

## CHAPTER 4

# The Shadows and Silences of Colonialism: Resisting Eroding Realities for Māori Children Through Language Re-Vernacularisation in Antipodean New Zealand

*Mere Skerrett*

NEW ZEALAND (NZ), as a colony of Britain, is still marginalising and colonising Indigenous peoples, NZ society, and its education systems. The Māori are the Indigenous people of NZ. Staying with our racist colonialist past is important in order to deconstruct it and recognise ourselves as Indigenous peoples in our neocolonial/neoliberal present, especially if we want to transform it. Davies et al. (2013) discuss the construct of *recognition*, in the sense that acts of recognition (i.e., acts that are recognised and rewarded) simply serve, paradoxically, to reinforce the status quo or what is valued in society. Following in the behaviourist tradition, recognition assists in increasing the conformity of the collective by rewarding individuals according to the values of the norm, simultaneously shaping those values of the norm. The process acts as a unifying force, a powerful standardising force. The system of recognition then, as a system of societal/neocolonial control, is an authoritative regulating force resulting in the oxymoron of the rational autonomous/repressed subject, subjected to norms yet longing to escape the terms of subjection. It is this guise of the rational autonomous, yet regulated, individual which leads to cognitive dissonance and tensions between the colonizers/

colonized of colonialism. These tensions highlight the need to critically deconstruct how recognition operates, for example through the media, through schools and other societal constructs, whilst at the same time resisting those power constructs.

Failure to locate our Indigenous lives in colonial relations ‘past’ and neocolonial relations ‘now’ operationalises the status quo of White supremacy or presumptions of power whilst simultaneously silencing Indigenous voices and erasing Indigenous histories. The loss of a past through colonialism always leads to tensions through the loss of a present and presence, with the stress and trauma of not knowing and forced becomings being passed down through the generations. The dominant settler view continues to structurally mask the sometimes subtle, sometimes not, yet always harmful ways colonialism happens in the now. That explains why racism (Bonilla-Silva, 2012), through its racial grammar, and linguisticism (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2015), through language hierarchies, are so difficult to eradicate and, importantly, why we must stay with our colonial past. Bonilla-Silva (2012) argues that racial domination “works best when it becomes hegemonic, that is, when it accomplishes its goal without much fanfare” (p. 173). Skutnabb-Kangas (2015) argues that language domination provides the ideologies, structures and practices to discriminate between peoples based on the language(s) they speak.

In colonial NZ, racial domination was obtained through a hegemonic system of governance used by the British through an effective device known as *indirect rule*. This system controlled the colony through utilising the pre-existing Indigenous power structures (Simon, 1998) whilst entrenching Britain’s common law system. In NZ, the indirect rule of colonialism led to societal relations of *Pākehā* domination and Māori subordination in all aspects of living, speaking, being and becoming. Furthermore, Bonilla-Silva (2012) adds, racial domination generates a grammar that maintains the racial order as ‘just the way things are,’ without question. Maintenance of the status quo or hegemonic normalising discourses shape how we see, or don’t see, the ‘world’ (as if that is real), how we frame, think and feel about matters of ‘race’ in a world now dominated by racial ideologies. He coined the term ‘racial grammar,’ a distillate of racial ideology and, hence, of White supremacy. Moreover, he proposed that if racial ideologies furnish the material that is spoken, argued and transacted, then it is racial grammar that “provides the ‘deep structure’, the ‘logic’ and ‘rules’ of proper composition of racial statements and, more importantly, of what can be seen, understood, [recognised] and even felt about racial matters” (Bonilla-Silva, 2012, p. 174). The grammar of racial discourse is acquired through social interaction and communication in the same way that we acquire the grammar of language/s which change over time. This grammar construct is helpful because it gives us a tool to question and rethink the histories and colonialist practices that create and maintain racist institutions and, of import to this chapter, education institutions. Schools and early childhood settings are not some universal, sacrosanct institutions that exist because ‘that is the way they are’. They are carefully designed constructs, with structures, histories, curriculum, signs, symbols, words, songs, dances, drama, arts, routines, and so on which, in NZ, signify and reproduce *Pākehā* (British)

Whiteness. To move backward into our futures, we must face forward into our pasts. This chapter stays with our colonialist past, the silences and erasures which cemented European Pākehā racial dominance, forcing Indigenous Māori subordination to live in the shadows of our lands. It argues that as Māori lands shifted to European freehold ownership title, Māori language/s shifted to a written English alphabet grammar. The accompanying racial grammar adapted to, and embedded in, the structures of NZ society lead to Māori subjugation, forcing us to live in the shadows and echoes of our language/s. Finally, this chapter traverses the struggles to shift Māori children from the margins of society through the early years' language revitalization movement which is Te Kōhanga Reo (Māori language nests).

## Colonial Positionings

NZ's colonial history is replete with the hallmarks of colonial violence. Mutu (2010) chronicles how NZ was annexed to New South Wales, then under British rule, in 1839. Annexation meant some form of British governance and policy had to be established, ostensibly in order to control the lawlessness of British settlers and offer protections to Māori, the Indigenous people. But, as with all 'protectorates' or 'trucial states' (states where treaties are signed), there is always a far more sinister agenda of invasion through settler colonialism. The guise of protection was a cover for ushering in land-hungry settler immigrants. As the balance of power gradually swung from Māori social structures to the advancing numbers of British immigrants, the British property (privatising land), political (common law) and sociolinguistic (monolingual English) systems were also ushered in. This property system regulated by common law principles facilitated the alienation of Māori lands and resources, away from the *Mana Whenua* (local tribal peoples with jurisdiction over lands) to the farming British immigrants, forever altering Māori people's lives. As Banner (1999) puts it,

the centrality of property within the thought of both peoples, however, meant that the transformation of Māori into English property rights involved much more than land. Religious belief, engagement with the market economy, political organization—all were bound up in the systems by which both peoples organized property rights in land. To anglicize the Māori property system was to revolutionize Māori life. (p. 807)

The transformation, initially by stealth, was all too soon to become all about wealth for Britain and its settlers. As Mutu (2010) documents, in March 1834, Aotearoa's first flag, the flag of the United Tribes was designed. The following year, James Busby, the British Resident in NZ, called a hui on 28 October at Waitangi, and by the end of that day, 34 chiefs had signed *He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tireni* (known in

English as the *Declaration of Independence of the United Tribes of New Zealand*) formally acknowledged by King William IV of England in May 1836. That declaration asserted that mana (authority) and sovereign power in New Zealand resided *fully* with Māori through their Confederation of United Tribes. There were three other elements:

1. Foreigners (the British or French mainly) would **not** be allowed to make laws;
2. Te Whakaminenga, the Confederation of United Tribes, was to meet at Waitangi each autumn to frame laws; and
3. in return for their protection, of British subjects in their territory the chiefs sought King William's protection against threats to their mana.

At that time, in 1835, Māori also thanked the king for acknowledging their flag, symbolic of Māori sovereignty. However, the king died in 1837, leaving his teenage niece, Victoria, to succeed him. Still, Māori continued signing the declaration. By July 1839, 52 chiefs had signed it, including Te Wherowhero, who was to become New Zealand's first Māori king.<sup>1</sup>

As the declaration was officially acknowledged by the British government, Busby saw it as a significant mark of Māori national identity and believed it would prevent other countries from making formal deals with Māori or claims on Māori lands. The laws of England then applied as in January 1840 (Webb, Sanders & Scott, 2010). The next critical move was the creation of a treaty between Māori and the British Crown, signed in February 1840, and meant to deliver us (Māori) from evil. But the reverse happened. We came under the hammer of the hierarchical British rule both classist and racist. Māori have been challenging the system that resulted from signing Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi) ever since. Māori customary rights were systematically eroded, despite King William's acknowledgement of Māori sovereignty, and Queen Victoria's treaty, leading Māori to often ask, 'Trick or treat/y?'

Abbas (2020) discusses how royal families were implicated in the subjugation of Indigenous peoples for economic gain. He cites the example of a documentary series *Britain's Forgotten Slave Owners*. This tells the untold history of British involvement in the slave trade which permeated more sections of society than the British were led to believe, cutting across the British royal family, the aristocracy and the banking and industrial classes. The British continued to own slaves up until 1833 when owning slaves became illegal. The spoils of slavery, however, persisted. Slavery gave Britain and British people great wealth, having fuelled its economic development including the industrial revolution and key socio-political infrastructures that still benefit them today.

But by the mid-19th century, when the slave trade was no longer the pillar of the colonial economies of Europe, other wealth-creating and exploitative projects were embarked upon. Centuries of plunder with the still extant slavery mindset led to British Europeans setting their sights on the lands and resources of the Pacific. The race was

on between the Europeans to gain a foothold in the vast Māori lands and resources of Aotearoa, culminating in the British signing a treaty with Māori (before the French). The act of ‘treaty-ing’, implicated in the same long-standing wealth-creating tactics and undergirding ideologies of slavery, was met with considerable debate, scepticism, and concern on the part of the Māori chieftainship in 1840.

One of the prominent chiefs at the time of signing Te Tiriti, Nōpera Panakareao, an influential leader of the north, supported its signing. According to Salmond (2017), he was essential to the Kaitiāia signings of 28 April 1840 alongside his wife, Eleanora. During the meeting at Kaitiāia, he was the last speaker before signing when he asked his people to accept Governor William Hobson. He then spoke the now-famous words, “The shadow of the land will go to Queen, but the substance remains with us” (Orange, 2004, p. 38). Only a year later, in 1841, the missionary Richard Taylor noted that Panakareao reversed his statement, that he feared the substance of the land would go to the British and the shadow only be left for Māori (Department of Internal Affairs, 1991). Panakareao’s prediction foreshadowed the dark ages of colonialism to come.

Evison (1997), in his book *The Long Dispute: Māori Land Rights and European Colonisation in Southern New Zealand*, documents how mounting pressure for Māori lands in the 1800s, in the face of much Māori resistance, left Māori the shadow portions. Skulduggery was rife. Many land deals through dodgy land deeds and forced land sales left all the southern tribal groupings landless and without the means to eke out an existence. Any hint of resistance often led to the threat of government troops being sent in against them. Contract/s were regularly breached as the land continued to be alienated through unlawful confiscations, illegal land sales, continuous dodgy deeds, deliberately misprinted maps with makeshift boundaries, immigrant settler/squatter thefts and racist settler-government political and legislative processes.

Evison argues that with the transformation and colonisation of Aotearoa, a new ethic crept into NZ affairs: deliberate lying by prominent Crown public servants like Kemp and Mantell through to the top echelons of Crown representation, the British queen’s representative Governor Grey. It is the primary role of the governor to grant royal assent to legislation and to summon and dissolve *elected* parliaments. But our settler government was never elected into power. In fact, it took nearly three decades for Māori men to gain the vote and even longer for Māori women. Legislation from Britain was imported holus-bolus, one case in point being the land privatising schedules of the Enclosure Acts of Britain. These land acts eroded Māori customary rights (the rights to sustain livelihoods through land use) in precisely the same way that it alienated land in support of the British ‘class’ society. The series of Enclosure Acts caused people in Britain to become homeless as their land was stripped through the law itself. Karl Marx observed:

The law itself becomes the instrument of the theft of the people’s land. . . . The parliamentary form of the robbery is that of Acts for enclosures of Commons, in

other words, decrees by which the landlords grant themselves the people's land as private property, decrees of expropriation of the people. (Sharman, 1989, p. 45)

Between 1600 and 1900, there were more than 5,000 parliamentary acts which transformed land use for more than one fifth of England (Sharman, 1989), so by the time the British annexed Aotearoa, they were well versed in alienating customary lands in support of the newly landed gentry.

In a common law<sup>2</sup> country where *customary rights* are grounded, Indigenous customary rights are meant to be protected. In international law, a settled country must also recognise the *customary rights* of the Indigenous people. But Māori customary rights and protections offered under the newly established NZ parliamentary system did not last long. The test was first put to the courts in 1847, which found that, under the treaty, Māori customary rights were protected. But after that initial case, mounting pressure by settler immigrants led to a retrenchment of that ruling and the entrenchment of illegal land transfers, land wars and land confiscations. It was to take approximately 140 years for any real traction to occur within NZ's judiciary and legislative system in terms of honouring the treaty. The establishment of a NZ parliamentary system (and its developing administrative, political, legal and provincial ruling systems) based on the British system became the mechanism via which Māori customary rights were systematically legislated into the shadows as foretold by Panakareao.

## Imperialism and Its Colonial Powers

Evison (1997) discusses how Governor Grey, a British soldier, explorer and colonial administrator in NZ, Australia and South Africa and governor of NZ twice at pivotal times (1845–1853<sup>3</sup> and 1861–1868), was instrumental in leading the wars which spanned nearly three decades from 1845 to 1872. Grey was a key figure in the shaping of NZ war history, shaping societal discourse and introducing a racial grammar. He secured the Wellington area in 1846 as the future 'capital' and the seat of power. He prevented Ngāti Toa's prominent chief Te Rauparaha from any political activity by stealthily landing his ship, the HMS *Driver*, at Te Rauparaha's peacetime village, his *Taupō*,<sup>4</sup> in the middle of the night. At daybreak, he sent in a landing party of 200 armed men to surround the peacetime dwelling and added, "Without warning, the great chief was seized in his bed, naked and struggling" (Evison, 1997, p. 163). This idea of a 'naked' chief provides the racial grammar which plays nicely into the 'naked savage' myth. Te Rauparaha was abducted aboard the warship without warrant and imprisoned for 10 months without trial, eventually being released to Auckland (an area in the north, outside of his tribal area, effectively neutralising his chieftainship). This act alone was to have a crippling effect on the ability of Māori in both the North and South Islands to exercise *rangatiratanga*, or

sovereignty over their own lands and lives, whilst simultaneously contributing greatly to Grey's political advantage.

Following the wars, the colonising agenda was heightened. The landmark case in 1877 heard by Judge Prendergast led to his well-known finding that the Treaty of Waitangi was a *nullity*, again playing into the racial grammar discourse of Māori as 'savages' and the legal argument used based on the doctrine of discovery of 'vacant lands' and the false premise that there were no humans in Aotearoa when Cook arrived. Ngāti Toa leader Wi Parata had taken a case against the Bishop of Wellington (Williams, 2013) for misuse of lands initially gifted in 1848 for the establishment of school for young Ngāti Toa people. But the intervening land wars meant that the school never eventuated. In 1877, Judge Prendergast found that the British Crown 'owned' all the land by virtue of discovery and occupation and the doctrine of terra nullius (vacant lands), so no possible gift could have been made. Prendergast's finding that NZ was a territory inhabited only by 'savages', and the treaty was signed by primitive 'barbarians'. This was to have far-reaching consequences invoking precedential land law which continues to shift Māori land away from Māori customary rights and ownership. The racial grammar, replete with utterances of the treaty being 'worthless' because it was signed between a 'civilised' (British) nation and a 'savage' (Māori) nation, continues to 'savage-ise' Māori today. The more recent Foreshore and Seabed Act 2004 (Charters, Erueti & Erueti, 2007), in which there was a Crown 'presumption of power' and 'right' to take ownership of the foreshore and seabed, is testament to the ongoing shift of Māori customary lands. The racial grammar of the doctrine of 'discovery' (Miller, 2008) is still evident in the history books forming part of the curriculum in schools which are implicated in Māori language shift to English as successive governments manoeuvre to complete the colonial assimilation agenda.

## Māori Language Shift Through Colonisation

According to Anaru (2018), te reo Māori has Austronesian ancestry with its origins somewhere in China. Successive migrations and migration pauses saw the Māori people and their language travel through Taiwan, the Philippines and eventually to Aotearoa/NZ. This migration pattern happened over thousands of years. Once settling in Aotearoa, the migrations stopped, and the Māori language and culture emerged from within the contours and contexts of Aotearoa for many centuries. It became a new fluid language and culture as it melded and moulded to these lands whilst still holding much of its historical and genealogical remnants, its beliefs and the values of its ancient Polynesian past. The natural linguistic and cultural change was an environmental, physical and spiritual adaptation. Māori culture in Aotearoa is a millennias-old culture (Walker, 2004). It slowly settled into life in Aotearoa for more than 1,000 years before the arrival of the first Europeans in the late 18th century. In the past 150 years, it has undergone a rapid shift to English in a very unnatural process of change through colonisation. The

one constant, it is argued by Anaru, is that Aotearoa/New Zealand shall forever remain the birthplace of te reo Māori, and forever part of the *whakapapa* or genealogy of this land. However, the impact of decades of wars, introduced European diseases, increasing numbers of British settlers aided by successive corrupt settler parliaments, was to take its toll on Māori society. The Māori population decline was unavoidable. The shift of Māori lands into Crown/privatised British hands resulted in a phenomenon I have coined ‘linguafaction’ (see Skerrett, 2017), a condition which continues to facilitate Māori language shift to English, shrinking Māori language vernaculars and threatening language death. That we currently have a Māori language week is testimony to that. What other country in the world has a language week for its official language? Do the British have an English-language week in Britain?

### Silences and Erasures

Many colonialists fighting against Māori in the NZ wars became parliamentarians, public servants, historians, and the writers of texts underpinning the curriculum in the education system. They were the reframers of history and reshapers of society. In that way, colonial histories become the ‘officially recognised’ sources of ‘truth,’ while Māori histories, world views, ways of being, knowing, thinking, and speaking are systematically erased. Ngūgī Wa Thiong’o (2005), researching and writing from a Kenyan (also colonised by the British) position, talks about the cultural bomb as a mechanism “to annihilate a people’s belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves” (p. 3). He argues that when you opt for the colonizing language, you accept the fatalistic logic, to a greater or lesser degree, of its social norms, attitudes and values. He also illuminates how the colonial land wars shift into the classroom when he asserts that

the night of the sword and the bullet was followed by the morning of the chalk and the blackboard. The physical violence of the battlefield was followed by the psychological violence of the classroom. But where the former was visibly brutal, the latter was visibly gentle . . . one began to understand that their real power resided not at all in the cannons of the first morning but in what followed . . . the new school. The new school had the nature of both the cannon and the magnet. From the cannon it took the efficiency of a fighting weapon. But better than the cannon it made the conquest permanent. The cannon forces the body and the school fascinates the soul. (Thiong’o, 2005, p. 9)

Social structures and language/s built around those structures are important vehicles through which power is both erased and fascinated. The bullet was the means of the physical subjugation, the pen the means of sociocultural dislocation. Colonisation

and the colonial wars left many Māori silenced and impoverished, “living as outcasts on meagre, isolated reserves” (Evison, 1997, p. 231). Many Māori were forced into subsistence living, whilst more died of starvation. Governor Grey’s presence in Wellington encouraged the formation of NZ’s first scientific society, founded in July 1851 (Evison, 1997). As the first president of that society, Grey’s opening address portended doom and gloom for Māori:

We who stand in this country occupy an historical position of extraordinary interest. Before us lies a future already brilliant with the light of a glorious morn. Behind us lies a night of fearful gloom, unilluminated by the light of written records, of picture memorials, of aught which can give a certain idea of the past. A few stray streaks of light in the form of tradition, of oral poetry, of carved records, are the only guides we have. (Evison, 1997, p. 236)

In one foul discourse, he silenced and erased *mātauranga Māori*, Māori knowledge, language and, even more sinister, established a racial discourse of invisibilising people. Allegedly all that was left were carvings and poetry. According to Evison, Governor Grey’s scientific society’s successor is the Royal Society of New Zealand, a leading research network connected to NZ’s very powerful research communities. One of its early proponents, James Hector came from another royal society in Edinburgh in 1862 to do geological surveys. He became an indispensable advisor to the government on science, technology, medicine and commerce. He also founded the colonial museum to which the ‘carvings and poetry’ were enslaved as artefacts and exhibits. In the same year that Governor Grey founded the scientific society in the North Island, the *Lyttleton Times* in the South Island published a resolution from a public meeting in the capital city of Wellington:

The Native race is fast becoming extinct, and there is no prospect of their becoming as a body sufficiently enlightened for the exercise of political privileges before the period of their extinction shall arrive. Nevertheless, some participation may be allowed provided sufficient guarantees be given against the possibility of the superior intelligence of the Europeans being over-balanced by the ignorance of the uncivilized race. (Evison, 1997, p. 229)

Whilst the abolition of slavery in England in the 1830s meant British colonial activities in NZ prohibited the enslavement of Māori people it did not apply to Māori lands, lives and resources. The racial grammar discourses of NZ colonialism privatising Māori lands and shifting Māori people from invisible to uncivilized savages to extinct people and into museum curiosities was another form of enslavement as Māori human rights and lives were relentlessly eroded leading to silences and erasures.

## Shadows and Echoes

Forced language shift in colonial societies is an effective means of silencing Indigenous voices. The spiritual and psychological subjugation in the formation of a new 'national' (English) identity through a cultural particularism that is British is testimony to that. Nōpera Panakareao, who raised the notion of Māori living in the shadow of the land within a short time of signing the treaty, is also credited with saying in 1840, "Our sayings will sink to the bottom like a stone, but your sayings will float light, like the wood of the whau-tree, and always remain to be seen" (Salmond, 2017, p. 147). Perceptively, he recognised the threat not only to Māori lands but also to Māori language and knowledge.

Anaru (2018) uses Plato's allegory of the prisoner in a cave as a theoretical application to the Māori context. He argues the Cave is about the mind ascending from a realm of images (in the cave) to that of visible real tangible objects (outside of the cave). Furthermore, that the people in the cave are shackled in the darkness of the cave and only able to see shadows on the wall in front of them, radiated by a fire behind them. None of the radiated shadows has any substance or 'truth' so long as they remain distorted shadows on the wall. Striving for knowledge within a shadow world thus is seemingly futile.

Likewise, sayings that sink to the bottom of the water are no longer audible. The further down they go, the more they become muffled echoes of gurgling and then deathly silence. To the extent that they are no longer spoken nor heard, their ability to generate meaning, understanding, knowledge and growth are extinguished. Like the shadows on the cave wall divorced from realities, distortions and echoes of silence become divorced from meaning-making authenticities which define and enrich human lives.

## He reo e kōrerotia ana, he reo ka ora (A Spoken Language Is a Living Language)

Pojman and Vaughn (2011) argue in favour of Plato's claim that the sight and seeing realms are deficient if one rests on the argument that for senses to be used, all that is needed is the sense itself and that which can be sensed by it. For example, to taste sweetness, one needs the sense of a sweet taste as well as something that tastes sweet. They explain that if a person's eyes are capable of sight and that person is trying to look at something that is coloured, the sight will not see the coloured thing, unless there is also present an extra element which is made specifically for this purpose. That element is light. In line with Plato's argument, sight (in the visible realm) and hearing (in the audible realm) are deficient without light and sound. In tandem with that, for an oral language to be audible, it requires not only ears, but it must also be spoken; that is, it must have speakers to be a thriving living language. To draw on Panakareao's allegory, a sinking language becomes inaudible, a silenced language. He foreshadowed language shift, hastened by the English-language encroachment he witnessed. Subsequent English-only

education language policies accelerated it. The rich, exuberant Māori culture with unique world views, sights and sounds swiftly shifted to the shadows and echoes of society, carefully controlled through societal structural mechanisms and institutions, especially schools. Throughout the world, Indigenous languages living in the shadows of dominant colonial languages, cultures and ideologies face constant challenge and the threat of language loss through linguafaction, institutional racism and their racial grammars. The apprehensions and ideas portended by the likes of Panakareao and successive Māori chieftainship have led to the unremitting pushback by Māoridom over the last 200 years of the colonial experience in NZ. The establishment of a Māori King movement, called the Kīngitanga, in 1858 and the formation of the Kōhanga Reo movement in 1982 were critical and strategic manoeuvres in that push-back.

## Te Hua Kawariki: Māori Political Independence and Kōhanga Reo

Māku anō e hanga i tōku nei whare. Ko te tāhuhu he hīnau, ko ngā pou pou he māhoe, patatē. Me whakatupu ki te hua o te rengarenga, me whakapakari ki te hua o te kawariki. Nā Kīngi Tāwhiao. (Māhuta, 1993/2011, para. 13)

The first Māori King, Pōtatau Te Wherowhero, was quickly succeeded by his son, King Tāwhiao, in 1860. As we have seen, the first years of Tāwhiao's reign were dominated by land wars. King Tāwhiao and his followers were declared rebels and forced into exile and some 1.2 million acres of their fertile lands were confiscated, severely incapacitating Māori socio-political and economic advancement. But his quest for *mana motuhake* (Māori political independence) was ceaseless. King Tāwhiao is famous for the prophetic saying that opens this section, which speaks to Māori political independence, holding on to Māori land and ways of doing things and continuing to strengthen the people. Translated, it reads:

I will build my house, its ridge pole will be made of hīnau [a native lowland forest tree], its posts will be made of māhoe [whiteywood, a tree found in abundance in coastal regions] and patatē [seven-finger, again easily utilised as a resource]. Raise the generations with the fruit of the rengarenga [an abundant spinach-like native plant] and strengthen them with the fruit of the kawariki [coprosma]. (Author's translation of Māhuta, 1993/2011, para. 13)

The *kawariki* is a bitter plant that was given to children to make them stronger. I have titled this section 'Te Hua Kawariki' after King Tāwhiao's saying which I would argue speaks to the importance of utilising natural resources and specifically references the importance of strengthening children. Over his time, King Tāwhiao witnessed the increasing impoverishment among his people in the North and the impact on children.

Similarly, in the South, Evison (1997) argues, “loss of ancestral lands brought spiritual anguish, as well as deprivation and disgrace” (p. 24). I belong to both northern and southern tribes and was nurtured in the importance of fighting injustices and strengthening children. In Tawhiao’s proverbial saying, the reference is to sustain the body through natural resources like the fruit of the kawariki. In this chapter, of equal importance is to sustain the mind using words and language. The two are intricately entangled.

### Children of the Land

Prior to the impact of colonialism and the NZ land wars, many early colonial eyewitness accounts from Europeans observed shared parental roles in small family groupings. Children were cared for and treated with love and affection, and the children were independent thinkers, courageous, expressive, robust, and lively; possessed, in general, pleasing countenances; and were incredibly free and very intelligent (Salmond, 2017). John Walton, in 1863, wrote:

The unbounded freedom in which the children are indulged, seems very favourable to their growth, which is much more rapid than that of European children, who are less strong and active at ten years of age than those in New Zealand are at six. The tuition of the children begins at an early period, for the development of their mental powers is as rapid as that of their physical. . . . One effect of the excessive fondness of parents for their children is, that they are very rarely punished for any impropriety of conduct whatever. (Salmond, 2017, p. 459)

Children were situated within wider family groupings, not merely to their own nuclear family. Māori very commonly enacted this collective system of parenting called *whāngai* which literally means ‘to feed or nurture.’ This customary practice meant that grandparents or closely related blood relatives would foster child/ren, especially from large families. As William Colenso in 1868 stated,

their love and attachment to children was very great, and that not merely to their own immediate offspring. They very commonly adopted children; indeed no man having a large family was ever allowed to bring them all up himself—uncles and aunts and cousins claimed and took them. . . . They certainly took every physical care of them . . . petted and spoiled them. The father, or uncle, often carried or nursed his infant on his back for hours at a time and might often be seen quietly at work with the little one there snugly ensconced. (Salmond, 2017, p. 460)

The historic dismantling the Māori collectives of *whānau*, *hapū* and *iwi* and Māori communal ways of living came hand in hand with land loss and exacerbated language

loss which impacted the intergenerational transmission of knowledge to children. The reinstatement of these land and language structures is what underpins the political movement of the Kīngitanga and the self-help radical movement of Kōhanga Reo (Māori language nests). Kōhanga Reo is as much a political resistance movement to the prevailing racism and linguicism endemic in the colonial education system as it is a Māori-language regeneration movement. I have been instrumental in the establishment of Kōhanga Reo and birthed my five children into the movement. The aims of the Māori-language nests are to provide the *hua kawariki*, the fruit that cultivates our *tamariki* (descendants of the gods) to strengthen them, to shape their minds, to nurture their inner beings and to fortify their identities. Kōhanga Reo has been the *marae* (courtyard) of revolutionary action needed to rebuild, to revitalise the Māori language, dismantle racialized discourses, displace settler colonialism and move children out of the silences and shadows and into becoming more informed, more articulate, liberated children of the land.

## Discussion

This chapter has argued that the colonial agenda continues to promote the transition from ‘substance’ to ‘shadow’ by creating commodities, privatising lands and individualising responsibilities rendering structural and material (systemic) racism and linguicism invisible whilst simultaneously, paradoxically, masking and entrenching it. Colonial-settler racism and the apparatus of the colonial nation state works effectively through colonial processes through systematically stripping Indigenous nations of their collective power structures and voices to repressed individuals, easily regulated and controlled. Staying with our colonialist past ensures that we remain historically located. As argued by Abbas (2020), not to do so is to continue the colonial project of invisibilising our histories, erasing our perspectives and engulfing us within unquestioned, colonialist practices intellectually, physically, socially and spiritually.

The colonial history of NZ has shown how critical theories of racial hierarchy promoted, in the first instance, the massive land grab of the 19th century and resulted in linguafaction. Whilst the abolition of slave ownership in England not long before signing the treaty may have prohibited the physical enslavement of Māori bodies its legacy of cultural annihilation remained in the minds, ideologies, structures and practices of the colonisers. As Ngūgī Wa Thiong’o (2005) asserted, the ‘cultural bomb’ annihilated people’s beliefs in their names, languages, lands, histories, capacities, realities and ultimately in themselves. And the establishment of a British parliamentary system which privatised Māori lands simply locked Māori into an oppositional relationality of the Crown versus the people, quite the opposite of what a treaty is meant to do and be. Instead, it pitted the Pākehā Crown, with the assumption of parliamentary power and competitive individualism, against Māori collectivities and Pākehā immigrants, with

the presumptions of White supremacy, against Māori Indigenes struggling to assert rangatiratanga or Māori sovereignty.

The colonial propaganda disseminated by colonial media gave recognition to racial grammar discourses. The construct of racial grammar provides for a way of analysing the discourses of racism and linguicism which permeate into the heartwood of society. These became and remain the dominant societal pillars of NZ hegemony, reflected in current media disseminations, pathologizing socio-educational discourses and practices. First there are the myriad of discourses surrounding the doctrine of ‘discovery.’ Then the discourses soon turned into ones of civilised versus savage predicted in the reversal of the shadow of the land going to the Crown discourse, silencing and erasing aeons of Māori perspective, history, language, being and becoming. It led to a myriad of education discourses based around failure/s leading to deficit policies and thinking such as Māori being the lagging ‘tail,’ ‘priority’ learners ‘at risk’ with ‘warrior genes,’ systemic linguicism, streaming and racial profiling in schools.

Media and education institutions play out as powerful structural mechanisms of surveillance to reward and recognise, on one hand, and objectify, dehumanise, discipline, silence and erase, on the other. The guise of rational automaton yet controlled automaton leads to the cognitive dissonance and tension between both the colonizers and colonized, the former’s inability to recognise different humanities and the latter losing a sense of who they are to recognise themselves. Davies et al. (2013) in discussing this construct of ‘recognition’ note the importance of recognising ‘difference.’ They argue that the move from difference as categorical difference to difference as emergent, continuous difference and recognition as mutually constitutive intra-active acts of becoming, through which ‘being’ is made to make sense (Davies et al., 2013, p. 681), not to lose one’s sensibilities in who and what they are. But therein lies a tension or the potential for loss without careful articulation of the forces that work in anti-colonising endeavours.

It was argued that the initial observations of Māori prosperity in the early 19th century based on common land rights was eroded in successive land privatisation acts into settler-European hands. As had happened in Britain, “communal well-being was replaced by communal poverty and private wealth” (Evison, p. 231). It was also argued that Māori language was also heavily impacted, being marginalised in the shadows and echoes of schools and centres in NZ society. In line with the theorising around languages being inaudible, without sound, it is clear for a language to be audible it requires not only ears; it must be spoken. Panakareao’s allegory of our (Māori) sayings sinking like stones has emerged through English-only language policies first introduced in 1847 but still prevalent in NZ. Throughout the world, Indigenous languages living in the shadows of dominant cultures and ideologies face constant challenge and threat of language-in-culture death referred to as linguafaction. Systemic racism will always exist when structural policies and practices run deep into the fabric of society.

## Conclusion

This chapter has overviewed the struggle for resistance, survival, and revival. It illuminates the need for liberatory pedagogies that support our young people to sustain their own languages and cultures, to be courageous enough to shape their own identities, to live in their own skins and minds while simultaneously resisting capture in the tensions of new transformed realities.

## Notes

1. A Māori King movement, headed by Te Wherowhero, was established in the mid-19th century to counter the dominance of the British King movement, an act which precipitated the NZ land wars and land confiscations.
2. Common law is derived from custom and judicial precedent or case law in contrast with statute law.
3. Governor Grey left NZ in 1853 to become governor of Cape Colony, South Africa.
4. So named a 'night-time haven,' Māori protocol dictated no fighting at night.

## References

- Abbas, M. S. (2020). The promise of political Blackness? Contesting Blackness, challenging Whiteness and the silencing of racism: A review article. *Ethnicities*, 20(1), 202–222.
- Anaru, N. A. (2018). *A critical analysis of Indigenous Māori language revitalisation and the development of an ontological data base* [Doctoral Dissertation, Auckland University of Technology]. <https://openrepository.aut.ac.nz/handle/10292/11469>.
- Banner, S. (1999). Two properties, one land: Law and space in nineteenth-century New Zealand. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 24(4), 807–852.
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2012). The invisible weight of Whiteness: The racial grammar of everyday life in contemporary America. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 35(2), 173–194.
- Charters, C., Erueti, A., & Erueti, A. K. (Eds.). (2007). *Māori property rights and the foreshore and seabed: The last frontier*. Victoria University Press.
- Davies, B., De Schauwer, E., Claes, L., De Munck, K., Van De Putte, I., & Verstichele, M. (2013). Recognition and difference: A collective biography. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 26(6), 680–691.
- Department of Internal Affairs. (1991). *The people of many peaks: The Māori biographies from the Dictionary of New Zealand biography, Volume 1. Volumes 1769–1869*. Bridget Williams Books.
- Evison, H. (1997). *The long dispute: Maori land rights and European colonisation in southern New Zealand*. Canterbury University Press.
- Māhuta, R. T. (2011). *Tāwhiao, Tūkāroto Matutaera Pōtatau Te Wherowhero: Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*. Te Ara – the Encyclopedia of New Zealand. <https://teara.govt.nz/mi/biographies/2t14/tawhiao-tukaroto-matutaera-potatau-te-herowhero> (Original work published 1993)

- Miller, R. J. (2008). *Native America discovered and conquered: Thomas Jefferson, Lewis and Clark, and Manifest Destiny*. University of Nebraska Press.
- Mutu, M. (2010). Constitutional Intentions: The Treaty of Waitangi texts. In M. Mulholland & V. Tawhai (Eds.), *Weeping waters: The Treaty of Waitangi and constitutional change*. Huia Publishers.
- Orange, C. (2004). *An illustrated history of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Bridget Williams Books.
- Pojman, L., & Vaughn, L. (2011). *Classics of philosophy*. Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Salmund, A. (2017). *Tears of Rangi: Experiments across worlds*. Auckland University Press.
- Sharman, F. A. (1989). An introduction to the enclosure acts. *The Journal of Legal History*, 10(1), 45–70.
- Simon, J. A. (1998). Anthropology, 'native schooling' and Māori: The politics of 'cultural adaptation' policies. *Oceania*, 69(1), 61–78.
- Skerrett, M. (2017). Te Kōhanga Reo: Early childhood education and the politics of language and cultural maintenance in Aotearoa, New Zealand—A personal–political story. In L. Miller, C. Cameron, C. Dalli, and N. Barbour (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of early childhood policy* (pp. 433–451). Sage Publications.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2015). Language rights. In W.E. Wright, S. Boun, & O. García (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingual and multilingual education* (pp. 185–202). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Thiong'o, N. W. (2005) *Decolonizing the mind: the politics of language in African literature*. Cambridge University Press.
- Walker, R. (2004). *Ka Whawhai Tonu Mātou: Struggle without end* (Rev. ed.). Penguin.
- Webb, D., Sanders, K., & Scott, P. (2010). *The New Zealand legal system: Structures and processes*. LexisNexis.
- Williams, D. V. (2013). *A simple nullity?: The Wi Parata Case in New Zealand law and history*. Auckland University Press.