

Challenging and countering anti-Maori discourse: Practices for decolonisation

Keynote speech delivered by Dr Tim McCreanor to the New Zealand Psychological Society Conference on 27 August 2009 in Palmerston North, on behalf of Kupu Taea: Media and te Tiriti Project

He tao rākau, e taea te karo; he tao kōrero, e kore e taea te karo.

The taiaha can be parried aside but words go straight to the heart.

The whakatauki that opens this talk was suggested as guidance to the media research group I belong to by Naida Glavish, kaumatua and mentor of our work, to remind us of the importance of words and language in the social relations of Maori and Pakeha that we study and work to improve.

It is also the source of the name Kupu Taea under which, within Whariki Research Group at Massey University in Auckland, my colleagues Maori and Pakeha - Angela Moewaka Barnes, Belinda Borell, Hector Kaiwai, Ken Taiapa, Jenny Rankine, Sue Abel, Mandi Gregory and Ray Nairn, work. I acknowledge their support, encouragement and input. Mitzi Nairn, Ingrid Huygens and Rose Black have also all laboured mightily to improve my early drafts.

In this country there is no more important set of relationships and dynamics than those at work between Maori and the settlers who have arrived here since the early decades of the 19th century. Maori as tangata whenua and sovereign peoples have made their expectations and aspirations very clear.

We settlers not so; from the outset our talk and actions have been ambiguous and destructively double-edged in relation to our Treaty partners. It is the anglophile majority who have dominated the developing relationships and it is our actions, narratives and discursive frameworks that lie most heavily upon the land. In what I call the Pakeha cultural project, we wrote, proffered and signed Te Tiriti and then proceeded to re-interpret and enforce the understanding of it that best served our interests. Our discourses produce and enable a self-serving ‘standard story’ of Maori/Pakeha relations. They naturalise widely accepted anti-Maori interpretations of daily existence. They privilege entrenched Pakeha ways of knowing, define and delimit justice, and over-determine the form and functions of society.

In this talk I will argue that the Pakeha cultural project is critically underpinned by this standard story, a kind of ‘collective unconscious’ that we are all aware of, which is identifiable in a limited number of familiar and durable patterns of speech. I will describe some of these and illustrate their influence in everyday talk, the media, and social domains. I will argue that using these patterns can only construct Maori in denigratory, marginalising ways and will highlight their particular relevance to Psychology. The central challenge of this keynote is “How can we do better?” I interpolate into our analysis of the Pakeha standard story, some alternative, decolonising discursive resources that, by challenging our deadly ambivalence, might enable to us to tell our stories fairly and rebuild our social relations in a just and equitable manner.

At Waitangi in 2006 Canon Hone Kaa reminded the nation about the importance of power in the identity politics of this country:

It's good that you Pakeha are who you are, and it's important that you know who you are...but you need to understand how you are who you are – and how powerfully you are who you are."

Maori are beginning to turn their vessels toward chosen horizons, after the cumulative effects of their efforts at resistance to colonisation. They have enacted tino rangatiratanga through recovery of assets, economic re-investment and development, educational advancement and political unification. At this time, Kaa's is a mighty challenge to Pakeha to address the construction Pakeha power, as a part of our voyage to pro-Treaty futures.

Among those who work to such ends, psychologists and Psychology as a discipline should and does, through our principled commitments to social equity and our interests in the mental health and wellbeing of the nation, take a prominent place. As a teaching discipline and body of research and clinical practice Psychology has, through its code of ethics, nailed progressive colours to its mast:

The principle of respect for the dignity of persons and peoples, requires that each person and all peoples are valued in their own right...

Psychologists seek to prevent or correct practices that are unjustly discriminatory

Psychologists practicing in New Zealand recognise that the Treaty of Waitangi sets out the basis of respect between Maori and non-Maori

In addressing the rights of *peoples* directly in this way, the Society moves beyond a traditional psychological focus on individuals to attend to social and population level concerns. These are strong and taxing standards that foreground the relationships and responsibilities that a Psychology for Aotearoa seeks to develop with tangata whenua. They emphasise that it is not enough to lean upon Maori energies for redress or to leave it to the begrudging processes of the Crown.

For while Treaty settlements may return viable resources to certain Maori groups it is important to acknowledge that these represent a tiny fraction of the value of what has been taken. Even fiscal terms, as Hone Harawira told a recent gathering of Treaty educators, restitution amounts to about 3% of value and that therefore on such terms, settlement requires 97% Maori forgiveness. The challenge that he left us with is what to do about that gap, the disparities, the injustices and the damage that will remain long after the last claim is done. He characterised this gulf as the less tangible, social, political and relational aspects of the Treaty of Waitangi that are neglected but crucial to our healthy collective futures. He also pointed out that with Treaty settlements scheduled for completion in 2015, many of those in power are preparing to wash their hands of the Treaty and settle into the long established patterns of unjust exploitation of Maori land, resources and people that colonisation has bequeathed to them. There is a real urgency to this!

Social psychologist Margaret Wetherell in her contributions to understanding power relations has focussed our attention on the ways in which we use discourse – talk, text, language, imagery – in making meaning of our social and experiential worlds. She concludes that discourse, as a vital form of social action, is a “quintessentially psychological activity”, integral to so many of the processes and practices that Psychology works with – naming, blaming, attributing, identifying, explaining, justifying...yet this domain has received scant attention from the discipline. This is possibly because our culture discounts talk as ‘just hot air’; we say, ‘Actions speak louder than words’, ‘put your money where your mouth is’...

Despite being so neglected, discourse is central to the myriad transactions that enact relationships, power dynamics, meanings and material outcomes of our everyday experience. Discourse is the foundation of our interpretative work, endlessly shaping and shaped by our psychological, social, political and ideological actions and aspirations. The study of discourse in all its astonishing, banal, patterned flexibility provides important insights into how we are who we are, how we know what

we know and how we do what we do; into the web of relationships, narratives and actions that constitute the Pakeha cultural project.

To discuss and dissect these phenomena, requires that I articulate formulations from Pakeha discourse that are unfair, offensive and denigratory to Maori and unbecoming of those non-Maori who aspire to honourable, Treaty-based relationships with tangata whenua. No matter how much I dissent and repudiate, as Pakeha I acknowledge that these discourses are available to me at all times and to my shame there are times when I have tacitly or consciously let them pass unchallenged and drawn upon them myself. However to break the silence that naturalises and reproduces the standard story and its components I need to air and analyse, in order to counter and displace. I apologise for pain and distress incurred in this process but I can see no way forward without addressing these issues.

I begin by grounding the standard story within an influential text arising from the very source of the earliest organised colonisation of Aotearoa by the British. The slim volume *Information Relative to New Zealand*, subtitled “compiled for the use of colonists” written by the Secretary of the New Zealand Company, John Ward, was published in some six editions between mid-1839 and early 1841. Although it is impossible to say precisely what the impact of this book may have been, it is a compendium of the best available observation and data on the country from the Cook expeditions through Darwin and other scientific visitors, military personnel, clergy and adventurers. In spite of the obvious pecuniary interest of the NZ Company, as a book in times when popular tomes were a new phenomenon, it must have weighed in with considerable authority persuading colonists to emigrate, and then perhaps filling the weary months of travel and fuelling discussions and debates on shipboard. As could be expected, from the epigram out of the *Tempest* (“Scarcity and want shall shun you, Ceres blessing so is on you!”) to the concluding remarks about “Fitness for colonisation”, it is a highly persuasive piece of writing.

Amongst chapters on the geography, harbours, climate, natural history, resources, agricultural potential and history of the land is a 35 page essay on “the native inhabitants” gathered from the explorer and traveller accounts. Two key passages stand out not just for their crystalline certainty and their apparently completely contradictory content but for their discursive power and the way in which they appear to distil several key elements of the subsequent patterning of Pakeha talk about Maori.

These elements are prefaced with the comment:

“[Maori] are physically and intellectually superior to the New Hollanders; but although their capabilities of cultivation are great, they are yet essentially a savage people. We will not attempt to disguise the black side of the picture...” (p62)

Ward evokes the hierarchy of race so beloved of both theology and 19th century science and also the construction of the ambiguous other, the noble savage, where positives and negatives, valour and treachery are deeply entwined in the European consciousness.

By 1839 there was a body of explorers’ and travellers’ tales about the indigenous people of Aotearoa upon which Ward draws to portray Maori:

They are dirty in their persons and sometimes overrun with vermin. They have hitherto scarcely known the meaning of arts, trade, industry or coin; they have no roads, beyond footpaths from place to place. Their liberty depends upon the protection each individual can give himself...there is no system of law or government... Their most conspicuous passion is war and they kill and sometimes eat their vanquished enemies, scalping and exhibiting their heads as trophies...infanticide is not uncommon...The spirit of revenge

is implacable in their breasts...and their hatred of their enemies is deep and deadly. Many of them are covetous of accumulating property and they thief with little scruple. The licentiousness of the women is subjected to no restraint until after marriage. Polygamy prevails and it is usual for the head wife to commit suicide after her husband's death...with the physical powers of men, they have at present the intellect of children and in moral principle are little above the level of brute creation. (p62-63)

Maori life is represented through strong lenses of the primitive, the violent, the uncivilised and the inhuman. However with the PR master's wit for spin and perhaps some incipient understandings of the impact of 'recency effects', three pages later a totally different depiction appears:

There is a natural politeness and grandeur in their deportment, a yearning after poetry, music and the fine arts, a wit and eloquence that remind us in reading all accounts of them, and in conversing with those who have resided among them, of the Greeks of Homer. Their language is rich and sonorous, abounding in metaphysical distinctions and they uphold its purity most tenaciously...They have an abundance of poetry of a lyrical kind...they are passionately fond of music. Mr Nicholas speaks of "a plaintive, melodious air which seemed not unlike some of our sacred music...of the chanting in our cathedrals"...They excel at carving... They display their natural talents at astronomy...they have given names to each [star] and divided them into constellations ...Baron Hugel, a distinguished botanist, who visited the island affirms, as do the missionaries, that there is not...a single tree, vegetable, or even weed, a fish, or a bird for which the natives do not have a name; and those names are universally known. (p66-7)

Amid the commercialised hype, promises of a new Britain in the South Seas, and the outright deceptions of the NZ Co marketing of New Zealand, these constructions would have formed a complementary dichotomy, twin explanatory resources through which the ambivalent European cultural fascination with the Other could reverberate. Ward's Noble/Savage structure offered crucial seeds for the nascent Pakeha cultural project, sourced in our ancient ways but firmly facing the new world we contemplated. Dressed in the cloak of empirical truth, he theorises positions for very different approaches to relating to the indigenes of the colony, highly adaptive patterns for interpreting Maori behaviour and justifying settler reactions. Stepping ashore into territory very different from the green hills and satanic mills of England, places unrecognisable from NZ Company maps, without the institutions or supportive networks, infrastructure, resources or culture of 'home', the positive depiction of Maori would encourage the acceptance of shelter, sustenance and support from tangata whenua without much loss of pride or self-assurance, as the due of people themselves noble. As the strength of settler establishments began to grow and perhaps a familiarity and the competitive spirit of acquisitive Eurocentrism began to bear, the negative portrayals of Maori could be of great use in justifying a range of measures that set aside Maori concerns, asserted settler superiority, rationalised and drove the personal advancement and cultural imperatives of colonisation.

This historical exploration of the deadly ambivalence I referred to earlier is not intended as mere speculation. Quite early in the contemporary studies of Pakeha discourse we noticed a certain resonance between older, readily identifiable forms of anti-Maori talk, for example from early Pakeha politicians and decision-makers such as Richmond, Featherstone, Pember Reeves and others, and the more subtle patterns of Pakeha talk in the late 20th century.

There was plenty to talk about. The long-burning Maori resistance of the previous hundred years, along with the Maori urban migration of the 1950s and 60s gave rise to a more visible activism. This included Maori-led protest against racism in rugby, the Land March of 1975, the Treaty of

Waitangi Act and a growing number of Treaty settlements. In the context of the occupation at Takaparawha/Bastion Point, the so-called Haka Party Incident at Auckland University – a confrontation between engineering students and Maori and Pacific people over an obscene rendition of a haka used in capping parades – in 1979 led to an outpouring of Pakeha anger and anxiety. These reactions were funnelled by the Human Rights Commission into a formal inquiry and from the mid 80s I worked with Ray Nairn on the resulting database of public submissions, along with many other sources including historical materials, media reports and political speeches. Latterly with Kupu Taea, the studies have expanded to include focus groups, individual data, literature, film, professional practice, and mass media coverage including print, radio and television. Outputs show a clear reliance on certain elements of Ward's discourse and a number of other patterns, in a wide range of public and private talk. As noted above, these resources share the common property that they can only be used to denigrate, marginalise, alienate and oppress Maori people, culture and aspirations.

Building on this research base I now provide a brief outline of a dozen such patterns and describe key cues and assumptions; I also attempt alternatives that might be used to challenge and rebut the patterns. The pattern sketches are like the tips of icebergs and there is a great deal of detail that sits 'below', available for elaboration and engagement as the needs of a specific debate or context requires. Finally I will gather the two sets of resources into potted versions of the standard story and a decolonising story in an effort illustrate the power of such discourses.

I begin with those that resonate most strongly with Ward's representations of Maori.

The first pattern **Good Maori/Bad Maori** models Ward's central ambiguity.

Maori people are said to fall into two groups, those who fit into society and those who don't. Those who achieve in education, employment, sport, are law abiding, healthy and happy within existing structures are seen as good. Those who resist, protest, seek restitution, are poor, under-educated, unhealthy, criminal or anti-social, are branded bad.

A range of frequently-heard adjectives are used within this pattern: noble, principled, hard-working, dignified, older, co-operative, punctual, peaceful, honest, polite, happy, clean and tidy. On the other hand: savage, uncivilised, wild, greedy, rude, lazy, demanding, parasitic, urban, young, poor, unhealthy, failing, welfare-dependent, dishonest, dirty.

An example from the HRC database:

Our love for Maoris is lessened when we see and hear Maoris who behave like uncouth animals. They are not only ignoring our culture, they are ignoring their own! Where are the loveable, kindly Maoris who used to play tennis with us – and sing for pleasure? *HRC PI 55*

This pattern is underpinned by assumptions about the neutrality of Pakeha judgement, and the notion that Maori behaviour can be understood without reference to its social context. The theme works effectively whether individuals are named or not and there is a preference for seeing "bad Maori" as a minority who can then be dismissed as estranged troublemakers. The same person or group can be described as "good" or "bad" depending on the speaker's needs and the audience. Recent positionings of Hone Harawira first as part of the Maori Party coalition with National – affirming, collaborative, besuited – then as supporting young men who threatened the PM at Waitangi, because they are whanau, provide a good example of this pattern at work.

Counters to the **Good Maori/Bad Maori** pattern may sound like this:

Maori are not either/or but rather diverse, like all cultural groups, and the foundational notion that they are bad, inferior or primitive is a reflection of Pakeha prejudice, fear and self-interest. Pakeha

need to learn to celebrate Maori strengths and acknowledge tensions and difficulties in the context of cultural difference and the disruption of Maori society.

The second major pattern targets **Maori culture**

It depicts Maori culture as fundamentally inferior to our own. Maori artistic expression and material achievements are said to be negligible. Te Reo and Maori cultural practices are seen as frozen in a timewarp and described as inadequate in the modern world.

Cues include terms such as simplistic, limited, stone-age, inefficient, inadequate, undemocratic, sexist, and phrases such as stick games, grass skirts, mud huts, five musical notes. Here is an example from our databases:

“Maori are descended from stone-age, barbaric, savage, cannibals who owe all the benefits of modern life and civilization to European colonists.” Email from ‘Ozzie’, September 7, 2000, *New Zealand Herald Online*

Several key assumptions support this pattern. Cultures can be ranked from simple tribal to sophisticated western. Pakeha know enough about Maori culture to judge it.

The survival of Maori culture depends on Pakeha sponsorship. Together these resources serve to undermine and marginalise Maori ways of doing things.

Counters in the area of **Culture** might include:

Maori culture is a crucial element in the identity, meaning-making, character and development of Maori and of the nation. It is currently undervalued and marginalized in ways that need to change and develop. A key starting point is the idea that cultures are different rather than better or worse than each other. Each, with adequate resources, will flourish and adapt to provide sustainable and liveable lives for their citizens. Maori theory and values in areas including commerce, development, sustainability, spirituality, health and social wellbeing are vital. Pakeha must work to develop our sense of our own culture and unique ways of doing things.

Ward also prefigures a number of ideas about **Maori crime**

Maori are said to have little respect for people or property and so assault and steal at will. It is claimed that negative Maori values such as greed, laziness, jealousy and anger mean that there are no civil restraints on Maori crime from within the culture, making Maori predatory and parasitic upon Pakeha culture.

Cues include terms such as gangs, thieves, warrior, primitive, wild, enjoy violence, violence gene and identity imagery including Jake the Muss, Mongrel Mob and Black Power.

Media reports and headlines that identify offenders as Maori are a key site for the reproduction of this pattern, often with considerable subtlety as in this recent example from the ODT:

...the unarmed man walked into the Bank of New Zealand University branch at 2.50pm and demanded money from a teller...He is described as a Caucasian, *or light-skinned Maori*, aged in his mid-30s...*ODT, 24.11.07, p4*

Key assumptions include the idea that Maori offending is a cultural characteristic and therefore that to change it requires the abandonment or modification of the culture. One of the main effects is to mask the impacts of the wholesale disruptions to Maori social order caused by colonisation. A secondary effect is to obscure a wide range of crime that is heavily entrenched in Pakeha culture at all levels including ‘white collar’ circles.

An alternative standpoint on **Crime** can use these ideas:

Crime occurs in all cultures but the disproportionate involvement of Maori is at least as much a reflection of the wider environmental circumstances in which they find themselves, as it is of any individual or collective characteristics they possess.

The remaining themes are more explicitly about the relationships between Maori and Pakeha.

One People is what we have named a strong pattern about this relationship. It argues that we are a unified nation and should all be treated equally.

Terms such as Kiwi, New Zealander, citizen and taxpayer are cues but so also are iconic sports teams, and anything else that depicts nationhood as the primary organising feature of identity.

The assumption here is that such unity cannot co-exist with diversity and particularly not with strong, self-determining Maori identities. This theme is pervasive in Pakeha political discourse in particular. A typical example is John Key's comment in the run up to the last elections when he said:

“We want to have all New Zealanders on the general roll” (*Wairarapa Times-Age*, 3. 2. 07)

The exclusion of Maori seats from the governance arrangements for the Auckland supercity is another.

It is an effective way of silencing or marginalizing Maori calls for political, economic and cultural recognition.

Alternative ways of talking about **national identity**

Entrenched disparities mean that equity of outcomes will require unequal inputs for some time. National identity needs to be re-forged as “unity in diversity” under the Treaty of Waitangi. We need to acknowledge that Pakeha are one ethnic group among many, that there are multiple ways to be a New Zealander and that Maori aspirations may guide and contribute to our development.

Rights is what we have called a closely related pattern about relationships.

Equal rights for all is described as a democratic cornerstone. One person's rights end where another's begin.

The cues are democracy, rights, equality. An example is:

Our laws hold that every New Zealander, irrespective of ethnic or cultural identity, enjoys equality in citizenship (*New Zealand Herald*, 24.4.09).

The main assumption is that the best form of social order is derived from ‘majority rule’ democracy and the rights that it prescribes and permits.

The effect is to evoke the mythological level playing field of neoliberalism and to mask the historical and systemic infringements of Maori rights upon which our society is founded.

Ways of broadening **Rights**

The defining and enactment of rights via Pakeha law only is inequitable. The Treaty can delineate the rights of Maori (tino rangatiratanga) and Pakeha (kawanatanga), which may be different and complementary. Rights should be thought of as co-valent, collective and negotiable, to enable the expression of the values and practices of all cultures.

Another major current pattern we have called **Privilege**

Maori are said to have special privileges that are unfair and racist. Seats in Parliament, Maori All Blacks, housing loans, fishing rights, but nothing for Pakeha:

“Maori receive special treatment across a broad range of areas. Education is one I know factually. I suspect it's in a lot of other areas but I don't have evidence. There's Te Puni Kokiri and agencies like that designed to benefit Maori but there's no special Pakeha equivalent set up”. *Male 47, NZH 22.2.04*

The assumption is that such arrangements are a breach of egalitarian principles rather than redressing existing disparities arising from the Pakeha cultural project. Effects include raising tension between Maori and Pakeha, and masking the realities of the entrenched Pakeha privilege that advantages us in every sphere.

Another view of **Privilege**

The status quo is based on the economic, political, legislative and cultural privileging of Pakeha. Decolonisation requires the re-ordering of these debilitating arrangements. Existing provisions that target Maori are often superficial efforts to redress injustice and disparity.

Stirrers is another prominent pattern

Here the argument is that our race relations would return to their ‘best-in-the-world’ status if activists would desist from making trouble.

The familiar terms like radical, protester, agitator, are cues here and another feature is a sense that a small, unreasonable cohort of troublemakers are trying to get advantage for nothing.

Helen Clarke’s reaction to the Foreshore and Seabed Hikoi provides a very clear example.

What it is, is the same old faces. The Ken Mairs, the Harawira Family, the Annette Sykes, the haters and wreckers, the people who destroy Waitangi every year, now wanting to do a Waitangi in every town in New Zealand on the way to Wellington where they will do a Waitangi on the steps of Parliament. *(TVNZ website 4.5.04)*

The effect is to split the activists off from the masses, constructing them as self-interested attention seekers and constructing the people as dupes to their rhetoric.

An alternative frame sees this as an issue about **Maori leadership**

Maori leadership and justified activism is marginalized and denigrated by efforts to divide and rule. There are multiple examples of people who have been branded as troublemakers who have made huge contributions to society and the national good.

A less common pattern relates to what is referred to as **Maori Sensitivity**

Maori are seen as having become oversensitive about their culture and this has led to racial tension. The inability of Maori culture to compete is said to have created a defensiveness that is reflected in the determination with which Maori attempt to enforce cultural practices in their own spaces and particularly in public spaces and institutions. Where Pakeha do offend Maori they do so from ignorance rather than intent and it is Maori secretiveness and shame that are to blame.

Cues such as sexist, heathen, and phrases like ‘rammed down our throats’, force fed and culture Nazi are used of Maori language, protocols and values, to express Pakeha resentment.

The effect is to marginalize and denigrate efforts to acknowledge and include Maori ways in public life.

Re-framing *Sensitivity*

Maori defense of their rights, practices and culture is a necessary reaction to the myriad overt and covert acts of aggression and subversion performed by colonising practices and people. Claiming ignorance of Maori protocol and practice is no more acceptable before Maori law than it is before Pakeha law and it is Pakeha responsibility to acknowledge, learn and respect Maori ways.

And last but of course by no means least *Treaty of Waitangi*

The Treaty is seen as a historical document of little importance in the contemporary setting.

Talk of a 'Treaty industry', 'grievance mode', gravy train and diverse ideas about dispensing with it, are cues that draw upon this pattern.

The assumption here is that Pakeha are within their rights to unilaterally determine the worth and meaning of the Treaty.

The effect is to discount recourse to the Treaty in debates or conflicts between Maori and Pakeha. The preference is for the established institutions of police, courts and parliament to settle issues.

A *pro-Treaty* view

The Treaty is a contract and covenant by which Pakeha can live legitimately and justly in Aotearoa. We should work to enshrine it as the foundation and guide of a new constitution that enables the achievement of a Treaty-based future.

These then are some of the key elements of the standard story along with some attempt to challenge them with alternative resources. There are other patterns that I have not included for brevity. They include Maori inheritance, the notion that authentic Maori identity has disappeared; a Dawinist framing of Maori difficulties; negative ideas about Maori financial probity; and belittling acknowledgement of Maori success. Because the alternatives are themselves marginal discursive forms, they are not 'easy to hear', not comfortably colloquial and likely to attract rebuttal and rejection. These features are even more evident when narratives based on each set of resources are set against each other.

Here is how a standard story version might sound:

This country needs to get over this politically correct rubbish about colonisation. We used to have the best race relations in the world before a few radicals started stirring up trouble with the Maoris filling their heads with ideas and hopes that are completely unrealistic. All this nonsense about the Treaty which is ancient history that I wasn't party to, has gotten even the good Maoris, riled up, demanding and troublesome, thinking that they should get land and compensation. The problem is that Maori culture can't foot it in the modern world and it's being swept aside the same way the Maori did to the Moriori – at least we didn't eat them. Maoris are pretty upset about this but they've started ramming their language and their powhiris and their tangis down our throats. They need to move on and forget about losing what they never owned, pick up the spade, put on the suit and put their shoulder to the common wheel for the national good. We're one people now, kiwis, and we don't want Maori rights for this and that, privileging them and dividing our country.

A narrative based on the alternative resources might sound like this:

We can decolonise Aotearoa to create social equity among the peoples of this nation. We need to acknowledge and enact the Treaty and the indigenous rights of tangata whenua as tools to redress the wrongs and as guides to the ways forward. Fairly resourced, Maori culture as the vehicle for

Maori values, beliefs and aspirations will support its people as our society adapts to an ever-changing global world. Maori leaders need to be recognised as change agents, innovators and visionaries for a just society. Maori people as community, iwi and nation are inspiring, leading and supporting the development of sustainable futures for all peoples of Aotearoa. Pakeha in particular can educate ourselves to understand, endorse and co-operate in the development of Maori aspirations and self-determination, to create a national identity based on the diverse strengths of all groups that make up our society.

Speaking firstly of the anti-Maori materials, what I have offered is an impressionistic, collage of material ideas, imagery, tropes, phrases and discourses that can be used in many different situations and combinations to provide elements or iterations of a standard story of Maori Pakeha relations that is known by most Pakeha and drawn upon by many. I can make no claims to comprehensiveness and have hardly touched the surface of complexity, interconnection and nuance of the standard story patterns and narratives. While it may be that examples of the story in its entirety are rare, the fragments and their resonances are everywhere.

So I hope that you will agree that particularly when they are lined up for inspection and grilled in this way that what we have here is a very powerful and compelling story that reverberates endlessly over the kitchen tables, bars and media channels of the nation. I argue that such accounts represent a great deal more than 'hot air', that these are indeed the "tao kōrero" of our whakatauki, the "sticks and stones", the weapons of the mundane, everyday war that the conventional Pakeha cultural project wages against Maori self-determination.

Beyond the standard story I have tried to interrupt, destabilise and re-centre Pakeha discourse with alternative resources and narrative that set aside the fatal ambiguities of our talk in favour of a pro-Treaty vision. For such work there are also affirmative decolonising patterns evident in the work of others within and beyond Psychology that can be incorporated into building this resource. Among Pakeha Psychologists alone you have heroes who are steadily pushing forward. Ingrid's recently completed PhD examined pathways toward social justice trodden by Treaty workers and has surfaced a number of highly affirmative patterns in pro-Treaty talk that strongly complement what is offered here. *Right relationships* asserts the need for working from tino rangatiratanga/kawanatanga bases to build social change programmes; *Maori authority* acknowledges the reality and potential of Maori leadership in decolonisation. Rose's research on the discursive and material markers of Pakeha identity is steadily coming to fruition. The society's own NSCBI continues its mighty contribution and many others, Maori and Pakeha, in Psychology and in related fields, including the wider world of Treaty education through organisations such as Network Waitangi, Kotare Trust, the Treaty Resource Centre, are working steadily in similar directions.

To conclude, I argue that as Pakeha, as Treaty partners, as psychologists we have a number of tasks and challenges arising from this analysis. The first among these is to recognise the importance of this troubling domain of discourse to the wellbeing of our nation. It is critical that we acknowledge the standard story and the role that it plays in reproducing the status quo of unjust and exploitative relations between Maori and Pakeha. Without placing this discourse at the centre of the Psychologist's mission, we are perhaps like other deniers of injustice, complicit in both the colonising acts and the post-colonial traumatic syndrome that continue to blight Maori development and threaten to engulf the nation.

As the cut-off date for Treaty settlements looms, urgent proactive efforts must be made to incorporate and utilise discursive resources that challenge the standard story. As psychologists, in your teaching, in your clinical practice, in your research you have opportunities, influence and obligations to work for pro-Treaty change and development. Tiny changes spread over the population can produce mighty movement at the societal level. Unless such steps are taken then our

praxis will not change and we will be agents of the systemic discrimination against Maori that underlies so much of what you see in your diverse professional settings.

Ultimately as Ray Nairn has suggested, what is needed is to seed and nurture a new, decolonising speech community that, from a different set of understandings articulates a very different, pro-Treaty discourses about Maori/Pakeha relations in all areas of national and community life. Maori and minorities of Pakeha have long fought this fight and the innovation is really to bring these resources together, to animate them with our ideas and to explicitly name them as tools for decolonisation. We have seen the dramatic effects of such discursive and ideological shifts in important realms such as women's suffrage, anti-nuclear debates and climate change, and we have seen what can happen when critical domains such as the media take up the baton.

My challenge for Psychology as a discipline, and for Pakeha within it, is to find the ways in which, in all your enterprises, you can enact the vision of your code of ethics and the principles it turns upon. To deal with this challenge, Pakeha need to know a great deal more about ourselves and the sources of our power so that we approach our Treaty partner in ways that will produce the decolonising outcomes we both desire. These aspects of our social worlds are core business to Psychology. I urge you to heed this call to ensure that our share of the journey to equity entails more than accepting Maori forgiveness. Beyond this the greater goal is to contribute to a *just* Pakeha cultural project that can stand proudly with the aspirations and achievements of Maori.

The two parts of our research that I have shared with you today – our analysis of the discursive depth of the problem of ambiguous colonising discourse, and our tentative steps to provide some discursive tools to address decolonisation – are indeed small offerings when set against the weight of entrenched social action and 180 years of colonial practice. But our hope is that taken up, breathed into life, infused with your energy, applied and practiced in your settings, that these raw resources can help us to fulfil Hone Kaa's challenge for Pakeha and on a timetable of urgency from Hone Harawira, to be part of the work required to build a just and equitable nation.

I have spent this time talking about ways in which Pakeha talk about Maori. I end with Maori talking about Pakeha in this powerful passage from Patricia Grace's book *Cousins*:

Yet some Pakeha, those with pride, are seeking... are coming to understand that what they can do in the interests of justice is to know themselves, to understand their own true history, which does not appear truthfully on the pages of books, to understand the promises made on their behalf, to break their own silences, to search out the meanings of racism and injustice, for which they are responsible only if they are inert. The seekers, the honest seekers, those taking measures, working out what can be done, are proud people who act from a base of self-worth, humility and dignity. They do not feel threatened but challenged. They know they need not feel ashamed or guilty, because they are claiming their own true heritage and their lives are honourable. (Grace, 1992)

Tena koutou, tena koutou, tena koutou katoa