Māori Studies, Past and Present: A Review

Michael P J Reilly

What is Māori studies? It is an academic subject in which scholars research and teach the language, values, knowledges, and practices belonging to the indigenous people of New Zealand. Introduced as first-year university courses as far back as 1928, the actual teaching of Māori studies only began in 1952 at the Auckland University College; in subsequent decades, it expanded to other New Zealand universities.¹ The subject is now being taught in several Pacific universities in Tahiti and Hawai‘i, while in New Zealand, tribal or iwi wānanga (colleges of learning) have entire curricula dedicated to advancing Māori knowledge.

Within contemporary New Zealand universities, Māori studies is normally a self-governing unit with its own teaching programs and budget. Outwardly its structure reflects wider institutional forms, but on the inside Māori studies reveals its unique qualities, for it usually embodies a physical space where the predominantly Māori staff and students seek to practice the cultural ideas and values they study. Māori studies also provides a critical space where scholars work not only to transmit their learning to new generations but also to criticize the prevailing ideology of the dominant Pākehā society.² Māori studies, through its intellectual and cultural practices, aims to restore balance in the lives of indigenous students and their wider communities, many of whom continue to experience the longer-term effects of colonization.

The origin of this paper lies in the 2007 Māori Studies Subject Conference I attended where, to my surprise, I listened to some participants question the future of the subject.³ As someone who had studied te reo Māori (the Māori language) at high school and university and who had taught in Māori studies at the University of Otago since 1991, I did not accept such a pessimistic prognosis. I decided to review what had been written about

Māori studies since its inception in order to demonstrate the intellectual validity and vitality of the subject and to show how much it could contribute to *te ao Māori* (the Māori world), to New Zealand generally, and to wider studies of the Pacific and other indigenous peoples.

I discovered a series of key themes raised in the literature that form the major sections of this paper: Māori language and culture; research, *kaupapa Māori* (research according to Māori cultural principles), and *mana wāhine* (Māori feminism); *mātauranga Māori* (Māori knowledge) and the *wānanga*; Māori and universities; connections with indigenous and Pacific worlds; and the role of nonindigenous or Pākehā researchers. Because each section discusses a distinctive topic relating to Māori studies, I have treated them as autonomous entities. I begin with the language because I see this as lying at the heart of what has constituted Māori studies from its inception. For many it remains the soul of Māori studies today.

This paper has some limitations to which it is important to draw the reader's attention at the outset. First, because I am a Pākehā, there may be places where my choice or treatment of a topic does not reflect concerns common among Māori scholars, or where it idealizes actual practice. Second, this paper primarily focuses on Māori studies programs in New Zealand universities, not on those overseas or in other tertiary educational institutions such as polytechnics and *iwi wānanga*. Third, the paper reviews published material about Māori studies, so internal university documents not available to the public were generally not consulted.⁴ Nor did I interview senior Māori studies scholars; this oral history is a topic for others to explore. Finally, I have often relied on my own experiences working at the University of Otago, located in the lands under the *mana* (authority) of Ngāi Tahu, the *tangata whenua* (people of the land) for much of Te Waipounamu (South Island). Such experiences may not always reflect the realities of other Māori studies programs, especially those in Aotearoa (North Island).⁵

MĀORI LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

When Bruce Biggs began teaching the Māori language in Auckland University College's Department of Anthropology in 1952, he made an important decision about the subject's name, calling it "Māori studies" rather than "Māori language" because he thought the latter description would unduly restrict its future course content. The appellation "studies" also helped diffuse the concerns of faculty opponents who had questioned

the availability of written language texts. The choice of name was thus a political move to prevent arguments about reading material from hindering the introduction of Māori studies at New Zealand's universities. An early objective of Biggs and others became the publication of new language textbooks and collections of oral and written literature in Māori. Other universities later picked up "Māori studies," although Waikato and Canterbury opted for "Māori" (Pohatu 1998, 112, 154; Pawley 2001).

For Biggs, the language remained "basic and major" to Māori studies; the complementary "sociology" or culture courses were not as important. In 1978 Auckland offered thirteen Māori studies courses. Six of these were in language with two per year (first-, second-, and third-level), one focused on written texts and the language's formal structure and the other intended to develop speaking, writing, and comprehension skills (Biggs 1978, 4–5). English predominated as the language of instruction in reading and writing skills; this was also true at Victoria and Canterbury (Mead 1978, 16). By contrast, Tīmoti Kāretu, foundation professor of Māori at Waikato, explained that his department's philosophy stressed "the language [as] by far the most important facet of things Māori," and, therefore, the medium of instruction was te reo Māori in all but elementary classes (1989, 75). Teachers also tried to use Māori "in all outside situations" (Mead 1978, 15). Significantly, Waikato went on to establish a unique reputation for developing active speakers of the language (Kāretu 1989, 75).

The importance of the reo has been accepted by all Māori studies academic leaders from the foundational years to the present. For example, Te Kapunga (Koro) Dewes, who led Māori studies at Victoria from 1966 until 1976, wrote:

*Ko te putake o te Maoritanga
Ko te Reo Maori
He taonga tuku iho na Te Atua*

The tap-root of Maori culture is Maori language
a gift from God (1975, 55)

Patrick Hohepa, who followed Biggs to become the second Māori studies academic at Auckland in 1965 and who later became Māori language commissioner, made the point very succinctly: "Ko te reo te tūahu o te mana Māori. The Māori language is the tabernacle of Māori prestige and empowerment" (2000, 11). Kāretu, himself an early Māori language commissioner, stated in a lecture, "Ko te reo te moko o te hinengaro" (The

language is the visible sign of the hidden mind) (1995, iv). Finally, Mason Durie, who headed Māori studies at Massey, observed, “A people are not a people without a language; a language is not a language unless it is spoken” (2000, 55).

Godfrey Pohatu, who led Māori studies at Otago from 1986 till 1996, defined it as “first and foremost an academic programme that teaches, researches in, and supports the linguistic, cultural, social, and historical circumstances of the Maori people—as a collective entity—of this country” (1998, 145). He favored the term “Māori studies” because it provided “balance” between language and culture subjects. In addition, it gave him the necessary flexibility to recruit staff who were not strong in the reo but possessed other skills, although he still expected them to demonstrate some linguistic competency. For example, he conducted part of my telephone job interview in the Māori language, although I had not spoken any Māori for several years and was rather rusty. Such flexibility recognized the difficulty of recruiting appropriate staff (Pohatu 1998, 155). Pohatu agreed with Mason Durie that in an ideal world expertise in the reo is the most important selection criterion for staff recruitment, because it demonstrates cultural competence (M Durie 1996, 27; Pohatu 1998, 211).

The centrality of the reo in Māori studies is further demonstrated by the subject’s curriculum design at Otago University between 1990 and 2007. Pohatu believed that “Te Reo Maori is the only true vehicle of expression in any Maori Studies undertaking” (1998, 211). Accordingly, in 1990 he organized the curriculum to reflect this belief, with language courses forming the core requirement for a Māori studies major and courses such as Māori art, history, or mana wāhine as electives. This support of the language with a range of culture courses was standard in many Māori studies programs, although the culture content varied depending on individual staff expertise (Mead 1997, 22).

Pohatu’s successor as head of Māori studies, Tania M Ka’ai, conceptualized this curriculum design as a wharenui (meeting house), with te reo Māori as the tāhuhu (ridgepole) of the house, “symbolising its importance to a Māori Studies major,” supported by the poupou (house posts), each of which represented one particular culture study, such as history, Treaty of Waitangi, Ngāi Tahu studies, performing arts, or education. This structure is “based on the philosophy that Māori language is central to Māori culture. To understand the culture fully one needs to know the language that is part of, and reflects, that culture” (*Tā Te Tumu Ake Aro-*

tahi 2002, 14–15). This understanding of Māori studies is embedded in Otago University's Māori language policy: "Ko te reo te tāhuhu o tēnei whare. The language is the ridgepole of this house" (Timms 2007, 7). It is also powerfully transmitted in a waiata (song) formerly sung at Otago (Ka'ai 2000, 29, 31): "Ko tōku reo / Ko tōku ohoohe / . . . Tōku māpihi maurea / . . . Tōku whakakai mārihi / . . . Ko tōku mana" (My language / Is of great importance / . . . Is the object of my affection / . . . Is a precious treasure / . . . Is my mana, my power!)

Te reo Māori remains a vital part of Māori studies. Several institutions, such as Auckland and Massey, reflect Otago's stance and specify core language courses along with specialist culture courses for Māori studies. Other programs have in recent years developed alternative subjects of study, so that a student can opt to specialize in te reo Māori or in other subjects that concentrate on aspects of cultural knowledge, such as resource management, cultural studies, development, media and communication, and visual arts.⁶ This broadened curriculum parallels the institutional evolution of Māori studies. Initially a discrete subject hosted within another department, Māori studies became an autonomous department that taught a single major subject comprising language and culture before finally transforming at most universities into schools that teach multiple subjects of study.

The reason the subject expanded beyond its language core is connected with important social and political changes in New Zealand. Māori community leaders, with the support of a reformist Labour government, developed the 1984–1994 Decade of Māori Development, stressing "Māori solutions to Māori problems" and targeting areas where state solutions had already failed, such as education (M Durie 1998, 7–9). Then, in 1987, New Zealand's higher courts confirmed the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi as "a constitutional instrument in the renegotiation of the relationship between Maori and Pakeha" (R Walker 2004, 265–266). State agencies, including all universities, were now obligated "to deliver equity to Maori under the Treaty of Waitangi" (R Walker 1998, 10). New Zealand universities responded by investing significant resources in treaty-based equity (Jennings 2002, 12–13).

Two examples illustrate the practical effects of these changes. At Victoria, in the late 1980s, teaching departments started to include Māori content in their curriculum. The result was the evolution of "a larger conception of Maori studies . . . as 'an area of academic endeavour encompassing a number of disciplines while retaining a distinct Maori orienta-

tion with relevance to contemporary Maori development” (Barrowman 1999, 255). At Massey, a variety of new subjects were incorporated into Māori studies, such as health, politics, the arts, and history. The language remained “a core component,” but “the focus for departments of Māori Studies [was] now more clearly centered on Māori cultural, social and economic development” (M Durie 1996, 23). For Mason Durie, the “distinctive strength” of contemporary Māori studies lay “in the richness and uniqueness of Māori modes of expression: styles of thinking, speaking, relating, recalling, researching, recording, and within a developing intellectual framework that rests on Māori philosophies” (1996, 24).

RESEARCH, KAUPAPA MĀORI, AND MANA WĀHINE

Margaret Mutu, professor of Māori studies at Auckland University, defined research as “the pursuit of knowledge,” but she warned that it is also “the key to power and the ability to control one’s life and that of others.” A researcher intent on abusing that power will try to “control and restrict not only the amount of knowledge which is generally available but also to unilaterally determine what shall and shall not be allowed to become accepted knowledge”; conversely, researchers who share their knowledge provide “one of the key tools for empowering the people and providing controls to prevent the misuse and abuse of power” (Mutu 1998, 9). Research that is appropriate for an indigenous context will therefore form the basis of any Māori studies program. To do this properly, all staff must possess PhDs and publish or present their knowledge in forums that will ensure that it is disseminated throughout their various communities. These forums may sometimes be academic in nature, or may take place in ways appropriate for *te ao Māori*, such as presentations to the community.

For Māori studies, writing and publishing research in the *reo* is an important priority. Journals such as *He Pukenga Kōrero*, a significant forum for the reporting of Māori research and the development of appropriate theories and research tools, provide Māori studies with infrastructure that supports such objectives. Challenges remain, including how highly such journals are rated by the wider Pākehā academic community, and more especially how research funders rank academic journals; funders tend to give priority to publications that disseminate knowledge internationally.⁷ Writing in the *reo* may become marginalized by such comparisons. But, as the foundation professor of Māori studies at Victoria University, Sidney Moko Mead, argued, Māori studies academics have to put the effort into

such publications in order “to build up the mana” of the subject, since “no one else can do it for us” (1997, 48).

Research involving Māori communities positions “Māori culture at the core of Māori perceptions and experiences” (Gillies, Tinirau, and Mako 2007, 31). For Patricia Maringi Johnston, such an orientation overturns the historical dominance of Pākehā research, which too often “misrepresented and distorted our lives” because it was research “about Māori by non-Māori.” In its place, Māori researchers are locating their work, formerly “unheard and unsaid,” within “our own cultural-bound perspectives”; they provide research “by Māori for Māori,” thereby overcoming the community’s distrust of research and giving them the opportunity to become empowered (Johnston 1999, 4–7).

Researchers Anne-Marie Gillies, Rāwiri Tinirau, and Noreen Mako have emphasized the need to be cautious and protective of the community participating in the research. It is important that “the kuia [female elders] and koroheke [male elders] have control of the process, guided by mokopuna [grandchildren] trained in a Western system of knowledge, but retaining and prescribing to Māori ways of knowing and preferences for knowledge acquisition and sharing” (Gillies, Tinirau, and Mako 2007, 36). Māori educationalist Russell Bishop also underlined the absolute importance of the “mutual understanding and control by all participants” of the research process, with “reciprocal” involvement by everyone. In a Māori context this requires support and guidance of the research by the whānau (extended family), and its kaumātua (elders). It also requires “aroha (mutuality) between the participants,” including the researcher. All of them are involved at every stage of the research, from its formulation to its dissemination (Bishop 1998, 202, 204–205). As Johnston noted, “We are using research to name our pain, speak out our differences and seek out our truths” (1999, 10).

Research in and for Māori communities involves obligations and accountability on the part of the researchers. Johnston wrote, “If I produce something that does not empower Māori then I have failed as a researcher” (1999, 9). Researchers of Te Rōpū Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pōmare (Eru Pōmare Māori Health Research Centre), located at Otago University’s Wellington School of Medicine and Health Sciences, adopted as a principle the whakataukī (proverbial saying), “He reo e rangona, engari, he kanohi kitea.” (A voice may be heard, but a face needs to be seen.) It describes the reciprocal relationship created between the researcher and the researched community (Cram and others 1997, 40).

The complex connections created between them was beautifully described by H B McCarthy: “The invisible obligatory contract one signs with the community involved extends through the dimensions of time and beyond that of the individual” (quoted in Keefe and others 1999, 16).

The researcher is often also part of that researched community: the several roles cannot be disentangled, and all should form part of any research produced (Johnston 1999, 9). Bishop wrote of the “whanau of interest,” referring to the research whānau, where the researcher is a part of that group, rather than standing apart from it (1998, 200, 205). Maintaining distance and being objective or neutral are not realistic research aims. Linda Tuhiwai Smith described the Māori researcher as being both an insider, belonging to the community within which the research is being undertaken, and an outsider, in terms of being formally trained and employed to conduct a piece of research. Humility and reflexivity are important qualities for insider researchers since they must remain aware of their complex and ongoing relationships with the researched group. Guidance by an elder is especially helpful as a way of negotiating a researcher’s way in the community and through the research process (L Smith 1999, 137–139).

Māori studies differs from other academic subjects in that it stresses praxis—both the theory and practice of indigenous knowledge—as part of its mandate to pass on learning to new generations of scholars, and thereby to return some balance to the educational structures of New Zealand that still bear the imprint of their colonial past. For Dewes, the cultural or psychological violence that had been perpetrated on Māori students required Māori scholars to “put back into Maori minds, hearts and souls those things that were psychologically bruised in earlier generations” (1975, 66). By providing a “distinct Māori base” where Māori scholars and students could work within a supportive environment, Māori studies established tino rangatiratanga or self-determination (“For Māori by Māori”) within the universities (M Durie 1996, 27, 31–32). The ultimate manifestation of such autonomy are the schools of Māori studies, which bring together the fragmented Māori knowledge subjects throughout the universities (M Durie 1996, 24–25)—putting “Humpty-Dumpty together again,” as Mead described it (1997, 33).

The expression of tino rangatiratanga within the university is a reflection of larger political expectations. In the words of E T Durie, former chairman of the Waitangi Tribunal: “Aboriginal autonomy . . . means approximately that indigenous people . . . should be enabled and assisted . . . to

determine their own policy, manage their own resources, develop their own structures of representation, and if need be, to negotiate policy affecting them with the state.” He added that ever since the beginning of the New Zealand colonial state in 1840, “the consistent Māori position was that there was a place for both Māori and Pākehā, provided Māori autonomy was respected and maintained” (E T Durie 1996, 8–9).

Autonomy within the university structure has a number of advantages; in particular, it allows for the development of distinctive Māori theories and methodologies that are based on Māori philosophies, such as whānautanga (being family) and kōtahitanga (being united) (M Durie 1996, 24, 25–26). One of these is kaupapa Māori theory, “the Māori preferred way of doing things” (G Smith 1995, 22). Ka‘ai depicted Māori studies as practicing this theory: “Māori Studies in the University therefore serves as a space for teaching and research to be undertaken which recovers our histories, reclaims our lands and resources, restores justice and preserves our language and traditions within a culturally specific framework called *Kaupapa Māori*” (2000, 12; italics in original).

In classical Māori, kaupapa is defined as a flat surface, platform, or stage; a plan, scheme, or proposal; or the groundwork or medium for things (Williams 1988, 107). For Sheilagh Walker, kaupapa Māori is “the base on which the superstructures of Te Ao [The World] may be viewed”; it is concerned with all Māori people, as voiced in the saying, “He aha te mea nui o te Ao? He tangata, he tangata, he tangata” (What is the greatest thing of the World? It is people, people, people) (S Walker 1996, quoted in IRI 2000, 3).

Kaupapa Māori theory, according to Graham Smith (1995, 21–22), accepts the “validity and legitimacy” of Māori knowledges, and in that sense is a “‘self-determination initiative’ concerned for language and cultural survival.” In other words, it “is an attempt to retrieve space for Māori voices and perspectives” (Cram and Smith 2003, 3). For some, that space includes Māori spirituality at its center (Ratima 2008, 2). At the same time, kaupapa Māori theory acts as “a reactive, ‘resistance initiative’” critically responding to “Pākehā social, cultural, economic and political domination” (G Smith 1995, 21–22). For L E Pihama, it provides “an analysis of existing power structures and societal inequalities” and is able to draw attention to the hidden “power relations” and to the processes by which “dominant groups” are able to continue oppressing Māori (quoted in Keefe and others 1999, 13). Ka‘ai agreed, describing

kaupapa Māori as “a politicising agent that acts as a counter-hegemonic force to promote the conscientisation of Māori people” through its critique of “Pākehā definitions and constructions of Māori people” and its “validation and legitimization of *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori* [the language and the Māori customary practices]” (2000, 9–10; italics in original). This Māori phrase, also rendered “Te Reo Māori me ōna tikanga” (The Māori language and its customary practices), is frequently used to encapsulate the nature of Māori studies and is a “key element” of kaupapa Māori (IRI 2000, 4). For some Māori academics, the more important element of kaupapa Māori is its focus on developing and advancing Māori “using our own knowledge, values, and processes.” In that sense it can be described as a “Native Theory,” since it allows Māori to use “Māori processes and terms that may not be acceptable to the Western academy” in order “to make sense of [our] time and place in this world” (Eketone 2008, 7, 10).

Mana wāhine, often translated as Māori feminism, contributes a key element to kaupapa Māori theory (Hutchings 2004, 20; Jahnke 1997, 33). Traditionally, Māori men and women performed complementary roles, as demonstrated in their shared caring for the new generation (Barlow 1991, 144–149). However, colonization introduced foreign ideas that diminished women’s roles. By contrast, as Jessica Hutchings noted (2004), mana wāhine provides “a kaupapa Māori analysis” that focuses “on issues relevant to Māori women.” A mana wāhine analysis creates “a space for Māori women to identify and reclaim Māori women’s knowledge” by highlighting the important historical and cultural roles performed by women in Māori communities. Embracing all Māori women, mana wāhine argues for the Treaty of Waitangi and “challenges hegemonic colonial systems and ideologies” that attempt to silence or control Māori women, whether practiced by Pākehā or by Māori men. The aim is to reestablish a balance in gender relations (Hutchings 2004, 20–23). Pohatu highlighted how the “colonised intellectual history” of Māori male academics had prevented Māori women from being appointed in Māori studies before the 1980s (1998, 218, 267). Thus, when I studied at Victoria, Māori women only held junior appointments in Māori studies and carried heavy teaching workloads. For Huia Tomlins Jahnke, the challenge remains of “making connections” between the often powerful presence of Māori women in the past and how their roles “are defined, redefined, constructed and contested in the present” (1997, 35).

MĀTAURANGA MĀORI AND WĀNANGA

Mead equated Māori studies with mātauranga Māori, which represents “the heritage of the Maori, the knowledge which the elders are said to pass on to their mokopuna, the wahi ngaro [missing portion], which our youth long for, and the tikitiki mo to mahunga (the topknot for your head)” (1997, 26). The “tikitiki mo to mahunga” is an excerpt from a famous proverb by Māori scholar and politician Apirana Ngata (Mead and Grove 2001, 48n250).⁸ The head was “the most *tapu* [sacred] part” of a person’s body, and the hair was the most tapu part of the head (Hanson and Hanson 1983, 50; italics in original). As the tikitiki adorns a person’s presentation of self, so mātauranga Māori completes his or her identity as Māori. In Mead’s eyes, Māori studies is engaged in the task of rediscovering and reconstructing this wahi ngaro, “the lost portion of the heritage,” which disappeared through the process of colonization (1997, 34). In this historic task, the university cannot stand back and simply record cultural losses; rather, it must actively ensure the survival of mātauranga Māori (Mead 1997, 27–28).

Te Ahukaramū Royal of Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa defined mātauranga Māori: “He mea hanga te mātauranga Māori nā te Māori. E hangaia ana tēnei mātauranga i roto i te whare o Te Ao Mārama, i runga anō hoki i ngā whakaaturanga o te whakapapa kia mārama ai te tangata ki tōna Ao. Mātauranga Māori is created by Māori humans according to a world view entitled ‘Te Ao Mārama’ and by the employment of methodologies derived from this world view to explain the Māori experience of the world” (Royal 1998, 5). Royal translated “whakapapa” as “methodologies.” Classically, whakapapa refer to genealogies; in this case, the term is used by extension to describe the organization and analysis of things—in other words, a methodology (Royal 1998, 3). Te Ao Mārama, “the phenomenal world,” is based on key Māori concepts: rangatiratanga (leadership, autonomy); manaakitanga (mutual elevation of mana, hospitality); whanaungatanga (interconnectedness, relationships); tohungatanga (expertise); ūkaipō (nourishing of self, origins); and kōtahitanga (unity) (Royal 1998, 4–5).

Royal argued that Māori studies remains ultimately “subject to the Western paradigm of knowledge,” whereas mātauranga Māori belongs more properly in wānanga, which research and teach Māori knowledges (Royal 1998, 6–7). Modern wānanga such as Raukawa, which were first

discussed in the late 1970s, are iwi-based tertiary institutions dedicated to teaching and researching an iwi's own knowledge base. The Crown or Government of New Zealand legally recognized wānanga as tertiary educational institutions in 1990. In the Education Amendment Act of that year, they are defined as “characterised by teaching and research that maintains, advances and disseminates knowledge and develops intellectual independence and assists the application of knowledge regarding ahuatanga Māori (Māori tradition) according to tikanga Māori (Māori custom).” Currently, there are three wānanga: Raukawa; Te Wānanga o Aotearoa; and Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi. A significant proportion of students at wānanga are Māori; Awanuiārangi has the highest (91 percent) (Hook 2007, 5–6, 10; Timms 2007, 2).

Te Wānanga-o-Raukawa operates on a series of guiding principles or “kaupapa” premised on key Māori cultural values: manaakitanga, rangatiratanga, whanaungatanga, kōtahitanga, wairuatanga (spirituality), ūkaipōtanga (origins), pūkengatanga (teaching knowledge), kaitiakitanga (guardianship, accountability), whakapapa, and reo. These also apply to the other wānanga. Raumati Hook, formerly chief executive of Awanuiārangi, identified “manaakitanga and aroha [kindness, compassion, sympathy]” as the principles “at the heart of the Wānanga movement,” which are supplemented by others such as rangatiratanga and kōtahitanga. These values set wānanga apart from universities. The wānanga give “a ‘high priority’” to the reo as “the doorway [to the] house of Māori knowledge” (Hook 2007, 10; Timms 2007, 3–4).

University Māori studies programs are seen as having a role distinctive from that of the wānanga. For Pohatu (1998, 297), Māori studies teaches people how to pursue knowledge and to evaluate research methods. For Otago PhD student Catriona Timms, of Ngāti Raukawa and Scottish descent, universities provide “a generic view of the ‘Māori world view’” as opposed to that of a specific iwi. “Māori Studies departments and schools,” she argued, “can provide a constant challenge to the idea that mātauranga Māori has a lesser status than western knowledge” (Timms 2007, 2, 9). For Mason Durie, Māori studies encourages “an appreciation of the Māori situation” while ensuring that universities engage with the Māori world and develop both aspects of New Zealand’s “dual heritage” of Māori and Pākehā, as part of their research and teaching nexus as well as in their policies and practices (M Durie 1996, 25, 29–32). Royal himself envisaged a partnership between the wānanga and university Māori studies programs (1998, 6). Such a complementary relationship better describes

their respective activities and acknowledges what they share—for example, the value placed on acquiring the reo (Timms 2007, 6). Other common elements include the use of pedagogical practices based on kaupapa Māori theory and a commitment to enhancing the academic qualifications of their staff (Timms 2007, 8). This institutional complementarity is reflected in Māori Studies at Auckland—known as Te Wānanga o Waipapa—which follows the Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi model by operating as “a ‘university within a university’” (R Walker 1996, 169).

MĀORI AND UNIVERSITIES

The recognition of treaty obligations has meant that individual universities have had to work out new relationships externally with Māori communities and internally with Māori staff and students. An important part has been the development of partnerships, especially with the iwi who have mana over the lands in which each university is located: the mana whenua.⁹ For example, in 2001 Victoria created Toihuaewa, a forum where Māori staff and representatives of mana whenua and tangata whenua discuss Māori academic issues, under the leadership of the pro-vice-chancellor (Māori), who is responsible for the university’s progress on Māori and treaty obligations (Victoria University of Wellington 2010). Otago signed a memorandum of understanding in 2000 with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, representing the mana whenua. Besides creating a process for mutual recognition, dialogue, and consultation, the university also committed itself to tangible objectives such as promoting Māori language and research and recruiting and developing successful Māori staff and students (University of Otago 2003, 2008).¹⁰ The Office of Māori Development in the Vice-Chancellor’s Office was established, with Ngāi Tahu staff, as a link between the university and the mana whenua. Led by the director of Māori Development/Kaitohutohu Kaupapa Māori, the office advances policies and strategies that enhance Māori participation and research throughout the university, including support networks for Māori staff. Externally, Otago participates in Te Tapuae o Rehua, a consortium of five South Island universities and polytechnics and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, which was set up to enhance Māori participation in South Island tertiary education.¹¹

Māori-related university research “cannot divorce itself from the Māori world,” and Māori communities, such as iwi, need easy access to Māori scholars and the ability to endorse any research concerned with te ao

Māori (M Durie 1996, 28). For example, at Otago all university research is submitted to the Ngāi Tahu Research Consultation Committee, which provides advice to researchers and enables Ngāi Tahu to become involved in research projects of interest to them.¹² In this context, Māori university staff can be viewed as *taonga* (priceless heirlooms) because of their “dual edged accountability” both to their university and to their *iwi*; this makes a Māori staff member “the ideal bicultural researcher” (Pohatu 1998, 329, 357). Mead could not imagine any greater pleasure than working for both, unless it was to teach and research solely within an *iwi wānanga* (1997, 28). Nonetheless, the pressures on Māori scholars, especially in the increasingly regulated context of contemporary universities, made this “dual obligation” between being an academic and “being Māori” a unique challenge that only Māori faced, and that they constantly had to balance (A Durie 1995, 3–7). The balancing act can be dispiriting, especially when Western values still predominate within an academic discipline; as law lecturer Annie Mikaere observed, “It is extraordinarily difficult to maintain any degree of integrity as an indigenous person within an institution which requires such daily compromise” (1998, 13).

The development of Māori content within Western academic subjects in response to treaty-driven expectations of equity has brought these tensions to the fore. It is one thing to develop progressive university Māori policy, but it is often quite another to recognize Māori ideas and methods as having equal validity within long-established disciplines. Individual Māori scholars can face various kinds of resistance from Pākehā colleagues and, as a result, experience degrees of cultural and intellectual isolation (eg, Mikaere 1998).¹³ With its focus on “*te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*” (the language and Māori customs)—the ancient core of *te ao Māori*—Māori studies may reaffirm for those scholars the value of their own culturally informed teaching and research. In that sense, Māori studies provides a protective material *mauri* for Māori knowledge and scholars within the university.¹⁴

Māori studies fulfills various functions for Māori students. For example, at Otago many Māori students enroll in various professional courses, such as physical education or law, but wish to continue their study of the *reo* and culture. Timms stressed how Māori studies also assists Māori students in strengthening their self-identification as Māori people; this is especially important for those students who come to university having lost or never known what *iwi* they affiliate with (Timms 2007, 6, 9). Having a Māori cultural space in the university where, for example, students can

practice the performing arts and experience *whānautanga* has significant emotional and spiritual value, especially for those living far from home.

CONNECTIONS WITH INDIGENOUS AND PACIFIC WORLDS

Māori studies scholars have always been conscious of the international dimension of their subject, especially in relation to the academic subjects of indigenous and Pacific studies with which it shares many characteristics. Mead argued, “The world of ideas has always been open to us and we must travel that world and learn from it” (1997, 33). Mason Durie stressed the importance of Māori participating in “the aspirations and politics of an emerging confederation of indigenous peoples” (1997, 6). Māori studies scholars recognize that developing their own theories and research models goes hand in hand with theory that provides points of critical resistance against hegemonic structures of the dominant society, using critical theorists such as Antonio Gramsci, Paulo Freire, Frantz Fanon, or bell hooks to establish an alternative space for Māori as an autonomous group sharing a particular ideology. In that sense, Māori studies reflects “the international group of studies variously called native studies, black studies, indigenous studies or aboriginal studies,” which all seek to use universities for the betterment of indigenous cultures (Mead 1997, 43). All share “a history of colonization, subjection to cultural imperialism and a protracted struggle for cultural survival and emancipation against the powerful forces of the nation-state, the political economy and the ideology of assimilation” (R Walker 1999, 187). These affinities are demonstrated by the inclusion of “Indigenous Studies” as part of the English-language names of the Māori studies schools at Otago and Canterbury. In Otago’s case, the school offers a master’s degree in indigenous studies, which includes courses on international indigenous scholarship, Pacific Islands studies, and Māori studies, excluding *te reo Māori*.

Māori studies has had a long relationship with Pacific studies, so much so that some scholars lump them together (Wesley-Smith 1995, 116). Part of this bond is genealogical or cultural, for the islands of eastern Oceania or Polynesia remain the original *Hawaiki* (homeland) of the Māori ancestors. Ultimately, *mātauranga Māori* itself is “a body of knowledge” that these ancestors brought with them to New Zealand (Hook 2007, 11). According to Mead, “Maori Studies is Polynesian studies because Polynesia is the region against which we can understand our situation. The Maori case is but one example of events in Polynesia, of which we are an

integral part” (1997, 32). Wiremu (Bill) Parker, who taught *te reo Māori* at Victoria, proverbially alluded to this close relationship: “He kokoru noa koe e ruku. Ka hora te Moana-nui-a-Kiwa. (Explore a mere bay and the great ocean of Kiwa [The Pacific] opens).”¹⁵ Not surprisingly, individual Māori studies scholars such as Biggs and Mead are equally recognized for their research on Pacific languages, art, and artifacts.

These intellectual bonds also shape the ties between Māori and Pacific studies. Both subjects emphasize an “empowerment rationale” whereby Pacific or Māori scholars undertake “acts of political, cultural, and historical reclamation and stewardship,” teaching and researching their languages and other cultural knowledges, including spirituality, in order “to create ‘systematized bodies of knowledge,’ rooted in indigenous histories and cultures” (Diaz and Kauanui 2001, 318; Wesley-Smith 1995, 124–126). Both subjects share a vast store of cultural metaphors, drawn from a common world of values as people of the *moana* (sea) and the *whenua* (land), and expressed through cognate languages that Māori and Pacific scholars devote much energy to teaching to generations of students. They also share a foundational understanding of the interdependent physical and spiritual worlds, as well as the way introduced religions, such as Christianity, were converted for use by different Island communities (see Diaz and Kauanui 2001, 318–321). Just as each Island people adapted the inherited ancestral culture to the particular circumstances of their new land, so Māori and Pacific studies have adapted themselves in various ways, according to need, while retaining common cultural and intellectual foundations.

Māori, Pacific, and indigenous studies are linked by their ambition to inhabit interdisciplinary spaces, what Graeme Whimp has called the *vā*, “the space between, the separation that connects” (2008, 412). In many of these programs, a typical graduate will attain competencies in at least one vernacular language and in cultural and customary knowledges, and will gain insights through instruction from academics with diverse research interests in the humanities and social sciences. What distinguishes these scholars is their desire to break out of old disciplinary boundaries in order to create a new space and a new kind of voice for these studies of different indigenous peoples. An advantage of interdisciplinarity is its concern to break down the academy’s institutional isolation from wider communities (Whimp 2008, 406)—the same impulse that links Māori and Pacific scholars and students to their wider *iwi* and Island communities, respectively. To be a Māori, Pacific, or indigenous scholar is to be engaged—

indissolubly linked—by ties of kinship, affection, and moral and intellectual purpose to these worlds beyond the confines of the university. But Teresia Teaiwa warned that Pacific studies must rigorously critique not just the past “sins of colonialism and imperialism” but also more present ones such as “indigenous violence, corruption, neglect, and obfuscation” (2010, 117)—a critical awareness shared by many Māori and other indigenous scholars. As Edward Said reminded us, “for the intellectual, tough searching debate is the core of activity” (1994, 66).

Teaiwa distinguished what she called “Native or Indigenous Studies”—a description she applied to Māori studies, which focuses on one land and people and is frequently marked by “nationalistic ethnocentrism”—from Pacific studies, which is marked by its “commitment to making comparisons within and across the region” (Teaiwa 2010, 115, 117). This characterization of Māori studies may be true for some of its exponents, especially in more recent years when Māori and Pacific studies have often become institutionally separated, but the history of Māori studies since 1952 argues against such a narrow view being universally espoused. After all, Parker’s proverb encourages us not to swim simply in the one bay of Māori studies, but to stretch out farther into the inviting moana beyond and develop an understanding of the wider Pacific. At least some Māori studies scholars who are deeply grounded in “te reo me ngā tikanga Māori” remain just as keen on learning other vernaculars of their tuakana (elder siblings) of the Pacific, and on making comparisons between Pacific places, peoples, languages, and histories. Such an Oceanic consciousness suggests that Māori studies is not entirely confined to these southern Polynesian islands of Aotearoa and Te Waipounamu. For example, the first two heads of Māori studies at Otago, Pohatu and Ka’ai, embraced the Pacific, first as part of a Māori studies major and later as a separate subject.¹⁶ Consequently, the school amended its name to include Pacific studies, now an equal partner standing alongside Māori studies.

THE ROLE OF NONINDIGENOUS/PĀKEHĀ RESEARCHERS

For a Pākehā scholar in Māori studies this will seem an obvious subject of enquiry, but the issue is also raised by Māori researchers. Thus, Āneta Rāwiri asked, “Are Indigenous community-based collaborative research partnerships with non-Indigenous researchers possible?” (2007, 45). According to Rāwiri they are, but only when the nonindigenous researcher is willing to work outside Western intellectual frameworks and

instead operate according to “our cherished ancestral ways of life and values.” This requires a Pākehā researcher to acquire the language and learn about these cultural values (L Smith 1999, 177). Thus, from its inception Māori studies has always taught non-Māori students, as indeed do the modern wānanga, with the expectation that they conform to prevalent cultural practices. Huia Jahnke described how one Māori woman developed a coalition with Pākehā advisors in order to create strategies for her school. Jahnke commented that “privileged individuals . . . who are not themselves victims of racial domination are capable of choosing to support the work on behalf of those that are” (2001, 14). In Bishop’s whānau of interest, a nonindigenous researcher should become a part of the whānau: “for non-Indigenous researchers to stand aside from participation . . . is to promote colonization” (Bishop 1998, 214). Instead, they had to learn some “essential” behaviors: “listening, observing, imitating, respecting the tapu of knowledge and experience of kaumātua, and deferring to the group” (Glynn and Bishop 1995, 40). Graham Smith modeled several “bicultural” partnerships that shared a researcher’s power with the research community; for example, the tiaki model involved mentoring and sponsorship of the researcher by “authoritative Maori people,” while the whāngai model “incorporated [researchers] into the daily life of Maori” and developed a “life-long relationship” between the parties (L Smith 1999, 177–178).

Joan Metge, a Pākehā anthropologist and an example of Smith’s whāngai model, has reflected on Ngata’s famous saying, partly quoted by Mead. In it, Ngata stressed the distinctive natures of Māori and Pākehā knowledges; for him, they complemented each other and together made up a whole (Metge 1976, 313). Metge suggested that Māori and Pākehā cultures are complementary opposites: “the two opposites are seen as mutually defining each other and united in a larger whole by shared characteristics and the process of mediation” (Metge 1976, 320). Hook argued that a better description is “‘complementary respect’ where we each recognize our differences and indeed celebrate those differences” (2006, 10). Elsewhere, Metge envisioned “Māori and Pākehā working together as partners to create another common national culture in which everyone has a share.” Such a process would involve “people from different and even opposing backgrounds [working] their way through to understanding, reconciliation and even friendship” (Tremaine 2003, 60–61).

By contrast, Mason Durie argued that the preference by Māori students and communities is for teaching and research to be undertaken by Māori

(1996, 26–27). As a rule, Pākehā simply do not possess either the cultural knowledge or the subjective insights that Māori scholars do. However, those individual Pākehā I have observed in Māori studies, equipped with the *reo* and associated values, are probably best seen as exceptions to this rule since they normally have very positive relationships with their students, colleagues, or the particular Māori communities with whom they work. Such Pākehā work cooperatively with Māori colleagues, often taking a supporting collaborative role. They model behavior that is *whakaiti* (being humble) rather than *whakahīhi* (being self-conceited) (Metge 1986, 81–88). Examples include the contributions of Jane McRae and Jenifer Curnow, who have published about historical Māori-language newspapers and who helped produce the new edition of Ngata’s song-poetry collection, *Ngā Mōteatea* (Ngata 2004–2007), and Neil Grove, who coauthored the collection of proverbial sayings, *Ngā Pepeha*, with Mead (Mead and Grove 2001).

Pohatu described a historical moment in the 1980s when criticism of Pākehā appointments in Māori studies became very evident, and he asked Homi Bhabha’s question: “Must we always polarize and polemize?” (1998, 88, 217).¹⁷ Pohatu thought polarization inevitable, at least initially, because of the Western world’s dominance over indigenous interests. However, the Māori legal history researcher, Paul Meredith, deployed Bhabha’s ideas of hybridity and third space, that “liminal or in-between space . . . critical of essentialist positions of identity and a conceptualisation of ‘original or originary culture’” (Meredith 1999, 13). He applied them to a New Zealand context as a way of getting beyond what he called the “binary of Māori (the colonised) *or* Pākehā (the coloniser),” with its “adversarial polarities premised on exclusion and purity” (Meredith 1999, 12; emphasis in original). In place of “us-them” he posited “both/and,” which acknowledges and negotiates the differences as well as the affinities existing among New Zealand’s communities (Meredith 1999, 12, 14). Such repositioning recognizes the complex reality in Māori studies where students are affiliated through their parents to multiple cultures.

Other positive models for indigenous and nonindigenous intellectual and cultural relationships include that of Ocean Ripeka Mercier, who draws on M Nakata’s “cultural interface,” an experiential nexus between indigenous knowledge and the West’s (Nakata 2002). The interface is a “neutral space” where neither indigenous nor Western knowledge “is set above the other” or “used as a means of measuring the value of the other.” Here indigenous and Western peoples are equal and active participants, sharing

in the benefits of the interface, while both “retain control over their own knowledge.” This interface becomes “a third space, an interstitial space, a space in which local knowledge traditions can be reframed, decentred and the social organisation of trust can be negotiated” (Mercier 2007, 21–24). A second model, from Augie Fleras and Roger Maaka, criticizes the “adversarial mentality” that exists between the New Zealand Crown and Māori parties making claims against it under the Treaty of Waitangi. In its place the authors argued for “a constructive engagement model of intergroup dynamics.” This would provide “a more flexible approach that emphasises engagement rather than autonomy, relationships rather than rights, interdependence rather than opposition, cooperation rather than competition, restoration rather than restitution, and power-sharing rather than power conflict.” At its heart such a model assumes “a commitment for belonging together with our (fundamental) differences” (Fleras and Maaka 1998, 46–47).

CONCLUSION

Coming together to participate in common tasks gives expression to the important Māori value of *kōtahitanga*. As Metge pointed out, such a community recognizes that “each member is of value in his or her own right and made to feel significant and wanted” while at the same time differences “are acknowledged, accepted and provided for” (1976, 316). This describes well the cultural dynamic that underpins Māori studies and should guide any relationship between Māori, Pacific, or nonindigenous students, researchers, colleagues, partners, and friends. The teaching of Māori studies at universities may be imagined as a *marae* (open space for rituals of encounter), welcoming and uniting strangers and people of the land, with the behavior of both parties premised on the values of *manaakitanga* and respect. Such a collective approach is far stronger, I believe, than anything one of us can do on our own. This is a philosophy found within the ancient *whare wānanga*, an ancestral teaching institution that today’s *wānanga* and Māori studies programs identify with.

I end with the thoughts of *tohunga* (scholar) Māori Marsden (2003, 78–79), who described how a student of the *whare wānanga* dedicated to the spirit power *Tāne* went into the forest for two weeks “to meditate and fast” before facing an examination by his teachers. When asked what the spirit of *Tāne* had taught him, he described how he had sat under some *kahikatea* trees and reflected on why these trees had such a shallow root

system. He realized that kahikatea trees grew together so that in storms one tree “is held in place by the roots of another.” Just so, the student realized, a person who is part of a group will be supported by them all “standing together.”

* * *

PARTS OF THIS PAPER *were originally read as a 2008 Humanities Open Lecture at the University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand. Thanks to the audience members who encouraged me to revise it for publication and the colleagues who commented on an earlier version of this paper: Peter Adds, Rawinia Higgins, Brendan Hokowhitu, and Nathan Matthews. The paper has greatly benefited from the two anonymous reviewers and the editor, Terence Wesley-Smith, who very kindly provided additional readings. All remaining errors and omissions are solely my responsibility: “He Pākehā anake au” (I am only a Pākehā).*

Notes

1 New Zealand’s universities are all publicly owned and funded. The oldest four were constituent colleges of the University of New Zealand from 1871 to 1961: Otago was established in 1869, Canterbury in 1873, Auckland in 1882, and Victoria in 1897. They became independent universities in 1962, with two more, Waikato and Massey, following in 1964. Lincoln University was added in 1990 and the Auckland University of Technology (AUT) in 2000. After its debut in Auckland, Māori studies began to be taught at Victoria in 1965, Waikato in 1970, Massey in 1971, Canterbury in 1974, and Otago in 1981. In these institutions, Māori studies is taught as an undergraduate major subject and for postgraduate qualifications. By contrast, Lincoln teaches Māori studies across its undergraduate curriculum but only as a minor subject (Lincoln University 2009), while Auckland University of Technology concentrates on teaching the subject of Māori Development (AUT 2009).

2 Pākehā are the non-Māori people who live in and identify with New Zealand as their home.

3 Māori Studies Subject Conferences are periodically hosted by one of New Zealand’s universities. They bring together representatives from Māori studies units in all of New Zealand’s universities, including Lincoln and Auckland University of Technology. The aim of the conferences is to describe what everyone is doing and to propose plans for future subject developments. I attended the 2007 conference—my first—because I was then deputy dean of Te Tumu/School of Māori, Pacific and Indigenous Studies at Otago University, and I was leading the

Otago delegation to the conference. I also attended the 2008 conference as Te Tumu's acting dean.

4 These internal documents refer to the periodic reviews of the teaching, research, and service roles of individual academic units, such as Māori Studies, as part of each university's quality assurance processes. Review committees present their commendations and recommendations for future development in confidential reports, which are subsequently distributed to interested parties. I have only used reports that I had personal access to at the University of Otago.

5 A number of points in this paragraph were suggested by an anonymous reviewer.

6 This information is derived from the following websites (all accessed 4 February 2010):

University of Auckland Department of Māori Studies/Te Wānanga o Waipapa:
<http://www.arts.auckland.ac.nz/uoa/home/about/subjects-and-courses/maori-studies-1>

University of Waikato School of Māori and Pacific Development/Te Pua Wānanga ki te Ao:
<http://www.waikato.ac.nz/smpd/subjects/index.shtml>

Massey University School of Māori Studies/Te Pūtahi-a-Toi:
<http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/learning/departments/school-maori-studies/undergraduate-study>

Victoria University of Wellington School of Māori Studies/Te Kawa a Māui:
<http://www.victoria.ac.nz/maori/study/subjects/maor.aspx>

University of Canterbury School of Māori and Indigenous Studies/Aotahi:
<http://www.maori.canterbury.ac.nz/courseadvice.shtml>

7 In New Zealand, individual academic research is audited periodically for Performance-based Research Funding (PBRF) and given scores (A = international, B = national, C = active, and so on). Part of the government's university budget is allocated according to the PBRF audit. Academics know that work produced on New Zealand topics and published in New Zealand-based journals will score lower than work on non-New Zealand topics published overseas.

8 Today, this is an important proverbial saying often cited by Māori studies scholars. The full saying reads: "E tipu, e rea, mō ngā rā o tōu ao; ko tō ringa ki ngā rākau a te Pākehā hei ora mō tō tinana, ko tō ngākau ki ngā taonga a ō tīpuna hei tikitiki mō tō māhunga, ā ko tō wairua ki te Atua, nāna nei ngā mea katoa." (Grow and branch forth for the days of your world; your hand to the tools of the Pākehā for the welfare of your body, your heart to the treasures of your ancestors as adornments for your head, your spirit with God, who made all things.) Ngata's political skills lay behind the successful 1928 introduction of Māori as a subject in New Zealand's universities.

9 See NZUAAU 2005, 8; 2006a, 6; 2006b, 7; 2007, 7; see also Māori studies websites accessed 4 February 2010: Massey: <http://maori.massey.ac.nz/>; Auckland: <http://www.arts.auckland.ac.nz/uoa/home/about/departments-and-schools/maori-studies>

10 In 2003, Te Tumu/School of Māori, Pacific and Indigenous Studies signed protocols with local Ngāi Tahu rūnanga (councils), formally establishing its own partnership with the iwi, in which both parties committed themselves to collaborating and consulting each other; see Te Tumu 2009, 32–34.

11 See Te Tumu 2009, 31; <http://www.otago.ac.nz/staff/maoristaff.html> and <http://www.otago.ac.nz/maori/index.html> [both accessed 8 March 2010].

12 See <http://www.otago.ac.nz/administration/policies/otago0003272.html> [accessed 8 March 2010]

13 These comments are partly based on personal observations. Resistance at the individual departmental level can include criticisms alleging “political correctness” on the part of the university for introducing Māori policy; accusations of special treatment of Māori, implying that Pākehā are being discriminated against; unfavorable comparisons alleging a more primitive Māori culture when compared to the sophistication of European civilization; or negative personal responses to Māori scholars, including marginalization within a department.

14 A mauri can take two forms: first, a material object (such as a stone) that serves as a medium for the gods and protects people from any harm; and second, the “immaterial ‘life-principle’” of someone or something that ensures continuing life and prosperity. A material mauri is set up to protect an immaterial one (Hanson and Hanson 1983, 62–64). This image was suggested to me by the protective mauri, in the form of local stones, located at the entry to Te Tumu/School of Māori, Pacific, and Indigenous Studies at Otago.

15 The proverb appeared in the Wellington, New Zealand, *Evening Post*, reporting Bill’s retirement in 1980 (“Maori Teacher Retires after Active Career”). Various minor mistakes in the paper’s reported Māori text have been corrected.

16 Pohatu had strong ties with Hawaiian scholars and spent a sabbatical leave at the University of the South Pacific. Through her Hawaiian ancestry, Ka‘ai possessed especially close connections with fellow Hawaiian scholars, while her genealogical affiliations with Sāmoa assisted relations especially with the National University of Sāmoa. Another Otago Māori studies academic teaches a section on te reo Māori in a university dialectology course in Tahiti.

17 Exclusions of Pākehā from academic positions occurred in Māori studies at Victoria on several occasions around this time. One of them involved me; in 1985, shortly after submitting my master’s thesis in Māori studies, I was let go from a temporary language-teaching role following student complaints about being instructed by a Pākehā. The head of department, Sidney Mead, explained that it was not about me as a person, but rather as a structure, that is, as a Pākehā teaching in Māori studies. About this time he also wrote, “How can a

victim of oppression take from the hand of the oppressor the very substance of his identity?" (Mead 1997, 31). I heard of other Pākehā who felt obliged to stop researching Māori topics. Exclusions on the basis of the epidermis continue here and there but are not endorsed by all. Pākehā graduates of Māori studies are frequently supported by their Māori teachers, who value their research as much as that of their other students. After losing my job at Victoria, my former Māori language teacher, Bill Parker, wrote work references for me, even calling me to his hospital bedside during his final illness in order to double-check the facts for one last reference. Such gestures show the caliber of Māori studies scholars and the extent of their commitment to their students.

References

- AUT, Auckland University of Technology
 2009 Te Ara Poutama. Updated on 1 September 2009. Available at <http://www.aut.ac.nz/study-at-aut/study-areas/te-ara-poutama> [accessed 15 February 2010]
- Barlow, Cleve
 1991 *Tikanga Whakaaro: Key Concepts in Māori Culture*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Barrowman, Rachel
 1999 *Victoria University of Wellington 1899–1999: A History*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Biggs, Bruce
 1978 Appendix: Te Whakaako i te Reo Māori i te Whare Waananga o Aakarana [Teaching Māori in the University of Auckland]. In *Inter-University Maori Studies Conference, 17–19 August: Report to the New Zealand Vice Chancellors' Committee and Participating Universities*, edited by Sidney M Mead, 1–8. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington. [Text partly in Māori and partly in English]
- Bishop, Russell
 1998 Freeing Ourselves from Neo-colonial Domination in Research: A Maori Approach to Creating Knowledge. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 11 (2): 199–219.
- Cram, Fiona, Vera Keefe, Clint Ormsby, and Wayne Ormsby
 1997 Memory-work and Māori Health Research: Discussion of a Qualitative Method. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 3 (1): 37–45.
- Cram, Fiona, and Linda Smith
 2003 Māori Women Talk about Accessing Health Care. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 7 (2): 1–8.
- Dewes, Te Kapunga
 1975 The Case for Oral Arts. In *Te Ao Hurihuri: The World Moves On*:

- Aspects of Maoritanga*, edited by Michael King, 55–85. Wellington: Hicks Smith.
- Diaz, Vicente M, and J Kēhaulani Kauanui
 2001 Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge. *The Contemporary Pacific* 13:315–341.
- Durie, Arohia
 1995 Kia Hiwa Rā: Challenges for Māori Academics in Changing Times. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 1 (1): 1–9.
- Durie, E T
 1996 Viewpoint: Taku Titiro; Waitangi Day Address, Wellington, 6 February 1996. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 1 (2): 8–10.
- Durie, Mason H
 1996 The Development of Māori Studies in New Zealand Universities. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 1 (2): 21–32.
 1997 Taku Titiro: Māori Advancement into Te Aonui. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 3 (1): 6–10.
 1998 *Te Mana, Te Kāwanatanga: The Politics of Māori Self-Determination*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
 2000 Concluding Remarks. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 6 (1): 52–57. [Address to Toi te Kupu, Toi te Mana, Toi te Whenua: Māori Development in a Global Society Conference, 4–6 July 2000]
- Eketone, Anaru
 2008 Theoretical Underpinnings of Kaupapa Māori Directed Practice. *MAI Review* 1, Target Article: 1–11. Available online at <http://www.review.mai.ac.nz>
- Fleras, Augie, and Roger Maaka
 1998 Rethinking Claims-making as Māori Affairs Policy. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 3 (2): 43–51.
- Glynn, Ted, and Russell Bishop
 1995 Cultural Issues in Educational Research. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 1 (1): 37–43.
- Gillies, Annemarie, Rāwiri Tinirau, and Noreen Mako
 2007 Whakawhanaungatanga: Extending the Networking Concept. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 8 (2): 29–37.
- Hanson, F Allan, and Louise Hanson
 1983 *Counterpoint in Maori Culture*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Hohepa, Patrick
 2000 Towards 2030 AD (2): Māori Language Regeneration: Strategies, Government, People. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 5 (2): 10–15.
- Hook, G Raumati
 2006 A Future for Māori Education Part I: The Dissociation of Culture and

- Education. *MAI Review* 1, Article 2: 1–14. Available online at <http://www.review.mai.ac.nz>
- 2007 A Future for Māori Education Part II: The Reintegration of Culture and Education. *MAI Review* 1, Target Article: 1–17. Available online at <http://www.review.mai.ac.nz>
- Hutchings, Jessica
- 2004 Claiming Our Ethical Space: A Mana Wahine Conceptual Framework for Discussing Genetic Modification. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 8 (1): 17–26.
- IRI, International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education
- 2000 Māori Research Development: Kaupapa Māori Principles and Practices: A Literature Review. Report prepared for Te Puni Kōkiri [Ministry of Māori Development]. Auckland: IRI with Te Rōpū Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pōmare. Available at http://www.kaupapamaori.com/assets/Maori_research.pdf
- Jahnke, Huia Tomlins
- 1997 Towards a Theory of Mana Wahine. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 3 (1): 27–36.
- 2001 Navigating the Education Workplace: A Māori Centred Approach to Researching Māori Women in Educational Organisations. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 6 (2): 9–17.
- Jennings, John M
- 2002 *Research Audit of New Zealand Universities 2000–2001: A Summary of Findings*. AAU Series on Quality Number 8. Wellington: New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit. Available at <http://www.nzuaau.ac.nz/node/66> [accessed 1 February 2010]
- Johnston, Patricia Maringi G
- 1999 This Is Not Just Another Story: A Journey to Discover What Counts as Research. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 4 (2): 4–11.
- Ka'ai, Tania M
- 2000 *Ngā Hua o te Mātauranga Māori i roto i te Whare Wānanga: The Value of Māori Studies in the University*. Inaugural Professorial Lecture. Dunedin: University of Otago.
- Kāretu, Tīmoti S
- 1989 From Language Studies to Department of Māori. In *The University of Waikato: Twenty-five Years (1964–1989)*, 72–78. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- 1995 Te Tau o Te Reo Māori: He Whakaaro. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 1 (1): i–iv. [Text in Māori]
- Keefe, Vera, Clint Ormsby, Bridget Robson, Papaarangi Reid, Fiona Cram, Gordon Purdie, and Ngati Kahungunu Iwi Authority Incorporated
- 1999 Kaupapa Māori Meets Retrospective Cohort. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 5 (1): 12–17.

Lincoln University

- 2009 Centre for Māori and Indigenous Planning and Development. Updated on 19 November 2009. Available at <http://www.lincoln.ac.nz/About-Lincoln-University/University-structure-and-staff/Staff-and-faculties/Faculty-of-Environment-Society-and-Design/Centre-for-Maori-and-Indigenous-Planning-and-Development/> [accessed 4 February 2010]

Marsden, Māori

- 2003 Mātauranga Māori, Mātauranga Pākehā. In *The Woven Universe: Selected Writings of Rev. Māori Marsden*, edited by Te Ahukaramū Charles Royal, 73–79. NP: The Estate of Rev. Māori Marsden.

Mead, Sidney Moko

- 1997 *Landmarks, Bridges and Visions: Aspects of Maori Culture*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Mead, Sidney Moko, editor

- 1978 *Inter-University Maori Studies Conference, 17–19 August: Report to the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee and Participating Universities*. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington. [Only available copy in University of Auckland Library]

Mead, Hirini [Sidney] Moko, and Neil Grove

- 2001 *Ngā Pēpeha a Ngā Tipuna: The Sayings of the Ancestors*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Mercier, Ocean Ripeka

- 2007 Indigenous Knowledge and Science: A New Representation of the Interface between Indigenous and Eurocentric Ways of Knowing. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 8 (2): 20–28.

Meredith, Paul

- 1999 Hybridity in the Third Space: Rethinking Bi-cultural Politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 4 (2): 12–16.

Metge, Joan

- 1976 *The Maoris of New Zealand Rautahi*. Revised edition. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- 1986 *In and Out of Touch: Whakamaa in Cross-cultural Context*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Mikaere, Annie

- 1998 Taku Titiro: Viewpoint: Rhetoric, Reality and Recrimination: Striving to Fulfill the Bicultural Commitment at Waikato Law School. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 3 (2): 4–14.

Mutu, Margaret

- 1998 Barriers to Research: The Constraints of Imposed Frameworks. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 4 (1): 9–18.

Nakata, M

- 2002 Indigenous Knowledge and the Cultural Interface: Underlying Issues at the Intersection of Knowledge and Information Systems. *International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions Journal* 28:281–291.

Ngata, Apirana

- 2004–2007 *Ngā Mōteatea: He Maramara Rere nō ngā Waka Maha/The Songs: Scattered Pieces from Many Canoe Areas*. 4 volumes. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

NZUAAU, New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit

- 2005 *University of Canterbury Academic Audit Report Cycle 3*. Wellington: NZUAAU.
 2006a *University of Waikato Academic Audit Report Cycle 3*. Wellington: NZUAAU.
 2006b *Auckland University of Technology Academic Audit Report Cycle 3*. Wellington: NZUAAU.
 2007 *Lincoln University Academic Audit Report Cycle 3*. Wellington: NZUAAU.

All NZUAAU reports available at <http://www.nzuaau.ac.nz/reports-and-papers> [accessed 1–15 February 2010]

Pawley, Andrew

- 2001 Bruce Biggs, 1921–2000: A Tribute. *Oceanic Linguistics* 40 (1): 1–19.

Pohatu, Godfrey H

- 1998 *The University, Maori Studies and Treaty Praxis*. PhD thesis, University of Otago, Dunedin.

Ratima, Matiu

- 2008 Making Space for Kaupapa Māori within the Academy. *MAI Review* 1, Peer Commentary: 1–3. Available online at <http://www.review.mai.ac.nz>

Rāwiri, Āneta Hinemihi

- 2007 Whanganui Iwi and Adult Literacy: Ngā Whiringa Muka; Indigenous Community-based Participatory Adult Literacy Research. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 8 (2): 38–47.

Royal, Te Ahukaramū Charles

- 1998 Te Ao Mārama: A Research Paradigm. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 4 (1): 1–8.

Said, Edward

- 1994 *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures*. London: Vintage.

Smith, Graham Hingangaroa

- 1995 Whakaoho Whānau: New Formations of Whānau as an Innovative

- Intervention into Māori Cultural and Educational Crises. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 1 (1): 18–36.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai
 1999 *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Tā Te Tumu Ake Arotahi
 2002 *Tā Te Tumu Ake Arotahi: Self Review*. Volume 1. [Dunedin]: Te Tumu/School of Māori Studies.
- Teaiwa, Teresia K
 2010 For or *Before* an Asia Pacific Studies Agenda? Specifying Pacific Studies. In *Remaking Area Studies: Teaching and Learning Across Asia and the Pacific*, edited by Terence Wesley-Smith and Jon Goss, 110–124. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.
- Te Tumu, School of Māori, Pacific and Indigenous Studies
 2009 Staff Handbook: Policies and Practices. University of Otago, Dunedin.
- Timms, Catriona
 2007 Whāia te Māramatanga: Māori Language Revitalisation and Tertiary Education in Te Ika ā Maui and Te Wai Pounamu. *MAI Review* 1, Article 2: 1–12. Available online at <http://www.review.mai.ac.nz>
- Tremaine, Marianne
 2003 Book Review: Joan Metge, *Kōrero Tahi: Talking Together*. *He Pukenga Kōrero* 7 (2): 60–61.
- University of Otago
 2003 University of Otago Charter. [Dunedin: University of Otago.]
 2008 Memorandum of Understanding. Available at <http://www.otago.ac.nz/about/otago0005277.html> [accessed 13 March 2008]
- Victoria University of Wellington
 2010 Toihuarewa. Available at <http://victoria.ac.nz/home/about/facschools/toihuarewa> [accessed 16 February 2010]
- Walker, Ranginui
 1996 *Ngā Pepa a Ranginui: The Walker Papers*. Auckland: Penguin Books.
 1998 Treaty of Waitangi Review of the University of Otago. [Dunedin:] University of Otago.
 1999 The Development of Maori Studies in Tertiary Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In *After the Disciplines: The Emergence of Cultural Studies*, edited by Michael Peters, 187–198. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
 2004 *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End*. Revised edition. Auckland: Penguin.
- Walker, Sheilagh
 1996 Kia Tau te Rangimarie: Kaupapa Māori Theory as a Resistance against

the Construction of Māori as the Other. MA thesis, Education Department, University of Auckland.

Wesley-Smith, Terence

1995 Editor's Forum: Rethinking Pacific Islands Studies. *Pacific Studies* 18 (2): 115–137.

Whimp, Graeme

2008 Interdisciplinarity and Pacific Studies: Roots and Routes. *The Contemporary Pacific* 20:397–421.

Williams, Herbert W

1988 *A Dictionary of the Maori Language*. Reprint, seventh edition. Wellington: GP Books.

Abstract

This paper examines the development of Māori studies since it was first taught as an academic subject at Auckland University in 1952. While retaining a strong focus on language learning, Māori studies increasingly includes other culture-based subjects. It espouses theories and methodologies that empower Māori communities and critique Eurocentric scholarship, such as kaupapa Māori. Māori studies is described as mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), although iwi (tribal-based) wānanga (colleges of learning) argue they are the appropriate repositories. Wānanga, teaching specific iwi knowledge, complement the generalizing Māori studies, which challenges Western universities from within. New Zealand's universities are developing Treaty of Waitangi-based relationships with Māori communities, and with their own Māori staff and students. However, Māori intellectual practices within Western university disciplines remain contested. Here Māori studies can help support Māori scholarship in the wider institution. Māori studies looks outward to indigenous and Pacific studies, all concerned to rebalance the effects of colonization and explore interdisciplinary spaces. Māori and Pacific studies share a common ancestry and cultural world of language and metaphor. Although frequently separated institutionally, with some Māori studies programs focusing exclusively on Māori, others embrace Pacific studies as equal partners. Māori studies instructs nonindigenous or Pākehā students, but many contest their teaching or research function. Others argue for bicultural research models incorporating Pākehā or nonindigenous researchers and enabling mutually respectful and beneficial relationships in place of a Māori/Pākehā binary opposition, a position acknowledging researchers with shared cultural affiliations.

KEYWORDS: Māori studies, kaupapa Māori, mātauranga Māori, indigenous studies, Pacific studies, wānanga, nonindigenous researchers