

EUROPEAN ATTITUDES AND POLICY TOWARD THE EDUCATION OF MAORI IN NEW ZEALAND*

RICHARD K. HARKER

Introduction

Unlike the Aborigine in Australia, Maori have been in New Zealand for not much more than one thousand years. Their immediate origins "... derive from those Polynesians who first settled East Polynesia. This is well supported by recent linguistic, archaeological and physical anthropological studies." (Green, 1977: 38-39). The Marquesas, the Southern Cooks, and the Society Islands all have some claims to be the specific location as Green (ibid) shows. East Polynesia is thought to have been settled from West Polynesia in the first few centuries A.D. (ibid. 12), which in turn was settled from Eastern Melanesia (Fiji). It is at this point (between 1500 B.C. and 200 B.C.) that a distinctively Polynesian proto-language (and presumably other aspects of culture) separated out from an ancestral prototype linked to the Austronesian languages centred in Melanesia. Beyond this, Green states that:

Only in general can the source of the languages, populations and cultural complexes ancestral to the Maori be traced to Islands and Mainland of South-east Asia. (ibid: 38)

The first European arrivals found a vigorous population of some 100,000 (Green 1977: 32-33), predominantly confined to the northern half (with coastal extensions southward) of the North Island. When compared in terms of density with the Australian Aboriginal population some idea can be obtained of the advantages of agriculture, even in its Polynesian form (sub-tropical) when practised in a not very suitable climate (temperate). Such an economy was viable however in the northern and coastal parts of the North Island, hence the lack of any substantial settlement further south (McEvedy and Jones, 1978: 337). In terms of livelihood Green (op. cit.: 33-34) argues that -

... characterizations of Maori (pre-contact) economic systems which assign them to a single general agricultural category are misleading. Nor is the situation much improved by stressing the contrast between a category of agriculturalists in northern New Zealand and hunters and gatherers in the southern part. Rather it appears Maori economy ... exhibited an environmentally predictable regional diversity. The economics ranged from hunting and gathering with techniques for the preservation and storage of natural food products to semi-agricultural with the preservation and storage of both natural and garden products.

As with the Aborigines in Australia, one must speak of Maori cultures rather than a single Maori culture. Although the similarities between the Maori tribes were much greater than those between Aboriginal tribes (a common linguistic base for example), there was no pan-Maori identity. Such an identity only became possible after the arrival of non-Maori (Pakeha) in sufficient numbers to constitute a substantial group, and it could be argued further that "Maori culture" was in some respects an artifact of the early Pakeha residents and their attempts to understand the people amongst whom they had come to live.

The impact of Europeans (Pakeha) on Maori culture can be seen in a series of five phases (after Lyons 1979: 54-55). The first phase was the sporadic contact with explorers, sealers, whalers and later missionaries. This period

(to about 1840) was largely under the control of the Maori and the acceptance of innovations (such as muskets and literacy) was largely in the furtherance of traditional objectives. The muskets were used to prosecute the fearsome inter-tribal clashes (with devastating results) while literacy and the trappings of Christianity were also used in traditional ways. However both of these innovations produced contradictions which the traditional institutions had insufficient time to resolve before the second phase ended in conflict.

The second phase began in 1840 with the beginnings of systematic settlement from Britain. The demand for land from these new settlers was enormous and an increasingly alarmed Maori population saw the prospect of total alienation from their tribal lands. There was a certain inevitability about the land wars of the 1860's and the savage reprisals in the form of land confiscations which followed. The military defeat was paralleled by a period of economic, social and psychological depression which spawned a number of revivalist millenarian type movements and saw the population drop to its lowest level (42,000 in the 1890s). This third phase merged gradually into the fourth in which the Pakeha hegemony was almost complete, the Maori population being largely confined to isolated, rural areas of little political, economic or social significance. The beginning of the fifth phase can be faintly heard after the 1914-18 European War, rises to audibility after the 1939-45 re-run and crescendos to a shout in the 1970s. This phase is marked by an increasingly confident and strong Maori voice demanding: acceptance on an equal footing by Pakehas; that their culture be given proper expression in the social life of New Zealand; and that the life style derived from their culture be given equal validity and status in New Zealand's political, economic and social institutions. This present phase is complicated by the rapid urbanization of the Maori population in the 1950-1980 period and the massive over-representation of the rural to urban migrants at the lower, unskilled end of the occupational structure. Lyons (1979: 59) points to the structural as well as the cultural origins of the difference between Maori and Pakeha attitudes to work and the increasing coincidence of class and ethnic boundaries.

What Ritchie had to say in 1968 (*ibid*) is still a fair representation of the situation in 1982:

The present situation could be summarized by saying that if a Maori talks like a Pakeha, dresses like a Pakeha, owns a house and uses it like a Pakeha, then on these and other similar conditions he is accepted as an equal if he does not show these signs, then a variety of social and occupational exclusions will force him to the company of those like himself.

Settler Attitudes and Policy Toward Maori

This statement of Ritchie's highlights a much broader theme which Richard Thompson (1963: 53-56) claims runs through New Zealand's history from the earliest days of European settlement. This is the belief that Maori and Pakeha are 'one people' destined to live together in friendship and equality, and which he labels the 'Ideology of Equality' (*ibid*). He also points to a contradictory ideology, that of 'Cultural Homogeneity' in which the 'one people' share a single culture. Pakeha New Zealanders, Thompson claims, have an essentially ethnocentric approach to race relations, and the future "... is felt to hinge on whether the Maoris become pakehas rapidly enough" (*ibid*). Hence the Ideology of Equality needs to be modified toward the idea that Maori are good enough to become 'like us', unlike coloured races in other parts of the world. The Ideology of Equality in the New Zealand context then, is strongly assimilative in its implication and it is this aspect that I wish to trace through historically.

The first statement of an assimilationist policy for New Zealand is to be found in the Preamble to the Native Trust Ordinance of 1844:

Whereas the Native people of New Zealand are by natural endowment apt for the acquirement of the arts and habits of civilized life, and are capable of great moral and social advancement: and whereas large numbers of the said people are already desirous of being instructed in the English language and in English arts and usages: and whereas great disasters have fallen upon uncivilized nations on being brought into contact with Colonists from the nations of Europe, and in undertaking the colonization of New Zealand Her Majesty's Government have recognized the duty of endeavouring by all practicable means to avert the like disasters from the Native people of these Islands, which object may best be attained by assimilating as speedily as possible the habits and usages of the Native to those of the European population.

This policy was adopted by succeeding governors (Ball, 1940: 272) and was never seriously challenged until well into the twentieth century. During these years the government policy was to protect the natives and their interests from 'the depredations of settlers, particularly in terms of land (Sinclair, 1959: 76-77).

The settlers came to New Zealand to improve their position in life, to raise their standard of living; and the way to do it was to make money. In their calculations the Maoris were rarely taken into account ... speculation in land proved the quickest road to wealth in the early years ... the acquisition of land was the aim of most new arrivals. (Sinclair 1961: 4)

A series of ineffectual Governors were unable to withstand the increasing pressure for land from the settlers, which left little but good intentions remaining of the "protection" policy. However, with the arrival of George Grey as Governor in 1845, government took on some purpose, and "... he laboured to establish ... measures calculated to improve the condition of the Maori people and to 'elevate' them in the scale of civilization." (Sinclair, 1959: 84). By the early 1850s Grey at least was confident that the two races were well on the way to 'amalgamation'. However, Sinclair (*ibid*) regards his measures as superficial and confined to the immediate vicinity of European settlements.

Despite Grey's confidence, there appear to have been two major factors which he disregarded and which were to have profound and long-lasting consequences. First, the majority of immigrants regarded the Maori with strong antagonism and "... such a feeling formed a permanent background to colonization in New Zealand." (Sinclair 1961: 9-10). The so called 'amalgamation' of the races which was made much of at the time "... involved little recognition of any inherent value in Maori culture, and, despite idealistic trappings, it meant no more than the Europeanization of the Maoris" (*ibid*: 80). The second factor was the reserving to the Governor of the control of Maori affairs in the 1852 Constitution. Sinclair argues that it was a mistake on two counts: first, Grey's successors were not as competent as he and did not have his *mana* amongst the Maori people; and secondly, in Sinclair's words "Had the settlers' elected representatives been constitutionally responsible for Maori policy - and for the cost of any rebellion which might occur - they would have been forced to devote more serious attention to Maori affairs." (1959: 119)

The solution to the "Maori problem" according to the majority of the new settlers was the administration of "larger and more frequent doses of what was

causing it - European influence" (ibid: 115). Sinclair has suggested that what was needed was to reduce this influence in order that Maori could come to terms with the new culture in their own way and at their own pace, through some degree of segregation. Indeed, he points out that the 1852 Constitution Act "made provision for the declaration of native districts within which the Maoris could live in accordance with their own laws and customs" (ibid: 116). For a variety of reasons however (including the fear of 'locking up' rich lands) the provision was ignored. It was the process of 'unlocking' land which made the majority of settlers enthusiastic for the wars of the 1860s and which exacted the punitive confiscations which followed.

The Role of Education

In order to understand more fully the educational policy and practice toward Maori it is not enough to know of the attitudes of the settlers relating to Maori people. Additionally we need to know of the policy and practice of the settlers toward the education of their own children. When looking at the rise of public education in 19th century New Zealand it is possible to discern a variety of viewpoints which purport to explain and justify this development. At one extreme is the liberal, universalistic view that everyone has a right to education and personal development, and that the spread of public education paralleled the recognition of the justice of egalitarianism and democracy. At the other end of this debate are the neo-Marxist views that public education spread only as, and to the extent that it coincided with the needs of economic or political elites. Whether the development of educational provisions is a natural outcome of the evolutionary "logic" of capitalist societies, or was deliberately engendered by elite groups of one kind or another is an ongoing debate, which it is not the purpose of this paper to explore.

What is of primary concern to us here, as an indicator of the deliberate use of education as an agent of social change in New Zealand, is the locus of control, and the nature of the intended outcomes of the spread of public education.

Katz (1976: 392) identified five major arguments used by nineteenth century promoters of public education systems:-

1. urban crime and poverty;
2. increased cultural heterogeneity;
3. the necessity to train and discipline an urban and industrial workforce;
4. the crisis of youth in the nineteenth century city; and
5. the anxiety among the middle classes about their adolescent children

Katz was working with North American material and thus it remains to be established whether the same arguments apply to New Zealand. As a first step I have searched the New Zealand Parliamentary Debates for the discussions on education and its extension to an ever increasing section of the population. In the 19th century in New Zealand, landowners formed the well-to-do class exercising social, economic and political dominance over other groups. These settlers brought with them many of the attitudes and values of the time from their homelands. The details of the various parliamentary debates are set out elsewhere (Harker, 1980), and show four major themes that run throughout the arguments in favour of universal public education.

1. social control and the lowering of the crime rate;
2. the production of a discerning electorate;

3. the enhancement of economic productivity; and
4. individual "rights" to education.

Two of these outcomes (2 and 4) can be interpreted as support for the humanitarian, egalitarian view of the spread of public education. The other two (1 and 3) lend weight to the alternate view that public education was developed to serve the emerging needs of a capitalist economy. As Bowles and Gintis describe it: "Working people have managed over the years to get more education, but they have managed to get the kind of education they have demanded only when their needs coincided with those of economic elites." (Bowles and Gintis, 1977: 200). In the end universal education became a reality when it did because all four "outcomes" (or reasons) pointed in the same direction and it becomes a matter of opinion as to which predominated.

When we turn to a consideration of legislative provision for Maori children, we find that the debates were kept quite separate from the debates on the education of the European settlers' children. Moreover the period between 1860 and 1880 is crucial in this regard as it covers the height of the Land Wars, the formation of the national education system and the creation of the four Maori electorates to elect Maori Members of Parliament. This period also saw the debates on the Maori Schools Bill of 1867, and its amendment in 1871, and it is the details of these debates which provide insights into the uses the New Zealand parliament wished to make of the education apparatus in its dealings with the Maori people.

Up until this time schooling for Maori had been provided almost exclusively by missionary effort, with some Government aid to boarding establishments after 1847. By 1840 Beaglehole (1970: 24) reports that "a large proportion of the Maori population could read and write in their own language". A variety of factors however led to a significant decline in schooling over the next decades. These factors included a growing Maori nationalism, the reluctance of Maori parents to be separated from their children, and the Land Wars. By 1865 it was estimated that only 22 Maori pupils were attending any form of school in the colony (Barrington 1970: 28).

The 1867 Act replaced the mission schools with a national system of secular village day schools under the Department of Native Affairs. The curriculum was to be "the ordinary subjects of English Primary education" (Barrington 1970: 29). An essential feature of the new Act was its "self-help" philosophy.

... schools would be built only on the condition that the Maoris should write to the Colonial Secretary requesting a school, and should declare their willingness to provide one half of the costs of construction, one quarter of the teachers' salary, and an area of not less than one acre of their land for a school site." (ibid.)

In the debates on the 1867 bill, similar themes emerged justifying the provision of education for Maori children as in the debates on education for the European children. However, there was one major difference. The fourth theme described above (individual rights to education) disappeared, and was replaced with strong, and unanimous arguments in favour of using education to bring about the assimilation of Maori children to European culture and society. (It is perhaps worth noting that this unanimity extended to the four newly elected Maori M.P.s).

The consequences of all these moves have been noted by Jackson:

... both mission education and the development of day schools had the effect of taking the process of education out of the hands of the Maori family and its elders. With an increasing focus on literacy, the Bible and European values an hiatus in Maori cultural continuity was created. (1975: 36)

This was of little concern however to the policy makers of the day, who would have regarded it as a positive outcome. The debates on the second reading of the Maori Schools Bill show this clearly. J.C. Richmond the opening speaker, stated the basic aim of assimilation: "... for a people in the position of the Maori race it was a first condition of their progress to put them in the way of learning the language of the inhabitants and Government of the colony" (P.D. 1867: 862). The same sentiment was expressed by Mr. Hall, who noted that the Government's "great aim was the civilization of the remnant of a noble race" (ibid: 866).

In the same debate, Major Heaphy raised the social control issue:

It was hardly surprising that they should hear so much of Hauhaism when this retrogression (in Native schooling) was considered ... Any expenditure in this direction would be true economy, as the more the natives were educated the less would be the future expenditure on police and goals. (ibid: 863).

Mr. Carlton related the benefits of education to the extension of the franchise to include Maoris, and was clearly expressing widely held views in his declaration that the traditional Maori lifestyle could not be tolerated to continue: "... things have now come to that pass that it was necessary either to exterminate the Natives or to civilize them." (ibid) He plumped for civilizing them, since the colony could not afford a full scale military exercise. In reference to the Native Representation Act, which provided for four Maori members of Parliament, Mr. Carlton could only conceive of the English language being used in government, since the Maori language was "imperfect as a medium of thought" (ibid).

The debate on the 1871 amendment to this Act was uneventful except that it illustrated the views held by many Maori at that time (and expressed through the Maori M.P.s) that Europeanization was an appropriate policy. The member for Eastern Maori (Mr. Takamoana) put forward the suggestion that European children should attend Maori schools as it would facilitate the learning of European ways by the Maori children (P.D. 1871: 328). The fact that there were now Maori members in Parliament who participated in the passing of this legislation may have strengthened the beliefs of Pakeha members that what they were doing was in the best interest of all.

The predominating attitude to Maori culture at that time is to be found in the comments of an Inspector of Schools reporting to the Minister of Native Affairs, who speaks of the "demoralizing influence of their *kaingas*" (villages). (Russell 1871: 4). This particular phrase attained fairly wide usage, appearing in official statements as late as 1925 (N.Z. Government: 208).

The pressure for assimilation can be seen in the curriculum of the Native Schools in the 1870s, which consisted of English, writing, reading, spelling, and geography (Bird, 1928). The social control aspects of education are evident in the report from an inspector in Hokianga at this time:

It is an undoubted fact that the native village schools are working great good amongst the Maoris of the North ... as a proof of which I may point out the very orderly and law-abiding conduct of the

North Island natives in comparison with that of the more ignorant South Island tribes ... I believe that this state of things is in a great measure to be attributed to the establishment of native schools, as they have done much to give the Maoris a better knowledge of our manners and customs than they have had hitherto, and which they duly appreciate and are in many ways attempting to imitate. (ibid: 63-64).

By 1880 there were 57 village schools with 1625 children in attendance (Barrington, 1970: 31).

Over the next 50 years Maori education followed the leading principle of J.H. Pope - to bring the Maori into line with European civilization through a thorough use of European models in schools. The missionary zeal with which the policy of assimilation was followed is also shown in Bird's report on the degraded nature of a Maori village in the Ureweras which he subsequently revisited some years after a school had been established:

The children came forward without hesitation, friendly and smiling (replacing earlier hostility and fear). They were clean in person and in dress, could talk fairly well in English, and were well-mannered and obliging ... The native school offers to the Maori children in such a locality a pleasing asylum from the life of the *kainga* (native village)". (Bird, 1928: 67).

Bird, like most writers of the time, looked forward to the day when the native school would cease to have a separate existence - i.e. when assimilation was complete.

The Development of Attitudes and Policy in New Zealand

The attitudes of the settlers toward the Maori are reflected in the fiction of the time. Pearson (1958) in his extensive analysis of New Zealand fiction found that attitudes were either hostile or patronising (p.213), ranging from the racial (rights of conquest) to paternalistic ("our Maoris"). Talk of 'blacks' and 'niggers' was common, and Pakeha generally regarded Maori as dirty, degraded, lazy and immoral. Conversely, Maori held stereotypes of Pakeha as greedy, arrogant, rude and selfish. The issue of stereotypes at the turn of the century is further explored by Will (1973). He found in the newspapers he surveyed a mixture of favourable and unfavourable attitudes.

The view that the Maori lacked self-restraint, or that he was lazy, impulsive and irresponsible, were manifestly unfavourable attitudes. But the notion that he was able to 'better' himself - that in effect he could modify his character and change his habits - was a favourable attitude ... Yet the belief that the Maori 'needed' to elevate himself above his own culture was in essence a totally unsympathetic idea since it presupposed the Maori lifestyle and the Maori himself were in some way inferior to the European." (p.56).

Hence expressions of support for Maori were really opinions about his capacity to become less of a Maori. "Europeans expressed approval when Maoris aimed at social reform and individual betterment ... or when they appeared to be adopting pakeha manners and customs in a successful fashion" (ibid). The nativistic movements (Kingitanga, and those led by Te Whiti and Rua) were condemned in the newspapers precisely because they were seen as thwarting the

processes of assimilation. Will (p.60) contends that "the assimilation policy was really governed by an inability on the part of the pakeha to (ALLOW) differences to exist between the two ethnic groups". He relates this to two possible factors:

1. The Europeans were conscious of the fact that they were building a new society and everyone had to be in on it - i.e. it was new for them as well as the Maori.
2. Maori culture may have been seen as a threat to the Europeans and their 'work ethic' - a seductive temptation to the hard pressed pioneer.

Whatever the reasons, it is clear that as the 20th century dawned the assimilationist theme had strengthened, and the European hegemony can be seen to be complete when assimilation is advocated by leading Maori. In the annual report of the Health Department for 1906 both Pomare and Buck were such advocates. "There is no alternative but to become a Pakeha no hope for the Maori but in ultimate absorption by the Pakeha." (Pomare 1906: 67). Buck (1906: 74) advocated the removal of the Maori communal system and its replacement by individualized title to land "to enable him to take his stand on terms of equality with the whiteman as fellow citizen". This is a precise expression of the 'catch' in the New Zealand version of the Ideology of Equality - assimilation. Maori opinion however, was not unanimous on these points. Ngata for example disagreed with both of them (Williams 1965: 60) and he was to become much more influential in later governments.

In reviewing New Zealand's policy of 'amalgamation' in the 19th century Ward (1973: 308) concluded that:

... the colonization of New Zealand, notwithstanding the Treaty of Waitangi and humanitarian idealism, was substantially an imperial subjugation of a native people, for the benefit of the conquering race in which the notions of white supremacy and racial prejudice, familiar in other examples of nineteenth century European imperialism, were very much in evidence. 'Amalgamation' had operated to bring the Maori people under as much as possible the same political and judicial system as the settlers, with nominal equality before the law, but with very little assistance to attain a genuine equality in economic and social life ... This tendency increased rather than diminished during the century and by the 1890's it seemed as though... the Maori people, manifestly 'unequal in the field' with settlers who possessed the skills and values appropriate to competitive commercial enterprise, were being 'destroyed under a show of justice'.

And so it continued with few expressions of concern for the future of Maori people in New Zealand except within the framework of the by now dominant pakeha culture.

From 1880 the growth of the Native Schools had been steady and by 1939 the roll of these village schools had reached 10,403 (Barrington 1970: 37). It should also be pointed out that a very large number of Maori children attended schools provided under the national legislation of 1877. The separate Maori schools were finally amalgamated with the mainstream system in 1969, fulfilling Bird's hopes - at least legislatively.

A number of changes took place within the native school service during the 1930s, but it is doubtful if any of these seriously affected the underlying function of assimilation. Whitehead (1973: 36-58) provides an extended treatment

of the terms assimilation, inclusion, integration, and biculturalism. He suggests that policy changes were largely rhetorical in nature, and that no serious attempt has been made to modify Europeanization as the main function of schools. However, one of the changes which did occur was in the curriculum of the Maori schools which were given a practical and vocational (agricultural) bias. The beginnings of this shift can be seen as far back as 1907 when in a general review of Native Land policy it was suggested that:

... the primary education of the Maori should have what may be termed an agricultural bias. (A to J 1907 Glc: 21).

Rural England and France were cited as examples, with the objective seeming to be the production of a rural based peasantry. The review also advocated the agriculturalization of secondary education for Maori youth as "... an ordinary Grammar school course was not adapted to the present needs of the Maori people." (ibid). All these recommendations were to support the review's advocacy of the need for Maori to settle their own lands (and farm them along European lines) and that schooling should be adjusted accordingly. Ramsay (1972) provides more details on this point:



DISCOURSE

THE AUSTRALIAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

* Is a bi-annual journal (April/October) of socio-cultural orientation

* Welcomes articles (to about 5000 words) of international or Australasian interest on theory, practice, or policy.

* Is not bound to any explicit ideological view.

Subscriptions: *Domestic* - \$10 (individual) \$16 (institutional)

Foreign - Aus.\$14 (individual) Aus.\$20 (institutional)

All correspondence to:

The Editor,
DISCOURSE,
Department of Education,
The University of Queensland,
ST. LUCIA, Australia, 4067

The core of Maori educational policy in the 1930s may be found in T.B. Strong's statement that the type of schooling made available to Maori children should lead the "lad to be a good farmer, and the Maori girl to be a good farmer's wife".

Other things were afoot however which make the decade of the 30's a watershed in Maori life. The initial impetus came from the first Labour Government which came to power in 1935. Many of the processes set in motion at that time were accelerated by the social and economic impact of the 1939-45 War, at which time the rural to urban migration had its beginnings - see Butterworth (1973) for an extended discussion of this period. Significantly this is the period when the official policy of assimilation begins to change. Butterworth (1973: 17, n.21) notes the first official use of the term 'integration' in 1955. However, in 1949 Peter Fraser spoke of "an independent self-reliant and satisfied Maori race working side by side with the Pakeha as the Government's aim" (ibid). The succeeding National Party Government also spoke in 1952 of "complete economic and social equality with the pakeha", while retaining valuable elements of Maori culture (ibid).

Whatever the policy, the practice was another matter. Official recommendations and measures taken during the post-war years have been likened to a "lucky-dip-bin" (Walsh, 1973: 19) with each authority fishing out its own proposal. The need for some central direction resulted in the release of the Report on Department of Maori Affairs in 1961 (Hunn, 1960). This report dominated the debate on race relations in New Zealand during the 1960's, and reinforced the official policy of 'integration' (pp. 14-16), which was defined as: "To combine (not fuse) the Maori and Pakeha elements to form one nation wherein Maori culture remains distinct." (ibid). The rather ambiguous nature of this definition needs to be related to the general tenor of Hunn's remarks in the report: first it seems clear that he regarded assimilation as an inevitable outcome in the long run (ibid); second, the culture that was to "remain distinct" he clearly regarded as 'relics' of a tribal culture of which "only the fittest elements (worthiest of preservation) have survived the onset of civilization" (ibid); and third, he equated the Pakeha side of integration not with Europeans but with a modern way of life (p.16). It is to this way of life that Maori are to be encouraged to conform, and if Pakehas explain this to Maori then those who live "a backward life in primitive conditions (OR WHO) ... resent the pressure brought to bear on them to conform to what they regard as the pakeha mode of life (WILL) ... fall into line more readily." (ibid). A strange kind of integration indeed, and which contradicts the definition given that term in the Report itself.

Pressure to clarify the meaning of integration led to a publication dealing specifically with that issue. In that publication Booth and Hunn (1962) defined integration as:

... a dynamic process by which Maori and Pakeha are being drawn closer together, in the physical sense of the mingling of the two populations as well as in the mental and cultural senses, where differences are gradually diminishing." (p.2)

A new culture was to be made from combining and adapting two pre-existing ones, which is the fusion specifically rejected two years before in the Hunn Report itself, and is clearly assimilationist in outcome due to the unbalanced power situation that exists in New Zealand.

With the advent of the 1970's, the whole issue shifts into another gear with a rapid increase in the input from the Maori communities themselves, both through official channels and from individual contributions. For example, Walker (1972: 61) contended

... that the paternalistic, ethnocentric, assimilative ethos of the dominant Pakeha society is more inimical to social harmony in New Zealand than the desire of the Maori to perpetuate his own cultural and social institutions.

What was needed now and for the future were creative responses from the decision makers that would

- (a) Recognise, and respect, and foster the cultural differences of the Maori.
- (b) Emphasise his cultural identity.
- (c) Preserve continuity of that culture within the social mainstream by planning for the creation of neo-urban Maori communities, and by providing multi-cultural programmes within the education system. (ibid)

This is a clear expression of the cultural diversity model, which Walker developed further (Walker, 1973; 1980).

The main education input through official channels from Maori people came through the National Advisory Committee on Maori Education (NACME) Reports of 1970 and 1980. The 1970 Report made no specific comments on multiculturalism and express their objectives in very general terms - "... equipping Maori children to realise their full potential, first of all within the school system and later as effective members of the community". (p.3) The school was treated as relatively unproblematic and their recommendations were geared toward accelerating progress through the system. In the decade that elapsed before the next report emerged Maori people generally exhibited an increasing willingness to politicise and publicise their grievances and concerns, hence expectations in some quarters for a more radical reappraisal by NACME in their 1980 Report were high. Such expectations were not fulfilled however. The 1980 Report did adopt a more expansive view of education and related concerns, but nonetheless "... achieving the goal of a harmonious multicultural society in New Zealand" (p.4) seems still to be dependent upon achieving equal performance figures in national examinations for both Maori and Pakeha. Certainly the Report questions the overly monocultural view of what constitutes 'success', and they also have attempted to set their educational recommendations against a discussion of the nature of New Zealand society, which they see as a multicultural one. Their view of the meaning of multiculturalism is taken from a paper by Joan Metge which is reprinted as an appendix to the Report itself. In this paper, Metge (1979) points to three patterns of response to cultural diversity:

1. assimilation, involving negative values placed on diversity;
2. rights to cultural identity recognized, but seen as a 'problem' and tackled by selective action:
 - a. minority groups are helped to measure up to majority requirements - financial assistance, special courses etc.;
 - b. special programmes instituted for cultural maintenance;
 - c. special training for teachers and administrators involved with ethnic minorities; and
3. the diversity model; involving unequivocal positive value on diversity and where mutual respect is a basic premise of social organisation.

Metge points out that some senior government officials and some politicians are talking at the third level (the diversity model), while implying that the bulk of the populace are still at levels 2 and 1.

There are a number of points that need to be made in relation to Metge's patterns. First, most attempts at educational amelioration have been at level 2. Second, the 1980 Report (He Huarahi) is caught between levels 2 and 3, advocating a respect for diversity on the one hand, but on the other, anxious for extra assistance to 'measure up'. Both the 1980 Report and the Metge paper have been criticised by Spoonley (1981) who states that the figures on Maori pass rates presented in the report in a favourable light, are misleading as they show only absolute increases in Maori numbers. In comparison with non-Maori pass rates the situation in 1980 is worse than it was in 1970. The annual returns of the Department of Education support Spoonley in this, however the argument is only really valid within a level 2 (Metge) context. Spoonley's criticism of Metge is that New Zealand's version of pluralism involves more than cultural relations. Insufficient attention is paid to level 1 (assimilation), which involves the racism of the dominant group, echoing Walker's point noted above.

Disadvantage is not a matter of cultural strangeness or ignorance that can be educated away, but an issue related to matters of class, market access and power The paper by Metge and He Huarahi really do not even begin to address such questions but confine themselves to the relatively safe territory of cultural relations. (Spoonley, 1981)

This highlights the importance of economic and political considerations in any discussion of policy in the educational area. Government policy still seems somewhat ambivalent. In the 1977 New Zealand Official Yearbook, the Department of Education state (p.955):

We are, as a nation, committed to a policy of integration: two races, one people. It is a policy that places a great responsibility on education as a major social influence. Any restatement of educational objectives must give full weight to it.

Unfortunately in such a statement there is no explicit mention of culture, which should be kept quite separate from any consideration of race. It is difficult to escape the conclusion from such a statement on its own that 'culture' is subsumed under the 'one people' cliché, and that assimilation is still the ultimate objective. However, things are changing rapidly in this policy area, and not just in New Zealand. In a statement to a UNESCO regional conference of Ministers of Education (Department of Education 1979: 160-161) the Department states that their policy since the early 1960's has been based on the principle

that the needs of all sections of the community be met in the best possible way. This implies recognition of the different cultural values obtaining in New Zealand society and highlights the need for all children from all cultural backgrounds to have an equal opportunity to develop their talent.

While being rather vague in the general sense, the statement becomes more specific in relation to Maori Education, where policy is now based on the view that

the education system should ensure a growing understanding of Maori culture by all New Zealanders including the place given by Maoris to the Maori language so that the Maori child knows that his cultural differences are understood and respected by all he meets. (ibid; see also NACME 1970).

These policy statements show a move toward the diversity model (Metge, op cit). However, such a move is not without its problems as policy is neither formulated nor put into practice in a vacuum. Any move toward the acceptance of cultural diversity has to be viewed against the attitudes of the majority group. The Department is well aware of this, since they see the "major task that lies ahead is the education of all the people to understand and welcome cultural pluralism" (Department of Education 1979: 161). Thus the Department will not be able to move far toward realizing its policy objectives without the support of other government departments on the one hand, and non-governmental social institutions (including 'public opinion') on the other. In this regard, a researcher who has examined this issue in some detail (Spoonley, 1979) is quite pessimistic about the climate of public opinion in New Zealand. Despite plenty of talk about multiculturalism, he suggests that

... the wider community and the politicians (emphasize) the unity of New Zealand society and refuse to accept that ethnic pluralism exists, and that it needs to be reflected in the organization of social institutions. (ibid).

Thus despite over 150 years of educational endeavour in the field of education for Maori children, there is a sense in which the debate has only just begun. The major dilemma in the debate is the tension that exists between the desire for political and economic equality, and the desire for the preservation and maintenance of ethnic cultures. But this is not all. Just to be able to maintain a different culture is seen as not enough by many Maori. If the term 'multicultural' is to have any meaning at all when applied to a society such as New Zealand, then the task is to achieve an equality of cultural status, which is the basic prerequisite for the attainment of Metge's level 3 - the diversity model.

Correspondence to : Richard K. Harker
Education Department, Massey University
Palmerston North, NEW ZEALAND.

References

- * Paper presented to Australia and New Zealand History of Education Society Conference, University of Tasmania, August, 1982.
- Ball, D. (1940) Maori Education. In I.L.G. Sutherland (Ed.) The Maori People Today, Wellington, Whitcombe and Tombs.
- Barrington, J.M. (1970) A Historical Review of Policies and Provisions. In Ewing and Shallcrass (1970) 27-39.
- Beaglehole, T.H. (1970) The Missionary Schools, 1816-1840. In Ewing and Shallcrass (1970) 21-25.
- Bird, W.W. (1928) The Education of the Maori. In I.Davey (Ed.) Fifty Years of National Education in New Zealand. Auckland, Whitcombe and Tombs.
- Booth, J.M. and J.K. Hunn (1962) Integration of Maori and Pakeha. Wellington, The Government Printer.
- Bowles, S. and H. Gintis (1977) Capitalism and Education in the United States, In Young, M.F.D. and G. Whitty (Eds) Society, State and Schooling. Ringmer, The Falmer Press.
- Buck, P. (1906) Report to the Director of Health. Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives, 1131, Wellington, The Government Printer.
- Butterworth, G.V. (1973) Highpoint and Hiatus. In D.H. Bray and C.G.N. Hill (Eds) Polynesian and Pakeha in New Zealand Education, Vol. 1, Auckland, Heinemann.

- Department of Education (1979) Report to Fourth Regional Conference of Ministers of Education. Bulletin of the UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia and Oceania. No.20.
- Ewing, J.L. and J. Shallcrass (Eds.) (1970) Introduction to Maori Education. Wellington, Price Milburn.
- Green, R.C. (1977) Adaptation and Change in Maori Culture. Auckland, Stockton House.
- Harker, R.K. (1980) Culture and Knowledge in the New Zealand School Curriculum. Delta, 27.
- Hunn, J.K. (1960) Report on Department of Maori Affairs. Wellington, The Government Printer.
- Jackson, M.D. (1975) Literacy, Communications and Social Change. In Kawharu (Ed) (1975).
- Katz, M.B. (1976) The Origins of Public Education: A Reassessment. History of Education Quarterly, 16(4), 381-407.
- Kawharu, I.H. (Ed.) (1975) Conflict and Compromise: Essays on the Maori Since Colonization. Wellington, A.H. & A.W. Reed.
- Lyons, D.P. (1979) New Zealand. In Mamak, A. and A. Ahmed (Eds.) Race, Class and Rebellion in the South Pacific. Sydney, George Allen and Unwin.
- McEvedy, C. and R. Jones (1978) Atlas of World Population History. London, Allen Lane, The Penguin Press.
- Metge, J. (1979) Multiculturalism: Problem or Goal? Paper to 49th ANZAAS Congress, Auckland.
- (NACME) National Advisory Committee on Maori Education (1970) Report. Wellington, Department of Education.
- (NACME) National Advisory Committee on Maori Education (1980) He Huarahi, Wellington Department of Education.
- New Zealand Government (1925, 1977) New Zealand Official Yearbook. Wellington, The Government Printer.
- Pearson, W.H. (1958) Attitudes to the Maori in some Pakeha Fiction. Journal of the Polynesian Society 67(3).
- Pomare, M. (1906) Report to the Director of Health. Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives, H 31, Wellington, The Government Printer.
- Ramsay, P.D.K. (1972) Maori Schooling. In Havill, S.J. and D.R. Mitchell (Eds) Issues in New Zealand Special Education. Auckland, Hodder and Stoughton.
- Russell, A.H. (1871) Report to Minister of Native Affairs. Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives, F.5. Wellington, The Government Printer.
- Sinclair, K. (1959) A History of New Zealand. London, Penguin Books.
- Sinclair, K. (1961) The Origins of the Maori Wars. Wellington, New Zealand University Press.
- Spoonley, P. (1979) Educational Inequality and Affirmative Action: Prospects for New Zealand. Unpublished Dip. Ed. Investigation, University of Auckland.
- Spoonley, P. (1981) Educating Away Racism. The New Zealand Ethnic Relations Study Group Newsletter 2(1).
- Thompson, R. (1963) Race Relations in New Zealand. Christchurch National Council of Churches in New Zealand.
- Walker, R.J. (1972) Assimilation or Cultural Continuity. In G.M. Vaughan (Ed) Racial Issues in New Zealand, Auckland, Akarana Press.
- Walker, R.J. (1973) Biculturalism and Education. In D.H. Bray and C.G.N. Hill (Eds.) Polynesian and Pakeha in New Zealand Education Vol 1., Auckland, Heinemann.
- Walker, R.J. (1980) Educational Replanning for a Multicultural Society. In G.H. Robinson, and B.T. O'Rourke (Eds) Schools in New Zealand Society. Auckland, Longman-Paul.
- Walsh, A.C. (1973) Developments since the Hunn Report and their Bearing on Education. In D.H. Bray and C.G.N. Hill (Eds) Polynesian and Pakeha in New Zealand Education, Vol. 1, Auckland, Heinemann.

- Ward, A. (1973) A Show of Justice: Racial 'Amalgamation' in Nineteenth Century New Zealand. Auckland, Auckland University Press.
- Whitehead, P.E. (1973) A Philosophical Exploration of Some Unstated Educational Presuppositions Concerning Polynesian Education in New Zealand. Massey University, Unpublished M.A. Thesis.
- Will, D.G. (1973) Stereotypes of Maoris Held By Europeans: A Study Based on Four Newspapers of the Liberal Period. Massey University, Unpublished M.A. Thesis.
- Williams, J.A. (1965) The Foundation of Apirana Ngata's Career 1891-1909. In J.G.A. Pocock (Ed.) The Maori and New Zealand Politics, Auckland, Blackwood and Janet Paul.

Official Documents - and their abbreviations

- (P.D.) Parliamentary Debates (Hansard). Wellington, The Government Printer.
- (A to J) Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives. Wellington The Government Printer.