



dsw

**MAORI ADVISORY UNIT
REPORT (1985)**

C O N T E N T S

<u>SECTIONS</u>		<u>PAGE NUMBERS</u>
1.	Mihi	
2.	Introduction	
3.	Historical Perspective	1
4.	Philosophy of Maori Advisory Unit	3
5.	Bi-Culturalism: Taha Maori	5
6.	Institutional Racism	8
7.	Analysis of Department of Social Welfare: Maori Perspective	11
8.	Practical in Terms of Philosophy	13
9.	Future	19
10.	Present	20
11.	Conclusion	22
12.	Appendix	

He Ara ki te Aomārama:

(pathway to the future)



Tama-nui-te-ra traversed the sky in too big a hurry and gave out too much energy, more resources than was needed. So Maui-Tikitiki-a-Taranga decided on a plan by which order could be brought about. His plan required action which like other revolutionaries he felt was entirely justified because of the benefits it would bring his people. Out of pain suffered by Tama-nui-te-ra was born a world of order and certainty:

HE MIHI

Nga Waka, nga Mana, nga Reo, nga Iwi o Aotearoa,
Tena koutou, tena koutou, tena koutou.
Tena koutou i te ahuatanga ki o tatau tupuna,
na ratau i timata te rapu oranga mo tatau, mairano
i te wa i haere mai ratua ki Aotearoa nei.
Na ratau i takoto te kaupapa hei taurira mo tatau
nga uri whatupu.
Te mihi kia ratau: tena koutou, tena koutou,
tena koutou.

Ko enei etahi o ratau korero:

Hutia te rito o te harekeke
Kei hia te komako e ko
Ki mai ki ahau
He aha te mea nui o tenei Ao
Maku e ki atu

He tangata, he tangata, he tangata.

No reira i runga i enei korero, ano, mehemea i
mahi ai tatau i tenei kaupapa, ka ora ai ratau wairua
i roto i a tatau mahi. I runga i te aroha o te
tangata, noho ora mai koutou me o koutou whanau.

GREETINGS

The descendants of the canoes, the pillars of society,
the voices of authority, greetings, greetings, greetings.
Greetings to you in the memory of our ancestors.
Their attempts to provide for their people and their
decision to come to Aotearoa laid the foundation for us,
their future generations. We greet them; greetings,
greetings, greetings.

The following is the philosophy of one of their sayings:

The heart of the flax bush has been
ripped out. Where are the bell birds
that sang - nature has been disrupted.
A question is asked; "What is the most
important of all things in the world?"

The reply; "It is people, people, people."

Not part of this mihi, I ask a question "Why?"

The answer I get, "Of all Creation, People are the only
creatures capable of restoring the disruption to nature

as well as the injustices of our society." If we take up these challenges, the spirit of our ancestors will be rekindled by our efforts.

In the spirit of these words and the concerns for fellow people, we greet you and your families.

This is a special project, one in which the Director-General commissioned the Maori Advisory Unit to write a report on how we perceive the Department of Social Welfare and its capacity to meet the needs of the Maori people in relation to service delivery.

In undertaking to write this report we experienced some difficulty in giving it the attention it required due to the demands made on us in other areas of our work. The limited time factor in which to complete it also brought pressure on us to ensure that we did justice to this very sensitive subject.

We consider this as an initial stage for discussion and action in conjunction with the WARAG document on Institutional Racism in the Department of Social Welfare.

The main focus of this report is based on the views and comments expressed by the wider Maori community e.g. Maori voluntary organisations, voluntary workers, Maori consumers/clients. Our own experiences working in these areas; Maori Womens Welfare League, Marae Committees, Church groups, other Government agencies, as well as working in the Department of Social Welfare. From Maori staff within the Department of Social Welfare in the Auckland Region.

We have endeavoured to be objective in our approach to this report and to give credit where it is due to some of the staff in the Department of Social Welfare who have been instrumental in implementing an affirmative action plan towards change.

In this report we have not quoted statistics as they have already been documented in the WARAG report on Institutional Racism.

Institutional Racism has been reinforced by other Maori people both from within the Department of Social Welfare and the community when they were approached to make their comments known to us.

KO WAITANGI AHAU



KO MATAU NGA WHAKATUPURANGA
O WAITANGI

NAU TE RAURAU
NAKU TE RAURAU
KA ORA AI TE RANGATAHI

YOUR RESOURCES
OUR RESOURCES
WILL BENEFIT THE YOUNGER
GENERATION

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

THE FOUNDATION OF BICULTURALISM

MAORI - PAKEHA

When the Maori were guided and discovered these islands, they called them Aotearoa, "Land of the everlasting life". A land of abundance. The European forefathers came to this land also in search of a better life, and so, the first relationship with the indigenous culture.

The Treaty of Waitangi began the formal relationship between the indigenous, Maori and the pakeha, forging the bases of biculturalism. So Treaty of Waitangi is the covenant which commits us, to a bicultural Maori - Pakeha society, our own human covenant of peace. In its recognition lays the foundation for a true bicultural society, and paves the way for a multicultural society. We should therefore take this Treaty, our own covenant of peace, seriously.

At the time of the Treaty, 1840, the Maori were the majority, they all had the resources, the land and their mana. They saw that a partnership of sharing would benefit them as well as would the Pakeha and would bring them more mana. The Treaty is the foundation from which a bicultural society should have emerged, one where the indigenous Maori culture, would have contributed equally in decisions and policies.

What followed is history. The Treaty was disregarded, colonial rule depended on domination of the native races and this pattern of domination by white culture, continues to define the society we live in today.

Today Maori people are a minority, have become migrants in their own land, "Aotearoa, Land of the everlasting life". The Treaty is still disregarded as irrelevant, not important, contributing to the indifference of the majority to the minority, a sign of suppression of the minority by the majority. This insistence on monoculturalism leads not to unity and peace but uniformity.

History is important to Maori people and in fact it is a vital tool in the process of peoples development. Maori people have various sayings that relate to this issue. Two of which are:

"Me titiro ki nga wa o mua"

"Rapua te mea kua ngaro"

They both can be summed up with the proverb:

"When searching for direction
focus your eyes backwards
and see where you have
come from"

incorporate
welfare.

MAORI ADVISORY UNIT

Philosophy

The Maori people of Tzmakei Makaurau approved the appointment of three Maori Advisors to the Maori Advisory Unit in the Department of Social Welfare, Auckland Regional Office.

1. To advise of the needs, the concerns affecting the Maori people.
2. To bring to the Department of Social Welfare another dimension, that of caring and sharing (manaki me to aroha).

Job Description

1. That the role of the Maori Advisors is to advise the Department of Social Welfare of policies, changes and needs relating to Maori people with the view to making changes and taking action.
2. To advise the Regional Director on all matters regarding Maori people and to scrutinise:
 - Philosophy of the Department of Social Welfare
 - Staffing and Recruitment
 - Function of the Department of Social Welfare.
3. To consult with the Maori community through the support group (Roopu Runanga Awhina).
4. The Maori community to provide advisor and to provide a support group. (Roopu Runanga Awhina).

Role of the Support Group (Roopu Runanga Awhina)

1. To support, supervise, assist the Unit to incorporate Taha Maori into the Department of Social Welfare.
2. To support, supervise, assist them so that they will always remember that they are the servants of the people.
3. To take heed to uphold the desires and hopes of the people.

4. To evaluate the performance of their duties.

Selection Process

The selection of the three advisors was made by the Maori community under the auspices of the Auckland District Maori Council chaired by Dr Ranginui Walker.

A panel of Maori people was set up to select the candidates whose names were put forward by various Maori community groups in the Auckland Region. A series of meetings involving the selection process took place until the final selections were made. Approval of the appointments was made by the Director-General of the Department of Social Welfare.

BICULTURALISM

Biculturalism is the concept that the Maori Advisory Unit aspires to bring to the Department of Social Welfare.

It is the philosophical baseline that we are working from in order to bring a new dimension into the practices of the Department of Social Welfare, that of

- Taha Maori
- Taha Wairua
- Taha Aroha

Biculturalism is important today for Maori people, it recognises our being tangata whenua, belonging to Aotearoa, giving us our own identity, security as a people, our own sense of belonging.

Just as English have England, Samoans have Samoa, Rarotongans have Rarotonga, etc., giving them their own sense of identity and security as a distinct people.

A move towards biculturalism in the Department would mean more equal contribution of Maori input in policy and decision making in all levels.

Biculturalism does not mean other cultures and values will not be respected, on the contrary it will respect other values, and cultures more than it does at present in our society.

The push for multiculturalism today is, that it is a concept, endeavouring to respect the values and needs of the various cultures that make up our society today. It is for this reason, and because of our history of Aotearoa we view biculturalism as the only process towards a truly multi-cultural society.

There should be no conflict with this concept of biculturalism with the Pacific Island Communities, for we share a similar

philosophy in our culture, as "Pacific People". What is required is communication between the Maori and Pacific people on these concepts.

THE FOLLOWING EXTRACTS ARE VIEWS ON BICULTURALISM

"One of the main grievances of the Maori is the general attitude of many Europeans towards him. The condescending manner and paternalism. The Maori feels that having lived with the European all these years, he is still not known and understood. And where he is known it is often through negative stereotypes." Sir James believes that this imbalance in Maori - Pakeha perceptions has to be corrected before other cultural issues are dealt with, "because we've got to learn to be bicultural before we can be multicultural."

Listener 11 August 1984 p.29

Sir James Henare

"Biculturalism means the development of a society of two cultures, where people are sensitive to aspects of two cultures. In the past, the Maori people have made the adjustment and, partially by institutional compulsion or social expectation, they have in fact, operated biculturally. Maori culture is not to be seen as being just for the Maori - biculturalism involves all society, it need not segregate people into small cultural groups but can include everybody in diversity of cultures."

Race Against Time P. 51

Hiwi Taurua

"Bicultural means being at home in two cultures.
Individual biculturalism.
Individuals can be bicultural.
They are "at home" in two cultures.
Structural biculturalism.
We can talk of structural biculturalism.
This refers to the way two cultures participate in a society or institution, rather than to an individual person."

"Towards a Bicultural Society"

P.C.

"It is important to recognise that there are two main culture streams in New Zealand society - Maori and Pakeha. Essentially New Zealand is a bicultural society. I say that because Maori culture is indigenous to the Pacific and so in a sense embraces all the Pacific Islands cultural groups. We share similar philosophies and backgrounds. The other main cultural stream is Pakeha, coming from Western Europe. We are in a position to mould a bicultural society in this country and we must take a more assertive stance in doing this. Only then are we in a position as a country, to embrace other cultures that have an essential difference from the main groups."

Zealandia 28 October 1984

Toby Curtis

"The Treaty was an acknowledgement of Maori existence, of their prior occupation of the land and of an intent that the Maori presence would remain and be respected. It made us one country, but acknowledged that we were two people. It established the regime for no in-culturalism, but biculturalism. We do not consider that we need feel threatened by that, but rather that we should be proud of it, and learn to capitalise on this diversity as a positive way of improving our individual and collective performance."

Report Findings and Recommendations
of Waitangi Tribunal

"'Multiculturalism' means very similar things to 'bicultural' but refers to more than two cultures. People of a number of different races in New Zealand. We are multi-racial, ~~our~~ society brings together some things from a variety of cultures but only one culture has its values built into the social structures."

"Towards a Bicultural Society"
P.S. Methodist Church

INSTITUTIONAL RACISM

The following definition as defined in the document "Institutional Racism in the D.S.W." - 'the perpetuation by organisations of policies and practices which advantage Pakehas and disadvantage other racial groups', describes situations we have each experienced in the various other institutions we have been involved in.

The term 'institutional racism', is unfamiliar to many Maori people. The definition however is readily recognised and experienced by almost all of Maoridom.

This situation has been more readily known in the form of racial prejudice and discrimination. When Maori people have objected to incidents of discrimination, they have often met with more resistance and racism. In order to survive in jobs many Maori people conform and in doing so it is at the cost of their Maoriness, their own identity.

Institutional racism is what we believe Donna Awatere describes as the invisible signs in the structures and institutions (except prisons, borstals and childrens homes) that say, "Maori people not welcome keep out". It is the barrier that confronts us when competing for jobs and seeking accommodation. In general it is the barrier that hinders our development as a people, trying to change our situation.

This situation has been in existence since the days of Colonialism, it has been and still is reinforced by the institutions of church, education and law, it forms the values of these institutions, the base of society today, a society that is now recognised as being "Monocultural".

Since the Maori Advisory Unit began and during our visits to the district offices and various D.S.W. institutions, we have experienced and witnessed the signs of institutional racism in the department.

- (a) The disproportionate number of Maori staff to Maori clientele or consumer, both in offices and institutions.

- (b) The lack of Maori or other ethnic groups in the area of decision making
- (c) Policies relating to the selection of staff, controlled by the State Services Commission based on the principle of merit. We recognise that Section 28 5 appears to provide scope for specifically recruiting and selecting people of other ethnic groups, and relevant experience can make up for qualifications. The act is often interpreted in a narrow way and this limits the eventual outcome.
- (d) All the staff trainers in Tamaki Makaurau are Pakeha and the programmes are formulated and conducted by Pakehas.
- (e) Attitudes that we have witnessed in the form of questions and statements directed to us as Maori Advisory Unit add to the growing rise of awareness of Maori people of themselves as being a distinct people. This is seen by many as a form of separatism. Maori people however view this as "Mana Motuhake" self determination, a form of positive reinforcement in order to make up for the imbalance of culture in our society, "Temporary Segregation"

These items mentioned above are well documented in the WARAG report "Institutional Racism in the D.S.W." Much of what is stated in this report we have experienced in the short time we have been in the D.S.W. as a unit.

Discussions during our visits begin with explaining our role as Maori Advisors to D.S.W. but soon find the discussions move to the topic of race relations and justifying the need for our unit.

We have found this experience, although draining at times and time consuming, to be a useful means of helping staff to examine their own views and attitudes, whilst providing a platform to air their views on racism, a topic which has become a growing concern of our times and in the D.S.W. today.

We welcome the report of "Institutional Racism in the D.S.W." as a challenge to the Department of Social Welfare, the staff

and all policies that maintain and perpetuate racism.

Kia ora to the group of women who compiled the report, for their effort and concern for the discrimination of Maori and Pacific people. As feminists they understand the oppression of people because of their own experience as oppressed women.

The growing awareness of the Department of its need to address Maori concerns and needs more constructively together with the Minister's paper on "Progress Towards Biculturalism" and the recommendations to Cabinet are very encouraging.

The establishment of a Maori Advisory Unit attached to the Auckland Regional Office has been a positive move to meeting the needs of the Maori community.

C O N T E N T S

<u>SECTIONS</u>		<u>PAGE NUMBERS</u>
1.	Mihi	
2.	Introduction	
3.	Historical Perspective	1
4.	Philosophy of Maori Advisory Unit	3
5.	Bi-Culturalism: Taha Maori	5
6.	Institutional Racism	8
7.	Analysis of Department of Social Welfare: Maori Perspective	11
8.	Practical in Terms of Philosophy	13
9.	Future	19
10.	Present	20
11.	Conclusion	22
12.	Appendix	

He Ara ki te Aomārama:

(pathway to the future)



Tama-nui-te-ra traversed the sky in too big a hurry and gave out too much energy, more resources than was needed. So Maui-Tikitiki-a-Taranga decided on a plan by which order could be brought about. His plan required action which like other revolutionaries he felt was entirely justified because of the benefits it would bring his people. Out of pain suffered by Tama-nui-te-ra was born a world of order and certainty;

HE MIHI

Nga Waka, nga Mana, nga Reo, nga Iwi o Aotearoa,
Tena koutou, tena koutou, tena koutou.

Tena koutou i te ahuatanga ki o tatau tupuna,
na ratau i timata te rapu oranga mo tatau, mairano
i te wa i haere mai ratua ki Aotearoa nei.

Na ratau i takoto te kaupapa hei tauira mo tatau
nga uri whatupu.

Te mihi kia ratau: tena koutou, tena koutou,
tena koutou.

Ko enei etahi o ratau korero:

Hutia te rito o te harekeke

Kei hia te komako e ko

Ki mai ki ahau

He aha te mea nui o tenei Ao

Maku e ki atu

He tangata, he tangata, he tangata.

No reira i runga i enei korero, ano, mehemea i
mahi ai tatau i tenei kaupapa, ka ora ai ratau wairua
i roto i a tatau mahi. I runga i te aroha o te
tangata, noho ora mai koutou me o koutou whanau.

GREETINGS

The descendants of the canoes, the pillars of society,
the voices of authority, greetings, greetings, greetings.
Greetings to you in the memory of our ancestors.
Their attempts to provide for their people and their
decision to come to Aotearoa laid the foundation for us,
their future generations. We greet them; greetings,
greetings, greetings.

The following is the philosophy of one of their sayings:

The heart of the flax bush has been
ripped out. Where are the bell birds
that sang - nature has been disrupted.

A question is asked; "What is the most
important of all things in the world?"

The reply; "It is people, people, people."

Not part of this mihi, I ask a question "Why?"

The answer I get, "Of all Creation, People are the only
creatures capable of restoring the disruption to nature

1. ANALYSIS OF THE DEPARTMENT

Analytically, the Department of Social Welfare (like all Government Departments); can be described as a classic example of a bureaucratic organisation, the dominant form of institution in modern society.

A bureaucracy has been defined as a rational-legal organisation. Rational in that it's means are expressly designed to achieve specific goals. Legal, in that it's authority is exercised by a system of rules and procedures through the office the individual occupies.

The characteristics of a bureaucracy are; a hierarchy of authority, employees being organised in a clearly defined hierarchy of offices; specialisation of task and function; rules and regulations to provide for every contingency; records and files being kept, it being an important part of the rationality of the system that information is written down; authority based in the office or position held, and the ability to calculate consequences of action using the information gained and stored.

Certainly the D.S.W. typifies this. The organisation is hierarchial, authority is based on ones position in the organisation, a detailed manual specifies the rules for each situation, and there is a legislative base regarding the obligations of the Department and of the worker (e.g. State Services Act 1962, Social Security Act 1964, Children and Young Persons Act 1974).

It is the Legislative base of this organisation, the rules and procedures that exist within it, which reflect the values of the society that created and support it. Maori input has been non-existent as the Maori has had to conform and fit into the 'system'. Maori participation in policy and decision-making has been almost non-existent, another bureaucratic characteristic being the emphasis on "technical qualifications" as a criteria for entry into the organisation, thus disqualifying most Maori people.

The whanau can also be likened to an institution. The essential differences are however, that one operates with and for its members from the basis of aroha and taha wairua. The other, whilst offering a welfare service lacks these life-forces. Through its very structure it represents the 'final stage of depersonalisation', whilst the value base on which it is built works against the interests of many within its realm of responsibility.

Our kaupapa is to protect those interests and project the values of our people - a major consumer group - into this structure. Our kaupapa is also to look at the existing structures and where there is a need, suggest alternatives. In doing this we recognise the need to address the impact of such a structure, not only on our 'consumer' group, but also on the employees within the structure. A seeming internal indifference, or lack of consideration for the needs of employees within this Department, will transmit itself to the consumer, through the discontent of that same employee. In many respects it is a vital part of the process in attempting to 'humanise' an institution, to recognise that individuals, people, make up an institution. Humanity must be practised internally before it can be implemented through services offered to the public. Low wages in the clerical system, high staff turnovers in parts of the Department's operations, a feeling of powerlessness and an inability, or lack of encouragement to contribute ideas or feedback on Departmental policies and procedures which are perceived as unjust or unrealistic, rank high as part of the response we received from our korero with Departmental employees. Consultation with employees, encouragement to participate in forwarding ideas, concerns etc, are all ways of giving a person a feeling of worth and commitment. How can we care for others if we feel uncared for?

In particular the Maori staff members should have the contributions they can offer as Maori, acknowledged and encouraged. Maori members of staff often talked about leaving their Maoriness at home when they went to work, returning at the end of the day to put it on. Maori staff members with 10-12 years D.S.W. experience were reluctant to apply for senior positions because they thought academic qualifications were necessary. Ten to twelve years in the D.S.W. is a qualification.

Being a Maori should be considered an asset, not a hindrance to ones work and opportunities within the Department. This feeling of self worth must be returned to Maori personnel by recognition of the expertise and strengths that they bring by virtue of their Maori backgrounds. This in itself is a qualification of merit.

The Practical in Terms of the Philosophy

Most of the Department's functions in regard to policy, planning and service delivery are built upon an understanding of 'family' being a nuclear unit family of two parents and approximately two and a half children.

Benefits, court reports, interviewing skills and general assumptions and expectations of Departmental employees, indeed of the Department, are that this is the unit that society on the whole is made up of.

To the Maori, the family is of an extended nature. Maatua, is the term used for family members who take on the parenting roles which are not confined to a mother and a father. Whanau (extended family) means aunts, uncles, siblings, first, second and third plus, cousins. You are related by whakapapa, by tribal and ancestral links. As such you have a whanau responsibility to care for and extend hospitality to your whanau members on various occasions e.g. tangi, hui for weddings, birthdays, Christmas gatherings etc. Today such hui put great pressure on whanau members time wise and financially. Such gatherings are, however, the mainstay in retaining the cultural ways which still exist and which are manifested in the awhina (support) and aroha which emerges at such hui. Hui are a reaffirmation of ones place within the whanau, as well as providing the venue for reaffirmation of ones taha wairua; the whatu manawa (the energy source within each one of us) emanating in such a way that a tangi can be considered a wonderful occasion, because of the outpouring of aroha energy at such a gathering.

The implications of this vital component of taha Maori to the Department in its present form have been the occasion for conflict internally and externally. As benefit payments are at times pressured because of the sudden death of a whanau member, which has meant travelling and living expenses over the period of tangi, (usually three days). The system may allow for such expenses but beneficiaries are often challenged when attempting to apply for advances on benefits to cover these costs.

Internally staff members are entitled to a certain amount of bereavement leave for immediate family members. The concept of whanau is not accommodated here despite the fact that there exists the same expectation to attend the tangi of an uncle as there would be for a parent or sibling. Leave requirements can cover some of the necessary time required but at times the expectation to remain and awhina the whanau beyond the leave time allowed, puts considerable pressure on Maori staff members who are torn between the requirements of their job, as outlined in the manual, and the expectations of their whanau.

In the social work area many of the Department's practices, have in the past and at present worked against this notion of whanau in both the areas of adoption, fostering and generic social work.

The practice of placing Maori children in Pakeha foster homes has been shown to be inappropriate but still occurs. This situation is being addressed in the concept ^{Maatua Whangai, which unfortunately} instead of being allowed to grow and develop is generally floundering because it has been slotted into the presently existing structure as 'Maori fostering'. Maatua whangai implies far more than this but some members of the Department cannot see beyond this restrictive view.

Within fostering and adoption there is still an emphasis on the material 'wealth' in middle-class terms, of the potential foster-home in certain areas. The Maori would evaluate the home on the wealth of aroha that existed there as being the prime requisite.

Adoption procedures in the past have led to a growing number of young Maori men and women, who, because of their fairness at birth or the belief that Maori's were not good parents, were placed with Pakeha adoptive parents. These young people have in later years found an empathy with other Maori people which has led them to seek their identity in order to find themselves. While this is not uncommon amongst adopted people, it can be very traumatic amongst those who feel they are Maori, and who can detect it physically in facial features when older, but who do not know where to start in seeking to find themselves and their people. To be a Maori without a tribal link or knowledge of ones roots is a horrible space to be in. There are many in this space. Today adoption procedures are continuing to ignore the importance of the tribal identity and the his/her stories that accompany this, when placing children for adoption. Tribal considerations must be taken into account in the placement of older, indeed any age, Maori children, as this will effect the placement in time, as well as having an effect on the child as he or she grows and wishes to establish his or her identity - taha Maori.

An example of two Maori children from one tribal background being placed with adoptive parents from another tribal background, because both sets of 'parents' had agreed it was all right, showed an interest more in meeting 'parental' needs rather than the childrens. The confusion in later years would arise when the children would need to identify with one or other tribal group. Tribal differences in protocol, or based on historical factors could also cause difficulties - to the children. Tribal identity and matching of them is a vital consideration.

The development of whanau ... through maatua whangai, should ^{later} for all Maori children in this category in the future as whangai children.

We could go on with many other examples of how racism is practiced by the Department and its staff. For example, the lack of respect shown to older Maori people at benefit counters

by young inexperienced staff - thrown out to the counter to learn by experience, but at what cost? The Department's image has suffered tremendously because frontline counter work has not been accorded the importance it deserves. This is where the services are delivered. The quality of such service is judged by the public at this time. It is important that mature people or younger staff, reflecting the ethnicity of the consumer groups, who have been chosen for their ability to relate in a bicultural mode, and who are trained, or have their already existing skills enhanced by training, be placed in such situations. Respect is a quality which should be accorded to all, it will be returned if it is given.

It should also be noted respectfully, that there are exceptions to these generalisations. That flexibility and initiative does exist amongst some personnel in the Department and some office operations.

Social workers as are all Departmental staff, are predominantly Pakeha and middle-class in number. There is little awareness of cultural differences and few social workers are aware of, let alone regular participants at, Maori hui. In many areas the social workers come from outside the locality they are working in and have little accountability to the people they work for. Maori people are judged on child rearing techniques, living standards and their ability or inability to cope, by people who have no idea of the different mores that many Maori people live by. They judge them by middle-class criteria, reinforced by the Department and society and from the privileged positions of people who have options because they perpetuate the rules which uphold their privileged status. The Department has shown an overwhelming arrogance in allowing such practices to continue, in fact by attempting to reinforce and strengthen them, looking at the latest selection panel requirements as an example, and at the Pakeha working group reviewing the Children and Young Persons Act. Maori people were consultants but were not invited as working party members, despite the fact that the major group which is effected by this Act consists of Maori young people. This must not continue.

Particular strains are placed on Maori staff members because they are Maori. They experience feelings of conflict because their attitude towards clients is judged as being "not professional" one of "over involvement" "too personal" Maori staff cannot disguise their concern for people who look to them for assistance. The only alternative therefore in order for them to fit into "the system" is to forsake their "Maoriness" thereby hopefully reducing their strains, eliminating "feelings" of conflict within themselves and those real feelings of isolation because they are Maori and have a different approach to clients.

"Stereotyping" is alive and well and flourishes within the Department. That a large percentage of the population who receive benefits mainly Unemployment benefit are Maori and Polynesian re enforces the idea that "they are lazy and don't want to work" and that Maori staff are "good to them" because "theyre probably relations anyway".

As Maori staff they are also affected by their "pepper potting". This for Social work staff means they are alone, unsupported, now with Maatua Whangui some feel they are largely out on a limb from the rest of their colleagues. To be able to get together with other Maori staff would support them in being Maori.

Another issue is their need for Maori input for their work. Even if there were Maori staff trainers, their pressure within the Department could never replace hui, tangi etc as enriching reviving and learning experiences for them. They need not only trainers within the Department who could educate their colleagues, they need validation of their Maoriness by being freely and willingly released for hui and tangi.

The Department of Social Welfare has not given due consideration to the Maori people in the delivery of its services.

It has paid lip service to Taha Maori and applied superficial remedies without attending to the underlying causes before hand.

The Maori people mainly the Maori women who are doing voluntary work have in their desire to help alleviate the plight of the Maori families been exploited by the Department of Social Welfare and other Government agencies.

This has been in the form of calling on them to assist paid staff in carrying out their work, e.g. assisting in court, Maatua Whangai, working with at risk children.

They have not been given the resources that they urgently need at times to effectively carry out these extra responsibilities.

In many instances they have had to use their own limited resources to give immediate relief to families in dire need.

Consequently they themselves are financially, physically and mentally drained of their resources. This type of pressure can no longer be sustained.

The Maori people who belong to such organisations as the Maori Wardens Association, Maori Womens Welfare League, Arohanui Trust Inc., Marae Inc. Soc., to name a few have been the vital back up support for the Department of Social Welfare, but the crunch has been that due to their lack of academic qualifications they cannot enjoy the same priviledges and authority to make decisions accorded their counterparts.

The strong feeling is that the Department of Social Welfare's bureaucratic model is inappropriate and that it does not adequately cater to the needs of the Maori people.

If its aim is to successfully serve the needs of the Maori people it has to change its model to a bicultural one.

The Future

Our unit is committed to the concept of Maatua Whangai using the initiatives of Te Koputu Taonga, Wai Ora and Kohanga Reo as essential components in looking at alternative methods or systems of 'Welfare'.

Essentially we are talking about a concept of whanau and community development which ensures that the responsibility for providing care to its members, returns to the whanau, the hapu, the iwi. Those whanau which are dislocated through urbanisation can be replaced by alternative whanau, based on common bonds brought about by neighbourhood locations, adversity, or other factors.

This model of welfare (maatua whangai) is about the decentralisation of power and resources to such whanau or community linked groups. The function of Government employees would be to co-operate in facilitating the accessing of resources to those groups through such umbrella organisations, or administrative organisations, as Kokiri management units, marae committees, Maori committees, Maori District Councils. These would be part and parcel of the need for accountability, but it would be a two pronged accountability incorporating recipients into the process.

Another function would be to provide the resources to enable whanau members to learn skills they consider vital in assisting their ability to care for themselves. Programmes of skill sharing, such as those at Te Koputu Taonga, would incorporate the ideal of a working relationship between Departments and the community. The goal is to enable community people to develop and to be able to ultimately have the skills and confidence with which to determine their own futures.

Decentralisation means localising power (amongst other things). In line with this move and the concept of maatua whangai, the community in which the Departmental office or institution operates should be involved in these operations. As recommended by WARAG, community members should be involved

in writing job descriptions, selecting mokai (employees, public servants) and providing input on how they perceive their needs as it relates to service provision and policy making. Policies would be in response to these needs. Locally recruited employees would be more committed to serving the community they live in. The community, now being aware and involved in decision making as it relates to them, should be supportive of their 'mokai'. Concerns about consultation, which at present seems a major focus of energy by Head Office staff and Departmental/Ministerial Task Forces, would not exist. The community viewpoint would be known through the existing relationships between communities and Department.

Existing models of interdepartmental functioning would ensure that services should not be duplicated and that the accessing of resources could be facilitated more efficiently and effectively. Such models contribute to the breaking down of the compartmentalisation of society and competition for resources by Departments. An overview, in line with the holistic views of the Maori, should ultimately provide better servicing of people and a more informed *idea* of the needs of the community. Everything is interrelated as is the functioning of all Government Departments if they are in truth working for the people.

Training programmes would be developed along community and departmental lines. Both community and Departmental staff would attend such courses. Ideally there would be little differentiation between the two as the power is gradually given back to whanau members who will have learned the skills required to cope with the handling of such resources.

This is a guide to a future ideal.

The Present

The above-outlined model is a long term goal. Whilst working towards achieving this goal, short-term measures with hopefully long term effects, such as those recommended by WARAG are

essential if we are aiming at achieving an approach which meets the needs of Maori people in relation to policy, planning and service delivery.

Fortunately there is a growing awareness of the injustices of this present system. The Maori Advisory Unit is an indication of this. A recent video commissioned by D.S.W. which shows the alternative method of working with whanau by social workers is also part of the growing realisation that present and past departmental procedures have not worked. It is only by looking at alternative models of operating which must be developed from a bicultural philosophy that such injustice can be removed. The WARAG report confirms what Maori people have been saying for decades. There is nothing new or surprising to Maori people within the recommendations. They are actions that must be taken if the Department is working for the people.

We the Maori Advisory Unit recommend that the Task Force, to work on the racism within D.S.W., be made up of Maori and non-Maori, that the Maori members may if need be, selected from other departments or, community and co-opted on to the working group.

The Department has already begun to take steps towards this in its moves for consultations with Maori groups. What is needed however, is a commitment to biculturalism that is not superficial but structural in nature.

The WARAG report "Institutional Racism" recommends structural and operational changes which are vital and which are in tune with the mood and the calls of Maori people. Beyond this however, are the calls to recognise existing Maori models and initiatives as alternatives to present day institutions. This is the challenge that the Department must accept.

"Ma te Maatua Whangai e
whakahoki te warua-ora
ki te ira tangata
ki te iwi Maori hoki"

Matua whangai will restore the spiritual wellbeing of the Maori people:

IN CONCLUSION

Writing a report of this nature has been quite a big responsibility but a very necessary one.

We now take the opportunity to acknowledge the Director General for his role in this venture and to all the people on the staff in the Department who supported us in our task and to the Maori people in the community as well as all other peoples of Aotearoa.

Tena ra koutou katoa.

The Maori Advisory Unit,
Malcolm Peri
Moana Herewini
Rangitania Wilson.

COMMON QUESTIONS AND A RESPONSE

Mitzi Naim

Resource Officer for National Council of Churches and Catholic Church Programme on Racism

INTRODUCTION

Many of the "questions" which come up in discussions about racism come up in the form of statements. Some of the questions are factual and have straightforward answers; others are more about ideas and misunderstandings. People ask some of them for a variety of reasons, and it isn't always easy to answer the question the person is really asking. Sometimes the only "answer" is to ask more questions, and sometimes it's only possible to suggest the direction in which we think the answer may lie.

WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY RACISM?

Racism is a term to describe a social situation which comes into being when one group views its cultural values, lifestyles, and socioeconomic self-interest as superior to or having priority over those of other groups, and then has the power to carry those assumptions into norms and institutions.

Institutions are fairly stable social arrangements through which a nation takes collective actions. (Such as courts, schools, government departments, business, unions).

Racism is found by looking at the outcomes, what is actually happening, and then doing some analysis of the causes of those results. It's not about intentions.

Prejudice is about attitudes and intentions. Prejudiced people can thrive in a racist situation, although anybody can be prejudiced. One definition of racism is prejudice plus power.

BUT MAORIS ARE JUST AS RACIST AS PAKEHAS — THEY HATE PACIFIC ISLANDERS DON'T THEY?

Refer to question: what do you mean by racism? Any group of people can be prejudiced, including Maori people. There are some good historic reasons for some Maori attitudes towards Pakeha people — the surprise is how positive and forgiving most Maori people are towards us. Yes, there is prejudice between Maori and Pacific people. This is deepened by the fact that in a racist society they have often been played off against one another and forced to compete for scarce resources like housing and jobs.

ALL THIS TALK ABOUT RACISM IS PART OF A PLOT TO DESTABILISE NEW ZEALAND SOCIETY.

Racism is a dangerous instability in the New Zealand social framework, as other fundamental injustices tend to be. Stability in the long term is built on justice and participation for all. Talk about racism is part of an attempt to redress imbalances and wrongs by educating ourselves for changes.

THE CHURCHES SHOULDN'T BE STIRRING THE RACIST POT — DOESN'T CHRISTIANITY STAND FOR LOVE AND TOLERANCE?

SHOULDN'T CHRISTIANS JUST LOVE ONE ANOTHER? ISN'T THIS LENTEN PROGRAMME JUST CAUSING DIVISION?

Christianity stands for love and justice. Jesus invited people to change — Zacchaeus, Nicodemus, Matthew, Mary of Magdala, Martha of Bethany, the Samaritan woman, the Pharisees and Sadducees.

The churches, with Jesus, inherit the prophetic tradition which calls repeatedly for justice for poor and oppressed groups.

Historically the church has taken up this tradition over major issues of injustice such as slavery — even while parts of itself may have been caught up in the unjust situation.

The gift at the altar should be left until reconciliation takes place (Matt 5:23-24). God prefers justice rolling like a river, to services and offerings (Amos 5:22-24). This justice which God calls us to is not just good interpersonal relationships, but between groups of people.

THERE ARE HARDLY ANY MAORIS DOWN HERE AND VERY FEW PACIFIC ISLANDERS, SO HOW DOES IT AFFECT US?

Prejudice and discrimination are interpersonal, but racism is about institutional patterns which are set and can only be altered at a national level. Maori and Pacific people are a minority in this country, and we, the dominant majority, need to face questions of our identity and this nation's identity, and questions of racial justice, whether we live in the North or the South. Because of social stratification, many people in the North have virtually no contact with Maori and Pacific people. Another question is why those Maori and Pacific people who do live in the South are so invisible? Why are they so shy and unobtrusive? Why do they behave in such an "assimilated" way?

The proportion of Samoan people in the population of Christchurch is higher than the proportion of Samoan people in the population of Auckland, so "statistically" you're more likely to meet a Samoan person if you live in Christchurch!

WHAT ABOUT ALL THE OTHER ETHNIC MINORITIES?

I think most people would agree that if our society becomes multi-cultural, many groups of people will be better off — in fact we will all benefit. However, the historical fact is that the Treaty was signed between two peoples, and soon after that agreement, opportunities for developing as a bi-cultural nation began to be ignored and rejected. Sorting out bi-culturalism seems to be a good step on the way to multi-culturalism.

There is also a factor of urgency for Maori people in that if their language and culture dies out here in Aotearoa, there is no place where Maori is spoken and lived. All other peoples have some kind of roots elsewhere.

BUT THE MAORIS THEMSELVES WERE COLONISTS — WHAT ABOUT THE MORIORS?

This story is not a Maori tradition but a myth which was concocted by Pakeha scholars, such as S. Percy Smith and Elsdon Best, during the late 19th and early 20th century, working within the framework of their time, selecting material which fitted into their own speculations.

Like many of their erroneous theories, this one has been disproved by later scholars using modern developments in their discipline such as: a more complete archaeological picture supported by carbon dating; study of prehistoric artefacts over the whole Pacific area; pan-Pacific linguistic study; more comprehensive and detailed study of Maori oral traditions. In summary, the consensus is that from prehistoric times this country has been settled by people of common Polynesian stock who were all, physically, culturally and linguistically Maori, i.e. indigenous people. The word Moriori is probably a variant of the word Maori, and is the name of the tribe inhabiting the Chatham Islands.

This story seem to have become part of popular Pakeha consciousness, perhaps because it appears to justify European historical actions.

MAORI, PACIFIC ISLAND AND PAKEHA CULTURES DO NOT MIX.

Mixing of cultures isn't a goal we espouse. Cultures are very different and what is desirable is the flourishing of cultural diversity and space, and an increasing ability of citizens to move between cultures feeling 'at home', as many Maori and Pacific people but very few Pakeha people are already able to do.

In terms of very basic cultural values, it is difficult for people from different cultures to share a country with equity, but not impossible where there is goodwill.

ISNT RACISM JUST A PROBLEM IN THE NORTH?

No. One of the problems about racism is that it is seen in this way. In fact racism is a national problem about living as a nation with justice and equity. The fact that a large proportion of the population refuses to accept responsibility and locates the "problem" somewhere else is a key to the maintenance of the unjust legacy which we have inherited today.

SOME PEOPLE SEEM TO BE ADVOCATING SEPARATE DEVELOPMENT — ISNT THAT APARTHEID?

Apartheid is not the same thing as separate development, it is a repressive system based on legislation such as the Pass Laws, the Group Areas Act etc. It has co-opted the term separate development and used heavy amounts of propaganda to convince the world, often successfully, that that is what apartheid is about.

But detached from the system of apartheid, separate development is an idea which fits with autonomy, self-determination and other positive ways in which the aspirations of peoples to control their own lives on their own terms are expressed. Some Maori people point to alternative or parallel institutions as a means of retaining Maori control of Maori things, such as Kohanga Reo, where the dominant Pakeha group is unwilling, or unable to modify and change institutions quickly enough.

THE MAORIS HAVE BECOME UNSETTLED BECAUSE OF THE ANTI-APARTHEID MOVEMENT IN NEW ZEALAND.

Maori people have always been perfectly capable of analysing their situation and organising in the hope of change. For example, protests based on the Treaty of Waitangi began almost immediately. Flagstaves which flew the British flag were cut down four times during 1844-45. Hone Heke had signed the Treaty in 1840. Now, as a Christian, he tested his case by attacking the flagstaff because, as he said, "it has neither bones nor blood and would feel no pain."

In the past decade, Pakeha people have become more aware of Maori grievances because young Maori people, products of the education system, have carried this discussion, in English, off the marae into Pakeha forums.

There has always been a strong Maori presence in the anti-apartheid movement in New Zealand, and it has grown steadily with the general expansion of the anti-apartheid movement, and its contribution within the movement, including an ability to see the links between international and domestic racism, has been very important.

NEW ZEALAND RACE RELATIONS ARE A MODEL FOR THE REST OF THE WORLD

This is a myth, promulgated mainly by Pakeha people. The social outcomes for Maori people, as measured on most indicators (such as health, income, housing, cultural impact) don't say much for our race relations. Situations in other countries are often far from perfect too, but there are things we could learn from. For example, Australia has extensive interpreters services for immigrants; Canada is trying out a public service promotion bar if you're not bilingual.

WHY ARE WE WORRYING ABOUT OUR RACE RELATIONS WHEN OTHERS OVERSEAS ARE SO MUCH WORSE?

This is a strange attitude. The structures underlying our race relations are based in the injustice of racism, and as such are a long-term formula for disaster and slow genocide, or at the very least for Maori people to vanish as a distinctive cultural and language group.

We are called, as Christians, to do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with our God, in our own country. The fact that bad things are happening somewhere else doesn't make it okay for us to allow bad things to happen here.

Patterns of life expectancy, incomes, infant mortality, employment, education and so on are remarkably similar in white-dominated societies which have a colonial history.

IT'S VERY SAD BUT IT'S INEVITABLE. WE HAVE TO BE REALISTIC ABOUT ECONOMIC FORCES AND PROGRESS AND MODERNISATION. THEY WANT MEDICINE AND TECHNOLOGY, THIS IS THE PRICE.

It's too easy for those benefiting from a situation to talk like this. History shows that these statements are not true. In the period prior to 1863 Maori people still had their own economic base—communally held land and tribal labour—and operated very successfully, adapting new agricultural technology into their own context. They also showed an ability to take the new educational skills of literacy into their own system. The "price tag" was put on to education and technology later, by Pakeha dominated decisions, after the land wars had begun an assault on Maori land tenure, and legislation for changes in education was in place to undermine Maori education on Maori terms.

HAVEN'T THE MAORI GAINED MORE THAN THEY'VE LOST?

It wasn't supposed to be that kind of transaction. Much of what Maori people have "lost"—such as land, language, culture and self-determination, wasn't an inevitable price-tag on what they "gained", by which most people mean technology, medicine and things like that.

BUT WE'VE REALLY LOOKED AFTER OUR MAORI PEOPLE, HAVEN'T WE?

This sounds really paternalistic. Apart from the fact that Maori people are quite capable of looking after themselves provided they are not deprived of their share of resources, the statistics published by our own Pakeha-dominated and controlled institutions show huge discrepancies in the outcomes for Maori and Pakeha in terms of advantage and disadvantage.

MAORI PEOPLE ARE EASY-GOING AND LAZY, WHY TRY TO CHANGE THEM?

That is a pretty sweeping stereotype of Maori people, most of whom work very hard in appropriate situations. It is true that because of different values Maori people don't always have the same aspirations as Pakeha people. But it's not a question of "trying to change them". What is in question is what is happening to them as a people, which shows up in the statistics of all our government departments for a start. While people may have different social priorities, it's hard to argue that any people want their child to have a shorter life expectancy than other children, end up on the streets in trouble, or be unable to participate in a meaningful life. And in areas where Maori people are under-represented, like the Department of Foreign Affairs, it's hard to argue that no Maori people are interested in how this country presents itself overseas, which other countries it relates to and co-operates with.

WHY SHOULD I LISTEN TO ALL THESE RADICAL MAORIS INSTEAD OF RESPONSIBLE MAORI LEADERS LIKE SIR GRAHAM LATIMER?

Radical has become a bit of a label to pin on to anybody who threatens us. Some of "these radical Maoris" may have some perceptive ideas about what is happening and where we, as a country, could go in the next decade.

What do you understand Sir Graham Latimer to have been saying when he walked into Wellington in the forefront of the 1975 Maori Land March under the banner of "Not one more acre of Maori Land to be alienated?" What do you understand him to be saying through the New Zealand Maori Council's discussion papers on Maori Affairs and Land legislation?

On Marae all over the country, Maori speakers of all ages talk about life today. When one listens to what is said, a common mind is very often expressed.

WHAT ABOUT MY IDENTITY? I DON'T BELONG ANYWHERE ELSE.

Fine, but you need to consider on what terms we belong here. This country is located in the South Pacific, and has natural links with Asia, as well as its colonial links with Europe. What is Pakeha identity? Is it mono-cultural or bi-cultural? Which is desirable? Do we want to perpetuate a racist legacy or take some responsibility for changing it for a more just future for us all. Europeans do in fact have access to many other countries to which they are able to move, and live, like Australia, Canada, United Kingdom, Holland.

WE ARE ALL ONE PEOPLE. WHY CAN'T WE JUST BE ALL NEW ZEALANDERS?

We began as two peoples, agreeing to share one country, one nation, for our mutual benefit. Since then, the Treaty of Waitangi has been broken by one party, the party which subsequently became more numerous and more powerful. The name of New Zealand belongs to that group. The country was already known by its previous inhabitants by a number of other names, of which Aotearoa would today seem to be most commonly used. Maori people are still called Maori people, some accept New Zealander as well, others consider Maori alone to identify them appropriately. These phrases originated with Pakeha speakers, although some Maori people today accept and identify with them.

WHY KEEP DRAGGING UP THE PAST?

There are a number of answers to this.

What is happening now often has its roots in the past, and it is very hard to find solutions without some understanding of how the situation developed.

The two cultures, Maori and Pakeha, face different ways in time. Maori people face the past, which is in front, visible and known, and expect the future to come unknown from behind. Pakeha people face the future, with great interest in predicting, planning and providing. The past is out of sight behind us, often forgotten. Maori people, along with many of the world's peoples, think in terms of future generations, and the responsibility in the present to provide continuity between past generations and their descendants. Pakeha people tend to solve problems in the present short-term and assume that future generations will cope with the long-term results.

Many Pakeha people are afraid of looking at history, because they suspect that what they discover will make them feel bad or guilty. Refer to the answer about guilt versus responsibility.

BUT YOU CAN'T CHANGE HISTORY, CAN YOU?

In that history tends to be written by white men, and reflect their experience and interpretation, you can change history—how it is written and whose versions and interpretations are included.

It is also possible to change future history according to whether we work to perpetuate or work to alter the injustices of the historic legacy we receive from our colonial racist past.

A new crop of New Zealand historians such as Michael King, Claudia Orange, Hugh Laracy, Keith Sorrenson, Tony Simpson, Judith Binney are worth reading. These people give fresh versions and other interpretations to our history.

IT'S VERY SAD BUT THERE'S NOTHING WE CAN DO. I HAVEN'T GOT ANY POWER.

Easy for the "winners" to be fatalistic. That pushes responsibility for change on to the victims.

THE INDIVIDUAL IS RESPONSIBLE FOR HIS OWN DESTINY.

That is a statement very much based in western culture and philosophy. By no means all of the world's people would agree.

WE HAVE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY HERE, DON'T WE?

We really need to rethink what we mean by equal opportunity. Is treating people who are very different as if they were the same really equal? If the outcomes show inequality in access to opportunity, how equal has it really been?

If people can only take up their "equal opportunities" at the price of their own values and identity, is that really fair? Isn't that a hidden cost which upsets the equation?

WHY ISN'T THE INFLUENCE FOR GOOD OF THE MARAE STRONGER?

It is an uphill struggle for the influence of the marae to become stronger as long as Maori people and Maoritanga are marginalised in society. To reverse such things as the erosion of the Maori language requires a change of heart and behaviour by the Pakeha majority — recognition of Maori as an official language, more Maori language broadcasts on radio and TV, change in the status of Maori language and taha Maori in education.

The conflict between the Pakeha world and its time patterns and the world of the marae is itself a great problem in the building up of Maoritanga — what is really a lifestyle becomes a spare-time hobby. Maori identity is expressed at weekends, the Pakeha world rules during the week. So the marae is made marginal in time, and also, frequently, in space — investigate the sites of many urban marae and surrounding land use.

Nevertheless, the survival power and importance of the marae is still an extremely hopeful sign.

Remember, that most marae are in the country areas, while nearly eight out of ten Maori are now living in cities and towns. There is an urgent need for more urban marae.

MAORI LANGUAGE HAS NO LITERATURE. IT ISN'T USEFUL.

We are brought up within western culture to put great weight on writing, and to undervalue oral skills and records. We are a writing culture and have poor oral skills, which gives us some good reasons to prefer our written versions to our oral ones. But it is ethnocentric of us to transfer those evaluations to people from other cultures, believing that written is always superior or more desirable than oral mode.

However, the perception of Maori as being a language without a literature is not accurate, as the current exhibition, NGA TUHITUHINGA A NGA TUPUNA, at the Auckland Public Library makes clear. Here are displayed examples from the Grey Collection, including some manuscripts from the almost 10,000 pages in the collection which include waiata (sung poetry), whakapapa (genealogy), korero tawhito (mythology and history), karakia (religious concepts and practices), and whakatauki (proverbs).

Early books printed in Maori show the rise, before the wars and confiscations of the 1860s, of Maori participation in events of the day, in technology and in commerce. Later ones reflect the effects and show Maori attempts to find answers to their problems.

The exhibition also shows that from 1842 until the early 1900s there were at least 30 periodicals published in Maori.

Yet of all those manuscripts, only a handful have been published, in Ko Nga Moteatea me Nga Hakirara o Nga Maori and Nga Mahi a Nga Tupuna. The fact that so little of this huge body of Maori literature has been published shows rather a lack of resources for such publication, and a low priority for minority readerships within the printing trade.

In terms of language, which embodies culture, 'usefulness' is an inappropriate term or category for thinking.

There was a time when literacy and writing in Maori and English was higher among Maori than the Pakeha.

WHY DON'T THEY PUT ENGLISH SUBTITLES ON TE KARERE?

The Maori language has its own status. This is Maori news in Maori for speakers of Maori.

The production team is already starved of resources. Putting in a person to translate and another to do the technical side of subtitling would use up extra resources which could be put into better news coverage.

TEACHING TAHA MAORI IN SOUTH ISLAND SCHOOLS IS A WASTE OF TIME — THERE'S NO MAORI CULTURE CLOSE AT HAND TO SHARE IN. WHY SHOULD WE LEARN TO SPEAK MAORI LANGUAGE WHEN YOU CAN'T USE IT OVERSEAS?

In many parts of the South Island Maori culture is alive and well but largely invisible to Pakeha eyes.

There's no French culture close at hand either. It's no harder to travel to a New Zealand centre than to Noumea.

It is arguably not a waste of time to teach young people about their heritage in the land they live in.

It is Pakeha people who are experiencing a crisis of identity — along with the rest of the world's population which is white, in the minority (one eighth of the world's people) and finds itself by historical accident controlling a disproportionate share of the world's lands, people and resources. Our children's generation needs to be prepared to adapt, and taha Maori is one small step to help them. Bi-culturalism will be an advantage in tomorrow's world.

It depends on whom you want to communicate with overseas — Maori belongs to a language group spoken over a fifth of the world's surface, and Maori speakers readily pick up Polynesian, Malay and Tagalog related languages.

WHAT IS OUR TRIBE? WE PAKEHAS DON'T HAVE A CULTURE.

Yes, we are a disunited, mixed bag. Some people find it helpful to explore the idea that we are manuhiri, guests, new arrivals. We have certainly become the most numerous, dominant group. This makes us behave as the norm — which makes our culture invisible to us. We surely do have a culture: culture is the whole way of life of a people, the way we go about such things as communicating with one another, making decisions, the way we think about things, what we consider important, the way we structure our families and society. By and large our culture is the way things happen in this country.

WHO IS THE OFFICIAL VOICE OF THE MAORI PEOPLE? WHO DO WE BELIEVE?

It depends on the situation. Maori opinion covers a wide range, just as Pakeha opinion does. On some matters, church people should probably listen carefully to what groups like Te Runanga Katorika (the National Maori Catholic Council of the New Zealand Bishops' Conference) and Te Runanga Whakawhanaunga i Nga Hahi o Aotearoa (Maori Council of Churches of which the National Maori Catholic Council is a member) are saying. In some situations local elders are the experts. Sometimes a major Maori gathering can be regarded as laying out the thoughts of Maoridom on a particular matter — for example the recent hui at Ngaruawahia about the Treaty of Waitangi spoke with considerable gathered authority.

THE MAORIS THEMSELVES ARE DIVIDED. MOST ARE CONTENT WITH THE STATUS QUO. IT'S JUST A FEW YOUNG RADICALS STIRRING UP TROUBLE. THEY'RE BEING STIRRED UP BY PAKEHA STIRRERS.

Statements like these reveal a very low opinion of Maori people, their intelligence, analytic skills and ability to understand their own experience.

It is true that they are divided — policies over the last hundred years have produced that effect, sometimes deliberately — but Pakehas are divided too.

If you think it's just the young radicals, you should learn to speak Maori and go and listen to the old people on the marae. Those Maori people who have been most distanced from the rest of their people by constant assimilationist policies appear content with the status quo.

SOME OF MY BEST FRIENDS ARE MAORI AND THEY DON'T TALK LIKE THIS.

Well, they are your friends, and maybe they don't want to put the relationship at risk by offending you. And of course, not all Maori people think the same, after years of avowed assimilationist policies in education and housing for two examples, many Maori people have had little choice but to move to accepting the dominant social perceptions.

WHAT ABOUT ALL THE OPPORTUNITIES MAORI PEOPLE HAVE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, WITH ALL THE BURSARIES ETC. AVAILABLE FOR THEM?

The statistics don't bear out these impressions. There is at present no consensus about the reasons for Maori under-representation in higher education although some combination of the many put forward probably accounts for it. Auckland University Committee on Educational Opportunity for Maori and other Polynesian Students, Reports for 1976 and 1977, discuss some of the reasons.

"He Huarahi", published by the National Advisory Committee on Maori Education makes some suggestions.

About the bursaries which you mention, the majority come under the Maori Education Foundation which is a fund made up substantially of money from Maori sources such as the income from small units of land leased by the Maori Trustee, although some Pakeha individuals and families have also made donations, especially when the MEF was being set up. Some tribes also offer scholarships from special trust funds which they hold — similar to some civic trust scholarships: eg. the Masterton Education Trust. In other words, most of the 'extra' assistance to Maori students comes from collective Maori money.

It is a sobering thought that in all the New Zealand Company purchases, the selling tribes entered into the deals on the understanding that one tenth of the land ceded would provide for the tribe's health, welfare and education in perpetuity. Even in the Nelson purchase, where quite a lot of land was actually set aside, the amount of one tenth was not reached, and the trust management was erratic. But members of tribes who entered into those agreements in effect pay for their education three times over — through that original cession of land; through taxes which they pay; and through their interest in the MEF.

Among the etceteras we must include such things as Maori Affairs Department apprenticeships, set up because young Maori were simply not being taken on as apprentices through usual channels, and so Maori workers were underskilled; had all things worked out equitably, the Department's intervention would not have been necessary.

Similarly, the Polynesian Preference Schemes in some ATI and University courses. These are not as rosy as they sound. They operate in courses where there are more applicants than places. All PP candidates meet the entry qualifications — A or B+ Bursary or whatever — but a few certain places may be filled by Polynesian students rather than filling them solely on the basis of ranked order of marks.

These attempts to counter the statistical ravages of history are hard to evaluate.

CENTRAL OTAGO WAS JUST WASTE LAND AND RAUPO AND THE MAORIS ONLY USED IT AS A PATHWAY TO THE WEST COAST.

The concept of "waste land" for justifying colonial takeover, was frequently offered. But of course land could be owned, without necessarily appearing to be used, in European law.

WHAT ABOUT MAORI SEATS?

Representation in Pakeha seats is based on a formula where the total population of the South Island is divided by 25 which defines the size of an electorate. In the 1982/3 division this amounted to about 32,600 per electorate. There is a clear mechanism for adjusting the size of Pakeha seats. Maori seats have been a fixed number since 1867, and there is no mechanism for adjusting their size — the only discussion which takes place on the subject is the question of abolishing them. Despite provisions for people of mixed ancestry to transfer to the general electoral roll, there is little indication through this process that Maori people generally want to give up the four seats.

Historically, the Maori seats were instituted to limit Maori influence in Parliament, not to provide a Maori voice. Under the 1852 Constitution Act, eligibility to stand for Parliament, and eligibility for franchise, was an adult male one, based on a property qualification. Land was one form of recognised property, but only if it was under individual title, not if it was communally owned. After the Land Wars and the setting up of the Native Land Court, land which had been under communal title when confiscated was returned under individual title. Settlers became alarmed that, as a side effect of individualisation of title, Maori with property qualifications to vote might come to outnumber the settlers in certain electorates. The North Island settlers, concerned that power was concentrating in the South Island, proposed four electorates in which Maori people could vote for European candidates. The South Island settlers, realising that this would give the North three seats to one, forced through the Maori Representation Act which provided for Maori candidates. These four seats, set up in 1867, have forever restricted Maori representation in Parliament. A few Maori MPs have represented general electorates. I cannot think of any occasions on which they have identified themselves as having a position on a Maori issue which is incompatible with Pakeha advantage.

In a majority rule democracy, compared to a consensus democracy, minority opinion can get swamped at electorate level. At least, with separate Maori seats, it is possible for that voice to get as far as Parliamentary debate.

The Maori seats cover enormous areas, especially Southern Maori, and this presents special difficulties and expense. No Pakeha electorate is anywhere near in size: for example there are a dozen Pakeha seats in the same area as the Northern Maori electorate. The Maori population is much younger than the Pakeha population, and over the last two elections a steady increase in numbers of eligible Maori voters has begun. Regarding the number of total population each MP represents, that is, including children and young persons, there is a huge discrepancy. Estimates of the number of Maori seats which would exist if calculated on the same basis as Pakeha seats range from seven to ten.

Maori bodies such as Te Runanga Whakawhānau i Nga Hahi (Maori Council of Churches) encourage their people to seek more Maori seats in order that New Zealand can be even more democratic than it already is.

WHAT ABOUT THE MAORI AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT?

The Department has only very recently come under Maori control with the explicit aim of serving Maori interests, with the appointment of a Maori head of department and recruitment of Maori staff. Under this restructuring, which is not yet completed, policies like Tu Tangata, Kohanga Reo and Matua Whangai are emerging. Historically its predecessor, the Department of Native Affairs was set up under Pakeha control, to serve settler interests. Here is a summary of some of the information in A Show of Justice by Alan Ward.

Initially, under the Governors, there were two separate Offices: the Land Purchase Officer and the Protectorate of Aborigines (a "pro-Maori" advocacy). Governor Grey soon fell out with the Protectorate and disbanded it. "In so doing he destroyed an organisation which, despite its much-publicised failures, had quietly achieved considerable success in mitigating Maori-Pakeha conflict. The Protectorate had also begun to amass detailed knowledge upon which policy could be based in such fields as Maori land tenure, and the cessation of this development was unfortunate. There was not again to be a department of government so sensitive to Maori viewpoints and the absence of it was to be extremely serious in the next decade" (p73). Grey replaced the Protectorate with the office of Native Secretary, a clerk working under the Governor, mainly in the interests of promoting land settlement.

In 1852 the transition to settler self-government showed the retention of both the Land Purchase Office and the Native Secretary, and in 1856 Donald McLean combined both offices. During the years 1856-1893, the Native Department came into being, mainly concerned with health, welfare and minor adjudications, and was run down towards the end of that period. The impact of the setting up of the Native Land Court in 1865 and its subsequent workings was great during this period. In 1892 the Native Department in its old form went out of existence under men like Bryce, while the workings of the Native Land Court, transferring land from collective ownership to individual title, continued.

In 1906 the Liberals recreated a Native Department, "recognising special Maori needs to some extent, although it was paternalistic in character, largely concerned with the settlement of Maori land, and for many years gave little scope for Maori leaders to exercise responsibility through it" (p305).

In 1929, Ngata, as Minister of Native Affairs, began modest state funding for development of Maori lands.

The present Department of Maori Affairs was set up in 1953 under "An Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to Maori land and also to consolidate and amend certain provisions of the law relating especially to Maoris". The Department of Maori Affairs was reconstituted: "The general functions of the Department shall be to give effect, under the direction of the Minister, to the provisions of this Act and of all other enactments administered by it, to carry out any other directions of the Minister for the benefit of individuals or groups of the Maori race, and to provide the clerical and administrative services necessary for the efficient functioning of the Maori Land Court".

"In the exercise of its functions the Department shall always, to the extent possible, have regard to the following objects:

- (a) The retention of Maori land in the hands of its owners, and its use or administration by them or for their benefit
- (b) The preservation, encouragement, and transmission of the Maori language, Maori customs and traditions, Maori arts and handicrafts, and other aspects of Maori culture essential to the identity of the Maori race:

THERE ARE NO MAJOR ISSUES INVOLVING MAORI LAND IN THE SOUTH ISLAND. THERE WERE NO LAND CONFISCATIONS IN THE SOUTH. THE PIONEERS BOUGHT THE LAND. THERE WAS NO SETTLEMENT ON THE SITE OF DUNEDIN CITY.

It is true that confiscation was not a means whereby land was alienated in the South. However by no means all land grievances arise from confiscation. Historically, Maori people in the South Island were separated from their land early on. A few huge land purchases accounted for almost the whole Island. However, reserves which were supposed to be granted were not, and this accounts for some of the largest land claims in the country, those of Ngaitahu-Ngati Mamoe.

Dunedin city has a number of disputed blocks, notably the Otepoti Landinq now referred to as Prince's Street which was specifically reserved from the Otakou Block under the leadership of Tuhawaiki, the Upoko Ariki or paramount chief of the area.

The pioneers bought the land from the New Zealand Company or from the Crown — but it is the previous transaction which is in question.

DONT WE PAKEHAS LOVE OUR LAND TOO?

Yes, love of land is one of our values, but in practice we can be seen to subordinate that value in responding to other pressures or options, by leaving, selling or changing its use.

MY FATHER WASNT RICH, I DONT OWN LAND, WHAT'S IT GOT TO DO WITH ME?

As a pakeha we still receive benefits and privilege from the fact that our group controls most land resources — cities and their amenities, roads and parks, institutional facilities. The Crown is the biggest landowner in the country and controls many acres of Maori land taken as 'uneconomic units' since the second World War — Maori people would like that land returned to them as beneficial owners.

The way land is used — District Scheme Planning criteria, advice given by the Department of Agriculture or Farm Advisers, the policies of the Lands and Survey Department — reflects Pakeha values and culture.

WHY DO MAORIS SAY THEY WANT THEIR LAND BACK WHEN THEY DONT USE IT BUT JUST LET RAGWORT AND GORSE GROW ALL OVER IT?

There are differences in attitudes to land use between Maori and Pakeha, coming out of different values and attitudes to land, to economic activity and to the relationship between human beings and nature. Maori reasons for wanting their land back may include spiritual and ancestral connections. However, the ragwort and gorse aspects often originate in the fact that the land is marginally farmable without substantial development resources. Access to development resources has been a problem for Maori owners because of historical legislation which explicitly (eg. Advances to Settlers Act 1894) or implicitly, by working to criteria of individual title, excluded them. Planning legislation, like the Town and Country Planning Act, doesn't help to organise Maori communities to work the land according to their own ways.

Often people don't know who owns the land in question. Maori speakers complain that unkept land owned by the Crown, or others, is assumed to be Maori land. This reflects an attitudinal problem of the Pakehas.

MAORIS ARE GETTING WELL PAID FOR MAORI LEASEHOLD LAND, I KNOW OF SOME PEOPLE WHO HAD THEIR ANNUAL PAYMENTS 'UPPED' FROM ABOUT \$50 TO OVER \$1000 A FEW YEARS AGO FOR JUST THE SECTION THEIR HOUSE STOOD ON.

It is always a nasty shock when one's rent or mortgage interest goes up! But surely your friends must have seen an increase coming. After all, it is a long time since a site would have been leased at one dollar per week, so for some years the income of \$50 per annum had been a phenomenally low one, and your fortunate friends must have saved a good deal. \$20 per week doesn't sound excessive — it presumably parallels land values in the area. The problem lies with a process which held the cost artificially low for so long instead of allowing for gradual increases. If, in your assessment, the Maori owners are now being well-paid, isn't it possible that there was a substantial time when they were underpaid?

An examination of some of the lease contracts with timber companies over large blocks of land for pine forestry raises questions about how some of those deals will look in fifty years time without adjustments — some owners have felt considerable pressure to accept whatever they have been offered. John Miller of Te Matakite provides information on trends and pressures in Maori land dealings, which is printed in the NCC Programme On Racism's Landpack.

In some cases Maori owners around Wellington and some in the South Island have been somewhat restricted on the return they can get on leased land. The Maori Reserve Land Act 1955 is a piece of legislation which contains such restrictions according to some of those Maoris involved.

- (c) The qualification of Maoris for and their entry into all trades, professions, and occupations;
- (d) The promotion of the health, education, and general social well-being of all members of the Maori race" quote source Maori Affairs R.S. Vol. 8 p. 28.

Thus the cultural and welfare functions and the land use and land alienation functions came together under one Department. This Act, amended in 1967 and 1974, is currently being redrafted."

I CAN'T SEE THAT WE SHOULD FEEL UNDULY 'REPENTANT' FOR THE WAY THEY'VE BEEN TREATED.

We seem to have personalised Christianity to a point where we overlook social sin and collective responsibility. In the resource paper "The Figures Tell the Story" (NCC Programme on Racism) you will find a brief account of some of the discrepancies between Maori and Pakeha people in terms of the costs and benefits of our social policies. Because we belong to the dominant group, which has always controlled power and made decisions for both peoples, we do well to consider seriously the effects of being satisfied with our present patterns. Repentance is about new beginnings, about struggling against sin, about effective love of neighbour. I don't personally feel that I am to blame for our history and the state to which it has brought us, but I am willing to declare myself on the side of constructive change—to use a few traditional terms, that is how I experience salvation and live in faith.

WHY ARE WE BEING ASKED TO BE 'REPENTANT' ABOUT THE WAIRAU 'INCIDENT' (CALLED A 'MASSACRE' UNTIL RECENT YEARS)? IT MUST BE DIFFICULT TO BE REPENTANT BECAUSE ONE'S GREAT GRANDFATHER WAS KILLED IN AN 'INCIDENT'!

In recent years it has been recognised that 'massacre' is a loaded word. It is often found in accounts written by dominant groups, ignoring differences of opinion about what happened on a particular occasion—in particular oral history sources are overridden by written versions. However, all parties agree that something happened, hence the less loaded description, 'incident'. A similar change recently has been to talk of 'Land Wars' in preference to 'Maori Wars'. Modern historians find themselves revisiting old sources, and evaluating new ones—particularly when they have access to oral history—and giving new weight to documents previously overlooked.

I don't know very much about the Wairau incident, though I believe the land was already being considered under legal channels of dispute before Spain's Commission. So the party of Europeans jumped the gun of the legal process with a very shaky charge of arson—the Maori group had burned a hut made of raupo on land which they confidently believed would be confirmed as their own by the Commission. It was a hot-headed expedition considered to be rather frivolous—the Crown Prosecutor described it as "only a lark". The Maori people made several requests to "settle it quietly" and wait for due process of law. It is not clear who opened fire, but it was not until the wife of Rangihaeata fell that a fullscale conflict began. Rangihaeata subsequently claimed his right to customary utu, to which Te Rauparaha reluctantly consented. John Miller's book *Early Victorian New Zealand* gives a version which might be described as that of a 'modern' historian.

About great grandfather, I think you are confusing collective responsibility across time with individual/personal culpability. Not many people were killed at Wairau, and the number of their grandchildren is a limited one. Nevertheless, I would imagine one might feel some regret that one's grandfather joined a legally dubious expedition, and did not leave when told he was trespassing. For the rest of us, changes of attitude and behaviour (repentance) seem to me to be appropriate if we want a better and more just future for our children. Such incidents and their interpretation become symbols of what has been regrettable in our past.

WHY ARE YOU TRYING TO MAKE ME FEEL GUILTY FOR SOMETHING I DIDN'T DO?

None of us was around when the Treaty of Waitangi was signed, but it was signed on behalf of two peoples, Maori and Pakeha. In the history which followed, which was part of a process of colonisation going on all over the world, power, resources and control began to be wielded by European people in a way which benefited them as a group. Pakeha people today inherit a legacy which was developed through the injustices of history. When we learn about that inheritance, it's not very constructive to feel guilty. But it is constructive to take responsibility for deciding whether to carry on that legacy or whether to change the future.

I WORKED FOR WHAT I'VE GOT, WHY CAN'T I KEEP IT?

That's a bit of a theological one isn't it? What did Jesus say to Nicodemus? What does the Bible have to say about wealth? And the Church?

In one sense, it's true that you worked for what you've got. In other ways you may have had some invisible advantages. Such as belonging to a group which operates the whole system in ways that fit the culture you belong to, so you may have had access to resources like land, education, finance or skills in a preferential way that you weren't aware of.

ISN'T TO BECOME CHRISTIAN/CATHOLIC TO JOIN A UNIVERSAL CULTURE?

That seems to have been something which was assumed during the time of great missionary expansion in the colonial era, but has always been questioned and increasingly so today. People ask whether being Christian has to be tied to being westernised. In some places experience indicates that it doesn't have to be, historically Christianity has been expressed in a variety of cultures. In some ways all cultures are challenged by Christianity.

"The Church comes to bring Christ, she does not come to bring the culture of another race. Evangelisation aims at penetrating and elevating culture by the power of the Gospel."