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *What is Indigenous Knowledge? Voices from the Academy* (pp. 317 - 331). New York & London: Falmer Press.

Rakena, T. O. (2018). *Singing Communities: Nurturing Singing Cultures in Primary Schools*. Paper presented at the World Conference of the International Society of Music Education Baku, Azerbaijan.

Rameka, L. (2013). Culturally relevant assessment: Kaupapa Maori assessment in early childhood education. *Early Education, 54*, 12-17.

Rata, E. (1997). *Post-bicultural education: a class analysis of the 1980's bicultural project and the decline of biculturalism in the 1990s*. Paper presented at the NZARE Conference, Auckland, New Zealand.

Rata, E. (2000). *A Political Economy of Neotribal Capitalism*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Rata, E. (2017). Ethnic Revival. In F. M. Moghaddam (Ed.), *SAGE Encyclopedia of Political Behavior* (pp. 264-266).

Regelski, T. A. (2016). *A brief introduction to a philosophy of music and music education as social praxis*. New York, NY. & Abingdon, Oxon Routledge.

Remak, H. H. H. (1978). Exoticism in Romanticism. *Comparative Literature Studies, 15*(1), 53-65.

Ritchie, J. E. (1992). *Becoming bicultural* (1992 ed.. ed.). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers: Daphne Brasell Associates Press.

Rohan, T. (2018). Developing sociocultural consciousness and inclusive values through music education. In G. Mcphail, V. Thorpe, & S. Wise (Eds.), *Educational Change and the Secondary School Music Curriculum in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 42 - 55). New York, NY. & Abbingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Roy, E. A. (2018, 12/12/2018). Māori Santa invited to Wellington parade after racist boos in hometown. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/dec/12/maori-santa-invited-to-wellington-parade-new-zealand-after-racist-boos-in-hometown?CMP=fb_gu

Ryan, T. (2002). *The colonial New Zealand wars* (Rev. ed.). Wellington, New Zealand: Grantham House.

Sabaneev, L., & Pring, S. W. (1928). The Crisis in the Teaching of Theory. *The Musical Times, 69*(1029), 985-988. doi:10.2307/915476

Sabaneev, L., & Pring, S. W. (1932). Some social causes of the present musical crisis. *Music and Letters, 13*(1), 75-79. doi:10.1093/ml/XIII.1.75

Salmond, A. (1991). *Two worlds: first meetings between Maori and Europeans, 1642-1772*. Auckland, New Zealand: Viking.

Scanlen, S. (2018). Educational Change and the Secondary School Music Curriculum in Aotearoa New Zealand. Edited by Graham McPhail, Vicki Thorpe, and Stuart Wise (2018). *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*. doi:10.1007/s40841-018-0121-8

Schlotel, B. (1986). *Grieg*. London: Ariel Music.

Scott, D. (2015). *Parihaka invaded*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.

Semali, L. M., & Kincheloe, J. L. (1999). What is Indigenous Knowledge and Why Should We Study It? In L. M. Semali & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *What is Indigenous Knowledge? Voices from the Academy* (pp. 3 - 57). New York & London: Falmer Press.

Shears, R., & Gidley, I. (1981). *Storm out of Africa: The 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand*. Hong Kong: Macmillan.

Sherman, M. (2017). Te Tii Marae will no longer host Waitangi welcomes. *Newshub*.

Shieff, S. (1994). *Magpies : negotiations of centre and periphery in settings of New Zealand poems by New Zealand composers, 1896 to 1993.* (Doctor of Philosophy PhD Thesis), University of Auckland.

Simon, J. A., & Smith, L. T. (Eds.). (2001). *A civilising mission?: perceptions and representations of the Native Schools system*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.

Small, C. (1998). *Musicking: the meanings of performing and listening*. Hanover: University Press of New England.

Smith, G. (1997). *The Development of Kaupapa Maori: Theory and Praxis.* (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Auckland.

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples* (2nd . ed.). London & New York: Zed Books.

Smithies, R. (1990). *Ten Steps Towards Bicultural Action*. Wellington, New Zealand: The Catholic Commission for Justice, Peace and Development, Aotearoa-New Zealand.

Snedden, P. (2005). *Pakeha and the Treaty: why it's our Treaty too*. Auckland, New Zealand: Random House.

Sorrenson, M. P. K. (1985). The Aryan Maori (Book Review). *The Journal of the Polynesian Society, 94*(3), 296.

Stafford, J., & Williams, M. (2008). *Māoriland New Zealand literature, 1872-1914*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Electronic Text Centre.

Stanley, A. M. (2018). Remixing the classroom: toward an open philosophy of music education. *Music education research*, 1-3. doi:10.1080/14613808.2018.1536399

Stauffer, S. L. (2009). Placing Curriculum in Music. In T. A. Regelski & J. T. Gates (Eds.), *Music Education for Changing Times* (pp. 175 - 186). Dordrecht: Springer.

Stehr, N., & Adolf, M. T. (2018). Knowledge/Power/Resistance. *Society, 55*(2), 193-198. doi:10.1007/s12115-018-0232-3
Stewart, G. (2012). Achievements, orthodoxies and science in Kaupapa Māori schooling. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 47*(2), 51 - 61.
Stewart, G. (2014). The Māori body in education: From 'good with their hands' to the 'long brown tail'. In P. O'Connor (Ed.), *Education and the body* (pp. 11 - 21). Auckland, New Zealand: Edify.
Stewart, G. (2016). Indigenous knowledge and education policy for teachers of Maori learners. (Report)*4*(3), 84. Retrieved from http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/ps/retrieve.do?tabID=T002&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&searchResultsType=SingleTab&searchType=AdvancedSearchForm¤tPosition=5&docId=GALE%7CA458164603&docType=Report&sort=Relevance&contentSegment=&prodId=AONE&contentSet=GALE%7CA458164603&searchId=R1&userGroupName=learn&inPS=true
Stock, E. (1935). *The history of the Church Missionary Society in New Zealand* (Rev. ed.). Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Church Missionary Society.
Te Tiriti O Waitangi: The Treaty of Waitangi 1840. (2017). New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books.
Thomson, J. M. (1980). *A distant music: the life and times of Alfred Hill, 1870-1960*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
Thorpe, V., McPhail, G., Wise, S., Horner, M., Little, J., Mcacfarlane, K., . . . Wenden, L. (2018). Unfinished business and unintended consequences: A conversation about teaching music in New Zealand secondary schools. In G. McPhail, V. Thorpe, & S. Wise (Eds.), *Educational Change and the Secondary School Music Curriculum in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 165 - 180). Abingdon & New York: Routledge.
Thwaites, T. (2018). Curriculum and assessment changes in music education in New Zealand 1987 - 2016. In G. McPhail, V. Thorpe, & S. Wise (Eds.), *Educational Change and the Secondary School Music Curriculum in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 12 - 26). Abingdon & New York: Routledge.
Tilden, F. (1994). *Knowledge is power*. Charlottesville, Va.: NetLibrary, Inc. University of Virginia Library Electronic Text Center.
Towle, J. (1986). Insights: Where the Treaty of Waitangi leads a Pakeha *Pakeha and the Treaty: Signposts*. Auckland: New Zealand: Church and Society Commission of the National Council of Churches in New Zealand.
Tregear, E. (1984). *The Aryan Maori*. Papakura, New Zealand: R. McMillan.
Twells, A. (2009). *The civilising mission and the English middle class, 1792-1850: the 'heathen' at home and overseas*. Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Urban Culture: Awareness may save our skins. (1970). *Music educators journal, 56*(5), 37-38. doi:10.2307/3392685
Vasil, R. (2000). *Biculturalism: reconciling Aotearoa with New Zealand* (Rev. ed.). Wellington New Zealand: Institute of Policy Studies.
Volk, T. M. (1998). *Music, education, and multiculturalism: Foundations and principles*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Von Hoerner, S. (1974). Universal Music? *Psychology of Music, 2*(2), 18-28. doi:10.1177/030573567422003
Waitangi Tribunal. (2015). *The Ngāpuhi mandate inquiry report*. Lower Hutt, New Zealand Legislation Direct.

Waldorf, S. (2014). "Aboriginal Education" in Teacher Education: Beyond Cultural Inclusions. In G. J. S. Dei & M. McDermott (Eds.), *Politics of Anti-Racism Education: In Search of Strategies for Transformative Learning* (pp. 71 - 86). Dordrecht & New York: Springer.

Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu mātou: Struggle without end* (Rev. ed.). Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.

Walker, R. (2001). *He Tipua: The Life and Times of Sir Āpirana Ngata*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.

Walker, S. (1989). *Rogernomics: reshaping New Zealand's economy*. New Zealand: Wellington: GP Books.

Warzer, J. (2006). Music Education Administration in an Urban Setting: The Stone Drops Deeper Here. In C. Frierson-Campbell (Ed.), *Teaching Music in the Urban Classroom: A Guide to Leadership, Teacher Education, and Reform* (pp. 3 - 12). United States of America: Rowman & Littlefield.

Webb, L. (2016). Music in Beginning Teacher Classrooms: A Mismatch between Policy, Philosophy, and Practice. *International Journal of Education & the Arts, 17*(12).

Wenden, L. (2018). 'Top-notch' knowledge: transitioning to tertiary music study: a case study. In G. McPhail, V. Thorpe, & S. Wise (Eds.), *Educational Change and the Secondary School Music Curriculum in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 56 - 73). London & New York: Routledge.

Wheatland, T. (2009). *The Frankfurt school in exile*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wink, J. (2011). *Critical pedagogy: notes from the real world* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson.

Winton, S. (1986). On leaving New Zealand and returning to Aotearoa. In *The Pakeha and the Treaty: Signposts*. Auckland, New Zealand: Church and Society Commission of the National Council of Churches in New Zealand.

Witkin, R. W. (2000). Why Did Adorno "Hate" Jazz? *Sociological Theory, 18*(1), 145-170. doi:10.1111/0735-2751.00092

Woodfield, I. (1994). The 'Hindostannie Air': English Attempts to Understand Indian Music in the Late Eighteenth Century. *Journal of the Royal Musical Association, 119*(2), 189-211.

Yunkaporta, T. (2009). *Aboriginal Pedagogies at the Cultural Interface* (Doctor of Education), James Cook University.