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Abstract

During the 1980s — responding to indigenous Māori demands for self determination and redress for 150 years of violent colonisation — a dominant group (Pākehā) anti-racism movement adopted the Treaty of Waitangi as a framework to address issues of dominant cultural hegemony in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Consulting with Māori groups, this social movement (described as the Pākehā Treaty movement) developed a methodology of “co-intentional” relationships. This practice saw Māori and Pākehā groups working with their own people separately to progress a decolonisation agenda.

During the early 2000s, a “third generation” of activists with a commitment to decolonisation sought a place in this Pākehā Treaty movement. This third generation brought with them questions of identity and practice as they worked to negotiate their own cross-cultural relationships in a Pākeha space.

From a position as “insider” in this social movement, I draw upon the social constructionist influence on social movement studies, positioning meaning making as a “knowledge-practice” central to the work of social movements. In this qualitative study, I use narrative inquiry to explore the stories of third-generation participants for the meanings they construct about their Treaty/decolonisation work. The meanings participants construct are examined in dialogue - with movement discourse, where there is both convergence and tension.

By focusing on meaning making in the cross-cultural group experience, this research identifies that third-generation decolonisation practices flow from, and are critical to, the formation of socially just relationships. Out of the decentering encounters of socially just relationships, third-generation participants open up the fixed meanings of “others”, of identity, of power and language and the ways in which these “singularities” do not serve a decolonisation agenda. From my reading of activist narratives, I argue that socially just relationships allow for agonistic dialogue, where tension in meaning can be generative, where differences and challenges produced intergenerationally and intersubjectively can produce “new ways of being”.

This study contributes and speaks to several audiences: to the development of relationships in the Pakeha Treaty movement, to the cultural turn in Social Movement Studies, and to the re-imagining of methodologies in Peace and Conflict Studies.
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**Definition of Māori Terms**

Māori words are defined in a footnote the first time they are used in the thesis, they are also included here. Entries are drawn from (Moorfield, 2011) unless otherwise stated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aoraki</td>
<td>Mt Cook (Kāi Tahu dialect spelling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotearoa</td>
<td>used as the Māori name for New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aroha</td>
<td>love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atea</td>
<td>forecourt to the meeting house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hui</td>
<td>a gathering, meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hapū</td>
<td>kinship group, subtribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwi</td>
<td>extended kinship group, tribe, nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaupapa</td>
<td>plan, agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaumātua</td>
<td>elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana Whenua</td>
<td>the people who hold territorial rights, power from the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>traditionally meaning ordinary or normal; now Indigenous person of Aotearoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>New Zealander of European descent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rangatahi</td>
<td>younger generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangatira</td>
<td>chief(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūna ka</td>
<td>tribal council (Kāi Tahu dialect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangata Tiriti</td>
<td>Treaty People, people who came to Aotearoa under the authority of the Treaty of Waitangi (Treaty Resource Centre, 2008 p.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangata Whenua</td>
<td>indigenous people of the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taniwha</td>
<td>water spirit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tauwi  New Zealanders who are not of iwi/Māori descent (Treaty Resource Centre, 2008 p.78)

Te Ao Maori  the Māori world

Te Tiriti o Waitangi  the Treaty of Waitangi in the Māori language

tikanga  correct procedure

Tino Rangatiratanga  self determination, sovereignty

tipuna  ancestors

waka wairua  the joining of two concepts waka –canoe, wairua –spirit, spiritual vessel

waiata  song

wairua  spirit, soul, quintessence

Waitangi  place in the Bay of Islands where The Treaty of Waitangi was signed

whakaaro  understanding

whakapapa  genealogy

whānau  family

whanaunga  relation
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Chapter 1  Introduction

Look at the mouth of the river, flowing like metal from the dry bath of the valley
The mud flats full of life are silt and clay; it has been a long hard day full of strangers
Breathe in, the mountain breathes in the sea, catching the stories where the waters meet...¹

One sunny late summer afternoon (in 2002), I was pushing a sailing dingy out into the mud-
warmed waters of Te Ihutai (nose of the tide), the Christchurch² estuary, near the out-flow of
the Bromley sewage treatment plant. My brother-in-law pushed on one side and I on the other.
The boat scraped over the shell and mud bottom. Something slipped itself with a chilling
slither around my ankles. I looked down. A white albino eel wrapped between my legs. My
scream alerted my brother-in-law, and as the white eel moved on in its journey my bro saw it,
validating my story of the “one I was glad got away”.

For several nights following, the eel revisited, taking on taniwha³ proportions, asking me to
abandon my sinking boat and climb aboard for the journey ahead. I talked to my Kaumatua⁴;
“Well,” he asked, “will you?”

This research is a story of the estuary; it is a story of relationship, the estuary as meeting
place, where salt waters meet fresh waters. The estuary is a space of murkiness, incomplete
and ongoing conversations, entangled and unfixed. It is a place of ever-constant change,
meaning shifting and transition. It is a place of loss and decay and the tide that returns
bringing regeneration. As a meeting point in all its shifting complexity, the estuary is life-
giving, representing the potential of relationship. The estuary metaphor brings to mind the
postcolonial theorist Edward Said’s welcome of the relational dialogue of contradictions and
tensions: “to think through and interpret together experiences that are discrepant, each with its
internal coherence and system of external relationships, all of them co-existing and interacting
with others” (1994, p. 37). The estuary is a rejection of total knowing, a rejection of “regimes

¹ These are words from a song collectively composed by Danielle O’Halloran and Weave Trust,
Otautahi/Christchurch, 2002, performed as part of the production “Where the Waters Meet”.
² A city in southern New Zealand, also referred to in this work by its Māori name Ōtautahi.
³ Taniwha: water spirit. Definitions of Māori words are footnoted the first time used, they are also included and
referenced on the definitions page.
⁴ Kaumatua: respected indigenous elder.
of truth” and the positional superiority of western knowledge that seeks to control, classify and discover (Smith, 1999, pp. 58-59).

This research is also the story of the journey that the eel has come to represent for me, the journey of building peaceful relationships in Aotearoa and of understanding the role that Te Tiriti o Waitangi holds. Informed by social constructionist and feminist poststructuralist understandings, I am not interested in providing a definitive account of the Treaty and its role in peace building in Aotearoa. Rather, I am interested in the process of meaning making and how this relates to the work for decolonisation and social justice in Aotearoa. I have inquired into the meanings and discursive strategies that key informants use in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. My curiosity is with “counter-hegemonic discourse” constructed by those working actively in Treaty-based justice work. Specifically, in relation to the Pākehā Treaty movement, I am interested in those who hold third-generation perspectives. In the process of developing this research inquiry, the study becomes an exploration of socially just relationships, where meaning is unfixed, contradictory and in tension, where meaning making produces generative, dialogical "knowledges".

It is not surprising that I have developed the metaphor of the estuary or the place of waters meeting as a source of strength, a resting point when the research process has felt too complex. My political activities have been imbued with coastal imagery over the past decade, while the seabed and foreshore became the battleground of discourse and dominance as the Crown sought to secure its hegemony. I also pay full homage to Weave Trust, the cross-cultural collaboration I am a part of, and our exploration of our meeting points as Pākehā, Tangata Whenua and Tagata Pāsifika; the waterways of Ōtautahi/Christchurch became emblematic of our relational encounters, resulting in the performance and film, “Where the Waters Meet” (2002). Helping me to move on from the “absolutes” of truth in my early

---

5 Although convention is to refer to Aotearoa New Zealand, in this work I use the indigenous name of Aotearoa to signify the country of New Zealand.
6 Te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty/the Treaty of Waitangi are all used to refer to the Māori text of the Treaty of Waitangi, unless otherwise stated. Te Tiriti o Waitangi will be explained further later in this chapter.
7 “Meaning making” refers to the social constructionist argument that meaning and knowledge are made, not discovered (Burr, 1995; Mills, 1997). This concept will be discussed in depth in Chapter 2.
8 “Key informants”, “participants”, and “interviewees” are all terms used to describe the research participants. I prefer the concept of key informants, as in my mind it attributes more agency to those researched. I discuss this further in Chapter 3.
9 The Pākehā Treaty movement will be discussed later in this chapter.
10 Those that joined the movement in the late 1990s and early 2000s (Margaret, 2009).
11 New Zealander of European descent.
12 Indigenous people of the land.
13 People of Pacific origins.
activism, feminist poststructuralism became an ally to the experience of cross-cultural work, of fluid and multiple positions and of attention to power relations.

Who am I the researcher?

As this research explores questions and relationships that have emerged for me as a Treaty worker, I will introduce myself as I do/would when co-facilitating a Treaty of Waitangi workshop, by telling a story of my ancestry:

My Pākehā ancestors arrived here in Aotearoa from the 1850s onwards. They were settler people to the South Island, arriving on the shores of Lyttelton, Otago and Bluff. They left their home places in Cornwall, Scotland and England — I also have Jewish great, great-grandparents, who arrived from England, but possibly from Eastern Europe before that. I have both inquired about and imagined my ancestors’ journeys: the departure from their homelands with hope for a new life, new opportunities in a new place. My Cornish ancestor left the tin mines for the gold fields of Otago, fiddle under arm; my Scottish ancestors acquired farmland — which they had lost in Scotland — by ballot in North Otago; my English ancestors departed the slums of London for the wilderness of Western Southland and ventured into saw-milling and fed their children on possum meat. There are stories that my father’s mother is of Māori descent, born in Orepuki Te Waewae Bay; a journey is unfolding to remember and reclaim the memory of those tipuna-ancestors who have been lost and silenced in our family — a re-weaving of understanding and belonging, of who my children and I are.

All of my ancestors made their home in the south of the South Island, and this is where I choose to live: it is where I feel a relationship and where I am accountable. My former home is Ōtautahi Christchurch, and now Ōtepoti Dunedin is the home of my young family. My partner is of Canadian origins, although his mother was born in the heart of the Urewera — they were a Canadian logging family here to share their skills. Their two years at Murupara in the 1950s bestowed New Zealand citizenship, although they too are settler peoples — to western Canada from Scotland, Ireland and Germany. We have two children — Maia, who is 4, and Rowan, now 2, who was born during this research process. One more baby is on the way.

14 Traditionally meaning ordinary or normal; now Indigenous person of Aotearoa.
15 Area of the the central North Island belonging to the Nga Tuhoe people.
The dual role of an introduction like this in a Treaty workshop is both to provide the opportunity to connect and to model a different epistemological emphasis on what is important: who we are and the people that we come from hold meaning in this space. This enacts a feminist poststructuralist approach, emphasising that my positionality is important. I do not claim an “objective” standpoint in this research; my involvement and my inquiry are interwoven with my own story and the uniqueness of my subjectivity.

My relationship to peace and Treaty work

As a young activist in Aotearoa, my journey inevitably led me to the Treaty of Waitangi and a decolonisation workshop with a Dunedin-based, cross-cultural whanau\textsuperscript{16} group called Freedom Roadworks\textsuperscript{17}. This was the first time I began to question who I was and to explore the stories of the land I had grown up on.

However, it was not until some years later, when I had begun work for the Peace Foundation that the Treaty came to the forefront. We\textsuperscript{18} were in the process of shaping a youth programme for the Peace Foundation when Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the work of decolonisation became our central focus. At the PeacePacific\textsuperscript{19} Youth Forum (2001), honouring the Treaty of Waitangi was stated as the primary peace issue for young people in Aotearoa — for Māori and Pākehā, the work of this relationship needed to be at the core of what we did. From this hui\textsuperscript{20} emerged a national network of young people actively engaged in Treaty activism and education: this network became known as “arc”\textsuperscript{21}. For much of the 2000s, “arc” was a visible and active national youth network that worked to forge a relationship with the Pākehā Treaty movement.

\textsuperscript{16} Family.
\textsuperscript{17} For further context and discussion on Freedom Roadworks please see Appendix C.
\textsuperscript{18} Other young people in the peace movement.
\textsuperscript{19} PeacePacific was a youth forum organised to run parallel to the UN Regional Disarmament Conference, held in Wellington New Zealand (2001). PeacePacific was written by its founders without a space.
\textsuperscript{20} A gathering, meeting.
\textsuperscript{21} Former members of “arc” have formed the participant group for this research, and further discussion of the context of “arc” occurs in Chapter 3. “arc” members joined the wider Pakeha Treaty movement in the early 2000s; they can be described as “third-generation” Treaty workers. In keeping with the conventions of the network, “arc” is written without capitalisation.
Emergence of the research inquiry

I travelled to Bougainville\textsuperscript{22} in both 2003 and 2005, by invitation, to work with an organisation of indigenous women who were leaders of the peace process in their communities. We\textsuperscript{23} took up the opportunity to work with this organisation, while acknowledging an awareness of and discomfort with our position and power as white women entering an indigenous context. We worked to reflect on our power and to find genuine strategies for collaboration, to decentre our own knowing and to hold the knowledges of the women we were working with at the forefront. We did this imperfectly and earnestly by working together rather than individually, by negotiating the parameters and limits of our collaboration with Bougainvillean women, and by maintaining relationships of accountability at home in Aotearoa. During this time, my colleague and I observed the workings of international agencies and the operations of their personnel in Bougainville. We saw the “expert and western knowledges” being transplanted into Bougainvillean soil without relationship, without respect for what was already there, often even without permission, although cloaked in the rhetoric of “community development”. This reeked of a colonial and imperial mindset we were familiar with. We saw this invasion of western agendas as derailing the locally owned peace-building project and were dismayed at the way opportunities for relationship with indigenous communities were being squandered. We began to ask ourselves, what is our process? And how did we learn to work in the way that we have, as imperfect and flawed as it is? This questioning led us back home to Aotearoa and the Treaty movement. We felt privileged to come from a context where these strategies and understandings were demanded of us.

A second strand in this inquiry\textsuperscript{24} is my work as a Treaty educator, where I often work with groups of young people and am struck by the fragility, disconnection and pain of the Pākehā/European settler identity when invited to come into conversation with indigeneity, with Tangata Whenua. The ongoing question for me is, “How do we facilitate a space that allows for the discomfort of the past and the possibility of relationship?” Complicating this work is the question of how identities that are hybrid, emerging or marginal fit within the bicultural framework and story that we present as Treaty educators. How are we talking about

\textsuperscript{22} An island group in the Pacific; politically a part of Papua New Guinea, geographically a part of the Solomon Islands. A ten-year-long war was waged as the indigenous inhabitants resisted the environmental destruction of an Australian-owned copper mine. The PNG Defence Force was funded by Australia, and a complete blockade was imposed on the islands. A peace process was negotiated in 1998 (Havini & Sirivi, 2004).

\textsuperscript{23} My colleagues in “arc”.

\textsuperscript{24} In this section, I describe my journey towards and interest in the research inquiry. In the following chapter, I locate the development of the research focus and questions in relation to my review of the literature. These dual processes acknowledge an interplay of personal reflexivity and literature inquiry.
each other and ourselves in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi? How does this talk construct our
realities and opportunities for socially just relationships? These strands of questions have fed
into a desire to explore meaning making with my colleagues.

During the development of the research process, I attended a conference in Wellington called
Whiteness: Whitemess (May, 2010). Here concepts of “critical whiteness” were being used by
“artists, writers, theatre makers, performance artists, dancers, musicians, activists and
academics using their various disciplines and mediums to examine Pākehā relationships to
historic and current colonisation”. A number of Pākehā Treaty workers were participating
from across the nation, and I found myself located once again in a national gathering of
Pākehā Treaty workers. My discomfort at this placement became self-critical as I struggled to
speak of my identity and complexity. I remained silent. The experience of my silence brought
to my attention the need to explore my own discomfort. This exploration has influenced my
direction and current position in relation to these conversations. Until this experience, I had
been trying to locate myself and the research within the mainstream of the Pākehā Treaty
movement, to provide some contribution to the whole. I now realised this was not my place to
stand. I needed to move my orientation to the margins and third generation25 of the
movement.

This shift to the margins of the movement is not without its problems of representation and
power. In the Methodology chapter, I will discuss third-generation participants and the
multiple positions and identities they hold. Although this is where I am positioned
generationally, the third generation in this research is not a homogenous group. I inevitably
end up engaging in a cross-cultural research process where I represent the voices of
marginalised others. This research is plagued with my own discomfort and with significant
issues of power and representation, which I work to negotiate through different levels of
accountability and ethical practice (described in Chapter 3). However, this approach does not
neutralise these issues. Rather, it emphasises the importance of constantly attending to the
power of my role in facilitating the representation of participants’ voices. Through attending
to issues of power it was important that the research process mirror a concern for the socially
just relationships that I am investigating, that I also unfix my meanings.

25 Drawing on the work of Jennifer Margaret (2008), I identify as a third-generation Treaty worker. In the next
chapter, I will unpack this generational view of the Treaty movement and the definitions Margaret presents.
The research questions

The research questions have emerged out of my reading of the literature discussed in the next chapter and from my own story of emerging inquiry, which I have reflected on here. The research questions are founded on social constructionist concepts of meaning making and the idea that social movements create “knowledges” in dialogue. My research questions are:

- What meanings and reflections do third-generation Treaty workers construct in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi?
- What dialogue, tensions and convergence do these “knowledges” generate?
- How do these “meanings” and “knowledges” contribute to concepts of socially just relationships in Aotearoa?

Contextualising concepts in the research

Why Peace and Conflict Studies?

In the story thus far, I have explained why I orient myself towards peace work, so the next question I would like to address is why I position this research as important to Peace and Conflict Studies. A B Fetherston (2000), a peace and conflict theorist, brings to attention the power of discourse to constitute what is “right”, what is “legitimate” and what holds ultimate authority. She argues that the field of research has been preoccupied with the legitimacy of “objective”, “total” knowing and a modernist agenda uncontaminated by subjectivity (p. 190). Fetherston calls for reflection on the limits of this preoccupation with objectivity. She suggests that “Out of this reflection space can be opened to think differently, to ask different questions, and, perhaps, to generate different practices than the field has thus far been able produce” (p. 191). Echoing Fetherston’s plea to Peace and Conflict Studies, I offer this research as a methodology for reflecting on meaning in a social movement.

Unlike much of the research undertaken in Peace and Conflict, which focuses on peace and conflict “out there” in the world, I orient my research here to Aotearoa. One reason for this is that it allows me to be accountable to the community I research, as research is not neutral but is plagued with issues of power and representation (Smith, 1999; Strega, 2005). Secondly, it is a congruent response to my story of being a young peace activist participating in the aforementioned PeacePacific parallel youth forum to a UN Disarmament Conference. At this forum, young Māori issued the challenge that peace and disarmament are irrelevant if we do not address issues of power and colonisation.
What is the Pākehā Treaty movement?

The Pākehā Treaty movement is a national movement of regionally based groups and individuals that meets annually/biannually and also maintains contact through a closed email list. The predominant function of the movement is education, although other forms of political and collective action are used.

During the early 1980s, the Pākehā anti-racism movement that was addressing issues of apartheid was challenged by Māori sovereignty activists to address issues of racism here in Aotearoa (Consedine, 2001; Huygens, 2007). From these challenges, a localised language and framing for anti-racism work was adopted, honouring Te Tiriti o Waitangi as a strategy for addressing colonial injustice that persisted in the present. Te Tiriti o Waitangi was signed in 1840 between the Rangatira26 of hapū27 and the British Crown. Although its interpretation is contested, the Māori version of the Treaty signed by both the majority of Rangatira and the Crown reaffirmed the Tino Rangatiratanga or sovereignty of Hapu and provided for the British to govern the settler population (Consedine, 2001; Huygens, 2007). While successive violent acts of colonisation disrupted attempts to realise this political relationship, Te Tiriti o Waitangi is positioned as a tool for addressing the alienation of colonisation and for negotiating new frames of power sharing28. Since the early 1980s, the Pākehā Treaty movement has developed in relationship to Māori groups and has undertaken community education to further an understanding of our colonial history and the possibilities of “right relationships” with Māori, contesting dominant cultural meanings that would position Treaty and colonial injustices only in the past (Huygens, 2007, 2011).

Naming the movement

In recent times, the movement has moved to a more inclusive descriptor of “Tangata Tiriti” (people of the Treaty), thereby recognising the diversity of its membership as including Tauiwi (indicating all non-Māori). In her work, Treaty People Recognising and Marking Pākehā Culture in Aotearoa New Zealand, Rose Black, a Pākehā Treaty worker and researcher, describes the use of “Tangata Tiriti” by the movement in this way:

[T]angata Tiriti, meaning people of the Treaty, to distinguish from tangata whenua (Māori people of the land). These names have become more inclusive of all non-Māori peoples in the Treaty relationship and signal a move towards Pākehā being the name

26 Chiefs.
27 Kinship group, subtribe.
28 While this description is written as definitive, there are multiple and contradictory ways of writing this episode of history. The interpretation I present is developed from my positioning as a Treaty educator and draws upon the meanings and positioning of Pākehā Treaty workers and the Māori Tino Rangatiratanga movement.
for the dominant cultural group while recognising that there were other cultural groups involved. (2010, p. 145)

In her research, *Learning in Social Movements: Experiences in the Pākehā Treaty Workers’ Movement*, Jennifer Margaret describes a movement definition of Tangata Tiriti as also including people who have mixed Māori and Tauiwi ancestry but identify as Tangata Tiriti (2009, p. 3). Considering that this development of a Tangata Tiriti definition(descriptor) is still evolving and will be discussed further at later points in the thesis (Chapter 3 and Chapter 6), and recognising that the dominant group within the movement identifies as Pākehā, I will retain the use of a “Pākehā Treaty movement” description for the purpose of this research, as did movement researchers Huygens (2007) and Margaret (2009).

**What is a social movement?**

I have already referred to the Pākehā Treaty movement as a “social movement”, and in this research I assume that the concept of “social movement” usefully identifies this formation of collective action (Jasper, 2009; Melucci, 1985). Pākehā Treaty workers refer to themselves as a “movement”, and Margaret (2009) and Huygens (2007) have created precedence in their research for this form of collective action to be studied as a “social movement”. I align my understanding of what constitutes a social movement with Alberto Melucci (1985), who positions “movements” as social constructions and holds that social movements are not “things” but “systems of action”. Melucci expands his definition of a system of action: “a social movement as a form of collective action (a) based on solidarity, (b) carrying on a conflict, (c) breaking the limits of the system in which action occurs” (p. 795). Although this thesis does not try to argue that Pākehā Treaty work fits this definition, Melucci’s explanation raises further concepts in need of clarity. If we are to see a social movement as collective action, in conflict, breaking the accepted limits of a system, then the Pākehā Treaty movement is in conflict with what I describe as “dominant discourse” and the power of “dominant culture”, and it pushes the limits of acceptance of dominant meanings.

**Dominant discourse, counter-hegemonic discourse**

I use the concepts of dominant discourse and dominant culture in this research to signify a certain social constructionist frame of understanding how meaning is made and how power operates to maintain certain meanings as dominant. In this work, “dominant discourse”

---

29 In this section, I discuss the concept of discourse; in Chapter 2, I further explain the concept of meaning making; and in Chapter 3, I examine the philosophical framework of feminist poststructuralism and social constructionism. These sections interplay, are in conversation, creating an epistemological framework for the research inquiry.
(Gergen, 1995; Mills, 1997; Wodak & Meyer, 2009) refers to a hierarchy of meaning production: “some ways of making meaning are dominant or mainstream in a particular order of discourse; others are marginal, or oppositional, or ‘alternative’” (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 124). In this research, “dominant discourse” refers to the localised expression of the “standard story”\(^\text{30}\) (Huygens, 2007; McCreanor, 2005), where Pākehā discursive strategies maintain Pākehā dominance and the subjugation of Māori culture (Bell, 2004a; McCreanor, 2005). As Tim McCreanor (2005) explains, these “standard stories” reproduce meaning that does not need to be explained as it is maintained by social practice:

> These shared narratives and conventions facilitate the interchanges between individuals because they minimise the need for lengthy discussion of the detail of what underlies particular aspects of social life. (p. 54)

In this research, I accept an analysis of localised dominant discourse and the standard story as discussed by others (Bell, 2004a; McCreanor, 2005; M. Nairn, 1989; Wetherell & Potter, 1992) and centre my inquiry among the discursive strategies of alternative meaning construction. Throughout this thesis, this domain is commonly referred to as “counter-hegemonic discourse”. Māori have consistently resisted the standard story of Māori and Pākehā relations and the dominant and limited understandings of Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Awatere Huata, 1984; Durie, 2005; Smith, 1999; Ranginui Walker, 2004; Ranginui Walker, 1986), and Pākehā are increasingly responding to this Māori analysis by also critiquing dominance (Archie, 1995; Consedine, 2001; Kelsey, 1985; Spoonley, 1991). This response of alternative discourse construction is also represented within the Pākehā Treaty movement. I use Ingrid Huygens’ (2007, 2011) discussion of Treaty movement discourse and her positioning of Treaty movement praxis as “counter-hegemonic discourse”. These discussions of meaning, discourse, dominant discourse and counter-hegemonic discourse will be expanded upon in the literature review. “Dominant culture” or “dominant Pākehā culture” is thus used to refer to the cultural system of the settler coloniser that collectively benefits from and perpetuates “dominant discourse”, often at the disadvantage of Māori or other immigrant minorities (Awatere Huata, 1984; A. Bell, 1996; McCreanor, 2005; Spoonley, 1986, 1988).

---

\(^\text{30}\) Examples of dominant discourse and the standard story in relation to our colonial past and present are: “the violent history of colonisation, the systematic dispossession of Māori land and resources were the product of the 19th century and not the enlightened present.” And “the Treaty of Waitangi is an archaic relic of the past and on that basis should possess no more than a symbolic role in contemporary society” (Poata-Smith, 2005, p. 212) McCreanor (2005) provides a comprehensive discursive analysis of the “standard story” in dominant Pakeha discourse.
Generations in the movement

Margaret has developed a definition of generations in the Pākehā Treaty movement. In her research, she proposes a generational distinction based on when members joined the movement rather than on their age:

Generation One participants were involved in anti-racism work that preceded Treaty work and had been involved in the Pākehā Treaty workers’ movement since its inception in the early 1980s. Generation Two participants joined the movement from the mid 1980s to mid 1990s and Generation Three participants joined in the period from the late 1990s to early 2000s. (2009, p. 41)

In her research, Black (2010) included age as a demographic, and noted differences in the perspectives on Pākehā cultural identity held by older and younger Treaty workers. However, for the purpose of this research, I build upon Margaret’s generational perspective and locate this research within a “third generation” in the Pākehā Treaty movement. I will discuss the development of this positioning in the literature review.

Biculturalism

Biculturalism is a contested concept that can refer to a wide range of political and cultural arrangements (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999), everything from “efforts to celebrate Māori culture” or state recognition of Māori culture, to the implementation of Māori models of self determination (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999; Johnson, 2010). This thesis will expand on and problematise some bicultural manifestations and meanings. For current purposes, the term will be used to refer to attempts to recognise two distinct and separate cultures: Pākehā and Māori (Pearson, 2001).

Dialogical process

I use the concept of dialogical (Bakhtin & Holquist, 1981) process in relation to meaning making in dialogue. Meaning is unstable and always changing. In relation to the past and the future, “meaning always implies at least two voices, assumes underlying difference rather than identity” (Wegerif, 2008, p. 348). This concept includes the idea that meaning is relational, that meaning does not exist in a vacuum and is always generated in multiple conversations.
Thesis structure

In this introductory chapter, I have proposed the metaphor of the estuary as a means for exploring the themes and meanings discussed in this research. This metaphor supports social constructionist notions of unfixed and multiple meanings and embodies the overarching argument that develops through the thesis: that from within socially just relationships we can disrupt fixed meanings and generate dialogue. I have woven my own story with the research intentions, highlighting my voice and the partiality of this relational research endeavour. I have discussed the research questions and focus, along with the context for the concepts and language engaged in the research. The thesis chapters are structured as follows:

Chapter 2 Locating within the literature
The literature review traverses social movement literature and explores the influences of social constructionism on approaches to social movements, particularly in identifying “meaning making” as central to the work of social movements. The meaning making of social movements can be constructed as “knowledge-practices” (Casas-Cortés, Osterweil, & Powell, 2008), engaging in and co-producing new knowledges. The “knowledges” produced by the Pākehā Treaty movement are discussed, highlighting a genealogy of social movement discourse already theorised from within the movement. The gaps in current activist knowledge production are also identified. Both the theoretical literature and the discourse produced by the Pākehā Treaty movement support my development of the research questions.

Chapter 3 Methodology
The methodology chapter further explores the concepts of feminist poststructuralism and social constructionism and examines how these theoretical frameworks inform the epistemological orientation of the research, particularly as a disruption of the absolutes of “knowledge”. Responding to this philosophical positioning, a process of narrative inquiry is proposed as an appropriate methodological frame for the research inquiry. My positioning as an “insider researcher” in a social movement is discussed, along with the ethical and relational implications of my role as researcher. The research participants, the research process and the research context are considered, as they feed into the epistemological context. Finally, I highlight how I undertook a thematic and inductive analysis of narratives.
Chapter 4 Meaning making

This chapter begins with an overview of all the findings chapters and how these chapters respond to the research questions, the literature and the themes of the thesis. The meanings constructed in third-generation narratives are analysed, along with the dialogical dimensions of these narratives within Pākehā Treaty movement discourse and social movement literature. Key informants redefine the meaning of their work as “decolonisation”, and describe a “relationship-based” practice, along with the conditions for constructing a critical consciousness. These meanings both converge with and contradict wider movement discourse, and are offered as complementary frames in generative tension.

Each of the following chapters responds to the overarching themes of the thesis providing a different perspective and more depth to the ideas that through relationship we can unfix meaning and produce generative tension.

Chapter 5 Relationship: a decentering of “knowing”

Chapter 5 takes the concept and emphasis on “relationships” raised in the previous chapter and explores the decentering of the “fixed knowing” that relational encounters with difference can demand. A Levinasian ethics is drawn upon to highlight this disruption of “knowing” among the narratives of key informants, and how this forms concepts for socially just relationships. This process of decentering is positioned as a “knowledge-practice” for decolonisation, and the complexities of decentering encounters within a cross-cultural group are explored.

Chapter 6 The power to define?

“The power to define?” takes up the notion of “decentering knowing” and explores tensions in third-generation meaning construction, tension with binary constructions of identity politics and tension with defining others. Key informants argue for an “opening up of meaning” as they challenge rigid identity categories that do not serve a decolonisation practice. I propose that these tensions are productive, as they create space for relationships of agonistic dialogue and propose possibilities for unfixed and fluid meaning.
Chapter 7 Tensions and intersections

Expanding on the argument to “open up meaning”, this chapter explores tensions embodied by third-generation understandings of “power” in the context of socially just relationships. While an analysis of power is essential to decolonisation practice, key informants also recognise the complexities of entangled relationships and trouble an oppositional binary of power/powerlessness. Participants seek to create more fluid, unfixed and partial knowledge-practices, where the language of an oppositional dichotomy does not serve a decolonisation agenda. Through turning towards complexity, and approaching an intersectionality conditioned by a “return to the land”, key informants make space for relationships between concepts and positions.

Chapter 8 Contributions

Chapter 8 returns to the metaphor of the estuary as meeting point — unfixed and changing — seeing this fluid relational space as generative and regenerative. A response to the final research question is explored: How do these “meanings” and “knowledges” contribute to concepts of socially just relationships in Aotearoa? I argue that socially just relationships provide the opportunity for an unfixing of meaning and for tension between meanings to be composed as generative, further supporting and informing the work of socially just relationships. Although there are no certainties, the thesis proposes possibilities for continuing Treaty movement dialogue. The research has highlighted the importance of attention to the meaning making of social movements and to place-based knowledges, and speaks to the proposal within Peace and Conflict Studies that a decentering of “knowing” could be a foundation for peace research epistemology. The limitations of this research are identified, along with possibilities for further inquiry.
Chapter 2 Locating within the literature

The lagoon is on the maps. Stars fall into its waters: wounded Fish shelter there. People live on its margins, and crabs. Boats Drift across the water-top, and over all, the birds — ... We dreamed we won the land... Now we wake, and know The land won us a long long time An age ago (Hulme, 1992, p. 9)

Introduction

I began this literature review with a desire to map the territory by wading through, sometimes drowning within, a lagoon of postcolonial theory (Bhabha, 1990, 1994; Said, 1994; Spivak, Landry, & MacLean, 1996); identity politics (Lloyd, 2005; Weedon, 2004); indigeneity (Maaka & Fleras, 2005; Smith, 1999; Venkateswar & Hughes, 2011); social constructionism, knowledge, discourse and power (Foucault, 2002; Foucault & Gordon, 1980; Haraway, 1991, 2003; Mills, 1997; Sawicki, 1991; Weedon, 1987). While these broad approaches all informed my general research inquiry, I found my feet touched the bottom when I arrived at the “cultural turn” in social movement theory. Here I could make links back to Peace and Conflict Studies and my interest in the discursive possibilities of social movements as sites of social change. Central to recent developments in social movement theory is the social constructivist notion of “meaning making” in social movements as a process of countering normative and dominant discourses (Benford, 2002; Davis, 2002; Goodwin, 2004; Holland, Fox, & Daro, 2008; Jasper, 2009; Klandermans, 1992; Kurzman, 2004, 2008; Lehrner & Allen, 2008; Mueller, 1992; Polletta, 2004). Considering my interest in the Pākehā Treaty movement as a “social movement”, and meaning construction as a tool for social change, social movement theory was able to broaden and deepen my appreciation for these complexities and processes.

Alongside these theoretical waters within the international literature, I was also reading/wading/paddling/diving into the tidal pools of local literature in the fields of national identity and the politics of biculturalism (A. Bell, 1996; Bell, 2004a, 2006; C. Bell, 1996; Dugdale, 2000; Pearson, 1989, 2001; Spoonley, 1986, 1988, 1991; Ranginui Walker, 2004); discourse analysis of Pākehā racism (McCreanor, 2005; Rankine & McCleanor, 2009; Wetherell & Potter, 1992); and alternative and counter-hegemonic anti-racist discourses.
(Hancock, Epston, & McKenzie, 2006; Huygens, 2006, 2007; Margaret, 2009). The more reading I undertook, the less certain I felt of how to orient my research questions with and towards local literature. However, as the two waters merged and my reading developed, I came across the theoretical positioning of meaning making as central to the work of social movements and as constituting “knowledge-practices” (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008). The argument that Maria Casas-Cortés, Michal Osterwell and Dana Powell (2008) presented was a challenge to position the “theorising, practices and reflective processes” of social movements as central and authoritative “knowledges”, often in dialogue with academic theory (p. 41).

This illuminated the activist research from within the Pākehā Treaty movement as the central location for analysis, locating this literature review in the theorising undertaken by Treaty workers of their own collective practices, processes and “meaning making”. The published work of Ingrid Huygens (Huygens, 2001a, 2006, 2007, 2011), Mitzi Nairn (M. Nairn, 1989, 2009) and Jennifer Margaret (Centre, 2007; Margaret, 2009), among others (Black, 2010; Black & Huygens, 2007; Consedine, 2001; Gibson, 2006; Kirton, 1997), provided a platform for investigating meaning construction among those who identify a relationship with the Pākehā Treaty movement. In researching this small but reflective textual discourse, I located two significant gaps that further strengthened my research approach and questions. Little theorising had been undertaken with those holding a “third-generation” perspective within the movement — with the exception of Margaret (2009)31 — and current theorising predominantly referred to Pākehā, Tāuiwi or Tangata Tiriti as a homogenous group. This presented an opening supported by the literature for exploring “third-generation” perspectives from a heterogeneous group of participants struggling to work with difference and yet in relationship to a Pākehā Treaty movement32.

In this review of the literature, I will outline briefly the parameters of the concept of “meaning making”. Following this, I will examine the centrality of “meaning making” to social movement theory and discuss recent Pākehā Treaty movement theorising that highlights meaning construction. From this discussion, the “gaps” in the current research will be identified, as will the ways that these gaps came to inform the research questions and process.

31 Rose Black included a significant group of “younger people” in her research, although she did not employ a “third generation” description (Black, 2010).
32 A detailed participant description is discussed in Chapter 3 Methodology.
**Meaning making?**

Thus far, I have widely employed the concept of “meaning making” in this research without fully elaborating what I mean by it. From a social constructionist or culturalist approach, “meaning” is not a truth position, nor does it describe a fixed reality. Rather, I consider the process of meaning making as plural and as embracing a multiplicity of perspectives. “Meaning making” can be described as “how we make sense of the world”. It is not only a cognitive process, but also one of morality, perception, and social and cultural processes (Kurzman, 2008, p. 5). An “individualist” perspective on “meaning making” would argue that “meaning” is made from a rational, though distinctly individual, processing of sensory inputs. However, from a culturalist perspective, “meaning” is a construction; we construct meanings and are constructed by them. In other words, “meaning making” is a “collective contest over interpretation. Institutions, repertoires, and rituals offer a set of ready-made — though always contradictory — interpretations that allow people to assimilate information into established categories of understanding” (Kurzman, 2008, p. 6).

From a poststructuralist perspective, “discourse” can be understood as central to how we “make meaning” of the world (Haraway, 1991; Mills, 1997; Potter, 1997; Weedon, 1987). Discourse, from this perspective, is not simply a text or what is spoken; it is the idea of a system of symbolic rituals that informs a way of thinking — a way of thinking that cannot be understood in isolation: “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (Foucault, 1972, p. 49 as cited in Mills, 1997, p. 17). Truth, therefore, is something that cultures have to produce and reproduce; it is not intrinsic and to be discovered, even though many dominant discourses may parade as truth (Foucault & Gordon, 1980; Mills, 1997). Dominant discourses produced in institutions have the power to form our understandings of ourselves and others. Examples of meanings produced in dominant discourse and perpetuated through media may be “the Treaty has no relevance to the present day” (McCreanor, 2005, p. 60), or the idea of the Treaty claims settlement process is about “Māori privilege” (McCreanor, 2005, p. 57). However, Pākehā Treaty workers may work to produce counter-meanings or discourses, such as: “The Treaty is a covenant by which Pākehā can live legitimately and justly in Aotearoa” (Consedine, 2001; Huygens, 2007). Thus, although meaning makes us, and discourse and expert knowledge have the power to form our understandings of ourselves and the world around us, we also have agency to recognise the heterogeneity of meaning and, to some degree, agency in our own meaning-making strategies.
As Weedon argues: “Knowledge of more than one discourse and the recognition that meaning is plural allows for a measure of choice on the part of the individual and even where choice is not available, resistance is still possible” (1987, p.106).

It is this sphere of agency in what may be described as “counter-hegemonic discourse” (Huygens, 2007) or “subjugated knowledges” (Foucault & Gordon, 1980) that this research is interested in. As discussed in the Introduction, significant research has been undertaken by academics into the analysis of dominant discourses relating to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and race relations in Aotearoa New Zealand (McCreanor, 2005; R. Nairn et al., 2011; Rankine & McCreanor, 2004, 2009; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). This research inquiry is interested in Pākehā Treaty movement efforts to both counter dominant discourses and create alternative meanings, not as a comparative analysis with dominant discourse, but rather with a focus on a dialogical space of generative tensions within the movement.

**Meaning making central to social movements**

Social movement studies has traditionally had a “structuralist” bias, where causes, patterns and motivations were studied extensively in the behaviours, functions, strategies and outcomes of social movements (Goodwin, 2004; Polletta, 2004; Tarrow, 1992). As Charles Kurzman (2004) describes it, there was a preoccupation with “the structures in which individuals operated, rather than the world-views that allowed the structures to operate” (p. 8). The “cultural turn” in social movement studies has received much discussion within the literature over the past twenty years, where social constructionism is positioned as informing new approaches to the study of social movements (Davis, 2002; Holland et al., 2008; Jasper, 2009; Kurzman, 2004; Mueller, 1992; Polletta, 2004; Tarrow, 1992):

> A broad social constructionism, which views all knowledge and institutions as shaped by our cognitive frameworks, implies that no crisp distinction between true and false political claims can be sustained. Both can be “deconstructed” by being linked to the social context and position of those making them. (Jasper, 2009, p. 71)

As Jasper (2009) contends from a social constructionist perspective, all knowledge and meaning becomes relative to the context that is producing it. An affinity for a social constructionist approach has informed the questions guiding this research, and as such a social constructionist approach that highlights the importance of “meaning making” in social movements resonates well as the body of theory to further develop the research inquiry. Kurzman (2004) develops the idea of the agency that people can have in relation to the power
of discourse: “… the view that people construct their own history — not under circumstances chosen by themselves, certainly, but under circumstances they have the power to change. Opportunity, ultimately, is what people make of it” (p. 117). Kurzman would also assert that social constructionism does not need to reduce our analysis to the stage of individuals, that theorising across a collective is possible; he simply reminds us that our analysis is “heuristic” (2004, p. 118). I take this to be a decentering of the “knowns” of what we create in research, that we do not discover truth. I will explore this idea of the research as partial and incomplete — a perspective from my own subjectivity — further in Chapter 3.

While the “cultural turn” in the study of social movements has had several manifestations, much of the literature focuses on the role of meaning making in social movements (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008; Klandermans, 1992; Klandermans & Roggeband, 2009; Kurzman, 2008; Mueller, 1992; Tarrow, 1992). Francesca Polletta (2004) describes how an attention to culture helps us to make sense of “interpretive activities”, of how social movements constitute identities and meanings (Polletta, 2004, p. 100). A focus on meaning making in social movements changes our epistemological view of social movements themselves (Jasper, 2009; Klandermans, 1992; Mueller, 1992; Tarrow, 1992). A constructionist approach privileges the words of participants in a social movement, rather than applying a preconceived knowledge of participants. This changes the parameters of traditional research, where analysis and theory are prescribed by the expert observer (Davis, 2002; Tarrow, 1992).

Several theorists observe the “social change” power of “meaning making” in social movements as a site of discursive practice that ultimately can impact on dominant culture and society:

[N]ew social meanings — like new repertoires of contention — are products of the struggles within social movements and between them and their opponents (Mueller 1989). If we can demonstrate these processes, then we may have a key to how “culture change” occurs — not through the automatic diffusion of values through diffuse social learning processes, but from assimilation into general political culture of new frames of meaning from collective action. (Tarrow, 1992, p. 175)

Tarrow positions meaning as constructed by struggle, struggle over meaning within a movement and struggle over meaning in opposition (1992, p. 197). Bert Klandermans (1992) argues that meaning is constructed and reconstituted in both “public discourse” and through the process of “consciousness raising” (p. 99). Klandermans would argue, like Tarrow, that it is in the “clashes and confrontations between competing or opposing schemes, [that] meaning is constructed” (1992, p. 100).
Contributing to change in society is not just a question of the resources social movements can utilise, but is also a “delicate balance” of “resonance” of a movement’s meanings with societal culture and the possibility of conversion (Tarrow, 1992, p. 197). Social movements both utilise existing cultural meanings, appealing to popular discourse or “frame bridging” (in social-movement speak) and produce new meanings, “frame transformation” (Tarrow, 1992). In collective action, new meanings are produced, but always in dialogue with dominant meanings (Tarrow, 1992, p. 188), as no “talk” is free from the genealogy of the discourse that constitutes it (Foucault, 2002). Joseph Davis (2002) also describes this process of “resonance” with societal meanings while discussing the power of “counternarratives” that contest dominant discourse. According to Davis, counternarratives are not abstracted from dominant structures of meaning but rather “modify existing beliefs and symbols” and exist within the frames of reference society already holds (2002, p. 25).

Davis views story telling as a process of “exercising agency” in furthering social change agendas; he positions narrative as a vital tool of meaning construction:

Social movements tell a new story. In this way they acquire leadership, gain adherents, and develop a capability of mobilizing needed resources to achieve success. Social movements are not merely reconfigured networks and redeployed resources. They are new stories of whom their participants hope to become. (2002, p. 10)

Davis also views a focus on narrative as giving social movements the opportunity to respond to change: “it is not about following a script, but about choosing how to handle deviations from a script” (2002, p. 23), and it is the ability to construct new meanings that leads to “innovative action” and “alternative futures” always in relationship to the past (p. 24).

There is a growing trend in social movement theory to not only position meaning making as “an aspect” of social movements, but rather to “privilege” meaning making as central to social movements and as central to understanding social change generally:

Meaning-making is not limited to social movements. All action involves meaning-making, just as all action involves contention. However, social movements may be a particularly conducive site to privilege meaning-making, because their activities foreground resistance to the dominant norms and institutions of society. They raise questions about the possibility of alternative world-views and alternative dispensations, and in so doing they challenge participants and observers to re-think meanings that are too often taken for granted. Social movements actively make meaning, challenging established meanings. (Kurzman, 2008, p. 6)
As has been discussed, the purpose of social movements is often to counter and re-define dominant and normative meanings of social compliance as social problems; in this respect the “social change” movements engage in a struggle over the meaning of social and cultural practices. Positioning movements as the generative home of alternative and counter-hegemonic meaning, Amy Lehrner and Nicole Allen (2008) discuss the meaning-making strategies utilised in the domestic violence movement and highlight a struggle over meaning making as central to the work of that movement (Lehrner & Allen, 2008). I argue that the Pākehā Treaty movement is a similar example where meaning construction is central, where the movement has contested and reframed dominant Pākehā cultural understandings of the Treaty relationship (Huygens, 2007, 2011). In this sense, the Pākehā Treaty movement is one with a clear “cultural change” agenda (Lehrner & Allen, 2008). As for Lehrner and Allen in the domestic violence movement, so too in the Treaty movement there is a “problem of definition”; language can be understood as central to the understanding of the problems of domination by settler society.

This positioning of meaning making as central refines the research question as “What meanings and reflections are constructed in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi?”

Conceiving “knowledge-practices”

Maria Casas-Cortés, Michal Osterwell and Dana Powell (2008) further develop the idea that meaning making is central to social movements. They also argue that previous movement theorising has positioned meaning making as simply one aspect or a tool of social movement activity. Casas-Cortés et al embody meaning making with more power and describe it as knowledge producing, or in their words “knowledge-practices” (2008, p. 20). They argue that the positioning of meaning as knowledge allows us to see more that might otherwise be missed, and that when “knowledge” is exemplified through lived and place-based practices, different kinds of answers are illuminated (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 42). “This both radically shifts our conception of what social movements have to offer, and potentially broadens our understandings of what constitutes “the social” (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 21). From this standpoint, they argue for a study of social movements based on active activist reflection, not from the objective external spectator (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008). This theoretical positioning supports my location as “insider researcher” (Smith, 1999) — as an active participant in the movement I am researching — a location that will be discussed further in Chapter 3.
Along with the other social movement theorists discussed above, Casa-Cortés et al position knowledge-practices as engaging and co-producing counter-hegemonic discourses while also transforming or challenging dominant discourses (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 26). In this domain, social change is “embedded” in the meanings that movements generate (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 28) while these meanings are often in dialogue with theory destabilising the activist-academic distinction (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 23). This destabilising challenges us to recognise the agency of the subject. Donna Haraway (1991) explains the demands of situated knowledge:

> Situated knowledges require that the object of knowledge be pictured as an actor and agent, not a screen or a ground or a resource, never finally as slave to the master that closes off the dialectic in his unique agency and authorship of ‘objective’ knowledge. (p. 198)

By recognising the agency of the embodied subject, discourse becomes a site for both transforming epistemology and countering a dominant positivist frame.

As social movement activists/theorists, Casas-Cortés et al also envision further possibilities for knowledge-practices; they contend that knowledge-practices produce critical subjectivities whose embodied discourse produces new processes, frameworks and forms of intersubjective relations (2008, pp. 41-43). They argue that these “new ways of being” may even be a vehicle for new models for society. Further to this, as situated knowledges they are in constant tension with of conditions of power (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 42). Haraway (1991) contends that we need the analysis of power that situated knowledges can provide, as it is this analysis that produces the possibilities for change: “We need the power of modern critical theories of how meanings and bodies get made, not in order to deny meanings and bodies, but in order to live in meanings and bodies that have a chance for a future” (p. 187). Further to this, Casas-Cortés also credit knowledge-practices in social movements with the reflexive and responsive ability to generate “conjunctural theories” that go against orthodox approaches to social change (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 22). These conjunctural theories can create new possibilities beyond the normative approach of traditional social change analysis, producing “unfixed” knowledges (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 41). This idea appears to particularly lend itself to a “third-generation” perspective on the Pākehā Treaty movement, to the way that reflexivity may be used by a younger generation to create new and flexible models for action within the movement.

In summary, Casas-Cortés et al argue that social movements are spaces for knowledge generation; these knowledges are embodied in practice and can be understood as situated
knowledges. These knowledge-practices are crucial to visions for social change by social movements, for there is an inextricable relationship between knowledge and power. The agency that Casas-Cortés et al invoke in movement participants’ meaning construction supports this inquiry, which seeks to position movement members as active agents in meaning making. Reading the data analysis and themes that emerge from the research with the complexity of knowledge-practices in mind may illuminate a depth and complexity that could otherwise be missed. However, Casas-Cortés et al discuss knowledge-practices as flexible and unfixed and as transformative of normative paradigms. There is a sense of completion and coherence to the defining of knowledge-practice, and I am curious about the degree to which “meaning making” and knowledge-practices are also unfinished, partial, and in tension or conversation, about when meaning may be murky and unclear in tension and contradiction with its author. This informs the research question: What dialogue, tensions and convergence do these “knowledges” generate?

The Pākehā Treaty workers movement: activist knowledge production

In this section, I analyse Pākehā Treaty movement discourse and position it as the knowledge-practices and meaning-making strategies that some social movement theorists argue is the central work of social movements. Although the focus here is on activist knowledge production, there is a fine line between the activist/academic, and movement-generated knowledge. The latter is both in dialogue with theory and actively producing theory. For the purpose of this literature review, I work with texts that identify as movement-orientated work in line with Casas-Cortés et al’s positioning of movement knowledge-practices. I am also indebted to Ingrid Huygens (2007), who in her PhD research set a framework for analysis of Pākehā Treaty movement discourse, demonstrating that meaning does not just appear, there is a genealogy (Foucault, 2002). I give attention to Huygens’ findings as a platform for this study’s analysis; in addition, I identify gaps in current theorising and reflection that support and strengthen the orientation of this research.

Ingrid Huygens has published widely on Pākehā culture and Pākehā/Māori relations (Black & Huygens, 2007; Huygens, 2001a, 2001b, 2006; Huygens & Vaughan, 1983; Mulvey et al., 2000) in her dual roles as an active and committed member of the Pākehā Treaty movement and as an academic. In her PhD research, Processes of Pākehā change in response to the Treaty of Waitangi (2007), and her paper synthesising aspects of the same research for broader settler/indigene relations, Developing a Decolonisation Practice for Settler
Colonisers: A Case Study from Aotearoa New Zealand (2011), Huygens provides a comprehensive analysis of the “genealogy of discourse” — or in this case a “genealogy of counter-hegemonic discourse” (2007, p. 117) in the development over the last four decades of Pākehā anti-racism and Treaty work. Her analysis is built from an exhaustive review of published and unpublished materials, movement conference proceedings, and extensive archives of meeting minutes, newsletters and correspondence (Huygens, 2007, p. 116). Huygens’ analysis highlights the discursive and ideological influences on Pākehā Treaty workers as a movement and also demonstrates how Pākehā responded to the local context of colonisation. Along with this analysis of the genealogy of discourse construction, Huygens also carried out focus groups nationally with Pākehā Treaty educators co-theorising their practice and the process of Pākehā change in relation to the Treaty of Waitangi (2007, p. 163). Further to this, Huygens applied discourse analysis to the narratives of organisations engaged in Treaty-based change. All these strands fed into an analysis of how Pākehā, and more generally settler colonisers, may engage in the work of decolonisation (Huygens, 2007, p. 251; 2011), an analysis of what Casas-Cortés et al may call movement knowledge-practices.

However, Huygens’ research questions are different from mine: her interest is in the pedagogical processes of how Pākehā change in relation to the Treaty of Waitangi, while my research focus is on meaning construction within the movement. Social movement researcher Klandermans (1992) argues that meaning construction can be most evident in processes of consciousness raising (Klandermans, 1992); given Huygens’ focus on “processes of Pākehā change”, meaning construction may be most evident. Huygens’ theorising of Pākehā Treaty movement discourse and the co-theorising she undertook nationally with movement members provide this research with an invaluable platform and an analytical framework to work from. Huygens’ analysis of the genealogy of movement discourse finishes in the early 2000s, when third-generation members are defined as joining the movement (Margaret, 2009, p. 41). Although some third-generation members did participate in focus groups theorising on practice, many did not and many would have identified as “activists” rather as “educators” at the time of the research.

Although Huygens owns her research as a more “northern” perspective (Huygens, 2011, p. 57), her analysis provides a platform to refine my research questions. In particular, it helps me to refine the question, “What dialogue, tensions and convergences do these “knowledges” generate?”, as I will be able to analyse the dialogical dimensions of third-generation meaning
construction. I highlight once again that this is not a comparative analysis — rather, it turns attention to a new generation in dialogue with movement discourse.

Huygens asks “how may the critical settler participate in an agenda of decolonisation?” (2011, p. 54). Huygens’ response for the decolonisation work of the settler coloniser (for Pākehā in this context) theorised from movement discourse fits into several stages:

- **I ideological:** Re-visiting the history of the colonial relationship
- **Emotional:** Responding emotionally to the “uncomfortable” work of a shift in worldview about the colonial relationship
- **Cultural:** Building a critical sense of cultural collectivity
- **Constitutional:** Working towards an accountable, mutually agreed relationship

(Huygens, 2007, pp. 196-200; 2011, pp. 73-76)

Re-visiting the history of the colonial relationship demands that the standard story of colonisation be deconstructed to highlight how Pākehā privilege and worldviews have been constructed (Huygens, 2007, p. 197). Responding emotionally is described as the emotional work Pākehā do in response to having their “knowns” or the standard story challenged: anger, blame, fear, “grief at loss of innocence” (Huygens, 2007, p. 197). Huygens theorises that this process of responding emotionally is different for settler colonisers than it is for indigenous peoples as it requires settlers to recognise their role in oppression. Building a critical and conscious collectivity deconstructs “individualism” as cultural and challenges Pākehā to think collectively in analysis and action (Huygens, 2007, p. 198; 2011, p. 75). Huygens sees working towards a new framework for relationship between Pākehā and Tangata Whenua groups as the process of change for Pākehā, finding new, decentered ways of being in relationship (2007).

Huygens’ analysis of the “work” the settler coloniser needs to engage in as a decolonisation practice resonates with the theory developed by Rose Black (2010), also a Treaty movement researcher and activist. In her PhD research Black recognises three main aspects to a decolonisation practice of disrupting Pākehā cultural dominance: “...to know the culture of the colonisers; to identify how that culture has been naturalised; and to work with people to recognise the oppressive effects of imposing that unmarked culture on all” (2010, p. 197). Black observes that in their theorising, the Treaty movement or the “Treaty people” who participated in her research recognise Pākehā culture as dominant and identify the practices that maintain this system of dominance; they also assert a challenge to recognise the status of
Tangata Whenua and the role of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Black also identifies, echoing Huygens’ “accountable and mutually agreeable relationships”, a “striving for just relationships with Māori” (2010, p. 198).

To arrive at the before-mentioned knowledge-practice, Huygens positions movement theorising and practice as a “cognitive praxis” and develops a genealogy of the practice of anti-racism and Treaty theorising over four decades (Huygens, 2011, p. 57). The development of this cognitive practice is reflective, learning from and responding to previous problems in practice and theory. Huygens describes efforts by some Pākehā groups during the 1960s to “help” Māori out of their deprivation; this focus on “helping” stemmed from assimilationist ideas that still held Pākehā cultural norms as unquestioned (Huygens, 2011, p. 59). During the 1970s, an anti-racism analysis developed that questioned Pākehā cultural norms; this anti-racism analysis was informed by global movements emphasising a structuralist and institutional analysis of power (Huygens, 2007, pp. 120-121). This analysis was informed by the work of Paulo Freire and Antonio Gramsci, among others, and brought into focus the blindness of privilege and dominant cultural hegemony (Huygens, 2011, p. 60). Cultural change was the agenda and the process was positioned as “co-intentional relationships”, the oppressed and the oppressor “working towards the same end in different ways” (Huygens, 2011, p. 61). During this time, attention was also turned to the local context and the need to examine colonial history to inform analysis. Co-intentional relationships as a framework were deemed an appropriate way for Pākehā to address their “individualism” and to work consciously towards collectivity (Huygens, 2011, pp. 61-62). Huygens describes this framework as a realisation that Pākehā-only groups were required and where Māori and Pāsifika activists could act as “consultants” (Huygens, 2011, p. 62). Huygens quotes a personal communication from Ray Nairn:

It became obvious that (mixed groups) blurred responsibilities. The primary dominant group responsibility is to unlearn and dismantle its dominating institutions and social constructions, such as institutional and cultural racism. We kept hearing this quite clearly from the consultants. (Huygens, 2011, p. 62)

It is interesting to note here that when third-generation (“arc”) members joined the movement in the early 2000s, they were Pākehā, people with mixed ancestry, Pāsifika, Tauiwi, and all in different stages of their identity journey, there was possibly only partial or fragmented understanding of this distinction in movement history and discourse.

33 Cognitive praxis as defined by Huygens: “Cognitive praxis is the theorising and practices developed by a social movement in the context of local intellectual history and political culture, which in turn shapes the movement’s ‘project’ for change.” (Huygens, 2011, p. 57)
During the 1980s, there was a move to educate about the history of colonialism and the meaning of Te Tiriti o Waitangi; this was in response to Māori challenges to address local racism and history following the mass mobilising of Pākehā addressing racism elsewhere (the anti-apartheid movement) (Huygens, 2007, p. 122). Through significant hui and dialogue with Tangata Whenua, the meaning of the Treaty moved from “the Treaty is a fraud” (a tool of colonisation) to “honour the Treaty” as a way forward for realising justice (Huygens, 2011, p. 63). Huygens pinpoints a sense of the collective Pākehā response developing into a “movement” at this time. The focus for the movement became Treaty education, the need to inform the Pākehā public and change the culture of ignorance of colonial history, and the Treaty was positioned as the vehicle to understand the local context (Huygens, 2007, p. 127). This took the shape of a co-ordinated national education campaign called Project Waitangi, which even received government funding for its endeavours to educate Pākehā about the Treaty, to recognise the status of Tangata Whenua, and to move towards biculturalism (Huygens, 2007, pp. 125-126). The focus on the Treaty of Waitangi saw movement discourse develop from “co-intentional relationships” into “Treaty relationships”, framed as relationships of accountability between Pākehā and Māori (Huygens, 2007, p. 137). This period saw knowledge-practices within the movement develop: a critical re-reading of colonial history (Huygens, 2011, p. 68); a challenge for Pākehā to take responsibility for organisational and institutional structures; and the emotional processing that these education strategies demanded (Huygens, 2011, p. 69). During the 1990s, as the language of biculturalism and partnership was co-opted into tokenistic government policies that did not manifest any real power sharing, the movement moved to the arena of constitutional change as a process to ensure power sharing (Huygens, 2007, p. 137; 2011; Johnson, 2010). The language of “Treaty based relationship” was engaged (Huygens, 2011, p. 71). Huygens explains that the way forward was viewed as a constitutional arrangement between Tangata Whenua and all non-Māori as Tangata Tiriti (2011, p. 72). Huygens argues that by the 2000s Te Tiriti was on the agenda more than ever, with public dialogue occurring in several spheres (Huygens, 2011, p. 73). Her analysis of movement discourse development, the changes and challenges, ends here as third-generation members begin to join and become involved.

In addition to Huygens’ discursive analysis (Huygens, 2001b, 2006, 2007, 2011), there appears to be a wider tradition by Pākehā Treaty workers of examining discourse and being aware of the power of language (Kirton, 1997; McNamara, 2001; M. Nairn, 2009). John Kirton, (1997) in “Paakeha/Tauwiwi Seeing the Unseen”, provides significant analysis of the power of Pākehā/Tauwiwi hegemony and the blindness of dominant culture to itself,
concluding that Pākehā/Tauiwí need to develop new models for relationship with Tangata Whenua that challenge hegemonic discourse:

For it is not about our becoming personally less monocultural, more ‘culturally sensitive’ or ‘culturally aware’; it is about ourselves constructing and using collective discourse of relationships and ‘ways of being’ that generally are unlike any Pākehā/Tauiwí today use in public arenas. At the same time, we will develop new kinds of interaction with — but not dependency upon — Tangata Whenua. (p. 81)

Kirton’s new forms of relationship dismantling dominant power structures can be seen in Huygens’ “accountable and mutually agreed relationships” and in Black’s “recognition of dominance”. I would position these relationships as Casas-Cortés et al’s knowledge-practices, capable of creating new, critical subjectivities.

Mitzi Nairn, in the 2009 Treaty Conference proceedings, brings our attention to the inadequacy of English as the language of the coloniser to communicate key concepts, or a different ontological/epistemological framework (M. Nairn, 2009). She also brings our attention to how meaning shifts over time and how language may become co-opted and lose the strength of its original meaning. Nairn provides the example of the problem, also described by Huygens above, with biculturalism losing its original potency. She also argues that the emphasis on cultural issues, within the term bicultural, misses the important point that the Treaty was primarily about power and resources (M. Nairn, 2009). So attention is brought to the power of language and the shifting of meaning and suggests that conversation and dialogue allow for the development of language that fits the local reality (M. Nairn, 2009).

So although there is a movement focus on analysing the power of dominant discourses and the use of language — and although Huygens has applied “discourse analysis” to the counter-hegemonic discourse in organisational narratives of Treaty change (Huygens, 2006, 2007) — as Margaret (2009) notes, there is minimal focus on or attention to power as it works within the Pākehā Treaty movement itself. Jennifer Margaret, in her Masters research examines the intergenerational dialogue of “learning about the practice of working with Māori activists” (Margaret, 2009, p. 1). Margaret notes in her findings that a potentially valuable strategy to improve the sharing of learning in the movement could be to focus on how power relations operate within the movement:

... the focus of the Pākehā Treaty workers movement is on shifting power relationships in broader Pākehā society. Power is perceived as a negative force. Discussing concepts of power and finding constructive frameworks within which to discuss its exercise within the movement could be of value. (Margaret, 2009, p. 91)
An attention to power relations and the power of discourse within movements can be very important, as several social movement theorists remind us. Poletta (2004) addresses the potential for movement practices to become “normative” as time progresses, even taking on a status of rule-book compliance (Polletta, 2004). Davis (2002) also identifies certain movement narratives as “scripts”, produced by collective practices that individual processes of meaning making and self narrative must organise around and continually reproduce as frames of meaning within the social movement. Davis argues that storytelling in this way can be used to control conformity, and can be difficult to challenge due to the nuance of story (2002, pp. 23-25). Robert Benford (2002) develops this analysis further and argues that once a movement has constructed its meanings, members often work to reinforce those constructions by preventing the development of competing or alternative meanings (2002, p. 53). Benford also positions meaning making in narrative as “internal social control mechanisms, channelling and constraining individual as well as collective sentiments, emotions and action” (2002, p. 53). The idea of movement narrative as a form of control illuminates the power of discourse to construct reality, and highlights that just because social movement meaning construction may seek to counter dominant discourse, it is not always free from mechanisms of power and social control.

Margaret (2009) emphasises the importance of sharing dialogue and creating movement processes conducive to intergenerational communication to counter the restrictions that can be created by entrenched positions (Margaret, 2009). In reflecting on the process of her own research and the need for such intergenerational dialogue to encourage learning and understanding amongst movement members, she reflects:

> It generated learning for participants about the distinctions between generations. Some participants also became aware of their assumptions about other movement members based on their age. It also created awareness of differences and a sense of continuity in the experiences of each generation within the movement. This study has highlighted a need to continue to explore the implications of such intergenerational awareness. (Margaret, 2009, p. 97)

Thus far, we have seen how Huygens’ invaluable framing of discourse development ends in the early 2000s when third-generation Treaty movement members were joining the movement and how Margaret brings our attention to both the need to consider power within the movement and the potential for intergenerational understanding. There appears to be a space for exploring the meaning construction and the perspectives of a third generation within the movement. This attention to a newer generation and their perspectives may expose significant insights and experiences; in the words of one third-generation view, Hannah Ho Wai Ling, at
the 2009 Treaty conference, “Treaty stuff used to be a path to address racism, critical reflection upon dominant culture, but has largely been institutionalised. For most people, especially youth, it’s boring. There needs to be a new way to get in, and get engagement” (Ling, 2009). In the words of Casas-Cortés et al, there may be new and “conjunctural theories that go against orthodox approaches to social change” (2008, p. 22) to be exposed.

Also strengthening this argument for a third-generation perspective is an issue of definition that Margaret raises when she discusses the definition of the Pākehā Treaty movement. In recent times (since the mid-2000s), the movement has begun to be referred to as the Tangata Tiriti Treaty workers movement, or even the Pākehā, Tauiwi, Tangata Tiriti Treaty workers movement, as an attempt to be more inclusive of the diverse identities of people involved. As Margaret explains:

In the last five years there has been a shift within the movement away from defining ourselves as a Pākehā or Tauiwi movement to a Tangata Tiriti one. In a purpose statement drafted in 2008 by a national group of Treaty educators, the group described itself as: ‘A network of Tangata Tiriti, open to all, working for a society that honours our responsibilities under te Tiriti o Waitangi’ (Treaty Educators, 2008). The impetus for the change came out of a need to acknowledge the position of people within the movement who are from non-Pākehā ethnic groups ( Tauiwi) and those who have mixed Māori and Tauiwi ancestry but identify as Tangata Tiriti. It also reflects an understanding of the Treaty as having established a political relationship (Margaret, 2009, p. 3).

Although Margaret describes how this recognition of the diversity and complexity within the movement has evolved, she positions her own research as a perspective within the “Pākehā” Treaty workers movement, as she explains that there are different historical and political relationships for Pākehā and other groups in relation to the Treaty and notes that Pākehā culture is still the dominant culture within the movement. Further to this, I notice that in Huygens’ (2007) research, the movement is positioned as “Pākehā”, and the diversity within this description and the movement’s practitioners is not explored. Kirton (1997) also refers to “Paakeha/Tauwi” as a homogenous group without exploring the complexity of Tauiwi identities in relation to Pākehā. So although there has been a shift in defining who the movement is, there has been little collective theorising from movement members who fit within and shape these shifting definitions. Third-generation perspectives represent some of this shifting of definition; exploring meaning from a heterogenous generation grappling with the complexities of their own identities may illuminate critical subjectivities “whose embodied discourse produces new frameworks and new forms of social relations” (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 22).
One challenge for those who do not fit the “Pākehā” label could be “why situate yourself in relation to a movement that does not fit for you?” Polletta (2004) addresses this as she argues the need to provide space for marginalised views within social movements: “For activists representing a marginalized sub-group, it makes little sense to forward claims in an altogether new lexicon or to operate entirely independently of the mainstream movement, which has resources and political clout that it does not” (p. 106). Polletta (2004) illustrates this argument with the example of deaf activists who refuse the label of disabled but do not cut themselves off from the larger disability rights movement. The same could be extrapolated for “Tangata Tiriti”, Tauwi and people of mixed ancestry, who may align with the movement’s agendas — supporting Tino Rangatiratanga and self-determination for Tangata Whenua — but do not fit the identifier of Pākehā.

**Summary: focusing the research**

The influence of social constructionism on social movement theory has seen the development of an emphasis on the meaning-making potential of social movements. This meaning-making potential can be a site for agency, countering the normative power of dominant discourses and constructing counter-hegemonic meaning. As such, social movements are a vital place for research due to their potential for social change. The centrality of meaning making to social movements has developed part of my first research question:

- What meanings and reflections are constructed?

Jennifer Margaret (2009) has brought our attention to the importance of intergenerational dialogue as a process for learning in social movements, and Mitzi Nairn (2009) positions meaning as changing over time. Thus far, little attention has been given to the voices of a third generation in the movement34 and their meaning construction, nor to voices that do not fit under the universalising banner of “Pākehā”. This lack of attention creates the space for this research to inquire after the experiences of a group of heterogeneous third-generation members. As such, it informs the orientation of my first research question:

- What meanings and reflections do third-generation Treaty workers construct?

---

34 With the exception of Margaret’s own research as a third-generation member herself, and three Pakeha third-generation members participated in her process of intergenerational dialogue.
Casas-Cortés et al have brought attention to the power of meaning making in social movements, arguing that they constitute knowledge-practices. Their privileging of knowledge-practices highlights the potential for social movements to co-produce and engage:

- Counter-hegemonic discourse and challenge and transform dominant discourse;
- Critical subjectivities whose embodied discourse produces new frameworks and new forms of social relations;
- Reflexive and conjunctural theories and analyses that counter orthodox approaches to social change (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 22)

This analysis informs one aspect of the second research question, re-positioning meaning as situated “knowledge”. I am also interested in the degree to which meanings and “knowledges” are partial, incomplete, contradictory and under construction.

Ingrid Huygens, as a Pākehā Treaty movement theorist, provides an analysis of the genealogy of discourse development within the movement. This discursive analysis was co-theorised widely with movement members and provides a platform to analyse how the meaning construction in this study is in dialogue and in resonance, or when there is divergence or tension. I emphasis this is not a comparative analysis between generations, but rather a dialogue across generations.

Meaning within social movements can be normative (Polletta, 2004) and controlling (Benford, 2002; Davis, 2002), and little focus has yet been given to the internal power dynamics within the Pākehā Treaty movement. My awareness of complexities, differences and tensions in dialogue and meaning informs the second research question:

- What dialogue, tensions and convergence do these “knowledges” generate?

Situated within these research questions is an appreciation for all the work that has come before, the richness and the productivity of the estuary as a meeting of waters, and attention to the change of tides as new people arrive to learn from and bring their own stories to the place of meeting. Casas-Cortés et al. acknowledge the uniqueness of knowledges generated by a relationship to place: “the knowledges produced by movements are enriched by their spatial and temporal proximity and accountability to the places which they affect, and from which they come” (2008, p. 42). Recognising the importance of meaning and knowledge production, my curiosity extends to the contribution these meanings may make to a social change agenda. Considering the concept of relationship is central to the Pākehā Treaty movement (the Treaty
relationship) and considering my own interest and development of inquiry discussed in the previous chapter, the final research question brings “meanings and “knowledges” to focus in local decolonisation practice:

- How do these “meanings” and “knowledges” contribute to concepts of socially just relationships in Aotearoa?

Recognising my desire at the beginning of the literature review to map the territory and master the literature, I am reminded of Alison Jones’ (1999) warning against the “modernist project of mapping the world” (p. 311), her warning against the desire for control and coherence. Although I have named some ground in theory to position this research on and towards, it is partial, incomplete and a process of coming clear rather than being clear (Lather, 1991). Again, in the next chapter I describe another process of becoming clear, how I applied a methodological framework to these research questions. I now understand Keri Hulme’s words in a different light: although there may be maps, the lagoon was here first and is always changing.
Chapter 3  Methodology

Half a mile offshore, walking on silver water, we found a curved path that extended gracefully and without apparent end to our north and south. It was a shallow tidal channel and the water it held caught and pooled the sun, such that its route existed principally as flux; a phenomenon of lights and of currents. Its bright line curved away from us: an ogee or line of beauty whose origin we could not explain and whose invitation to follow we could not disobey, so we walked it northwards, along that glowing track made neither of water nor of land, which led us further and still further out to sea. (Macdonald, 2011, p. 43)

Introduction

The meeting place of land and sea, a place of flux and changeability, echoes this exploration of both my methodological framework and the application of a qualitative research method in a social constructivist framework. The questions that this chapter seeks to answer are “How did I come to know what I know?” and “What philosophical assumptions did I bring with me?”; these very questions blur the horizon of what is knowable through research. Long nights of reading have fed the orientation of this chapter and have, through theoretical complexity and contradiction, led me still further out to sea. However, what I present here is an overview of the theory that has guided my interactions both with key informants and with the interview text. As uncertain as I have felt about the process at times, there is a path to follow.

In the previous chapter, the influence of social constructionism on social movement theory was explored, along with conceptions of “meaning making”. This discussion led to the development of the research questions, to “what the research is about”. In this chapter, I provide an outline of “how I went about the research”, beginning with my engagement with feminist poststructuralism as the theoretical underpinning of the research process, and examine why the epistemology of social constructionism fits well with research seeking a social justice ethic (Strega, 2005). From this theoretical positioning, narrative inquiry is discussed as an appropriate method responsive to the research questions and sensitive to the dynamics of meaning making in social movements (Davis, 2002).

In recognition of feminist poststructuralist concerns for subjectivity (Gavey, 1989; Weedon, 1987) and my concerns for accountability as researcher in relationship (Huygens, 2007;
Margaret, 2009; Smith, 1999), I position myself in the research and in relation to the participants and discuss the responsibility of defining this research as “insider research” (Smith, 1999). With respect to the social movement that this research is connected to, I discuss my efforts to be accountable as I engage in the process of research. The key informants of the research are discussed, as is the process of defining a participant group and engaging participation. I also address issues of power between myself and key informants and examine the dynamic of being a “researcher” within relationships that are important to me, personal and ongoing.

In the final section, discussing the research process, I explain the research contexts, the form and shape of individual interviews, and the reflective and reflexive process I undertook to refine the research questions and process. Finally, the chapter describes the thematic analysis of the content of the transcripts.

Philosophical framework

Previously I have discussed how a social constructionist perspective positions meaning as a construction, both constructing and constructed by us. This outlook was central to the development of the research questions:

- What meanings and reflections do third-generation Treaty workers construct in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi?
- What dialogue, tensions and convergence do these “knowledges” generate?
- How do these “meanings” and “knowledges contribute to concepts of socially just relationships in Aotearoa?

Here I further develop a discussion of “knowledge”, “discourse” and “power” from a feminist poststructuralist position, to understand “how” these philosophical assumptions shaped the process of the research inquiry.

Feminist poststructuralism, drawing upon the analysis of Michel Foucault, is concerned with understanding power relations and how power is produced and re-produced through language, discourse and institutions. This orientation incorporates social constructionist concerns about knowledge production and subjectivity, while also identifying sites for change in power relations (Gavey, 1989; Weedon, 1987).
From this feminist poststructuralist perspective, absolute truth does not exist. Rather, “knowledge” is socially constructed and is neither fixed nor absolute. Knowledge is understood to be produced by the processes involved in obtaining it, and it can only ever be partial and incomplete (Barrett & Phillips, 1992; Burr, 1995; Foucault & Gordon, 1980; Gavey, 1989; Mills, 1997; Weedon, 1987). As Susan Strega argues:

Knowledge is not “discovered” but is a product of discourse and power relations, a discursive struggle over which (and whose) perspective or understanding emerges as the one that “counts,” the one that has the power to organize relations. (2005, p. 218)

Situating my theoretical perspective and relationship to the research in this way means I make no claim to the definitive — this research and the themes that have emerged are partially formed, evolving, and meaning making is relational. By decentering the voice of my analysis in this way, I critique the concept of absolute knowledge and emphasise my own subjectivity, agreeing with Strega that knowledge is subjective rather than “discovered”. From this perspective, my voice is very much present — both consciously and unconsciously — in the research, and while I claim my subject position, it has been a challenge to own this as relational work (as I will explain later).

Strega (2005) and Weedon (1987), among other theorists (Barrett & Phillips, 1992; Burr, 1995; Foucault, 2002; Haraway, 1991; Mills, 1997; Sawicki, 1991), also bring to our attention the claim that knowledge is a product of discourse and power: “... not all discourses will carry equal weight or power. Some will account for and justify the appropriateness of the status quo” (Weedon, 1987, p. 35). As was touched on in the previous chapters, these theorists point out that some discourses emerge as powerful and dominant. This research process is concerned with what could be described as “counter-hegemonic discourses” in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and decolonisation processes. I explore meaning making that has not been privileged in dominant institutions, media or within dominant culture. However, in making the claim that the research is concerned with “counter-hegemonic discourse”, issues of power relations are not neutralised. Power relations operate within this sphere also, and between myself and the informants of the research (as will be discussed further). Huygens (2007) demonstrates a genealogy of the movement discourse, adopting the view that discourse is historically constituted (Foucault, 2002) and that subordinate and resistant discourses continue to relate to the histories that produce them. Davis (2002) and Benford (2002) brought our attention to the normalising and controlling potential of social movement discourses to reproduce themselves through movement narratives, highlighting issues of power. In this research I make no claims to an authorative account within a marginal
discourse; to do so would be to run parallel to a hegemonic paradigm (Strega, 2005). Instead, I seek to embrace a plurality of meanings (Gavey, 1989).

Central to poststructuralist theory is the concept of subjectivity and the understanding that “subjectivity is constituted or constructed through language and discourse” (Gavey, 1989, p. 465). Subjectivity moves us away from the humanist belief in a core essentialist self and embraces the idea of a changeable and contradictory subject (Gavey, 1989; Weedon, 1987). The extreme case for subjectivity could argue that we are merely the product of language and discourse. However, I align myself with Vivien Burr:

... if we are to characterise experience and behaviour of human beings as nothing more or less than the manifestations of prevailing discourses, then there really does not seem to be much point in suggesting that people can change their situation or that of others by their own intentions and actions. (1995, p. 89)

Jana Sawicki (1991) and Vivien Burr (1995) both argue that we have agency and abilities to critically understand the discourses constituting our lives and that this understanding can lead to change and a freedom from our usual ways of understanding ourselves:

[C]hange is possible because human agents are capable (given the right circumstances) of critically analysing the discourses which frame their lives, and of claiming or resisting them according to the effects they wish to bring about. (Burr, 1995, p. 90)

So rather than seeing ourselves as victims complicit in dominant and powerful discourses that control our understanding of self and each other, the intention in this research is to explore meaning making in, outside and around these paradigms as sites of resistance. As Foucault suggests, an “opening up” of marginal, subjugated, alternative discourses gives us fresh possibilities for understanding ourselves and constructing our identities (Burr, 1995; Sawicki, 1991). This concept of the agency of the subject is critical to this research, as it positions the participants in the research as active agents in meaning production and as engaging critically in the discursive influences on their realities. Casas-Cortés et al. brought our attention to the agency of social movements to create critical subjects whose embodied discourse can generate “new ways of being” (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008).

As a practitioner in peace and social justice work making the transition to a role of researcher, I was concerned that my research contribute to socially just relationships and be a process of relational reciprocity with those who participate within it. Strega argues that feminist poststructuralism is a methodological frame that makes way for those seeking social justice and anti-oppressive agendas:
... I believe that we must unapologetically challenge the epistemologies and methodologies that dehumanize and depersonalize those on the margins, and justify social injustice and inequality on the basis of our difference from the ideal White, heterosexual male Enlightenment subject. (2005, p. 215)

In this challenge, Strega argues that feminist poststructuralism creates space for anti-oppressive research and social justice outcomes by raising useful questions “about knowledge, power, truth, difference and the constitution of self” (Strega, 2005, p. 215). Fetherston (2000) (in the Introduction) brought our attention to the need for peace research to unhinge from a preoccupation with objective, total knowing, to embrace the subjective, and to do this in order to reveal possibilities not previously seen. So although I make no grand claims of contributing knowledge as “truth”, I offer a process of research that aims to do no harm, that acknowledges the importance of relationships, and that in some ways will contribute to relationship building. I hope that my attention to meaning making may generate a space for perspectives that may not always be visible, and that the research process embodies the socially just relationships I seek to contribute to. I also hope that through the storytelling aspects of individual interviews, key informants have gained something from the reflective process of telling their own story.

**Identifying a methodological approach**

I began this research process expecting to use discourse analysis, an exploration of the discursive strategies influencing and used to construct meaning. Discourse analysis fits well within a feminist poststructuralist frame as it is oriented towards the location of power and sees language not simply as descriptive but as social practice (Gavey, 1989; Wetherell & Potter, 1992; Wood & Kroger, 2000). As the research process developed, I became concerned that discourse analysis might restrict engagement with the rich content of key informants’ stories, and might not be sensitive to exploring resistant and alternative discourses. I continued to sit uneasily with my understanding of discourse analysis as an uncovering and representation of discursive strategies that participants did not intend as they offered their stories to me. I shared the concerns of Weatherall, Gavey and Potts (2002): “That is, discourse is a shared cultural product (and producer); it does not speak the truth of the individual participant in any straightforward or transparent way” (p. 533). I feared that I would be solely reading and interpreting informants of the research and that I could undervalue their voice of agency. This did not sit well with my frame for accountable and ethical research, and — at best — discourse analysis felt like an uneasy relationship to hold exclusively with the text.
Social movement theorists brought my attention to narrative inquiry as a focus on the stories of social movements and also on the discursive influences of social movements. According to Joseph Davis (2002), social movements particularly lend themselves to narrative analysis, as a narrative approach “illuminates core features of identity-building and meaning-making in social activism” (Davis, 2002, p. 4). Davis highlights the construction of meaning in social movements and challenges social movement theorists to take up narrative analysis as crucial to refocusing on the relational aspects of meaning making and knowledge practices:

Stories do not just configure the past in light of the present and future, they also create experiences for and request certain responses from their audiences. They are fundamentally transactional, and this, in addition to their organizing operations, accounts for their discursive power. (Davis, 2002, p. 12)

Troy Glover (2004) also present the case that narrative inquiry is an appropriate fit for studying voluntary and grassroot associations. Glover explains that descriptive narrative inquiries are an expression of self, other, and collective identity through stories (Glover, 2004). A narrative approach appeared to cohere with the questions of meaning construction at the core of my research process.

**Narrative inquiry**

My interest in the research moved from a solely discursive reading of the text to one of positioning the text as narrative, although in many senses this has been a subtle move as narrative analysis (like any analysis) is also a layering of interpretation and relationship (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007). As I learned more about the contested and diverse field of narrative inquiry, I gathered that narrative analysis was most distinctive in its definition of the text as story. Narrative is an approach that values stories as a source of “knowledge”; the stories that people weave about their experiences illuminate processes of meaning construction (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Hinchman & Hinchman, 1997; Riessman, 1993, 2008). Through a narrative approach, I have intertwined a method that facilitates an engagement with both semantic and latent themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006) — semantic being meanings as “described” by key informants and latent themes having a more “discursive” orientation.

Narrative inquiry and analysis fits within the “cultural turn” and social constructionist era in the human sciences (Riessman, 2008). As Clandinin and Rosiek (2007) explain, narrative — along with discourse analysis — sits comfortably with poststructuralist concerns: “Post-
structuralism and the more diffuse post-modern cultural developments to which it contributed are often considered the natural home to narrative inquiry” (pp. 51-52). This is not to say that narrative analysis is only used in the constructivist tradition; there is a multiplicity of narrative approaches, including those with a more positivist view point (Riessman, 2008). Narrative inquiry is not only interested in what is “described” by a story; data is conceived as “story”, and in a constructivist view the story is seen as temporal and socially constituted (Clandinin, 2007): “The general approach has a great deal to offer disciplines and professions that want to see how knowledge is constructed in the everyday world through an ordinary communicative act — storytelling” (Riessman, 2008, pp. 13-14).

The lived experience of interviews and the process of transcribing supported this move to narrative. I became transfixed by the richness and the reflexivity of the stories that were shared with me. The reorientation to a narrative method allowed the content of the stories to speak as processes of meaning making, and I used a thematic approach that could respond to content shared with me (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Riessman, 2008). All the while, I kept in my mind the understanding that these stories were co-created by the interview experience, socially constituted, a snapshot of a moment in time, partial and incomplete.

Riessman explains that a narrative approach is also an interpretive act that exposes the subjectivity of the researcher:

> Investigators do not have direct access to another’s experience. We deal with ambiguous representations of it — talk, text, interaction, and interpretation. It is not possible to be neutral and objective, to merely represent (as opposed to interpret) the world. (1993, p. 8)

Again, this highlights my concern to reveal my role as researcher in relationship and to recognise my subject position as influencing the research, deconstructing notions that research should or could be “objective” (Fetherston, 2000).

**Positioning self (relationships in the research)**

In this section, I explore the responsibilities of “insider research”, responding with a reflexive and reflective practice, and discuss how relationships in the research influenced the process of research. I also bring to attention the key informants of the research, discussing the politics of representation and agency.
Insider research

It is often assumed in traditional social science that a researcher is an outsider to the context, community and subject they research. In accord with poststructuralist critiques of “knowledge” and “objectivity”, I purposefully engaged in this process with the intention of undertaking research as an insider, within a community with whom I have relationships and feel accountable. In this I embraced the methodological space that has been created by feminist and indigenous epistemologies (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008; Hollingsworth & Dybdhal, 2007; Kovach, 2009; Smith, 1999). Although the insider/outsider research positioning can be problematised and is subjective, it is a useful frame of understanding that allows me to situate myself in connection to this research, as it highlights the relational underpinnings of the process. In the introduction to the thesis, I situated my story in relation to the subject area and movement. Here I talk about my relationship with the research participants — the key informants of the research. My concern for the power and privilege of the “researcher” and the complexity of insider research has been influenced by Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) and the research of Ingrid Huygens (2007) and Jennifer Margaret (2009). Linda Tuhiwai Smith explains the responsibilities of the insider:

The critical issue with insider research is the constant need for reflexivity. At a general level insider researchers have to have ways of thinking critically about their processes, their relationships and the quality and richness of their data and analysis. So too do outsiders, but the major difference is that insiders have to live with the consequences of their processes on a day to day basis for ever more... (Smith, 1999, p. 137)

Reflective practice

The community of people I approached with my research questions are people I have had long-term working relationships with. These colleagues are also friends; our work for social justice in a youth network has spilled into late night conversations, week-long hui on Marae, shared sorrows, joys, struggles, road trips and even the birth of babies. Approaching a participant community I have varying degrees of relationship and shared story with has emphasised rather than diminished the need for ethical, reflective and reflexive practice (Etherington, 2007; Hollingsworth & Dybdhal, 2007). Kim Etherington (2007) calls for us to be transparent about our values and beliefs through all stages of the research process and regards reflexivity as the tool that allows us to include “ourselves” in the research relationship (Etherington, 2007, p. 601). In addition to meeting ethics approval and engaging in
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35 Due to lack of “objectivity”.
36 How do we define who is outside and inside? — who defines — when are these boundaries crossed? (Caine, Salomons, & Simmons, 2007).
37 Ethics approval- number 10/069. The participant consent form is also included as Appendix B.
consultation with Ngai Tahu, I wove a web of accountability and support around the research that would both enable and strengthen my reflexive practice and provide opportunities for communication. I list my strategies below:

- I communicated with the wider Pākehā Treaty movement and the smaller youth network about my research intentions and invited feedback. I did this via email networks as well as face-to-face meetings with key people about my intentions.
- I maintained a research journal that allowed me to question and reflect on the process of research and respond reflexively to my own position and agency as researcher.
- I reflected on the research process with participants and actively responded to their concerns and suggestions.
- I organised regular sessions for accountability and reflection with a widely respected “second-generation” Treaty worker during the research process and during the process of analysis. These sessions were invaluable to developing a research process that felt safe.
- I provided a direct opportunity for key informants to communicate with this second-generation Treaty worker about any issues that arose in the research that they did not want to raise with me.

Although I have made attempts to be accountable and responsible for this research there remain significant issues of power and representation due to the cross-cultural composition of the group that participants are drawn from. These issues of power and representation are not resolved through an ethical and reflexive practice, rather the discomfort of these dynamics of power keep me ever vigilant to what I can see and aware of what I don’t see in the cross-cultural endeavour.

**Relational considerations**

At no point in the research process did I intend to tell an organisational story — i.e. the story of the youth network (“arc”), from which the key informants were drawn. I never wanted to tell a pan-organisational story, as I was concerned by ideas of a definitive account. Rather, I came to the research with personal questions and an area of inquiry that I continued to muse over after a decade of Treaty work and with the hope to provide a process for others to learn from. I wanted to continue to learn from those I had journeyed with in this work. The network known as “arc” had not been nationally active since 2006, after a particularly tumultuous hui that saw the network regionalise, although many of the national relationships remained active.
I had varying degrees of relationship with the people I approached with my research intentions. I had remained in close contact with some, and I had not spoken with others since the last troubled national hui. There were varying degrees of trust and comfort evident among these relationships, so it was my intention that this could be a relationship-building and healing process, alongside one of co-theorising and reflection.

I would also like to weave into this story of relationship-based research a reflection of the difficulties that have arisen from being personally embedded in relationships I am researching (Huygens, 2007; Margaret, 2009). My vision has often been unclear, as there has been very little distance between the subject matter and my own personal and working journey. Connected to this has been a sense of paralysis at times, a fear that I am unable to do this work and these stories justice. However, there is a certain freedom that comes from a feminist poststructuralist frame: what I offer here is imbued with self, co-created, partial, un-fixed and temporal. In recognising this, the intimacies of my own identity work and my home life have been a part of the research process. Alongside this journey in Treaty work are my own unfinished questions about my identity. There is a vulnerability that comes with an unfinished identity project38, and at times in the interviews and the development of the research process I have felt, and can hear, that vulnerability and uncertainty speak; in those moments I miss the “other” and am present in my own rawness. My question has been, to what extent did I as interviewer call to be cared for by the interviewee in those moments of vulnerability?

Additionally, I undertook the research interviews when I was six months pregnant with my second child: travelling to undertake these interviews was the first time I had left my two-year-old daughter. I do not want to paint myself as a waddling, fragile player in this process. However, to some extent that is how I felt as I got off planes and entered people’s homes and hospitality — a little anxious, a little separated, and rather earnest. These are all elements of the relational tone and space in the interview experience and possibly an element of the intimate stories shared with me.

Another concern that is important to highlight in the context of relational and reflexive research is that at times there was a certain clumsiness and awkwardness in my bringing forward issues about the power dynamics of the research relationship. In my desire to do right by the key informants, I may have negated their own agency, or missed opportunities to share

38 This is not to claim that any “identity project” is complete, rather to acknowledge the state of flux my whanau and I negotiate in relearning lost stories.
power (Etherington, 2007, p. 602). This is illustrated in the feedback from one participant in response to my concerns that the research interview was an awkward, contrived encounter:

... I don’t know if it is contrived, it probably feels more contrived for you than me, but it has created a space for this to happen. Which is, you know, we are all into process and frameworks, and it’s a framework, and so I think that is why I could feel my pain so tangibly, because there was this space that had been created by that introduction, and that by you explaining this process, and by all these bits of paper that held this discussion outside of our lives and brought this to this point, you know. (Esmeralda)

I often had to challenge my own thinking about the “imposition” of research in others’ lives and simply appreciate the trust that was held in these relationships and the space created for dialogue. Although I may have felt awkward that the interview context was not “natural”, I was reminded of the “research interview as a legitimate interactional encounter” (De Fina & Perrino, 2011, p. 1).

**Participant community**

**A third generation**

As discussed previously, Jennifer Margaret (2009) set a precedent for a generational distinction of movement participants. I identify as fitting within the “third generation” of the movement, those who “joined the movement from the late 1990s to early 2000s” (Margaret, 2009, p. 41). Likewise, the participant community that I have drawn upon also fits within this third generation description/perspective, or has at times. This is not to say that participants would actively identify as “third-generation Treaty workers”. Several participants would identify in this way, while others might operate with different identity descriptions or would choose to opt in and out of this description at different times. However, all participants felt comfortable associating with this description.

**“arc”**

The participant community is connected to “arc” — a national youth network that was active between 2001 and 2006, and which has continued with ongoing regional and national relationships. This national youth network described itself as being part of a larger Pākehā Treaty movement. Although there are other third-generation Treaty workers who are not
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39 During its time of activity, “arc” had as many as 30 young people who identified as part of it and many more who associated with it. National hui that occurred three to four times annually would typically be attended by 15 people. “arc” had active regional groups in Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch.
associated with the “arc” network, “arc” worked to negotiate cross-cultural relationships and to incorporate diverse identities, movement dynamics that are under theorised, as identified in the literature review. I approached people who identified as being part of this youth movement and who, from my perspective and through dialogue with others, had remained active in Treaty and decolonisation work and discourse. For instance, several participants had recently organised and/or participated in a national gathering called *Whiteness: Whitemess* (May, 2010), and were fresh from a collective theorising and discursive space.

Engaging participants was a relationship-based process, and as such involved being in contact with those I continued to have relationships with and others who I had the means to contact. As mentioned before, I also made my intentions known to the remnants of the national “arc” network and invited feedback on the process and participation. Some potential participants were unavailable at the time of the research due to being overseas; however, the seven who took part in interviews were spread nationally and were representative of regional groups within the former network. To clarify, at no point did I define this research as being the story of “arc”; however, the old “arc” network was the location for inviting participation.

**Working a participant description**

All participants signed a consent form as part of their participation in the research interview, and although most did not want to be anonymous, uncertainty was expressed by some participants. To respect this uncertainty all participants have chosen an alias and their narratives are referenced to this alias. Demographically there is very little homogeneity among the participant community, and as the research inquiry developed in relation to “gaps” identified in the literature review I had no interest in defining a uniform group of participants. I have agonised over how to write a description of the key informants, as it can appear as a project of “othering” (Fine, 1994; hooks, 1990), a project of defining difference on my terms. Many within the group hold marginal and sometimes solitary identities and could easily be identified through this descriptive project, which complicates the anonymity I have treated all participants with. However, to not describe these complex identities also feels silencing of particular positions and worldviews. Consequently, my efforts to describe the participants have been negotiated with those who are involved and are based on how participants self identify:
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40 Attached as Appendix B.
41 i.e. those who identify as being solely Pakeha.
42 Solitary in the context of the small youth network.
• At the time of the interviews, all participants were in their 30s and late 20s.
• Of the seven interviewees, four identified as Pākehā, one as Chinese, one as Māori and another as New Zealand born, mixed-ethnicity (afa-kasi) Pākehā and Samoan.
• Six participants identified as women at the time of the research and one as transgendered. Soon after the research, another re-identified as transgendered.
• Two participants identified as heterosexual, and others as lesbian, bisexual or queer.
• One was a mother at the time of the interviews and one was pregnant.
• Professionally, the group was made up of community development practitioners, community workers, artists, an academic advisor, a lawyer and a post-graduate student.

As part of this descriptive project, I include myself here as being in my 30s, of Pākehā and Māori descent, identifying as heterosexual, a woman, a mother, a Treaty educator and community worker.

Although I approached the research as a feminist, I did not specifically intend this project to be a privileging of women’s and marginalised gendered voices, although I was interested in the diversity represented in the group. These participants were able and willing to respond to the research at the time, and are representative of the “arc” network that was women-led and had more participation by women. I also want to emphasise that this descriptive exercise is a very small window on the complexities, nuances and transitions the participants hold in relation to their own identities. It depicts a limited representation of the shifting situations — of power, privilege, marginalisation — that we each occupy at different times, and the voices in the research are not simply “marginalised” or “privileged” (Lloyd, 2005; Said, 1994; Weedon, 2004).

Being sensitive to the politics of representation (Brown & Strega, 2005; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Smith, 1999) in the interpretive phase of this research, I purposefully do not attach generalised themes to particular identity positions. I make no grand claims to know what all Māori or transgendered people think about this particular set of issues (Hinchman & Hinchman, 1997, p. 5). I do acknowledge that these identity positions impact and shape, and are shaped by, our meaning-making strategies. I also acknowledge that this diverse group of people worked at negotiating a space and relationship within what was traditionally a Pākehā Treaty movement.
**Key informants and agency**

... we recognize the distinct and embodied nature of situated — rather than detached or “universal” — knowledge. (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 29)

Earlier in the chapter, the agency of the subject was discussed from a feminist poststructuralist perspective, inviting consideration of an active and critical subject both engaging and responding to the power of discourse (Davies et al., 2006; Haraway, 1991; Weedon, 1987). In describing the people involved in this research, I move between the language of “key informants”, “participant community”, “participants” and sometimes “interviewees”. As I have mentioned previously, I do this purposefully as I have struggled with the language of research participation, sometimes finding myself slipping into the language of “my participants”. I find this particularly paternalistic and narrowing of the rich dynamics of relationship. I move between these different descriptions to remind myself of the agency and embodied knowledge of those who actively worked with me. The term “key informant”, in my mind, invites more autonomy and agency into the research relationship. “Key informant” reminds me to engage with the situated knowledge of the movement actor because theorists Casas-Cortés et al. brought our attention to the knowledges generated through action:

Movements are intensely involved in the epistemological work of analyzing, envisioning and elaborating new ways of knowing and being in the world. These knowledges are, moreover, potentially as valid and significant as those generated by institutionally and culturally recognized experts, and are in fact often produced in dialogue and collaboration with them. (2008, p. 28)

This embodied subjectivity promotes an orientation towards the research participants as active agents in meaning construction, and deconstructs any notions of passive subjects open to my expert gaze as researcher.

**The research process**

In this section, I discuss how the research process developed. I consider the context of research interviews, the process of the interviews, the influence of reflective journalling, concerns that arose in the process of creating transcripts and, finally, I explain the steps involved in a thematic analysis.

**Considering context**

Researchers with an interest in the discursive have emphasised the importance of discourse in context (Van Dijk, 2009) and view the interview as shaped by its context (Denzin, 1989). As Teun A Van Dijk explains, “... ‘context’ is fundamental to the study of language, discourse
and cognition” (Van Dijk, 2009, p. 1). Responding to this emphasis, I reflect on the context of the research interviews and the intimacy of the spaces created.

In the context of this research, all interviews occurred in key informants’ own homes or family homes, with the exception of two interviews that occurred in friends’ flats. All participants chose the site for the interview, and my role was to bring food to share. After settling in, talking about the ethics of the process and acknowledging the awkwardness of a more formal interview structure with digital recorder at hand, we began our conversations with a mihi or introduction to each other. Occasionally the process of conversation was uninterrupted; however, more often the surroundings of home life became a part of the conversation: the phone ringing, children sharing an experience or needing help with a negotiation, flatmates checking in, or a call to join the household for dinner. Although these interruptions often broke the flow of the narrative, they were a sharing of the intimacies of life and a reality for all the participants. The intimacy of home life surrounded the interview itself, as we caught up on stories outside of the dimensions of the research or I joined the household for a delicious meal. Many times I was reminded of the privilege of conversation in these relationships, and was aware that participants could be unlikely to share the same depth or rawness of their stories with an outsider. I was also aware that the intensity of one-on-one conversation had an element of sharing of confidences; this dynamic may not have developed in a group interview context. As such, I felt particular responsibility to care for the stories shared. And I could also understand the uncertainty expressed by some regarding their anonymity in the research process.

**A reflective and emerging process**

It’s difficult to learn in total agreement. (Hollingsworth & Dybdhal, 2007, p. 147)

An aspect of the research process that was particularly enjoyable was that I was constantly surprised by what I heard in the interview narratives. This was a process of rich learning as I was immersed in the language and perspectives of others who held very different stories from my own, even though we had worked together over a number of years.

I did not arrive at the research process with a tightly conceived hypothesis to prove or disprove, rather I arrived with a general sense of appreciative inquiry: “What are our meaning-making strategies in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi?” To begin with, I explored different models for carrying out the research inquiry, such as co-theorising in group
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43 Reviewing the ethics approval, participant information, consent form and additional feedback mechanisms.
interview settings and focus groups using participatory action methods (McIntyre, 2008). A precedent had been set by Huygens (2007), Margaret (2009) and Black (2010) for movement research to adopt participatory action methods. However, given the diverse geographical locations of the participant group and the realities of work and home life commitments, individual interviews emerged as the most appropriate structure for key informants. Despite this reality, there are limitations to the individual interview procedure in a social movement context: for instance, all participants expressed an interest in reuniting to co-theorise and dialogue collectively.

The research interviews were semi-structured and open ended, designed to invite opportunities for storytelling around particular themes (Clandinin, 2007). I presented participants with an information sheet and a guide to the interview with a series of themes and suggested sub-topics at least two weeks before the interview (see Appendix A). I invited participation and feedback on the interview themes developed prior to the interview (Lyle, 2009).

One example of my refining of the research process took place in response to the first interview. When we reflected on the process of the interview, the interviewee challenged me that I was “holding back”, that we had always learnt together “in dialogue”, and she had a sense of me keeping my responses to myself. In reflection, I realised there was a disconnect between my epistemological standpoint — that the narrative is co-created — and my positivist concerns that I remain the neutral and silent listener. The interviewee challenged my position of neutrality and explained that she could “feel” my responses and wanted more from the encounter of the interview. This feedback allowed me to relax into the research process and embody an understanding of my epistemological frame. In further interviews, I refined the process in two ways: I invited further participation in co-creating the themes of the interview at the outset, and I relaxed my approach as interviewer and allowed more space for dialogue (Etherington, 2007), finally understanding the research as a relational process.

**Writing in self**

A significant strand in the research process has been my reflective and reflexive journal. I have explored the reflexive process of journaling from a number of perspectives: as “intertext” in the poststructuralist frame presented by Nicholas Fox (Fox, 1995) and as an autoethnographic account (Ellis & Bochner, 2000; Lyle, 2009), writing myself into the research. Ellis and Bochner (2000) describe an autoethnographic process as a process of reflexivity and critical agency:
Back and forth autoethnographers gaze first through an ethnographic wide-angle lense, focusing outward on social and cultural aspects of their personal experience; then, they look inward, exposing a vulnerable self that is moved by and may move through, refract, and resists cultural interpretations. (p. 739)

As the reflexive process developed over a long period of time, I slipped in and out of the dedicated discipline that I have come to understand autoethnography to be. However, my research journaling has informed all aspects of the research process and has been most valuable in highlighting the presence of my voice in the analytical phase. I have explored presenting my own story in the research as dedicated intertext excerpts within the text of the thesis, but have favoured a weaving in and out of my own voice.

**Transcribing: an interpretative process**

During the transcribing phase, I noted further contradictions of my own reluctant voice and the relational presence of the research. In the process of transcribing, I both consciously (tired of my own voice interjecting with agreement “mmms”) and unconsciously privileged the voice of the interviewee. In my doing so, the interpretative process of creating transcripts is exposed (Riessman, 2008). I removed myself from the relationship the transcript could represent (Riessman, 1993) and focused my attention on my actual words and questions, rather than my agreements interjected into the narrative of the interviewee. This again represents the constant tension I experienced as researcher between privileging the voices of participants and my own role in the co-construction of narrative. It also highlights the process of transcription as an interpretive act in itself (Bird, 2005). Although I now understand the transcribing process as interpretive (Bird, 2005; Riessman, 2008), my intention was to follow a verbatim approach to transcription. Once the transcription was completed, I then returned the recording and transcription to the interviewee. The interviewee had full control over any editing or changes they wanted to make to the final transcript. This was an important process given the relational tone and intimate space generated in the interviews; however, very few changes were made.

**Applying a method: Thematic analysis**

Within narrative inquiry, there is a particular approach described as thematic analysis (Riessman, 2008, p. 53). I settled for a constructivist approach to thematic analysis, described in the work of Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke (2006):

> From a constructionist perspective, meaning and experience are socially produced and reproduced, rather than inhering within individuals (Burr, 1995). Therefore, thematic analysis conducted within a constructionist framework cannot and does not
seek to focus on motivation or individual psychologies, but instead seeks to theorise
the socio-cultural contexts, and structural conditions, that enable the individual
accounts that are provided (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 85).

In utilising a thematic analytic approach, I looked for both semantic themes — that which was
described — and latent themes — those themes on a level of discourse (Braun & Clarke,
2006). Rather than approaching the data from a theoretical position, looking to prove a tightly
conceived theory or even searching for my own themes, I arrived at the analytical phase and
used an inductive approach where I actively searched for codes and themes (Braun & Clarke,
2006). There are significant parallels in this approach with constructivist grounded theory
(Charmaz, 2006).

So what did I actually do?

This description of the method draws heavily on steps laid out by Braun and Clark (2006):

- I listened, transcribed, listened again, and then read and re-read the transcripts.
- Parallel to the above process, I kept a journal and reflected on what I was reading, and
  began to sketch codes.
- Through more reading, I began a system for coding and systematically coded each
  transcript.
- With large bits of paper I began to map the codes into themes.
- The next stage was to organise the themes.
- I undertook ongoing analysis to define and name themes.
- I checked in with my movement research support person that the themes developed
  were appropriate.
- I analysed themes to fit within a constructivist and dialogical framework.
- Finally, I organised the themes into chapters and a written report.

Summary

In this chapter, I further developed the epistemological frame of feminist poststructuralism
and social constructionism, and highlighted the assumptions I brought to the research and
claims about what can be known. From this positioning, I established that a narrative inquiry
is a suitable methodological frame for approaching the research questions: “narratives” have
been described as a natural home for meaning making (Hinchman & Hinchman, 1997). I
discussed my position as insider in relation to the research, along with the demands this
positioning makes for reflective, reflexive and accountable practice. Included here were my attempts to weave a frame of accountability and support around the project. Further to this, the reflexive practice engaged in has also become a vital strand to the method of analysis. I gave context to the participant community and the diversity of their identity positions. Considerations and concerns with the research process were explored, beginning with how context shaped the intimacy of the interview content. What I actually did and my rationale for the research process were presented, along with the contradictions between my philosophical assumptions and my inexperience as a researcher. Finally, the “how” of a thematic and inductive analysis of transcripts was described.

The overriding theme of this chapter is that the “how” of this research, the methodology, has been a learning journey: through a reflective practice, I have been able to weave a method that responds both to my questions and to the area of research. Coming to grips with some of the theoretical transitions and contradictions, embodying an understanding of knowledge as subjective, has allowed me to find my temporal line, to walk the coastline, the place of flux.
Chapter 4  

Meaning making

He au kei uta e taea te karo, he au kei te moana e kore e taea.

You may dodge smoke (au) on land, but you cannot dodge current at sea.44

Introduction to findings

I have arranged the themes in the findings chapters in dialogue with my reading of the literature. The literature review brought to our attention “subjects whose embodied discourse produces new frameworks” (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 22), and the methodology highlighted the agency of key informants as knowledge makers (Weedon, 1987). This embodiment and agency emphasise the dialogical dimensions of key informants’ storytelling, both with theory and in generating knowledge-practices. In these findings chapters (as discussed in the literature review), the themes and analysis generated from transcripts are presented in dialogue with social movement theory and Pākehā Treaty movement discourse; they have also prompted the reading of a wider literature base broadly fitting under descriptions of feminist poststructuralism and postcolonialism. Several participants themselves identify a “feminist analysis of power” informing their work and understandings.

Chapter 4 predominantly responds to the research question:

- What meanings and reflections do third-generation Treaty workers construct in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi?

As an overview of “meaning making” developed from a thematic analysis, this chapter draws upon the centrality of meaning making to social movements as producers of counter-hegemonic discourse (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008; Kurzman, 2004; Tarrow, 1992). Meaning making is positioned as “dialogical”, in conversation with the “genealogy of discourse” theorised (and co-theorised) by Huygens (2007).

---

44 This whakatauki was sourced from Nga kōrero a Reweti Kohere (Kohere, 1997, p. 131)
Through in-depth analysis, Chapters 5, 6 and 7 address the complexities of the second research question:

- What dialogue, tensions and convergence do these “knowledges” generate?

In positioning these chapters as place-based, generational knowledge-practices, I explore the nuances of Casas-Cortés et al’s (2008) arguments. These chapters also embrace the dialogical dimensions of movement discourses, being sensitive to areas of contradiction, tension and convergence, while generating conversations with feminist poststructuralism (as discussed in the methodology) and a broad postcolonial theory. Through responding to these first two research questions, the overarching arguments of the research emerge. Each of the findings chapters develops a different perspective and more depth to the ideas that through a decolonisation practice that attends to relationships we can unfix meaning and compose tension that is generative. The themes that emerge in these chapters are harnessed to inform a response to the final research question:

- How do these “meanings” and “knowledges” contribute to concepts of socially just relationships in Aotearoa?

These responses are collected and summarised in the final concluding chapter, “Contributions”.

The interlocking of meaning and the artificiality of abstracting and extracting excerpts from the narrative woven by story problematise the application of chapter “boundaries”. Although these distinctions are imposed and are a limitation of the academic process, I hope to demonstrate how chapters talk to each other in both confluence and contradiction, and how each responds to the whole.

In this analysis of research findings, the themes surface through my inductive reading of transcripts. The themes that have developed in “meaning construction” within narratives are not quantified or validated, but are common to most transcripts. As a qualitative narrative study, this work does not lend itself to quantification, and in saying this I also want to emphasise that I am not trying to argue for a consensus of “meaning”; rather, I would prefer to describe the process presented here as a landscape of meaning making, territory in tension and convergence. Space is also provided for dissenting themes between narratives and contradictory themes within narratives, recognising the diversity of participants’ positions. As discussed in the literature review, this reading of the meanings is inductive (I approached the
transcripts widely without preconceived themes and coded all the data to create a rich data
description (Braun & Clarke, 2006)). Although, for the purpose of analysis, I abandoned
Huygens’ “genealogy of discourse” (Huygens, 2007) and the themes developed for the
participants’ “Guide to interviews” (see Appendix A) to allow the data to “speak with its own
voice”, this was an artificial distinction. As discussed in the literature review, all meaning is
in dialogue and constructed by discourse (Foucault & Gordon, 1980; Mills, 1997), and as I
argued in the methodology I am not the “objective” observer approaching research from a
position of “neutrality” (Strega, 2005; Weedon, 1987). Rather, my presence is embodied in
the intersubjective relation with participants, and my reading of themes and positionality in
the research are informed consciously and unconsciously by competing discourses.

As the opening whakatauki in part proclaims, when at sea the current dictates, so although I
argue for agency in meaning construction, I acknowledge the power of discourse to dictate
these waters. I also acknowledge my own discomfort with the power of composing the voices
of others in cross-cultural research, so while I may work to bring attention to power and
representation, my own privilege and power also blind me.

**Introducing third-generation “meaning making”**

In this chapter, the importance of a space for reflectivity in movement practice illuminates
alternative meanings and the situated and partial knowledges generated in the discourse of
research. The meanings represented here are not neutral, immune to power or even positioned
in direct opposition to dominant discourse. However, this chapter provides an overview of
meanings brought forward in the narratives of key informants; complex aspects of these
themes are developed further in later chapters. Here they are set in conversation with a
genealogy of movement discourse (Huygens, 2007, 2011), although I also acknowledge the
limitations of this conversation. Movement discourse has predominantly been developed
amongst Pākehā, and here I use it in conversation with a cross-cultural group. My reading of
movement discourse is a reduction of the rich, complex stories produced by Huygens,
possibly a “fixing” of what could remain more fluid. Despite these limitations, I use this
reading of movement discourse (as discussed in the literature review) as a reference for a
dialogical understanding of third-generation participant voices.

While reflecting on the process of the interview experience, one participant articulated that
the mere possibility of a space for “meaning making” was an exploration of methodology,
providing for the possibilities of “doing what doesn’t exist” as co-producing and transforming epistemology:

Meaning making — we were just... trying to do something that doesn’t exist in lots of ways and things are breaking and are broken, and it is like this kind of research feels like a real looking after again in that sense of unfortunately when we are walking places, we don’t even know who the land is. It is that process of unfortunately everything breaks and we have to make it again, and it is almost like that is part of our methodology... This kind of work is working our methodology, so that eventually we are developing— these bodies of being, or ways of being — that will walk us out of that. (Sebastian)\(^{45}\)

Sebastian here echoes John Kirton’s call for “new ways of being” for Pākehā in relationship to Tangata Whenua, drawing on their potential as critical subjects within the movement to produce new frameworks and new forms of social relations (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 22). Possibly this creates space for subjugated knowledges, allowing for a reworking of our epistemological frame.

In this chapter key informants develop a knowledge-practice for decolonisation which I argue attempts to embody this “new way of being”. Key informants immediately redefine the “meaning” of their work as “decolonisation”; the Treaty is positioned as a “way into” a decolonisation practice. The meaning of the Treaty as a document about relationships is adopted: a relationship-based way of working is signified as fundamental to decolonisation, and a care for relationships is applied in the microcosm of the group process. The meaning of decolonisation for key informants is unpacked as a knowledge-practice for developing a “critical consciousness”. Spirituality is identified as pivotal to decolonisation work, although questions remain over how to acknowledge the spiritual in a cross-cultural group. The themes are offered in the following order:

1. Defining “the work”: Treaty or decolonisation?
2. The Treaty as way in
3. Relationship-based
4. Critical consciousness
   4.1 Knowing self, knowing my people
   4.2 Locating power
   4.3 Feeling the pain of colonisation
   4.4 Collectivity

\(^{45}\) Please note that excerpts of narrative are presented verbatim; grammar and syntax may not always be the correct usage.
5. Talking of spiritual?

In this chapter, I try to ensure the strength of participants’ voices. I was overwhelmed by the richness of narrative and did not want to lose or silence particular perspectives, this presence of voice was also supported by the approach of narrative analysts (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Riessman, 1993, 2008). The dialogical dimensions of the themes presented here are interwoven with excerpts of narrative.

1. Defining “the work”: Treaty or decolonisation?

I approached interviews with a particular set of analytical frames and perspectives. A tension often developed within the interview around my use of language, my frame of reference “Te Tiriti” as talking point for our conversation. The use of definitions in the framing of what we were talking about was fundamental to “how” we would talk and “what” we were talking about; this was a tension of definition and demonstrated the limits of language in reducing concepts and setting in concrete diverse discursive space (Mills, 1997).

I had positioned “Te Tiriti”, “Treaty work” and the “Pākehā Treaty Movement” as talking points; ways into a much larger conversation that I hoped would develop. Thus I saw the tension and discomfort with my definitions as productive space that allowed the interview encounter to explore the territory of knowledge construction. Few participants felt comfortable with describing their work as “Treaty work” in the present, although most had either used that definition strategically at some time, or had used it early in their journey.

There was a general reframing that the discussion we were having was better defined by concepts such as “decolonisation”, “critical consciousness”, and “analysis of power”. Even those who felt comfortable with a “Treaty” frame described their work and understanding of the issues within the “larger” picture of decolonisation:

- *It was a decolonisation process for me, and then the Treaty was a part of trying to understand what I was doing here...*

- *It all relates to the Treaty, but the Treaty in that broader picture of colonisation in the Pacific. (Pearl)*

- *So that is all I had at the start was the Treaty; I didn’t really have relationships with Māori, I didn’t really have anything going on, I only had the Treaty, so that was my big picture. And so over the years I have been decolonising myself and strengthening relationships with Māori and with people in the movement, and now the Treaty is, as*
a tool has become just one part of a multifaceted way of being in this country.  
(Esmeralda)

We are talking about colonisation. That colonisation is violence, it’s about death, it is about destruction of peoples and it is an extreme violence. I think it’s important to separate that out from Te Tiriti because Te Tiriti wasn’t about and isn’t about that; it is about a potential for right relationships. (Rachel)

I used “Treaty work” when the Treaty stuff was a bit hot. I felt like there was a point where it was, like, “oh, hot topic” …so I would have used that term then. And, but I guess I felt that for me it fitted under a larger banner of decolonisation and anti-racism work. (Tai)

Decol is such, more an applicable [term] because Treaty is couched in, um, I just think it is couched in jargon, but decol, decol is great because that is about letting go and reclaiming what is good and what is right, you know. Now I like those phrases a lot better actually...

That is the most powerful place I could self identify within that Treaty movement. Okay, this is about decol, it is about questioning ourselves, it is about questioning our identities, our relationships with each other, with the land, our history. It is really that sense of location. (Hinengaro)

Huygens (2007, 2011) describes a process of discourse development in the movement during the 1980s in response to significant hui and conversation with Tangata Whenua. There was a move to localise/indigenise anti-racism analysis and to pick up the Treaty of Waitangi as the symbol to mobilise under (Huygens, 2011, p. 63). In the above excerpts, there is convergence with this discourse and the consequent movement framing of Te Tiriti as a model for right relationships: “the Treaty was a part of trying to understand what I was doing here”, “it is about a potential for right relationships”. There is also a reframing of the work as “decolonisation” and understanding of the Treaty as a tool of decolonisation practice, and yet key informants also express a sense of frustration with the limitations of the Treaty as “couched in jargon” or useful “when the Treaty stuff was a bit hot”.

This frustration appears to disrupt what Davis (2002) describes as movement “script”, or what Benford describes as a “sacred movement narrative” (Benford, 2002), particularly considering how significant the development of this appropriate local language was for the movement. In many ways it defined the movement for what it is. Casas-Cortés would see this as evidence of critical and reflective processes redefining meaning (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008), which is the appropriate work of a new generation. For myself, I remember moments of tension and surprise in interviews when dissatisfaction with “Treaty” was expressed. As a full adopter of movement discourse, I had invested much of my own meaning construction in the sacredness
of the Treaty relationship. I realised I had expected to hear this reflected in the stories of my participants.

2. The Treaty as way in

The above narrative excerpts position Te Tiriti as a tool, a beginning point for many participants into a decolonisation practice. This idea of Te Tiriti as a “tool” or way in developed as a significant theme in this re-conceptualising of definitions:

*I came here via the Crown, and via that signing of the Treaty I have responsibilities to uphold. And that not just that, I have responsibilities for anyone who is Tauiwi as well, because I am coming from that privileged Pākehā position, you know, European, English tradition... so that is what I saw the Treaty as, a tool for talking about that and for taking responsibility for that.* (Esmeralda)

*This is to acknowledge where we are at as community, as whanau, as hapu, as iwi, as Pākehā. Yeah it is slow — these conversations — and we need something like the Treaty to be our bounce board. It will be our bounce board to spiral us off into other conversations.* (Hinengaro)

*It’s an entry point or, or a doorway. Um, and back then, yeah... To go on record and say, it wasn’t, it’s, it’s never been that important to me, the Treaty or Te Tiriti o Waitangi. The stuff that’s been really important to me wasn’t Article 1, 2, 3, 4. It isn’t the fact that, you know, who signed what, when, how, which translation we’re looking at. For me, that stuff’s just been, all that kind of knowledge and learning around that has been an accessway to go, “Woah, that happened in the context of colonisation, that happened in the context of imperialism, that happened in the context of grievance and land loss and genocide and theft,” and that’s been the big thing for me, and I guess the Treaty has, has, kind of holds that together, or it’s a focal point.* (Tai)

To describe the Treaty as a starting point resonates with the genealogy of movement discourse as the appropriate local language for a wider, more global perspective of colonisation and the current manifestation of power in settler societies. Key informants refer to Te Tiriti as the tool that engaged them (in the past) and yet position it as possibly less relevant in the present.

This tension in meaning and dissatisfaction with Treaty as “the answer” or “the way in” may possibly represent the need for new concepts that promote a “decolonisation” agenda as Te Tiriti o Waitangi moves into dominant discourse and acceptance. Mainstream Treaty movement discourse has not lost contact with the bigger picture of decolonisation, as evidenced when Huygens (2011) describes her analysis as a “decolonisation practice” and when Kirton (1997) argues that the overarching need is for a new epistemology. This tension, then, may be a call for dialogue, for conversation on how the movement balances its strategies
for disrupting dominant power relations with the need to keep the honouring of Te Tiriti on the political agenda. The idea is that “one size may not fit all”, that the disruption of power and the work of decolonisation may need new and complementary frames of engagement (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 22). One participant warned of the power of discourse to limit and control:

So that was all I wanted to talk about and think about for a few years was the Treaty, the Treaty, the Treaty, and then I started to see actually if you are going to frame your whole movement around, like, a tool of colonisation, then let’s acknowledge how the impacts of that tool of colonisation is going to ultimately have on your movement. (Hinengaro)

At the 2009 Treaty conference, Hannah Ho Wai Ling (2009) named the Treaty as “boring” for a new generation. Ling argued for “gender” as a frame to engage young people in a critical analysis of power and colonisation. In attention to intergenerational dialogue, new frames and “reflexive and conjunctural theories” (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 22) and practices may be possible.

3. Relationship-based

Embedded in movement discourse is the concept of Te Tiriti o Waitangi symbolising “relationship” between two peoples. Huygens (2007, 2011) traces the progress of co-intentional relationships in early movement discourse, observing how they developed into models of the “Treaty relationship” and how the work for the movement in the present developed as “working towards an accountable, mutually agreed relationship”(2011, p. 74). Third-generation members readily adopt this relational discourse:

... that te Tiriti holds the promise, a way for there to be peaceful relationships in Aotearoa. (Rachel)

The thing I think of is a relationship-based way of working implicit in the Treaty, and that was what we were all doing —

I just see Treaty as a manifestation or a representation, living representation of relationship, and a relationship model and a relationship way of working and a way to simply and easily, yeah, contextualise two world views, or more than one world view. (Adelaide)

In this adoption of the relational framing of the Treaty, key informants take a model of the Treaty relationship and develop the idea of a “relational way of working” with each other as
essential to their decolonisation practice. Tai explains that the context of the Treaty relationship demands attention and care for all relationships:

Someone said “relationship-based” and I was, like, oh, that makes sense to me... that would be my focus and the work, whatever it would be, is just kind of contextual and it fits in that framework for me in a wider goal... So it could be whatever it is, but for me it now fits under my criteria... of relationship stuff... Well, I guess when I’m assessing to, we all worry about burn-out and stuff, so when I look at the stuff that I want to do or can do or am asked to do, I go, “How does this fit? Where’s the relationships?” And if there’s not any, I won’t usually bother to do it. (Tai)

Relationships — arc was always relationships, and that was discourse as well, yeah, and so it was about relationships. (Esmeralda)

The whole picture gives me a way of, an idea of why relationships are important in this work. They are vital, and I don’t, I have very little desire in working on anything without relationships being the core, the core foundational aspect of any work I do, not just this work but any work. I’ve actually got no interest in working on anything without relationships, yeah, but it is arc that taught me that. (Esmeralda)

Positioned as a “knowledge-practice”, care and attention for all relationships as the way to manifest the work of decolonisation can also be traced in Huygens’ positioning of Pākehā needing to construct a critical collectivity, for Pākehā to operate with “one voice”. Within key informants’ narratives, this is expressed as a process for care, healing and support across relationships of difference. For key informants the work of decolonisation is inherently relational, and attending to the process of how we work together matters to the whole and to the outcome. Further dimensions of the relational as a “knowledge-practice” for decolonisation will be explored under 4.4 Collectivity and in the following chapter, “Relationship: a decentering of knowing”.

Also evident in these understandings of relationship is the “peaceful relationship”, a framing of Treaty work as the “peace work” for Aotearoa. This in part connects to my own positioning, the research coming from the context of Peace and Conflict Studies. It also connects to the birth of “arc”. Key informants in this research all had a relationship to the “arc” network, which grew out of PeacePacific, a youth peace movement initiative in relationship with a group of young Māori that contextualised Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the violence of colonisation as the number one peace issue for Aotearoa. As one key informant described this “powerful” reframing of the issues:

I can remember that real power and, yeah, and I am Pākehā and I have all that internalised, you know, racism — oh, you know, colonial stuff — so feeling incredibly empowered by being able to reframe it as peace... being able to say, “I do peace
work at home.” And just people going. “Oh, what? You know there is no war here.” I suppose for a lot of people that was a new idea or a revolutionary, it was challenging, yeah, so very early on that was really useful for me. I suppose it gave me language and it gave me power. I found it was a way that accessed Pākehā mindsets, I suppose. (Adelaide)

In the next chapter the centrality of relationships as peace work, as decolonisation, will be explored as a decentering of knowing.

4. Critical consciousness

But I think we all acknowledged that we were in a space of learning and trying, and we were making [a]conscious choice to engage in these, to shift our consciousness, our collective consciousness and our individual consciousness. So that to me was really, that wasn’t something that I was familiar with at that time, and that is something that I would come to demand, to expect later on. (Hinengaro)

Hinengaro brings to our attention a critical theme in participants’ meaning construction of a decolonisation practice, their individual and collective journeys of consciousness, identity, and the unravelling of colonisation. Borrowing from key informants’ narratives and co-mingling their ideas, I call this theme “critical consciousness”. This theme converges with Huygens’ concept of “decolonisation practice” (2011), as many of the concepts here are in conversation with how Pākehā Treaty workers have co-theorised with Huygens a “decolonisation agenda for the critical settler” (Huygens, 2011, p. 54).

The sub-themes that fit within this development of “critical consciousness” are described as:

- knowing self, knowing my people
- connecting with the pain of colonisation
- locating power
- collectivity

I do not present these sub-themes as stages of “consciousness”; rather this is a discussion of the themes as constructed by key informants. There is an apparent dialogue here with Paulo Freire’s “critical consciousness” or “consciousness raising” (Freire, 1974); this is not surprising considering the influence that Freire and his critical pedagogy had on the development of movement discourse (Consedine, 2001; Huygens, 2007; Kirton, 1997). Freire argues that a culture of silence should be disrupted by individual consciousness raising based in the experience of collective process (Freire, 1974). Connection can also be made with the
idea of “transformative learning” proposed by Jack Mezirow, which refers to opportunities for learners to challenge their cognitive frames through critical reflectivity (Mezirow, 2000). There are also links here to bell hooks’ (1994) pedagogical framework “teaching to transgress” as a “practice of freedom”, where hooks argues that we should embrace contradictions as part of what we struggle to change in the world and that our position must never be fixed and absolute, but always in dialogue beyond the self (hooks, 1994). However, this study does not examine social change processes or theorise movement learning strategies as Huygens (2007) and Margaret (2009) have done. Rather, my interest here is in movement discourse, and as Bert Klandermanns (1992) brought to our attention, meaning construction can be most evident in processes of consciousness raising. Similarly, Francesca Polletta (2004) highlighted how “interpretive activities” can expose how we constitute our identities (p.100). As Adelaide describes it:

There was an absolute commitment to our own learning, and if we were going to be in this work, then we actually had to do that. And a lot of that was about our own personal identity and our group identity and how we could be. (Adelaide)

4.1 Knowing self, knowing my people
All participants indicated the importance of learning about their identities in relation to the story of colonisation in Aotearoa, learning who their people are in relation to our colonial relationships and how they got here. Participants talked about trying to make meaning out of their own family stories as they find their place in the wider political landscape of colonial relationships:

A starting place for me to just ask myself questions about my identity, I think probably everyone does that in a different way. My Mum didn’t get that opportunity til she was, like, fifty, and she went to University where those spaces were opened up for her and people started talking about the Treaty. I was fortunate that came along very early, but, yes, it started to crack open all these things like: What is my relationship with my whakapapa? This whenua, Pākehā, my Dad’s Pākehā? Does that mean I hate all Pākehās when this man has taken me?... it just started all these identity questions. (Hinengaro)

Definitely this work... really made me kind of look at, at our ancestral stuff. You know, kind of why, why we moved and why we came, and, yeah, what makes us Chinese, what makes us not Chinese, what is a New Zealander, that kind of stuff. (Tai)

When I think about that period of time I think about — I guess I had always had eyes that had looked out, and suddenly I could feel eyes on me. And slowly that experience of being watched and watching myself... not floating always outward. (Sebastian)
Finding their own place in the colonial story of Aotearoa connects with Huygens’ “re-visiting of the colonial relationship” (Huygens, 2011). For key informants this is about not only understanding what happened to Māori, but also exploring their own place in the context of relationship that contests the standard story of colonisation. As Sebastian describes the process of “turning inwards” — a disruption of disembodied analysis — finding that “decolonisation” requires a repositioning of self. Taking responsibility for knowing about the history of self disrupts a dominant subject’s desire to “know the other”, to be taught by the other (Jones, 1999, p. 312). Knowing about our own entanglement in the colonial story can also avoid the construct of the “silent settler” and works towards a telling of complex and multiple histories (Bell, 2006, pp. 265-266). To realise the psychological process of decolonisation, Ofelia Schutte observes, “One must learn that one could not be oneself without a relationship to the other and that such a relationship ideally must not be wrought with injustices” (1998, p. 66).

4.2 Connecting with the pain of colonisation

Interwoven with the concept of knowing your own story is a feeling response that I have described here as “connecting with the pain of colonisation”. Huygens positions the emotional work of the settler coloniser as often uncomfortable, most often expressed as guilt, denial or defensiveness: “As might be expected, feelings of responsibility and guilt were more prominent, since Pākehā were coming to appreciate that their cultural group had asserted control of society to the detriment of Māori” (Huygens, 2007, pp. 197-198).

In re-telling their early experiences, Pākehā participants in my research also acknowledged stages of “Pākehā guilt” or resistance in relation to how colonial injustice was storied by Pākehā Treaty workers or the “good white person” (Ahmed, 2004). This dynamic will be explored further in “Chapter 7: Tensions and intersections”. In further research, it would be interesting to explore these expressions of guilt, both for their discursive dimensions — how discourse may construct them — but also because, as Sara Ahmed contends:

Declarations of shame can work to re-install the very ideals they seek to contest... they may even assume that the speech act itself can be taken as a sign of transcendence: if we say we are ashamed, if we say we were racist, then “this shows” we are not racist now, we show that we mean well. (Ahmed, 2004, p. 27)

In these narratives, connecting with the pain of colonisation was often expressed as grief and/or as anger and outrage:
I just want to cry for a bit. Just right from starting talking about it, the pain of all of this is just so... palpable for me... which is probably why I can’t work the way I used to as I feel it now. Before I guess I didn’t feel it; I was angry and in denial, like a lot of people in this world. It is too hard to feel, so you ignore it... the reason I can relate to that is that is what has happened in my own family... and that is pretty much the same thing, except that it is different in NZ; there is a whole people that has had a loss... I recognised that my post-traumatic stress, my trauma is quite individual — I share it with my immediate family, but I don’t, it is completely different from a whole people. (Esmeralda)

If I am truly honest and reflect on what I feel sad [about]... it continues to be about the loss of that knowledge, the loss of the language, the loss of the right prayers to say, the loss of the right ways to heal the body, the loss of the right ways to heal the mind and to heal the relationships. (Pearl)

That rage, that utter rage, and I think that when I first came to, or first kind of learnt about te Tiriti and the wider context of that, the theft, you know, the, the colonisation, not only in Aotearoa but worldwide, it was just this utter feeling of absolute rage, you know. Or how, how could they not have told us, how can this be hidden, how can people not be swinging from rooftops, turning over cars, and burning everything? (Tai)

What I find interesting in these narratives is that the pain, rage and grief are not only expressed in “empathy” for the external other, but are also expressed as being felt in their own story: “the reason I can relate to that is that is what has happened in my own family”.

Connecting with the pain of colonisation within and without possibly allows for more complex and relational understandings, as psychoanalyst and critical theorist, Julia Kristeva, notes: “How could one tolerate a foreigner if one did not know one was a stranger to oneself” (Kristeva, 1991, p. 182). Some of this dynamic will be explored further in the following chapter when concepts of relationship and alterity are discussed.

It is also important to note here that many key informants attribute important aspects of their learning to Freedom Roadworks:

Freedom Roadworks... the first hui I went to with Freedom Roadworks on decolonisation was just a big step up for me in hearing words that could hold who I am. (Pearl)

Freedom Roadworks, which has a focus on decolonisation, is a cross-cultural whanau group based in Otepoti Dunedin. Their discourse can be seen to have a strong influence on third-generation members; in Appendix C, I discuss some of the philosophy that the group represents. As they formed part of her study, Huygens summarises some of their positioning:

---

Family.
They suggested that when tauiwi are facilitated to appreciate the pain and vulnerability their ancestors felt at being displaced, and the subsequent processes of denial and distancing, they are able to explore their present feelings towards Māori in this country.” (Huygens, 2007, p. 168)

Freedom Roadworks express this as recognising the “losses for the colonised and the coloniser” (Appendix C); in facing the intergenerational grief that the coloniser also holds, there are possibilities for transformation. The third-generation Treaty workers in this study may have readily adopted notions from Freedom Roadworks due to proximity (many participated in their workshops) or due to an affinity for the dynamics of working cross-culturally. I also wonder if, in recognising the complex emotional responses to this work, Freedom Roadworks opened up the definition of the Pākehā Tauiwi experience? What this “knowledge-practice” of emotional connection brings to the discussion is the need for continual attention to the emotional work of decolonisation, avoiding simplifying and defining what the other may be experiencing. Pearl recognises these complexities, where a decolonisation practice operates on multiple levels of self:

“Our identity is our whole person, it is inclusive of all those parts of us, those parts of us are being held and those parts that need to be held. And those parts that are well, and those parts that aren’t very well, for all sorts of reasons: including the consequences of colonisation, including our own personal histories and stories, our journeys with our families and with our relationships...that is what identity work is...it is not just one bit, it is not just ethnicity.” (Pearl)

Another dimension of this emotional work is being prepared as Pākehā to recognise that you may individually represent the violence of your culture. Some key informants spoke of holding a position and perspective as the critical settler and learning to bear witness to the pain of colonisation for Māori:

“And also you have to be prepared as Pākehā to stand, I think it’s part of the work to stand, and to hear some of the rage and the grief of the people who have been done over by your people. It can be hard to hear that because it feels personal when people attack you for being Pākehā, but it’s recognising the broader context that we’re in and what that represents. (Rachel)

“It was a really horrible situation and it felt awful, but I could understand all that. I couldn’t understand, but, you know, it was ok, and it was from the Treaty that I knew it was ok, and that because the Treaty states, Te Tiriti, Māori have sovereignty, Tino Rangatiratanga over everything and this has been taken away by what I represent as a Pākehā, and their anger was palpable and I was represent, I was a place for that to go...” (Esmeralda)
4.3 Locating power

Adopting an analysis of structural power and of power relations within the group and within language and discourse is an important theme for third-generation members. An analysis of power is central to the work of “critical consciousness”:

Again it comes back to what is the dominant, to me I look in terms of power structures and whatnot, so who had the power, how are they applying the power, and who is getting in the way of the peaceful application of that power? And how we are dealing with those kinds of problems? Those are the issues I want to be looking at still today: who has the power? How have they gotten that power? How is that power applied to the people in communities? And if it is unjust, then how do we shift that power balance? (Hinengaro)

So if Treaty breaches happened because Pākehā culture or, you know, white culture thinks it can do certain things, then we have to look at white culture. We can’t just look at Treaty breaches or, you know. Homophobia happens because heterosexual culture decides it’s doing this, that and the other. I was really looking lots into white privilege and how, how that operates and affects everything. (Tai)

An analysis of how power operates, structuralist concepts of power, and the power of institutionalised racism, along with the dynamics of the privilege of “whiteness” are all echoed here. These ideas resonate with a structural analysis of power and a framing of this analysis as a need for cultural change for the dominant culture (Huygens, 2011, p. 61). In “Chapter 7: Tensions and intersections”, some of the contradictions and nuanced understandings of power will be explored further.

In Margaret’s (2009) research, third-generation participants raise their awareness of being newcomers in the movement and how this awareness and their respect for elders in the movement can inhibit their level of interaction or questioning (p. 73). Elsewhere, Margaret also refers to the limits of the movement’s ability to attend to its own internal power dynamics even though it holds a strong focus on how power functions in society (p.91). Within the third-generation group experience, there is a degree of levelling and a fluidity and responsiveness expressed that challenge power relations and inclusivity in the group process. Although this attention to group dynamics is complex, is not always “safe”, and contains its own inter-generational dynamics, there is the opportunity to challenge and be challenged:

I like to think it was such an open and safe space. It certainly endeavoured to be, but because those challenges came, I am sure it wasn’t, um, that we were incredibly lucky that there were the people affiliated within arc PeacePacific who were able to articulate discomfort or challenge and to say within an arc collective space, “Hey, either this space isn’t working for me or these other spaces we are going into are challenging...” (Adelaide)
So that is a real learning, yeah, how do you challenge and be graceful in your challenge? (Hinengaro)

A contribution of this research, as will be developed further, is to bring movement relationships into focus, as a micro expression of a decolonisation practice, for tension and differences to be composed generatively.

4.4 Collectivity

In Hinengaro’s concern for the “graceful challenge” is a care for group process and collective relationships. This care was already raised under Relationship-based, and will be addressed again in the following chapter as it is a strong theme through all narratives. Huygens describes “collectivity” as the strategy for Pākehā to overcome the divisiveness of “individualism” (2007, p. 198). Rachel also positions collectivity as the challenging work for Pākehā in this way:

I think it’s a really critical part of the work, and I think it’s something that we struggle with as Pākehā. It’s something I’ve struggled with a lot learning, and a lot of that learning has happened for me in Māori spaces, how we find it hard as Pākehā to understand the collective working and that you actually don’t have to say everything yourself because if someone else over there...can be saying it for you. (Rachel)

Collectivity and the collective experience are not only positioned as a challenge, they are also celebrated as healing work and a process of recovering from what has been lost through colonisation:

As one of the biggest senses of loss that I have in my life, as a Pākehā, is a lack of collective, a lack of community. I find western individualised culture really destructive and really awful, but I don’t really have many ways to deal with that without, you know, in a healthy way... And so arc in many ways created the best that I have come across it, because it was relationship based, and I think it gave me a really stro... It was an amazing backbone of strength that the collective of arc had that allowed me to do the learning I did and be in relationship... (Esmeralda)

Along with this celebration, there was a healthy questioning of what “collectivity” and community genuinely meant in an indigenous context and whether it was possible to transform one’s ontology significantly to embrace or even understand a full letting go of individualism:

I don’t really know what it is to be a collective because I have never lived it; all I have done is see it from the outside very superficially, and so that is not a knowing at all. In reality, I don’t really know if I would want to be giving up or able to give up my privileges or the things I enjoy about not being a collective; that’s what I know, that’s what I am in the world. I don’t know if I really know how to put myself second.
in a real sense, not a superficial sense, yeah, and, ahh, so I guess what we are talking about is ontology, ways that are completely different. (Esmeralda)

The different challenges of working collectively were also expressed, the challenges of leadership amongst a collective process and of operating as “one voice” while being a group of difference. Although these challenges were not resolved, they were positioned as tensions and opportunities to work reflectively with an awareness of power relations amongst the collective, as discussed under Locating power. In these sub-themes, we have seen a strong attention to group process, relationships and power relations. I position this as third-generation members making efforts to apply their macro analysis of power to the micro group relations. This application speaks to the contribution that a third generation makes to concepts for socially just relationships in Aotearoa. Their contribution is to hold the idea that the process of how we work together towards a decolonisation agenda is important, or — as Pearl articulates — may be what is most important:

If the process is right, it actually doesn’t matter a hell of a lot what is inside it, because it will be right, it will all be ok, and that is the beauty of it, so it is good. (Pearl)

Other participants expressed the idea that in attending to group process and working on relationships through care, attention and respect, that differences and tensions can be transformed:

Because I believe in forgiveness is like a paramount principle, and I also know it takes time to forgive and we need our time to heal, but I believe that we all, surely at the end of the day, we need to forgive each other our rights and all of our wrongs. (Hinengaro)

My desire for collective, collectivity and responsibility and accountability, is also an ... understanding that relationships — even when they are difficult — need to be worked on and supported and grown. (Esmeralda)

Casas-Cortés et al. (2008) discuss the “performing of the process” as a form of knowledge-practice: through experimenting with process and practice, social movements cultivate their knowledge of how to relate to each other (p.36). I position this process of collectivity and attention to power relations as a “performing” of the ideals held for the Treaty relationship, as a performing of critical consciousness, embodying a “relational way of working”. Within the microcosm of the group process, meanings constructed and adopted about Te Tiriti and decolonisation are translated into a focus on socially just relationships with each other. Key
informants give attention to the health of relationships, to justice between subjects, as the only way to be in this work together.

**Talking of spiritual?**
The final theme in this chapter is what I describe as the Talking of spiritual? theme. Time and again throughout interviews, key informants identify spirituality as pivotal to a decolonisation practice:

> That spiritual stuff was a really big challenge and was really pivotal... I think there was some kind of spiritual burn-out as well, you know... the ancestral stuff’s fucking massive, you know. It’s, we’re not just holding our own stuff; we’re not these doodoodoodoo individuals walking around in Aotearoa — there’s all that ancestral stuff that, yeah, at the moment we acknowledge, or even if we don’t, is all there. (Tai)

> So we were talking about decolonisation and were aiming to decolonise, but we had left out spirituality; we had just refused to really work with that or look at that in ourselves. (Esmeralda)

> But there was something really spiritual that was happening, and I think a lot of these, I think it was because we were forming these relationships that were really deep, ae. A lot of webbing of our spirits going on there, a lot of healing going on in our conversations, a lot of trust... (Hinengaro)

Makere Stewart-Harawira (2007) reminds us that within Māori society “spirituality and politics were inseparably bound together” (p. 135); for Stewart-Harawira the most urgent decolonisation project is to reconcile “the political and the spiritual” as primary (p. 125). Esmeralda recognises her decolonisation practice as missing spirituality, and while key informants identified the work as spiritual, many acknowledged that there was little framework to hold the spiritual, be that traditions passed on by elders, older generations in the movement, or a religious framework:

> There was this absolute rage of, yeah, and I think that that’s what, I think that’s really important, and inter-generationally I think that it needs to be held somehow, and I think that because we don’t have those inter-generational communities or those supports for many, many reasons, often because, you know, young people are really annoying, um, that that rage can go into so many places, you know. (Tai)

> ... a collective identity, a collective way of being, a collective way of processing, a collective way of relating to the wairua of the rivers and the land that we didn’t come from. We didn’t have elders with us all the time, so it was coming from our young desires to do that, but on our own. (Pearl)
You know, we’ve all come from Christian backgrounds, lots of us, but we don’t, no-one, no-one identifies as Christians, no-one probably identifies as Christian, or if, if we have a spirituality, it’s quite individualistic. It’s, we’d probably not be part of a wider kind of faith-based group or whatever. And then kind of going, “Oh weird, but lots of Pākehā Treaty workers are Christians, still.” And for me kind of going, “How can you be, how can you be a Christian when the legacy of colonisation!” and, you know, just couldn’t, just couldn’t, just didn’t get it. Um, and then having to get it, and now I get it. (Tai)

Tai raises a significant contrast between the third-generation members in this study and earlier generations of Treaty workers. Christian social justice groups and the Quaker groups have been significant supporters of anti-racism work and Pākehā Treaty work (Huygens, 2007, p. 118), and here there is a perception that many Pākehā Treaty workers would identity some form of relationship to more organised religious traditions. The narratives expressed a spiritual “cringe” or self-conscious awkwardness in attempts to acknowledge the spiritual dimension of the work:

I remember us trying to do some spiritual practices, but they were so heebee jeebee to me. But we had to bring something from home, or something, and there was rocks and candles... It started to feel a bit hippy, but also too, that is the awkwardness too, the reclamation of spirit is such a process. (Hinengaro)

... this unsaid attitude that it was airy-fairy or hippy or new agey or all these sorts of things, so the spiritual aspect of the work we were doing was being held by certain people, but it was unsaid and it was un-talked about, and it was unsafe to talk about. (Esmeralda)

A tension that occurs in the analysis of these narratives is the artificiality of extracting “the spiritual” as a theme when wairua/spirit was talked of as embedded in all aspects of the work. Here I am confronted with the limitations of English language to communicate a holism and multiplicity of conceptual arrangements. However, I purposefully do not engage Māori spiritual frameworks that from my understanding could hold this complexity. I do not engage a different epistemology, so as to make a point of the limitations of the discourse I am using. I also struggled to find literature that these narratives could engage in dialogue with, literature that could engage with cross-cultural attempts to acknowledge spirituality in decolonisation. To highlight this absence, key informants struggled to access a language that could appropriately hold the meaning of what needed to be expressed:

... having a bit more of a spiritual outlook on life, embodying or being consciously spiritual. And, um, and so what that means to me is that in embracing and an awareness of my existence in New Zealand that stands outside identity... I think things happen for a purpose, and so me being in this land living here is, I don’t know how to talk about it; it’s, um, I don’t really know what I am trying to say. (Esmeralda)
Now this is a whole area I don’t know how to discuss... but it has to be said that there was an attempt to honour a, to honour Te Ao Māori, and in a sense you could say that was an attempt to relate Pacific understandings of spirituality within the work — the work meaning decolonisation or Treaty work or understanding identity — those, all those things in time as young people in a national network. (Pearl)

You just fully vibe on the whole wairua; this other time I went over to Russell, and we were all just, like, connecting at another level, but we wouldn’t have been able to talk about that, I don’t think. (Hinengaro)

While acknowledging that there was a demand to attend to spiritual dimensions, key informants experienced a lack of collective frames or religious traditions to draw upon to respond to this need. Attempts to respond collectively often involved a “cringe” or self-consciousness in response to “new age” or individualised attempts, or problematising and discomfort with the co-option of Te Ao Māorispiritual frames. Key informants were left without a language that could even communicate these struggles. There was a demand to respond to the “spiritual” while many were also often deconstructing their own personal fundamentalist Christian experiences. There are strong links here to other themes “knowing self”, and the “pain of colonisation” where spirit/wairua is embedded. The narratives hold a sense of dislocation and an uncertainty about how to re-weave spirit into the fabric of decolonisation, as colonisation for both the colonised and the coloniser has seen a loss and dismantling of spiritual traditions that do not fit into organised religion. Pearl acknowledged this loss earlier: “the loss of the right prayers to say, the loss of the right ways to heal the body, the loss of the right ways to heal the mind and to heal the relationships”.

One possibility for understanding these tensions is as a “tyranny of the secular”, as an example of where secular discourse that is embedded within New Zealand settler society continues to hold dominance within these alternative meaning making spaces. This understanding is most strongly demonstrated in the “cringe” and in a struggle to find language to express meaning. However, the tyranny of the secular is not the only frame of understanding that connects to these issues. Key informants also felt discomfort and self-consciousness with the politics of appropriating Te Ao Māori ontology, particularly in the context of a cross-cultural group negotiating individual and a collective identity. Pearl describes this challenge as one too many for a cross-cultural group working in collective ways:

*I think it was the challenge was too much; it is ok if you are just thinking about politics, if you are just thinking about the practical ways, if you are trying to... it is*

47 The Māori world.
Maybe the spiritual in this sense has come to represent that which cannot be known in the cross-cultural interchange, that which is incommensurable, “the residue of meaning that will not be reached” (Schutte, 1998, p. 56) in relationship.

**Summary**

At several points in this chapter, third-generation voices trouble the genealogy of movement discourse; in this troubling, participants also hold respect and reverence for who and what has come before, recognising that their work could not exist without a context to relate to:

*A number of us were very clear and wanting to learn from and honour, work with, acknowledge our elders and their experience and learnings and their backgrounds.* (Adelaide)

*Another really important space has been the broader Pākehā / tangata Tiriti movement, and particularly elders in that movement. There have been people who have played a critical role in my understanding, in my learning, both about how to do the work and the content as well. There’s been huge learning from people who have been incredibly generous. I think about us starting out in PeacePacific and arc, and I cringe a little bit now because I think we were so… we had a bit of that righteousness.* (Rachel)

In this recognition of the movement they are relating to, key informants express an awareness, a humility for the righteousness of a youthful perspective:

*I think of the difference between then and now. I didn’t have a sense of responsibility… that the clumsy, brutal stumbling around, that we do that as young adults and we do it in places where young adults shouldn’t really do it…* (Sebastian)

A frame that encompasses both respect and a “graceful challenge” is possible, as is demonstrated in key informants’ attempts to work in relationship and collectively. The frame for this chapter is similar; third-generation voices are in both convergence and contradiction with movement discourse, and the possibilities that emerge are for complementary, reflexive and conjunctural theories and practices (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008).

In responding to the research question, “What meanings and reflections do third generation Treaty workers construct in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi?”, key informants render an immediate response. We are not just talking about Te Tiriti, this is decolonisation work, Te Tiriti can be an accessway to a decolonisation practice. This redefining of the research
question opens up the possibility for a wider conversation; it brings to immediate attention a process of meaning construction. This redefining does not deconstruct movement discourse — the importance of a Treaty frame as the appropriate local language — instead, it offers complementary processes for accessing mindsets that may not be reached through a “Treaty” discourse. This particularly applies when the focus of decolonisation is a disruption of dominant power relations.

Key informants also demonstrate how they adopt movement discourses and apply them in different ways, constructing a “knowledge-practice” from understandings of the Treaty relationship and practising this meaning as a “relational way of working”, as building socially just relationships with each other. A decolonisation practice that is relationship based brings “knowledge” into practice.

Critical consciousness is expressed as a “knowing of self” in the big story of colonialism, disrupting the construct of the “silent settler” (Bell, 2006, p. 265) without a history or identity, while also attending to the complexities of this emotional work. In processes of consciousness raising, meaning construction can be most apparent (Klandermans, 1992), so here we see an adoption of movement practice and a concern for the multiple complex responses to this revisiting of history.

Again, in “locating power” by developing an analysis of power and in experiences of collectivity, third-generation members embody discourse and work towards new forms of social relations, performing their macro analysis within the microcosm of the group (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008). Here, I am reminded of the words of Sebastian at the beginning of this chapter: “working our methodology”, practising the change we want to see in the world as developing “these kind of bodies of being”.

Finally, in this chapter I addressed the significant reference in narratives to the spiritual dimensions of decolonisation work. Here the questions remained open as Pearl asked whether the spiritual was a “challenge too far” for a decolonising, cross-cultural endeavour.

This chapter speaks to the overarching theme of the research and to the final research question in particular. In attending to our relationships with each other, we are disrupting a colonial mindset. Our decolonisation practice requires socially just relationships, and through attending to relationships with each other we develop our practice. The following chapter begins with the centrality of relationships, and explores the decentering encounters of socially
just relational encounters, demonstrating how key informants open up “fixed” meanings of “others”.
Chapter 5  Relationship: a decentering of knowing

The noise of gulls comes through the shining darkness
over the dunes and the sea. Now the clouded moon
is warm in her nest of light. The world’s a shell
where distant waves are murmuring of a time
beyond this time. Give me the ghost of your hand:
unreal, unread the dunes,
the sea, the mangroves, and the moon’s white light,
unreal, beneath our naked feet, the sand. (Fairburn, 1966)

What is “unreal” and “beyond this time” sets a theme for this chapter on relationships,
learning from each other in socially just relationships and relationship as a decentering of our
“knowns” 48. The metaphor reminds me of what one cannot hold onto (what one cannot grasp),
what one is unable to know, the “incommensurable” within the encounter with “others”, and
what always changes in the meeting of waters.

Introduction: relationships are everything

In the previous chapter, key informants through “working our methodology” brought forward
the relational as a “way of being” 49 together. The social movement theory of Casas-Cortés et al
provided a frame for recognising that this knowledge-practice is produced in the critical
intersubjective relation. The relational as a “way of being” resounded with movement
discourse, Kirton (1997) also argued for new “ways of being” (p. 81) in relationship with
Tangata Whenua, and Huygens (2007, 2011) positioned the movement as working towards
“accountable, mutually agreed relationship(s)” (2011, p. 74). Key informants took this
challenge for a re-envisioned Treaty relationship and performing the relational as an ethic for
all encounters, understanding relationships as pivotal to the work of decolonisation.
Esmeralda’s words remind us of the centrality of this knowledge-practice:

48 In this chapter, as well as elsewhere in the thesis, I use “knowns” and “knowing” to describe internalised
categories and discourses that shape our assumptions, including our assumptions of others. These assumptions
are often based on dominant and powerful discourses (Levinas, 1969).
49 These are the words of Sebastian: This kind of work is working our methodology, so that eventually we are
developing these things — these kind of bodies of being, or ways of being — that will walk us out of that, you
know (Sebastian), quoted at the beginning of Chapter 4.
The whole picture gives me a way of, an idea of why relationships are important in this work. They are vital, and I don’t, I have very little desire in working on anything without relationships being the core, the core foundational aspect of any work I do, not just this work but any work. I’ve actually got no interest in working on anything without relationships... Esmeralda

In this chapter, I discuss the concept of “relationship” as a way to decentre a colonial mindset, to disrupt universal knowing. Key informants are engaged in a process of constant motion, tension, reflection and learning, occupying positions of discomfort and vulnerability in relationship. Here I shed light on the idea of “relationship” as a process of encounter, rather than as an accomplishment of knowing the “other”. I explore these ideas of relationship through the narratives of key informants and the meanings they construct of their work as “relational”; I also explore the disruption of “totality” through this discursive analysis. These ideas feed into the concept that through decentering encounters, we unfix our rigid knowing of each other and embody socially just relationships.

It is important to point out that in using the term relationship, I am referring to the work of listening to another’s stories, to engaging in dialogue without consuming the other as “known”, as Alison Jones (1999) explains:

[F]or dominant group members, supporting struggles for a just social order may necessarily involve both knowing about historical structures of privilege and inequality within which we all live, and a gracious acceptance of not having to know the other. (Jones, 1999, p. 316)

In this chapter, the intersubjective moves beyond a project of “cultural sensitivity” to “know” another culture or to become knowledgeable about the “other” and evaluate the “other” on dominant cultural norms and categories (Bell, 2008). Here the concept of ethical intersubjectivity (Butler, 2004; Levinas, 1969) operates in the opposite direction; rather than us becoming “knowledgeable” of others, our “knowns” are decentred. The philosophy and ethics proposed by Emmanuel Levinas, a twentieth-century French philosopher of Lithuanian Jewish origins, is positioned in dialogue with key informants’ narratives. This dialogue illuminates where key informants work to be bound by relational responsibility for others. For Levinas, echoing the words of Esmeralda above, the relational is primary: “The social relation itself is not just another relation, one among so many others that can be produced in being, but is its ultimate event” (Levinas, 1969, p. 221).

I must pay homage to Avril Bell (2008), Rose Yukich and Te Kawehau Hoskins (2011), and Kevin Clements (2010) for exposing me to the application of Levinasian philosophy to the
Pākehā/Māori or Settler/Indigene relationship in Aotearoa. Their analysis has set a frame for exploring the theme of “relationship” in dialogue with Levinasian ethics. The tension in this chapter develops through accounts of relational encounters in the cross-cultural space. The cross-cultural space is not devoid of dominant power relations. The necessity of a “decentering of knowing” is very much a project for those from a dominant cultural group; for those who occupy marginalised space, there is a day-to-day necessity to translate self and “knowing” according to the demands of operating inside dominant culture (Jones, 1999; Schutte, 1998). This process is not the same for everyone, and there are multiple differences within the group (ethnicity, culture, gender, sexuality, to name a few), so I work to explore the tensions created in the possibilities of cross-cultural relationships.

I begin this chapter exploring what it means to be “happily unsettled” in relationship encounters as a process for disrupting the colonial mindset. Key informants then describe what they can never know of others, what is incommensurable in relationship and how such relationships expose our vulnerability. The tension between processes of decentering colonialism and of recentering indigeneity are explored in the cross-cultural space. I also describe how a third-generation employs language to express these concepts of disrupting knowing, as a decentered way of speaking. Finally I discuss the disruption of individualism that extends to a focus on group process.

**Happily unsettled?**

*I think at least there is not really so much pretence when you are just going with your heart — it is also easier to move from there, it is also easier to get called up... you are not convinced you are on the money anyway, and I think that being unsettled, that being happily unsettled is maybe a good way to be...* (Sebastian)

So what is Sebastian bringing our attention to when he talks about being “happily unsettled” and about a space that is “easier to move from” and “easier to get called up” from? What does it mean to occupy a space that is both unsettled and happy? One possibility for understanding the unsettled is proposed by Levinas when he contends that “The love of life does not resemble the care for Being, reducible to the comprehension of Being, or ontology. The love of life does not love Being, but loves the happiness of being” (Levinas, 1969, p. 145). Here Levinas refers to Being as the “object” and being as the “process”, so we can understand the position of reductive fixed knowing of “Being” for its limitations, while destabilising this fixed position opens up different possibilities.
Exploring the narratives of key informants through a Levinasian window can reveal how relational encounters have the potential to disrupt the totality of colonial and imperial ontology, the reductive power of a superior and dominant gaze: “Western philosophy has most often been an ontology: a reduction of the other to the same by interposition of a middle and neutral term that ensures the comprehension of being” (Levinas, 1969, p. 43).

A central project for Levinas is to dismantle universalism and displace the “essence” of the other, that which is essentialised by a Western binary. This works to disrupt the Western racist binary that privileges Western values as paramount, and hence the violence of Western imperialism and colonialism as a justifiable outcome. “Western society has long maintained an allergic relationship to these alien others, in its thought and its treatment of them” (Deidrich, Burggraeve, & Gastmans, 2006, p. 41). Levinas disrupts the idea of a universal reality embedded in the Western philosophical tradition and perpetuated by Western political dominance. This dominance is based on objective assumed knowing of the other, on taking the other into an organisation of predetermined categories:

> Instead of making an allowance for the person in and of himself, secondary characteristics and specific qualities are considered first — sex, colour of skin, race, religious beliefs, etc. The other which stands in defiance to my way of compressing and squeezing the world into an intelligible totality must be bested, and never listened to on his or her own terms. (Deidrich et al., 2006, p. 41)

There is enormous violence in this reductive consumption of others, as Heather Macdonald (2011) explains:

> When I assume that objectivity in relationship is the ultimate form of self transcendence, I have totalized that person, reduced them to a knowable thing that cancels out the opportunity for real ethical love and social justice. (Macdonald, 2011, p. 305)

Levinas argues that Western ontology positions difference, that which is outside of Western norms, as inherently inferior (Levinas, 1969). He argues that plurality and multiplicity are chaos to Western thought and truth only exists in the singular and in totality. Levinas would position “truth” as relational and would claim that it can only be found in difference, not in what is the same (Butler, 2004; Deidrich et al., 2006; Levinas, 1969).

The words of Deidrich et al are a fitting summary of the interpersonal relation that maintains a frame of Western superiority: “I do not allow the other to appear in her own light, but the light that I lend her” (2006, p. 42). Rachel describes the way in which Pākehā culture has a deeply ingrained ontology of domination and suggests that as Pākehā it is uncomfortable, although
very important, to challenge this internalised frame and claim a position of “not knowing” in recognition of alterity, of difference:

* * *  

*I find it quite hard to articulate in a way because some of it has probably become quite embedded, but one of the important learnings is around working cross-culturally. For Pākehā I really think being part of a colonising culture what is deeply engrained is a sense of rightness and righteousness. Because I don’t think you can go and impose your culture on others without thinking there is something right about your culture, which inherently means there is probably something not right about the other culture you’re imposing on. I think some of that rightness stuff is really deep. So it’s hard to stand in a place of unknowing and it’s hard to get it wrong and that’s just what is kind of the basis, not the basis, it’s what’s central to working cross-culturally — that you’re going to not know, and you’ll never know another culture and all its nuances from the outside. Accepting that not knowing and still finding a way to work and not feel too unsure about how to step forward is quite an important thing. Partly it’s about coming to know your own culture and understand your own culture is important to how you do that. (Rachel)*

Central to Rachel’s process for decentering her “knowing” is the concept of “alterity”, a concept of otherness where difference is positioned as a teacher of self:

* * *  

*The breakthrough in constructing the concept of the other occurs when one combines the notion of the other as different from the self with the acknowledgement of the self’s decentering that results from the experience of such differences. (Schutte, 1998, p. 54).*

Although this project of decentering that alterity employs is experienced by Rachel as “hard work”, it could also be positioned as a generative process, as it allows her to negotiate a socially just cross-cultural engagement. Levinas sees the possibility for transcendence of the restrictions of fixed knowing, echoing the words of Sebastian’s state of “happily unsettled”. Esmeralda’s narrative evokes the decentering that occurs in relationship with Tangata Whenua, which allows her to see the colonial discourse that shapes her thinking:

* * *  

*... so it is in relationship with Māori that I could see my colonial practices, and I can’t see them very well without (Esmeralda)*

It is through the relational encounter that Esmeralda can see herself, this decentering is positioned as the need to know yourself (Jones, 1999), and we discussed this in the previous chapter as a development of critical consciousness.
The incommensurable

But even being held by Māori is very confusing, it is still very confusing. The deeper you go with it, the less you know and the more you have to acknowledge the less you know. (Pearl)

What Pearl describes here is the “confusion” that has the potential to decentre our “knowing”. Schutte (1998) calls this confusion “the incommensurables”, the meanings that are missed and cannot be translated cross-culturally, also captured by Rachel’s words above “you’ll never know another culture and all its nuances from the outside”. I am reminded of the beginning metaphor — of what is “unreal”, of what is beyond the comprehension of this time. Although this place of “not knowing” develops in relationship with difference, key informants attempt to deconstruct the dominant cultural demand for the culturally different other to engage and perform their culture for consumption; it is a relationship that incorporates an understanding of power:

I learn about myself by being in relationship to people who are not me, and that is the best way to learn, but if people don’t want to be doing that with me that is totally fine and I understand that they have probably got really valid reasons. (Esmeralda)

The questions that Levinas proposes are how do I not reduce the alterity of the other into all my own preconceived assumptions, categories and knowables, and how do I not interpret the other into my own language and internalised discourses? Is it possible for there to be other kinds of encounters and relationships that are not totalising of otherness? Macdonald (2011) explains that “Levinas (1961/1969) locates his ethics and social justice in relationship to the other. His philosophy is helpful in understanding what it might look like to be in a relationship founded in social justice” (Macdonald, 2011, p. 306).

Levinas challenges us to locate where in the relational encounter with the other there is a “moment” free from the controls of cognition, a pause in time before one subsumes and consumes the other into one’s own terms and frames of understanding (Burggraefe & Bloechl, 2002; Deidrich et al., 2006; Macdonald, 2011). In this pause, I make contact with the “face of the other” (Levinas, 1969); in this pause, I am exposed to the incommensurable, what I cannot know of the other (Schutte, 1998). There is the potential to be free of my judgements and assumptions consuming the other into what is manageable for me to comprehend (Deidrich et al., 2006; Macdonald, 2011). The pause in this moment is also described by Schutte (1998) as the moment when the other ceases to make sense to our perceptions. Or in other words, I “feel” the other removed from all their social positioning, and I experience their vulnerability. I see their “face” (Clements, 2010). If I choose to turn towards their face, there
is a freedom from all other constraints in this pause of encounter. As Macdonald (2011) asserts:

[I]n that moment [that pause], we were all liberated from our self-belonging by a tear, an interruption in the signifiers and the signified and so totality broke into pieces… the undoing of totality is the moment when the common face turns into the uncommon, into the unfamiliar and into the uncanny. (Macdonald, 2011, p. 308)

This is the moment where it is possible to be open to learning, to be taught by the other. I choose to respond to “the face”, rather than turn away into the safety of what I previously believed I knew. I have the opportunity to disrupt and decentre my knowing and face the unknowable other. I am reminded of Pearl’s words:

... the deeper you go with it, the less you know and the more you have to acknowledge the less you know. (Pearl)

For Levinas, this “transcendence of discourse is bound to love” (Levinas, 1969, p. 254). In other words, transcendence of what controls us and the limits of our colonised thinking is possible in ethical intersubjectivity, placing relationship at the centre of the pursuit of social justice (Macdonald, 2013).

**Vulnerability as teacher**

To respond to the face, to understand its meaning, means to be awake to what is precarious in another life or, rather, the precariousness of life itself. This cannot be an awareness, to use [Levinas’s] word, to my own life, and then an extrapolation from an understanding of my own precariousness to an understanding of another’s precarious life. It has to be an understanding of the precariousness of the Other. (Butler, 2010, p. 7)

A further challenge to Western hegemony is the idea that in the face of the other we come into contact with their vulnerability; this vulnerability, as Butler emphasises, is not simply a transposition of our own experience, but recognition of the other. In a paradigm of domination that sees the “strong” elevated above the “weak”, it is a challenge to allow the “vulnerable” to be our teacher (Burggraeve & Bloechl, 2002; Deidrich et al., 2006).

By turning towards vulnerability as teacher in the face of the other, we can experience our own liberation, realise the possibility of being something other than all the discourses that have created, constrained and disciplined us (Deidrich et al., 2006, p. 50). This brings to mind the words of an Australian Aboriginal activist group: “If you have come here to help me, you
are wasting our time. But if you have come because your liberation is bound up with mine, then let us work together.”  

This liberation does not stem from the redemption of being a “good white person” (Ahmed, 2004; Jones, 1999), rather it is redemption through freedom from one’s internal baggage.

Sebastian exemplifies this moment of “liberation” in his description of an experience of encounter with a Rangatahi group after a week-long hui together at Waitangi:

> I feel like for me that is when all that stuff spiritually cracked open, you know, like, that I had been really haunted my whole life by this stuff, but I had never had access to a way to find anywhere to even, I don’t know — again, it was one of those life moments that just changed the formation of your bones... (Sebastian)

In this excerpt, Sebastian depicts an image of the huge and dramatic internal shift that took place from being open to a relationship with difference, where his own assumptions were off centre.

Participants’ stories do not always describe the process of decentering knowing as “transcendence”. As discussed earlier, this is sometimes described as a place of discomfort and as “hard work” very much in tune with movement discourse of the uncomfortable work of the decolonisation practice of the settler coloniser (Black, 2010; Huygens, 2011). Key informants also give emphasis to the energy and care required to care for relationships in cross-cultural encounters. Pearl refers to the “heartfelt” efforts of working together cross-culturally:

> There was desperation to do things the right way, wasn’t there? There was this absolutely heartfelt, brow beating... we were prepared to take the pain to do it the right way. And we egged each other on in that direction... (Pearl)

To do it the “right way” in the cross-cultural encounter, to honour the demands of an ethical intersubjectivity, highlights the sense of responsibility key informants hold for each other through a decolonisation practice.

**Processes of recentering and decentering**

Through attending to the dynamics of the cross-cultural space, tensions are apparent between processes of decentering a colonial mindset (for a dominant cultural group) and the need to
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50 Attributed to Aboriginal Australian activist group, Queensland, 1970s.
recenter indigeneity. Hinengaro explains that from her multiple positions of “difference”, she is challenged to respond to all differences beyond her own:

I do think there is something really powerful about being a young woman, about being... a young Māori woman. I think there is something very powerful about being a young Māori woman that is gay because you are dealing with oppression on so many different tiers, and for me personally, and you never allow yourself the benefit of looking at all those different oppressions because it becomes a bit overwhelming, enduring, because you are different. The only way that you fit in is you are different. And from that difference you have to develop a very swift sense of accommodation for everything that is different, and I think that is where you learn a lot of those things about humility and grace, but those are things we constantly try to work on and refine and are not perfect... (Hinengaro)

Hinengaro positions her experiences of difference as “powerful”, allowing her the perspective or the necessity to respond to difference in others, a recognition that teaches her grace and humility. The process of recognising difference appears to be a different project for those who constantly have to translate themselves in and out of dominant culture. Avril Bell brings attention to Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s position that the project for indigenous peoples is to be a “recentering” of identity (Bell, 2008, p. 852). Pearl speaks to this process of recentering or decolonisation as learning about her own people while in relationship with Tangata Whenua:

I don’t know anything about my own people yet...it was absolutely true for me at that point...what has happened is that the learning has been part of that. The learning about my own people, my Samoan people, I was particularly announcing that I don’t know anything about my Samoan side. I don’t know anything about the language, and the pain of that, the pain of the loss of language and culture and the lack of acknowledgement of it within myself, of my identity. The racism against myself that had been internalised. The cop on the head, the internal colonisation process I didn’t have the words for it then, but there was all of that going on inside me... I needed to have a long time really of learning about both things at the same time. (Pearl)

Possibly Pearl is describing a decentering of the internalised colonising voice, making space for a recentering of identity, a knowing of her own people. This highlights the need for a process of decentering and unfixing, to be a process that serves decolonisation, emphasised by Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s words:

While the west might be experiencing fragmentation, the process of fragmentation known under its older guise as colonisation is well known to indigenous peoples. We can talk about the fragmentation of lands and cultures. We know what it is like to have our identities regulated by laws and our languages and customs removed from our lives. Fragmentation is not an indigenous project, it is something we are recovering from. While shifts are occurring in the ways in which indigenous peoples
put ourselves back together again, the greater project is about recentering indigenous identities on a larger scale. (1999, p. 97)

The process of recovering from the violence of colonisation is a process of recentering indigeneity, while possibly decentering the internalised coloniser. An indigenous centre is possibly less homogenous and static, and possibly more a space of encounter and relationship. As Pearl describes it, she learnt about her own people while in relationship.

What Pearl’s words bring to mind is Ofelia Schutte’s (1998) concerns for alterity in cross-cultural communication, where she recognises the alterity within, the internalised “other”, particularly for those with hybridised identities (Schutte, 1998, p. 57). This discussion was raised in the previous chapter — where the pain of colonisation within and without was acknowledged, and the complexities of the emotional work of decolonisation were recognised. In the cross-cultural context, these processes of recentering and decentering become complex and multi-tiered: “Cultural alterity demands that the other be heard in her difference and that the self give itself the time, the space, and the opportunity to appreciate the stranger without and within” (Schutte, 1998, p. 61). This quote recalls Pearl’s earlier words reflecting on the cross-cultural experience: “we were prepared to take the pain to do it the right way. And we egged each other on in that direction”. In this complexity and the different processes required for those from within and outside of dominant culture, there is the possibility of the tensions of centering and decentering being “too much” for the cross-cultural space to hold. In Chapter 7, key informants identify times when the emotional and spiritual work of decolonisation needed to happen in separate spaces for those holding different identities.

**How key informants speak**

Decentering of knowing is also present in the ways key informants position the meanings they make from the stories they engage in. They position reflections as personal, not universal, their convictions are personal “truths” rather than as totalising truth claims. We can call this a decentering of speech. Some of the decentering of speech is missed in the excerpts I use, as I edit the opening uncertainties in speech to get to the heart of the narrative, very much an interpretive act in itself and possibly positioning much of what is presented as more authoritative than it was in spoken form. Examples of this decentering of speech are “my experience”, “the way I see it”, “I suppose”, “one way of understanding” and “I think”, claiming what is spoken for the self. Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1997) would
describe this as an example of “constructed knowing” where knowing is contextualised and is a product of a web of relationships: “an appreciation for complexity; and a sense of humility about their knowledge” (Love & Guthrie, 1999, p. 26). Humility and uncertainty operate discursively alongside the meanings being articulated. The interviews carry a sense that these lessons have been hard won and painfully rendered. However, there is also a sense that they will not be surrendered. These are life-long lessons.

Responsibility disrupts individualism

... the ability to sit within our own humility and the ability to have grace for our own process and for each other... And I just don’t think that we can create anything without getting real with what is required of us. And I think the other thing too is this over-arching responsibility. It is a privilege to sit in these spaces and engage; with that comes responsibility, and responsibility is multi-tiered and is really fucking hard. (Hinengaro)

Hinengaro describes the demands of holding humility and responsibility for self and others. It is the call to respond to the other that defines our responsibility for the other (Deidrich et al., 2006, p. 45). In taking the Levinasian encounter beyond the interpersonal relationship and into a wider context, we end up in a situation of multiple others, many of whom we may not ever contact, but to whom we hold responsibility (Clements, 2012, p. 345). Accordingly, this extension reverberates back to us; through having multiple responsibilities to multiple others, we cannot give all of ourselves to just one (Deidrich et al., 2006, p. 46). So ultimately we also have responsibility for ourselves; however, the responsibility to self comes via the relational, it is not inherently embedded in us. This matrix results in consequences well beyond our intentions and responsibilities well beyond our understanding (Deidrich et al., 2006, p. 46). As Hinengaro experiences the layers of responsibility: “it is a privilege to sit in these spaces and engage; with that comes responsibility, and responsibility is multi-tiered”.

It is in this translation to the wider context and the call to live consciously with constant awareness of these responsibilities that Levinasian ethics can appear overwhelming and possibly disabling (Bell, 2008). However, the process of responsibility is never complete; it keeps us in a state of humility, always open to learning and reflection. It is through these unattainable limits of responsibility that our colonial ontological view of superiority can be upturned (Bell, 2008). In Levinas’ words:

Multiplicity therefore implies an objectivity posited in the impossibility of total reflection, in the impossibility of conjoining the I and the non-I in a whole. This
impossibility is not negative — which would be to still posit it by reference to the idea of truth contemplated. It results from the surplus of the epiphany of the other, who dominates me from his height. (Levinas, 1969, p. 221)

This positioning of the subject holding multiple and limitless responsibility disrupts the notion of individualism, an idealisation of being free from the hindrance of others (Deidrich et al., 2006, p. 46). This disruption echoes movement attempts at “collectivity” as a strategy to displace the divisiveness of individualism (Huygens, 2011).

Holding a position of limitless responsibility could be interpreted as a role of passivity. However, when you consider that we also have responsibility for ourselves — because we must take care of ourselves so that we are available to respond to others (relational self-responsibility) — there is empowerment within relationship (Deidrich et al., 2006, p. 46). I see this as a further challenge to Western individualist ontology — our selfhood is interwoven into the fabric of relationship — and this resonates with my understandings of indigenous ontology as profound disruption of the individualism inherent in Western liberal thinking. Makere Stewart-Harawira reflects on the teachings from her elders, recognising the embodiment of the relational in all things: “To honour the sacredness inherent in all things and all beings, to recognize the truth of our inherent interconnectedness and to act in the world and towards each other appropriately. “All my relations”” (2007, p. 134).

In this extension of responsibility and disruption of individualism, an ethic for relationship is set that is unfinished and always in process. Macdonald (2011) would argue that this ethic is the frame for social justice, that social justice is made of relationships, where people are “willing to be transformed by that very lack of understanding” (Macdonald, 2011, p. 310). Adelaide depicts the process of collaborating with a Rangatahi group as not the time to interpret, but as the time to listen and learn:

*Those were real learnings for me and, okay, this isn’t a place for comment or feedback; this is just about hearing and listening and being and massive learning in going, “Oh, ok, I will be standing with these words and these people and I will have absolutely no input into it.* (Adelaide)

As someone from a dominant cultural group, Adelaide describes this process as a letting go of power, a letting go of engagement dictated on dominant cultural terms. As Levinas describes it: “A calling into question of oneself, a critical attitude which is itself produced in face of the other and under his authority” (Levinas, 1969, p. 81). Adelaide also refers to how pivotal this encounter was to the ability to respond, recognising the Levinasian call to responsibility:
I reflect on how that weekend played — it actually probably didn’t matter any content of that hui. If we hadn’t responded in the way that we had, none of the last 8–9 years would have happened... I would have had no understanding of how it would play out in terms of a trust-building relationship way. (Adelaide)

Key informants also identify relationship as the space where they make many mistakes, and as the space to learn from these mistakes of missing the other:

That's the only thing we can be sure of in this work is that we'll make some terrible mistakes, but if we have the relationships solid and honest and conscious and compassionate and gentle and generous, then there’s room to go, “Oh shit, I’m so sorry, that was terrible, what, what, what can we do? (Tai)

As reflected in Tai’s words, the ethical relation, the limitless responsibility, is always unfinished and in process; there is the possibility to learn and be transformed by “conscious and compassionate and gentle and generous” relationships.

A “relational” group process

For things to get done properly, and for the process to be well taken care of, and for each part of that to be honoured it is just, still so rare, unfortunately, and still so beautiful to have that. (Pearl)

In the previous chapter, we saw the development of a decolonisation practice that valued a relationship-based way of working and “collectivity” as key to applying “knowledge” as practice in the group context. In this chapter, we have seen how key informants conceptualise responsibility, and how from a Levinasian view this responsibility for others has the potential to disrupt individualism. Pearl, above highlights the importance of the process to be “honoured”, of the centrality of process for key informants as a decolonisation practice. We also heard from key informants in the previous chapter that to operate collectively was a “healing” way to work, restoring what had been lost in the destruction of colonisation:

The kind of vehicle for that, I guess, was all of us being in relationship and working things out together, and it is actually that sense of communion which I think was, or community I think was kind of, which was empowering and healing and the only way to be there in any of that, and I feel that was much a part of... and learning how to be together, we learned how to learn this stuff, you know... (Sebastian)

In the narratives of key informants, there appears to be a “need” to work collectively. Sebastian identifies that the only way to “be there in any of that” was to learn through relationship. These experiences evolve through dialogue; according to Levinas, “language constitutes the relation to the other” (Levinas, 1969, p. 295). It is in the process of
relationship, lived and breathed, it is in the process of dialogue that we may find the “pause”, the “face of the other”. Levinas argues that we cannot find the “face” in the written word (Deidrich et al., 2006, p. 43). It is only in dialogue, relationship: “the face to face remains the ultimate situation” (Levinas, 1969, p. 81).

It is possible that these processes of decentering require the emotional support of a group process and/or that decentering demands a different way of being, dislodging the self as an independent, individual actor. As Adelaide theorises, it wasn’t a question of how to respond; the process had to be collective in response to Tangata Whenua:

“Our partners were a collective, our partners had a world view that was collective. I don’t even remember thinking about it, of “We have to work collectively.” It was “We need to organise ourselves.” It wasn’t “How should we organise ourselves?” (Adelaide)

Pearl also describes this orientation towards collectivity, a looking towards indigenous process, possibly a “recentering of the indigenous”:

“Right from the beginning there was always a looking towards Māori and a look towards indigenous process even if we didn’t know much about it personally, a looking towards there. (Pearl)

Sebastian refers to the collective process as instinctual:

... and the instinct to work like that was second nature to us. (Sebastian)

And Pearl describes the process as the only paradigm she could work from:

“Working in relationship with difference — cross-culturally — requires process. As a Pacific person, Samoan, it is really difficult for me to work on my own; I absolutely need to work in a group, and I need to have, and I need to work in conversation and in dialogue. And form consensus. All of those things are completely natural to me, and when they can’t happen in that way it feels really odd, and I can’t, I don’t work very well, I just sort of clam up and get frustrated. Consensus building, talking, all of those things we choose as the basis of our process, instinctively almost, and they are so perfectly correct for tikanga and for the Pacific way. (Pearl)

Disrupting the colonising and imperial totality appears to create the space and the need for a different way of working, a different “way of being”, a “working [of] our methodology”. The learning and shaping of this “group process” comes from a looking towards the indigenous centre. The liberation from our internalised “knowing”, assumptions and discourses, the space of being “happily unsettled” appears circular, to both support and need a collective way of being, a “relational way of working”.
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**In summary**

The central argument is that peaceful, tolerant people emerge out of good relationships. (Clements, 2012, p. 345)

Clements reminds us of the possibilities held in intersubjectivity, where key informants have positioned “relationships as everything” resonating with Levinas’ “ultimate event” of being (1969, p.221). In this chapter, I have explored the narratives of key informants in dialogue with the philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas and have shown that the ethics of Levinas provide an opportunity to illuminate further meaning into the decolonising knowledge-practice of a “relational way of working”. I have argued here that in relational encounters with difference we need to allow ourselves to learn and be taught by the other. A socially just intersubjectivity can disrupt the totality of colonial and imperial universalism and can interrupt totalised truths about others — there is both discomfort and freedom in this disruption, in “the other” as teacher to the self. I do not propose causality, as it is also the experience of being decentered, unsettled that composes the conditions for what may be described as a socially just relationship.

Narratives such as these of cross-cultural encounters could be read as romanticised — alterity exoticised. However, the process of decentering knowing can be “hard” or “painful”, and it is a process without completion, a process of learning about self. There are different processes at work for those from dominant cultural perspectives, and tensions are present between the decentering of the dominant culture and the process of recentering indigeneity in the cross-cultural space. The possibility of recognising alterity within the self — the embodied shifts in self for those with complex and hybridised identities — may be an area for further study. I am also aware of the contradiction and power of representing and presenting the voices of “others” in a chapter committed to the decentering of the knowing of others.

I have not described here a normative or definitive model for socially just relationships; this is not a grand unifying theory or prescriptive formula for the relational. Rather, this is learning in action that relies on our creativity and reflexivity. The curiosity that first arose during my experience of living and working in Bougainville (as referred to in the Introduction) was the first seed of the questions explored in this study. At that time, I was curious about whether a model for socially just relationships could be articulated from the experience of Treaty work in Aotearoa. I now see that the process for socially just relationships flows from and is critical to decentering encounters. This is less a formula than a process of response and creativity.
However, Treaty work and a decolonisation practice do appear to provide fertile opportunities for decentering encounters and socially just relationships.

In “working our methodology” as relational, there is a decentering of Western colonial epistemology, of “how we know”; this is extended to “how we be together”, allowing us to realise socially just relationships. In what is unfixed, what is unreal, and what is beyond the grasp of this time, in the meeting of waters, there is the possibility to be “happily unsettled”.
Chapter 6 The power to define?

Just outside my office the river runs through campus, contained and constrained by walls of concrete, on its singular journey to the sea — not far from here. Restrained in its particular containment, in its angry rush to meet salt water, and yet confined within memory, are the many origins of its waters lost upstream.

*Personal observation of the Leith on a stormy day*

[T]he unity of self or mind felt by the dominant subject is a totally artificial one, and that the oneness of his or her subjectivity (covering the fragments that make up his or her personality) is made possible only by adherence to a philosophy of colonialism, whether adherence is owned up to or only enacted indirectly. In other words, postcolonial feminisms propose the view that we are not born a unified self, that the sense of being “one”, of being self, is something derived from language… (Schutte 1998, p. 66)

Introduction

If we are not unified subjects and our senses of self and identity are socially constituted, what meaning does this have for identity politics? What does this mean for the political claims and strategies our identity politics are organised around? What happens if our identity politics demand the positioning of a singular identity? What happens to those that do not fit the singular or conform to the essentialised category of identity? In recognising these tensions, are there other ways to formulate an identity politics that allows a third generation to realise a decolonisation practice?

In this chapter, the narratives of key informants bring these questions to the forefront; these speakers are grappling to find their place within the expression of identity politics, and they question a simplified, essentialised binary construction of identity. However, key informants do not fully reject identity politics and essentialism, as this language can also be utilised strategically, tension between meanings is instead composed generatively, in agonistic dialogue. Bringing forward the idea of a relational “decentering of knowing” from the previous chapter, key informants challenge the power of “defining others” and argue for specificity as they struggle to find a language that represents their own realities. The uncertainties and possibilities presented in this chapter are both uncomfortable and a call for
dialogue, where we will continue to learn from each other in relationship. Rather than fully deconstructing identity politics, I position the “knowledge-practice” as an opening up of meaning. Key informants call for processes of “becoming”, and for the unfixing of rigid categories. In response, I explore ideas of a “hybridity” (Bhabha, 1994) and a “multivalent recognition” (Snyder, 2012). This chapter speaks to the concepts of socially just relationships, through unfixing and opening up rigid meanings that do not serve a decolonisation practice, we can compose tension and differences as generative.

My own story of weaving identity is also relevant to this chapter; my own concerns speak directly as intertext (Fox, 1995) to the tensions discussed here. Although I would like to let the participants in the research speak for me, it would be dishonest to hide behind my interpretation of their words. It was in my early days as a fervent Treaty Movement convert that I adopted a Pākehā identity as a politicised position. Parallel to the national journey of Pākehā Treaty movement politics, I was also becoming immersed in the life of Te Rūnāka ki Ōtautahi, the Ōtautahi/Christchurch tribal council, and in the teachings of Te Kahu o te Aoraki — the waka wairua of the Rūnāka. In these local relationships with Mana Whenua I was being increasingly challenged to explore my own whakapapa, while nationally I was operating as a distinctly Pākehā subject, both in Pākehā forums and in relationship with a Rangatahi group who held very strong Māori and activist identities. We viewed ourselves as their Treaty partners. This was a challenging position to hold; I felt increasing affinity with my whakapapa and encouragement to move fluidly in a Māori world at home in Ōtautahi, a Māori world represented by many “white” Māori who expressed comfort with their identity. Nationally, I was trying to hold a politically and singularly Pākehā position. I often felt destabilised by these split realities and how I expressed myself within them: I saw the only option for redemption to be becoming a coherent self with one voice. I launched on a journey to the south west of the South Island — deciding that going to live on the land of my ancestors might resolve this split subject and might enable me to uncover the stories lost in my family and to claim my Kāi Tahu status. With visions of open arms waiting on the marae ake, I headed to Riverton and Te Wae Wae Bay. However, many events collided to render this experience of the “journey home” particularly poignant.

51 I choose these words to depict the intensity and righteousness of my youthful beliefs.
52 The spiritual body that supported the work of the Rūnāka.
53 Tribal council.
54 The people who hold territorial rights, power from the land.
55 Genealogy.
56 Dialect for Ngai Tahu, a southern tribe.
57 Forecourt of the meeting house.
Ultimately, the journey led to more questions than answers and no easy embrace on the atea. With only a great grandmother’s first name to go on and no paper work to verify her story, ideas of my coherent conversion slipped into uncertainty. This was and continues to be a painful and uncomfortable uncertainty, depending on the contexts I find myself in. However, the challenge for me is to claim a split self, a space at the crossroads where there may not be a final coherent destination. This is a place for negotiating unresolved internal tensions and a position of potential insight — if partial and incomplete — into two different worlds, a place where “relationship” embodied is vital to my sense of self.

**Why identity politics?**

My own story highlights my negotiations with the identity politics of the movement. In their stories, key informants both converge with and trouble the politics of identity. Key informants are conversant with the “co-intentional” structure that Treaty politics have demanded in Aotearoa: the need for distinct definitions of Māori and Pākehā working towards relationship from separate spaces (Huygens, 2007, 2011). The movement that key informants are an active part of is based on an expression of Pākehā identity that “revisits the history of the colonial relationship” (Huygens, 2007, 2011), or “remembers its history as coloniser” (Bell, 2006), and is working towards “right relationships” with Tangata Whenua (Black, 2010; Huygens, 2007; Margaret, 2009). Esmeralda articulates her understanding of taking up a position as Pākehā:

*What has happened for me is that I have claimed Pākehā identity, and I guess it is in response to Māori claiming Māori identity as there has to be an “other”… I have claimed that other position and I understand why Māori have had to claim their identity and demand respect for their identity... In recognition, I need to trace my own identity and history and whakapapa so as not to be appropriating someone else’s unconsciously, so the Treaty asks those things of me…* (Esmeralda)

Esmeralda references her “Pākehā” identity to the struggles of Māori for self determination and to the articulation of a Māori identity, illustrating the framework that Te Tiriti provides for these two distinct Treaty partners. Tess Moeke-Maxwell (2005) highlights the development of these identity politics as the effort by Māori to address dominant cultural hegemony:

*By the 1970s many Māori were disillusioned with monoculturalism. The emergence of the first urban Māori intelligentsia brought an articulate, eloquent, anti-colonial*
voice (Walker, 1990). Counter-nationalists’ efforts centred on Māori sovereignty, which rested on resurrecting the Treaty of Waitangi. They argued that the disadvantaged social position of Māori was rooted in colonialism... In arguing for Māori sovereignty, Māori strategically invoked a primordial identity. (p. 500)

Moeke-Maxwell goes on to describe these identity politics as “essentialised”, and discusses the way the state has further prescribed these essentialised definitions through the institutionalisation of “bicultural” politics. Paul Meredith (1999b) is also concerned with an identity politics that restricts diversity. He suggests that “the emergence of a cultural politics in Aotearoa/ New Zealand concentrated and contested around the binary of Māori (the colonised) or Pākehā (the coloniser) [is]over-simplified and essentialised” (p. 12). Meredith is concerned that this dichotomy is “adversarial” and does not make space for “diverse realities” and relationships between categories (p. 12). Esmeralda goes on to express her concerns with identity politics and the need to be open to a “healthy questioning”:

*I suppose that is poststructural analysis that is coming in there, and it’s not a disregard for identity politics, but a healthy questioning of identity politics rather than a black and white acceptance of them. Cos, I mean, identity politics are what happened in Germany, ethnic cleansing is based on identity politics, there is a lot of negative that can come out of that.* (Esmeralda)

So far in this discussion I have discussed a convergence with movement identity politics that is rooted in an analysis of colonial history and that requires Pākehā to not just co-opt a “native” position (Bell, 2004b) and to work towards “right” Treaty relationships. I have also identified the possibility of an essentialising of these politics, particularly when they are subsumed by the state. Esmeralda, echoing Moeke-Maxwell and Meredith, also brings to attention some uncertainty about how identity politics on the essentialised end of the spectrum can play out as oppressive rather than liberatory. Esmeralda expresses awareness of a spectrum of identity politics that runs from essentialism to deconstruction (Snyder, 2012) and of how she may negotiate that terrain.

**Troubling essentialism**

Moya Lloyd argues, from a postcolonial and poststructuralist standpoint, that in identity politics “identity” is conceived as “constative”, as a stable subject (2005, p. 27). The problem with a stable, unchanging subject is that it does not allow for divergence and difference, or for identity that is in process, ambiguous and precarious (Lloyd, 2005). From an indigenous perspective, Yin Paradies (2006) argues that essentialism excludes those who do not inhabit
the full construct of what it means to be “indigenous”. This creates in dominant culture a sense of what is a “good” or “authentic” indigenous person (Smith, 1999, p. 72). The stereotypes that are created from the “boundary construction” of the genuine indigenous person negate what it is to be a colonised person or community living with the multiple realities of colonisation, which have harmed the possibility of embodying a “coherent” indigeneity (Paradies, 2006). There is a double bind here: colonisation has fragmented, and yet because of fragmentation I cannot be accepted as indigenous unless I perform my indigeneity in certain ways. Paradies suggests that the totality of an essentialised indigenous identity has the potential to reduce political power, rather than enhance strategies for social justice (Paradies, 2006, p. 357).

As Meredith suggested above, the “essentialist” dichotomy not only defines who is “authentic” but can also limit the possibilities for relationships between groups. Edward Said (1994) would argue that such limitations on relationship can perpetuate injustice and ignorance:

I do not mean what people mean when they say glibly that there are two sides to every question. The difficulty with theories of essentialism and exclusiveness, or with barriers and sides, is that they give rise to polarizations that absolve and forgive ignorance and demagogy more than they enable knowledge. (p. 35)

It is this potential for ignorance that concerns Avril Bell (2004a), where an authentic “Māori” identity serves the ignorance and non-engagement of Pākehā. Whereas Moeke-Maxwell (2005), as discussed above, is concerned with Māori essentialising themselves as “traditional” (p. 500), Bell positions the problem as a Pākehā need for a “traditional” and “authentic” Māori identity that supports notions of Pākehā nationalism:

The key to avoiding the politics of repressive authenticity is to maintain the links between tradition and current political concerns and between... the traditions of the past and the dynamic cultural expressions of the present... In other words, it is the ‘detachment’ that underpins the Pākehā nationalist fantasy of Māori cultural purity which must be resisted, rather than tradition itself. (Bell, 2004a, p. 98)

Bell is suggesting that by maintaining a conversation between traditions and current dynamics, oppressive aspects of essentialism can be avoided. Hinengaro expresses some of these tensions of “boundary” and “authenticity” in this story about being positioned as Māori in Pākehā contexts, but not being Māori enough in some Māori contexts:

You know, going through schools, my notion of myself, was, I was young, I was Māori, we were innately useless and evil, anyway my sense of self was quite scuwiff. In the arc environment, there was the space to challenge some of these fundamental
assumptions about self, so that was awesome. Issues with that are multi-tiered, so you become the Māori in these Pākehā spaces and you speak for all Māori. Well, I could speak for urban Māori who were brought up hating themselves, well, I can do a really good job of that. And then in these other contexts, when we were with these other “real Māoris”, then you weren’t seen as a Māori ever — it was very odd. (Hinengaro)

Hinengaro is expressing the painful and confusing position of multiple experiences of oppression, the racism of the colonised experience of her upbringing, and then being stuck in between worlds, not fitting the definitions of either.

The boundaries of the either/or of identity politics can become policed, Moeke-Maxwell argues that through the politics of essentialism, “A traditional/spiritual Māori women’s subjectivity is promoted as the only desirable and authentic Māori identity available to Māori women” (2005, p. 502). Those that do not “assimilate” into Pākehā culture or embody the “traditional” are viewed as rootless and are “pathologized as colonized” (Moeke-Maxwell, 2005, p. 502) Yin Paradies (2006) acknowledges the necessity for indigenous peoples to re-centre their collective identity and the empowering nature of this experience for many; she also observes from the standpoint of her own experience that:

Despite assertions to the contrary, Indigenous constructions of (pan) Indigeneity also involve elements of boundary construction/policing, which seek to construct Indigenous and non-Indigenous identities as “mutually impermeable and incommensurable”. Such policing serves to alienate past and potential future Indigenous people, or force those who inhabit Indigeneity into a “prison-house” of identity. (Paradies, 2006, p. 356)

This analysis echoes Meredith’s concerns about the loss of relationship in binary constructions of identity.

For Pākehā, an identity politics based on a simple binary can overly specify and narrow the Pākehā experience58. In this story, Sebastian depicts growing up in an extended Pākehā family and then finding that this was not “normal”:

I think we had an interesting up bringing in a sense because we grew up in an intergenerational household. We were in some ways brought up by the oldies, because Mum and Dad were — they were great — but the actual time we would spend peeling spuds or whatever was usually with my Great Aunty and Nana...

And in lots of ways I feel like I grew up with lots of my ancestors because I could hear — I remember as a kid, I could hear my Great Great Grandfather’s laugh even

---

58 Although I mainly draw upon indigenous critiques of the essentialism of indigenous subjects, I also apply these critiques of essentialism to the experiences of the dominant group. However, I do not want to oversimplify this application. There are different dynamics of power operating for those being defined by dominant culture.
though he had died way before I was born, but through the stories that kept on coming out...

The first kind of Treaty workshops I did I found really troubling and really, really struggled with because I didn’t. I guess the way I identified was/is a little bit unusual, particularly because of what I was being told Pākehā families were, and in that kind of nuclear family, and you don’t have connections to your ancestors. (Sebastian)

In the language of research participants there is a tendency, particularly when addressing issues of Pākehā power, to universalise Pākehā experience, or to speak for all Pākehā, such as “I still don’t think as Pākehā it’s the default position” or “in terms of Pākehā that we”. I find myself doing this as well, and even in the body of this thesis I slip into universalised claims. This represents a struggle to address dominant cultural power, along with a language that can exclude or that can limit diversity. As Sebastian’s story illustrates, this universalising of experience made him feel estranged during his first experience of a Treaty workshop.

**Strategic essentialism**

Makere Stewart-Harawira (2007), along with Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), troubles the “authenticity” of essentialism, but critiques postcolonial and poststructuralist feminisms for “invisiblising the specific experiences of Indigenous women” (p. 128), and claims that disrupting essentialism can alienate indigenous peoples from the land:

> While I concur with the view that deeply embedded discourses of the inter-linking of Woman and Nature have frequently invoked both as passive victim I am concerned about the effects of Indigenous delinking of these categories. The delinking of Indigenous from Nature, and by definition also the land, may undercut the arguments on which Indigenous peoples the world over base their claims to self-determination, that of place in relationship to the land. (p. 128)

Smith (1999) is also concerned about how deconstructions that evolve in one context can be transposed to maintain injustice in others, referring to “postcolonial theories transplanted from one context to another to continue to justify dominant cultural hegemony” (p. 74). This concern demands that local context be taken into account, avoiding a broad application of theory. Sebastian also highlights the importance of context:

> I remember being challenged by that partner of mine in Scotland around using the term Pākehā and referring to Aotearoa — things that I didn’t even think of but that were kind of — the only way he could see it was that was my way of indigenouslyfying myself. Which is a really interesting, as an external, you know, or making exotic my whiteness — or kind of unwhitening my whiteness or something — which is
interesting because here those terms kind of do the opposite of that in lots of ways; it actually locates me in a context. (Sebastian)

Smith (1999) also imagines a very different picture of essentialism in the discourses of indigenous peoples from that of poststructuralism: “The significance of place, of land, of landscape, of other things in the universe, in defining the very essence of a people, makes for a very different rendering of the term essentialism as used by indigenous peoples” (p. 74).

One postcolonial feminist theorist, Gayatri Spivak (1996), proposes a “strategic essentialism”, using notions of essentialist identity to further political aims. Tai invokes this strategy by using different identity labels at different times:

*I think that's how I use labels: strategically. So I'll identify as a woman, even though I don't really. If I feel like it, if it'll be of a strategic advantage, I'll say that I'm a woman, or I'll, I don't know if I'd use lesbian anymore, for a strategy. But yeah, Tauwi, Chinese, New Zealander, I'm an ordinary New Zealander...* (Tai)

Lloyd (2005) understands that a strategic essentialism occurs because the politics of the context necessitate such a positioning:

> Strategic essentialism occurs not through choice but because of the way that the political is configured at certain historical moments; that is, when legitimacy accrues to those who can speak on behalf of the “real” needs and desires of specific peoples. At such times the domain of the political recognizes only constative claims (p. 68)

Moeke-Maxwell also identifies the strategic usefulness of this form of conscious essentialism. Her study of bi/multi-racial women showed that it was possible for them to find a place in identity politics by strategically essentialising themselves “along a spiritual axis”: by claiming a spiritual Māori identity, women could experience autonomy, agency and acceptance (2005, p. 508).

Another possibility proposed by Lloyd (2005) is to reconfigure the essentialism/anti-essentialism binary and position notions of essentialism and anti-essentialism as an agonistic relationship. Agonistic in this context emphasises the positive aspects of being in conflict, without the necessity for consensus (Lloyd, 2005; Mouffe, 1999). This approach does not collapse differences of perspective but maintains their integrity in conscious conversation. The tension that emerges through these dialogical renderings of movement discourses and a third-generation perspective on the dynamics of identity politics does not need to be resolved. Rather, the tension offers a productive and generative dialogue, a “healthy questioning”.

Taking the politics of local context into account, it would appear that we do not need to directly apply postcolonial and poststructuralist concerns to identity politics. Rather, it is a
matter of how we generate space within identity politics to avoid the extremes of essentialism without negating or marginalising the importance of recentering indigeneity. This generation of space could also be described as an opening up of meaning, connecting to Bell’s (2004a) concern for an active conversation between the past and the present, and the configuring of an agonistic relationship where consensus is not the motivation (Lloyd, 2005; Mouffe, 1999).

Defining others?

A politics of recognition is also about definition: if we recognize something such as racism, then we also offer a definition of that which we recognize. In this sense, recognition produces rather than simply finds its object; recognition delineates the boundaries of what it recognises as given. (Ahmed, 2004, p. 17)

A further tension in the expression of movement identity politics appears as a “defining of others”; as Ahmed suggests, boundaries are set by naming and defining. In the previous chapter, I discussed the disruption of “knowing” of the other, and here key informants’ narratives express sensitivity to experiences of being defined by others and to defining others:

*All those different identities we bring into those spaces, and so if you are this inclusive ropu working for justice and Tino Rangatiratanga or whatever, your definition of that is you are also the ropu who says, “No you can’t be part of it because you look like this or this is your whakapapa.” Who is to define what someone’s whakapapa or identity is?* (Adelaide)

*I have got Pākehā whakapapa, why should I have to split myself in two? And that was really challenging for some of the older Treaty workers because, and I was one of those Māori’s who look Māori…* (Hinengaro)

Adelaide and Hinengaro’s narratives depict a struggle to define who is Māori and who is not, and who is Pākehā and who is not. These struggles become a questioning of who holds the right to define another person’s identity; instead, key informants argue for specificity and the right to self identify. Chris Weedon (2004) brings our attention to how the body can have meaning imposed upon it:

*There is often a radical difference between how individuals see themselves and how others define them. At issue here are often discourses of the body and what it means. The body is central to identity — both chosen identities and those imposed by institutions.* (p. 14)

The meaning imposed on the body of the subject does not necessarily serve the agency or self-determination of the subject. Key informants demonstrate this concern through the questioning that occurs in relation to “who has the power to define another?” They ask, “Is
this another expression of Pākehā or dominant cultural power in delineating how a person must identify?"

Who came up with that word, and who has defined that word and is using it? Because do they hold those spaces, those conflicts, in themselves, those feelings? Or are they naming it for other people? And the reality is that was a Pākehā conference even though it was possibly open to others, so it was Pākehā who decided that, possibly. (Esmeralda)

A lot of the conversation was “Pākehā this, Pākehā that, Pākehā this, Pākehā that”, and I was, like, “Well, should I even be here? I’m not Pākehā, so you can’t, I can’t relate on that level, you know.” And then there were talks of the terms “Tauiwi” and I was, like, “Well, is that just another Pākehā-dominated term that’s, like, just changed its name?” Or “Tangata Tiriti”? You know, like, how is that different, how is it the same? (Tai)

Weedon asserts that the power of defining others “limits the possibilities of identity. The meaning of the visual is not at the disposal of individuals but is overdetermined by the history of representation” (2004, p. 15). I understand that we risk re-enacting colonial power in defining who someone is to fit them into our categories. This reminds me of Davis’s concerns (2002) that social movement discourses can become controlling.

In questioning the “power to define”, research participants continue their disruption of “knowing the other” and argue for specificity, unfixing identity and the unified subject. Esmeralda describes the experience of allowing others to self identify and a certain freedom and space that comes with a fluid exploration of identity tensions:

That gave arc its specialness because people refused to be defined as either Māori or Pākehā or Tauiwi. There was a whole lot going on, so we tried to as a group of young people to be with that and relate in that place so people could be who, could self identify and be who they wanted to be in spaces. And so out of that you can learn and evolve and one day you can be something and the next minute you can be, you know, a fluid thing, and that is the realness of being alive here. (Esmeralda)

Allowing for specificity and exploring the tensions and fluidity in identity construction relate to the development of a critical consciousness discussed in Chapter 4 — the knowing of self, remembering all the waters of our origins. Recognising specificity and creating the space to self identify also make it possible to contest universalism and essentialism, to not consume the other into our “knowns” (seen in the previous chapter through the practice of a relational way of working).
The naming of names
Further to the politics of specificity, key informants also negotiate their responses to identity markers. Pearl recognises that identifiers need to acknowledge relationship when she calls into question “Tauiwi”, an identifier she is often both prescribed and utilises. For Pearl, “Tauiwi” does not acknowledge the relationship she holds with Tangata Whenua:

*I have never been quite sure about this thing about — Tauiwi. We are another iwi, yes, we are from other iwi, but we are not quite that much “other”, you know. I don’t know, how far back do you go?*

*I really relate more to Tagata Pasifika. Which I think includes us as relatives more adequately, and we can talk about the Treaty’s effects on Tagata Pasifika and we can talk about the coming here through the Treaty as Tagata Pasifika, but Tauiwi I think I am a little bit tired of it for some reason. Tired of being other iwi because we are not just any old other iwi…*

*You can say that there are ways in which it is not wrong to say that, and without acknowledging those relationships, those historical relationships, we don’t get to be any of those rightful things. We almost don’t know how to relate because none of the correct order is there...* (Pearl)

Again, we hear concern about dominant culture’s role in prescribing how and who can relate, where language can restrict meaning and can negate the opportunity for relationship. Greta Fowler Snyder (2012) presents a case for “multivalent recognition”, an identity politics of many meanings. She describes this as a “third way”, like Paradies (2006), and asks for an opening up of essentialised identities to incorporate many performative expressions. For Snyder, it is necessary to move on from the limitations of essentialised politics of recognition where those who don’t fit in are repressed or excluded, but she also critiques a full deconstruction that renders the politics of identity meaningless:

*While the extremes are acknowledged as problematic, articulating a practicable third way between essentialism and deconstruction is a perennial problem… I both challenge the positioning of the politics of recognition at or near the essentialism end of the spectrum and outline an incarnation of a third way: what I call a multivalent politics of recognition. (Snyder, 2012, p. 250)*

One related “opening up of meaning” could be the term “Tangata Tiriti”. The Introduction and the Literature Review introduced the evolution of “Tangata Tiriti” in movement discourse. Although its use varies, it began to be used after a Pākehā Treaty worker hui in the mid-2000s as an inclusive term to describe Pākehā and all those who may not fit under the embrace of “Pākehā”. Participants received and conceived Tangata Tiriti in different ways. For some, it opened up space and recognised complex and interwoven identities:
It felt like an opening of space. And it was cool, and I think, yeah, it felt like Tauiwi and Tangata Tiriti was, gave more space to kind of move with the stuff, or more room to kinda look at the myriad of difference and diversity in amongst all this stuff. So it was choice, yeah. (Tai)

The understanding of Te Tiriti expressing a political relationship is important to my understanding of it in terms of then seeing from that the positioning of Tangata Whenua and Tangata Tiriti relationships. That, to me, is significant I suppose in terms of those groupings giving more space for people to identify under Te Tiriti — for people with mixed ancestry, people who whakapapa but carry more of Pākehā identity, and people who are not Pākehā — Tangata Tiriti gives a place much more than the bi-cultural Pākehā – Māori understandings. (Rachel)

For others, Tangata Tiriti continued the politics of defining, naming and completing the conversation when more dialogue and more attention to relationship was needed:

Tangata Tiriti... so it’s more inclusive, but you see it’s all just discourse and I am interested in the relationships and how it actually is, rather than how we talk about it. The talking about it mirrors it, but, supposedly, but in this case is, did Tangata Tiriti come out of the need to find a term for relationships or did it come out of the need to, or the desire to have different relationships, do you know what I mean? Did the discourse come first? ... that makes a difference for me. (Esmeralda)

That was quite a refreshing concept, but still we were into defining, identify and define ourselves. Now think back through arc, always a critical issue defining ourselves — we can’t define ourselves. (Hinengaro)

The other side of key informants’ problematising of Tangata Tiriti is that it should not blur or hide the work that Pākehā need to do in addressing dominant cultural power:

I also think ... it’s important that while we’ve moved to using the language of Tangata Tiriti much more, to recognise what Pākehā culture is about and not lose that, because Pākehā have a distinct role in relation to Te Tiriti relationships and a specific place, and it’s Pākehā culture which has dominated through the colonial process, and there are specific journeys in terms of the long-term process for change for people who are Pākehā and specific things that need to be addressed and recognised. (Rachel)

Using identifiers and naming names requires attention to power and a care for dialogue. The stories of key informants have demonstrated that it is important that these meanings do not become fixed and isolate us from each other. Bell (2004b) calls for the potential of “becoming” as well as “being”:

Whatever identity labels we use, it is important that they capture the ways in which identity is a becoming as well as a being, and in the context of our settler society, a becoming that crucially involves the myriad practices and power dynamics of colonisation. (p. 136)
A process of “becoming”, in relation to our colonial history, and in relation to each other, resonates with Schutte (1998), quoted at the beginning of this chapter, who claims that the unified self is something derived from colonialism and constructed through language (p. 66).

**Imagining possibilities**

Resonating with Schutte’s reference (above) to the power of language, Esmeralda is concerned that the naming of names, employing the language of definition, closes the space for conversation, for dialogue:

> I think that is what discourse is often about, “Oh I feel so uncomfortable... let’s... come on, box this and label it and give it a framework so we can be comfortable with it,” but in doing that it is named and it is done and dusted...

> It sort of stops the discussion, and I think it still needs to continue. It’s not that Tangata Tiriti isn’t a useful term in the future and in certain situations, but I feel like that issue, that reality it is not an issue, that beingness in New Zealand is all the time, and there is still not an acknowledged space. (Esmeralda)

The concern that “labels” foreclose the possibility of dialogue and the reimagining of relationships connect with the arguments of Casas-Cortés et al when they position social movements with the potential to “move away from universal formulaic paradigms” (2008, p. 39) and to work with, rather than in spite of, difference (p. 40).

In referring to conversations with older generations of Treaty workers, Tai expresses the potential for understanding generated in dialogue:

> I think we had some yarns, or the next time I saw them, wherever it was, maybe it was up at Waitangi, those relationships had started, you know, and so you yarn with people and that’s how those relationships continue and that’s how that space gets opened up... (Tai)

Remembering the position of “happily unsettled” from the previous chapter, the challenge appears to be to engage in conversations, in dialogue, that may be uncomfortable. Through dialogue we may acknowledge tensions in position and meaning, creating space and understanding, although possibly not resolution. Recalling the concept of “agonistic” relationships, it may be possible to be together respectfully without consensus. Casas-Cortés et al. (2008) warn that without these processes of reflectivity, of dialogue, of dealing with inconsistencies, the “theory” of social movements is at risk of missing the reality of politics on the ground (p. 41).
Above, I suggest a possibility for continuing and opening up dialogue about the expressions of identity politics within the Pākehā Treaty movement. One possibility for unfixing simplified binary categories in the experience of identity politics is the postcolonial concept of “hybridity”. Promoted by Homi Bhabha (1994), the concept of “hybridity” is rewoven (and reclaimed) as a position of resistance, countering the “colonisers”’ imposition of essentialism (Meredith, 1999b, p. 13). Hybridity becomes a productive “third space”, where new forms of meaning can be generated and restrictive boundaries blurred (Bhabha, 1994). Recalling Smith and Stewart-Harawira from earlier in the chapter, we need to be cautious in applying theory from one context to another: “hybridity” may not serve the needs of a local decolonisation agenda. However, for Moeke-Maxwell, “hybridity” does not “foreclose the possibility of decolonization”. Rather, it makes it possible as “a place of resistance as bi/multiracial women strategically negotiate subjectivating interpellations that are heavily laden with gendered and racial specificities that serve the needs of New Zealand nationalism and its patriarchal elite” (Moeke-Maxwell, 2005, p. 508).

Earlier in the chapter, we heard Hinengaro ask, “I have got Pākehā whakapapa, why should I have to split myself in two?” Avril Bell (2004b) explores the politics of “hybridity” of Māori and Pākehā identities and argues that the pressure of the bicultural framing of identity politics demands an either/or position:

Bicultural politics then, have resulted in a separation and a ‘turning inwards’ on the part of both Māori and Pākehā (Spoonley 1995: 100-1), thus working against the establishment of identities and cultural practices that make connections between them. The mixing that hybridity represents cannot fit within the bicultural frame. (Bell, 2004b, p. 127)

Having the “choice” to choose an in-between position is particularly complicated in Aotearoa, as a distinctive Māori identity is expressed to resist assimilationist policies (Bell, 2004b, p. 126). However, the possibility of a position of hybridity requires further exploring and dialogue considering the potential it offers as an embodiment of relationship and the opportunities it presents for some as a liberatory process (Bell, 2004b; Meredith, 1999b; Moeke-Maxwell, 2005):

The concept of hybridity is liberating because it opens up a space to think about the way New Zealand colonial culture creates unequal subjects. The concept is emancipatory in that its existence (construction and performance) liberates the subject from a sense of unbelonging, dislocation and alienation. (Moeke-Maxwell, 2005, p. 503)
Connected to the concept of hybridity is Snyder’s (2012) “multivalent politics of recognition”, as discussed above, where different meanings can proliferate and co-exist in contradiction. Lloyd (2005) suggests that there does not need to be a stable subject to further our political aims (p. 2). This suggestion supports Snyder’s proposal to stretch boundaries, providing more space for “contesting the meaning and values attached to an identity category” and for a working “with, within, and through a particular identity: it requires offering ‘racialized’ but not delimited visions of identity” (Snyder, 2012, pp. 254-255).

It would appear that any project that works to open up identity politics needs to be grounded in dialogue and relationship with our history and Tangata Whenua. Snyder also cautions, as do Smith and Stewart-Harawira, that this proliferation of meaning should take local context into consideration (Snyder, 2012, p. 253). Key informants are sensitive to the politics of identity in Aotearoa while they struggle to find a “language” to describe their realities and relationships:

_We didn’t have a language or a frame to have those conversations in. Yeah, we all thought it was about Treaty justice, and I don’t know if we ever did finish that statement of who are is and what, did we?_ (Adelaide)

They call for a “remembering” of what brings us together, rather than a simplification of what keeps us apart:

_Maybe we can’t quantify ourselves as, maybe it is this other thing that is where we are striving for: justice, where we are talking about looking at our history, all these conceptual things are what brought us together, you know. This collective consciousness thing again as opposed to “This other part of me is Māori and this other part is Pākehā, or my ancestors signed this document.” No, it wasn’t about that — it was about really creating this collective consciousness._ (Hinengaro)

**Summary**

In this chapter, key informants have contested the idea of a singular, unified and contained subject. Through this process of “healthy questioning” they have both aligned themselves with manifestations of Pākehā Treaty movement meanings and proposed a critique for when the meanings attached to identity politics become rigid or essentialised. Key informants problematise simple binary constructions of identity that do not allow for divergence and difference and that have the potential to reinforce dominant cultural hegemony. The tensions that arise through this disruption of meaning provide the opportunity for agonistic dialogue,
for ongoing relationship, where tension may not need to be resolved but is the fertile ground for change, for relationship building imagining new possibilities.

I discussed the power to define others, the naming of names and the use of identifiers. Again, I positioned this as a challenge for our language to be open to relational understandings; potentially uncomfortable conversations and working with difference may reveal other possibilities. I explored “hybridity” and “multivalent recognition” as possibilities for opening up meaning through the experience of identity, while maintaining that these possibilities must develop in relationship to our history and with Tangata Whenua. The overarching argument here recognises the need to open up and unfix meaning, where fixed meanings do not serve decolonisation. Within socially just relationships, we can compose our differences in agonism, possibly generating more fluid possibilities, new ways of being. The following chapter explores an opening up and unfixing of meaning in relation to concepts of power, as key informants “turn towards complexity” conditioned by their commitment to decolonisation in Aotearoa.
Introduction

What grounds everything for me is land stuff, and in Aotearoa it is land stuff and colonisation. It’s just, like, everything must refer back to that or else it has no substance for me. (Tai)

In the image above, members of “arc” stand together on the edge of the foreshore, their backs to Prime Minister Helen Clark, naming their support for Tangata Whenua as the foreshore and seabed battle rages. As these Treaty activists look out to sea, they face the tidal zone, the space of change and complexity. In this chapter, key informants walk a coastline of flux, where meaning is in tension, and — as Tai describes above — where everything refers back to the land.

I begin this chapter by exploring the productive spaces of tension from my experience as a Treaty educator. The reflections I hold as a Treaty educator expose my direct relationship and interest with the tensions in the narratives of key informants and inform my orientation towards them. However, this is not a simple application of my own interests — I have felt unsettled by the tensions expressed here for some time, and it is the process of having lived with these stories, the words of key informants for such a long time that has given me some strategies for articulating my own discomfort.

As a community-based adult educator I come into contact with a variety of groups, such as community organisations, educational providers and, most frequently, students enrolled in an academic course that requires a “Treaty of Waitangi workshop”. In all groups there are different levels of willingness to engage with the “revisiting” of the colonial story (Huygens, 2007, 2011) we present as part of a workshop; for some it is a requirement that they must bear or dismiss, for others there is shock, anger, grief, guilt and a myriad of emotional engagement, locating themselves in the colonial story of Aotearoa. Rarely is it an either/or of engagement; more often it is a complex mix of feelings and thoughts. This research has highlighted the experience of “relationship” as a foundation for change, proposing the question: How do our attempts to create a “safe” relational space in a workshop inflect the students' reflections on power and the dynamics we co-create with them?

I am often aware of the power I hold as an educator to reproduce meaning and disrupt the “knowns” of the group we are working with. It is in this reproduction of meaning that I feel the most unsettled in terms of my own practice. I am aware that often, and particularly when working with a resistant group, a certain intensity pervades the stories I reproduce of the dominance of Pākehā power and the violence of colonisation. In my need for a group to take up a critical position in relation to our colonial past, my language can verge on the totalising of Māori experience and the universalising of Pākehā power and identity. In this convincing tale of colonisation, I come into contact with the moments when I have “missed” my audience; while some are outraged by this story, others may remain unconvinced or may become defensive.

Rather than solely locating this “missing” as a pathology of the listener (“they are not ready to hear this stuff yet”, or “are so blinded by their privilege”) I have been curious for some time about what other discursive forces might be at work. I have wondered if the experiences of those present do not connect with the normative categories of experience I communicate. Or if the inevitable binary of power and powerlessness, coloniser and colonised, that is created in the discourse of a one-day-intensive workshop limits participation and agency. The tension as an educator is that on the one hand we are trying to create the opportunity for participants to experience a space of discomfort and to engage in discomfort reflectively, having their “knowns”, assumptions, world view challenged. In the course of a day, we would like to think that we create the opportunity to develop a reflective and critical stand in relation to power and how it operates, along with a place to stand in relation to our history. On the other hand,
we are all committed to the realisation of Tino Rangatiratanga\textsuperscript{60} as defined by Māori; this is our overarching kaupapa\textsuperscript{61}, why we do this work in Tauiwi Solutions.\textsuperscript{62} A “Treaty workshop” is often a code, a way in, to our much larger goal of decolonisation, a hope that we start the journey with/for those who participate. This research has proposed the importance of ongoing relationships to a decolonisation practice, the tension remains: how can we invoke this relational space in a one day workshop?

We work frequently and, it appears, more frequently with very diverse groups of young people, many of whom may whakapapa Māori and Pākehā — feedback can be “I feel split in two”. Others in groups bring many of their own stories of marginalisation and privilege to their understanding of the Treaty relationship, sometimes as a way to engage with the colonial story, other times in alienation to it. I don’t necessarily think our role is to resolve the splitting, or make peace with the tensions. An overarching theme that emerges in this research is to position tensions as opportunities for dialogue, positioning contradictions and inconsistencies as productive (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008) rather than personal pathologies. In the previous chapter, tension with an essentialised identity politics became an opportunity to open up meaning and decentre our knowing of “others”. The questions that arise through this chapter, engaging with key informants’ narratives, are:

- How might we focus on colonisation and dominant cultural power while acknowledging the complexities of power and powerlessness?
- What learning is there in the narratives of key informants as they recognise complexity and problematise simple binary or dualistic constructions of the world?
- What do socially just relationships do to power binaries?
- Are there other frames that may speak to and illuminate the generative capacity of these tensions?

Definitive answers to these questions may be beyond the scope of this final chapter. Casas-Cortés remind us that the meaning making of social movements does not need to be a search for “clear universal answers” (2008, p. 39), that reflexivity is generative in itself. In this chapter, key informants interact with notions and questions of power, and I work to value a “dynamic interplay of tensions and contradictions” (Lachman, 2010, p. 164).

\textsuperscript{60} Self-determination. 
\textsuperscript{61} Plan, scheme, agenda. 
\textsuperscript{62} Tauiwi Solutions is an Ōtepoti/Dunedin based provider of Treaty education that I work for.
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In this chapter, I explore tensions and unfix meaning around concepts of “power” in the context of socially just relationships; this work leads us to turn towards complexity, approaching an intersectionality conditioned by a “return to the land” and making space for relationships between concepts and positions. I begin this chapter with the “convergence” of third-generation narratives and Pākehā Treaty movement discourse, discussing the significance of an analysis of power to understanding colonisation. Next, I explore how key informants identify “tensions” with constructs of power/powerlessness and the discourses that reinforce an oppositional binary. As key informants trouble the language of dichotomy, I look at how they construct a “knowledge-practice” that turns towards the complexity of power and their intertwined histories as people working in relationship. Following this, I highlight the contradictions and tensions in separate practices as efforts to maintain a focus on colonisation while also acknowledging complexity. Finally, engaging in dialogue with previous chapters and the feminist theory of “intersectionality”, I explore these tensions and argue that contradictions can be productive and agonistic, that through relationship tension can be held in dialogue.

**Locating power revisited**

The discussion in Chapter 4 titled “Locating power” identified that a significant strand in the decolonisation practice of key informants is a critical analysis of power and power relations. Hinengaro’s words brought forward the role of power in her understanding of colonisation and the importance of understanding how structural power operates:

> Again it comes back to what is the dominant, to me I look in terms of power structures and whatnot. So, who had the power, how are they applying the power and who is getting in the way of the peaceful application of that power? And how we are dealing with those kinds of problems? Those are the issues I want to be looking at still today: who has the power? How have they gotten that power? (Hinengaro)

Rachel refers to an analysis of Pākehā power and privilege, Pākehā cultural dominance and the focus that is needed to deconstruct and transform this.

> ... to recognise what Pākehā culture is about and not lose that, because Pākehā have a distinct role in relation to te Tiriti relationships and a specific place, and it’s Pākehā culture which has dominated through the colonial process, and there are specific journeys in terms of the long-term process for change for people who are Pākehā, and specific things that need to be addressed and recognised. (Rachel)
These approaches to understanding power converge with movement discourse: a structural analysis of power has been a significant informer of discourse within the Pākehā Treaty movement (Margaret, 2009). In the literature review, I discussed Huygens’ genealogy of discourse — during the 1970s and early 1980s, first-generation Treaty workers (anti-racism activists) developed an analysis of dominant cultural power informed by Māori activists, global liberation movements, feminist and Marxist theory and the work of Paulo Friere (2007, p. 118). As Huygens explains, at that time it became evident that “a new analysis [was] needed to direct attention onto the dominant social systems and practices which created such distress for Maori” (2007, p. 120). It was identified that analysis needed to move from an individualised approach that positioned racism as an individual action by prejudiced individuals and that suggested Māori were at fault for their appalling social statistics. An analysis of institutional racism and a critique of colonialism developed, inspired by global movements (Huygens, 2007, pp. 119-120). During the 1980s, this analysis of institutional racism, identifying the structures and systems of power that perpetuated injustice, became localised and the Treaty was adopted as the appropriate local language (Consedine, 2001; Huygens, 2007).

John Kirton (1997), and other Treaty movement-related scholars (McCreanor, 2005; R. Nairn et al., 2011; Rankine & McCreanor, 2009), utilise a poststructuralist attention to power in language and discourse. For Kirton, this attention to power in “Paakeha/Tauwiwi hegemony” allows him to illuminate the “unseen” of Pākehā cultural power, that which is assumed and “known” (1997, pp. 28-30). Connections to Kirton’s analysis of dominant cultural power are evident in Rachel’s words, “Pākeha culture which has dominated through the colonial process” and “specific things that need to be addressed and recognised”. As discussed in the literature review, Pākehā Treaty workers readily adopted ideas of language, discourse and power as frames to understand the perpetuation of Pākehā hegemony.

**Power/Powerlessness**

There are moments in key informants’ stories where the language and discourse of “power” verge on the dichotomous, where understandings of political relations do not mesh with the complexities of “power” experienced. In these accounts, concepts of “powerfulness” and “powerlessness” are positioned as an oppositional binary, limiting more nuanced understandings of “power”: 
It’s really easy to see that there is coloniser and colonised, powerful and powerless, poor communities and deprived communities... the oversimplification that generates without recognising the different types of power. You know, Pākehā might hold quite a lot of resource power, but there are moral and ethical powers as well, and there is power that is generated through deep and rich community relationships and the power that comes from people self-advocating and working collectively. So just recognising that there is many levels and layers at work. (Rachel)

The experience of essentialised identity politics summoning an oppositional binary was discussed in the previous chapter; here again, the binary relation can be present in the language of power relations ultimately and intimately connected to the politics of identity. While Rachel identifies the “coloniser and colonised, powerful and powerless” as easily signified, she also positions these constructions of power relations as an “oversimplification”. Sneja Gunew and Anna Yeatman (1993) bring to our attention the universalising tendency of the oppositional binary proposed by power and powerlessness, which absorbs difference into the “known”. They position the need for a poststructuralist and critical examination:

to shift current debates beyond the current preoccupation with binary oppositions that invariably absorbs alterity into the hegemonic and familiar. Whenever such thinking prevails, we are merely in the business of juggling with traditional categories... without changing the power structures behind such constructions. (p. xiii)

Gunew and Yeatman challenge an oppositional language and frame of analysis that fails to address the underlying power structure. A binary manifestation of power-powerlessness fixes power on one side, negating the agency of the powerless subject and different expressions of powerfullness. Avril Bell puts this paradox succinctly: “Binarisms... are the stuff of colonialism, not a route to its usurpation” (2004a, p. 103). This binary construction also fixes ideas of privilege and marginalisation, masking the complexity of these experiences. Edward Said (1994) proposes caution for national liberation and emancipatory struggles and the oppositional character such struggles can promote:

[V]igilance and self-criticism are crucial, since there is an inherent danger to the oppositional effort of becoming institutionalised, marginality turning into separatism and resistance hardening into dogma… there is always a need to keep community before coercion, criticism before mere solidarity, and vigilance ahead of assent. (p. 63)

This warning addresses a binary construction that dismisses complexity, dissent and divergence, and as Rachel describes it this language does not serve her experience of Treaty politics as an interwoven terrain of complexity:
I think I’ve learnt a lot about the need to be able to deal with complexity and ambiguity and difference. I think the more you do the work, the more you realise how little you know, which is sometimes quite hard. Recognising the complexity... because probably reasonably early on in the work it’s, “Oh, okay, I’m Pākehā and then there’s another culture called Māori and these have been some of the historical relationships and that’s what this means for now”. Then over time moving from an understanding of Pākehā as a monolithic culture and Māori as a monolithic culture and recognising the diversity within both those cultures and how you walk the lines when there is diversity of opinion between Māori that you’re working in relationship with. How you don’t exacerbate internal differences by your own position in the work. (Rachel)

Here Rachel expresses an attention to differences, a concern to “walk a line” of complexity. Rachel also refers to the concept of the “monolithic” culture, and critiquing the universalising of such constructs raised in the previous chapter, Esmeralda brings this idea forward in this depiction of how power and privilege work through her.

Previous to working with the Treaty I had no, did no thinking and had no consciousness about who I was in the world. I did not know I was white or that I was a woman, or I was just unthinkingly participating in the world, whereas now I have an understanding of how power works on me and how I work with power. What I was initially going to say is that I have an understanding of how I am oppressed in the world and how I have privilege in the world and consequently how that can be oppressive for others. (Esmeralda)

Esmeralda recognises the nuance of privilege and oppression; she experiences both and recognises the Treaty context for bringing these complex learnings to the forefront. Although key informants recognise that this deconstruction of an oppositional binary can develop in the context of Treaty work, there appears to be a frustration with some language of the politics of power that can reinforce notions of simple binary constructions.

**Discourse that reinforces the binary**

I found lots of the language really full of prejudice, really full of — even kind of conversations around migrant and refugee stuff was really crass on my ears and I just hated hearing it, but people were talking like and, you know, I guess the rightness being pinned on only one kind of — not Treaty signature — I remember something felt really discordant when I got back, and it took ages for me to become comfortable with it again. (Sebastian)

Sebastian describes the experience of returning to Aotearoa from time living with migrant communities in Europe and his struggle to re-adjust to a local language of power in an “arc” context, language that he experienced as exclusive. Possibly Sebastian is describing a
discourse invoking an oppositional binary that absorbed difference and complexity into universalised categories. Bronwyn Campbell (2005) in her research, “Negotiating biculturalism: Deconstructing Pākehā subjectivity”, talked with psychologists committed to a bicultural practice. Through a discursive analysis of this talk, Campbell uncovered a discourse of dichotomy and struggle, binaries operating in bicultural efforts that limited the relational:

[O]ur talk was thoroughly saturated with constructions of dichotomies. These dichotomies worked to distance bicultural Pākehā from other Pākehā, from Māori, from their own histories, families, and friends. The journey of “becoming bicultural” was fraught with the significance of struggle and battle; loss, displacement and discomfort. (p. 194)

By attending to this talk deconstructively, Campbell was able to unpack the binary constructions and comprise an unfixed position: “the dichotomous constructions of bicultural discourse were reconstituted as fluid, partial, and multiple possibilities for bicultural Pākehā subjectivities and relationships” (p. 194) were invoked.

Avril Bell (2006) challenges the binary opposition represented in bicultural politics and problematises expressions of biculturalism that do not recognise the intertwined stories of our colonial relationships: “Histories that only treat Māori and Pākehā as discrete and opposing groups will not serve the purpose. Nor will histories of contact that only represent Māori as victims and Pākehā as victimisers”(p. 266). Rachel also alludes to a sense of our intertwined histories and how the language of biculturalism is not able to encapsulate this complexity:

... because the language of biculturalism was very alienating and misleading, because it did make it seem like the Treaty was a document about culture, and yes on some levels of course you can’t, it’s complex and it’s in there... but when you think of signatories to legal document then those parties — it was a political document, basically, so the political parties... I think, and some people would argue, that if you were Pākehā but live fully under hapu authority, rather than Crown authority, at the time of the signing you could sit on the tangata whenua, the hapu side of the Treaty. So it’s that moving away from it being about brown people and white people essentially. (Rachel)

Pearl, like Rachel, wishes to acknowledge the complexity of relationships, where a bicultural frame proposed by the Treaty is unable to recognise the full expression of relationships between Tagata Pāsifika and Tangata Whenua:

We are not here because we have made a Treaty with Maori. We are here because the Crown opened up immigration and signed a treaty of friendship with some of our nations and also have colonised and continue to have responsibilities of government, of governance in some Pacific nations...
So there is all of that; there is all of that that comes under the same journey the same work, but it isn’t Treaty work as such, it is bigger than Treaty work.

That isn’t to say that Tauiwi don’t have a place there (Treaty work); we do and we come here partly through that, but what I am looking for, what I am waiting for, is to arrive... we haven’t been allowed yet to have a right relationship with our whanaunga, with our relatives, with our Maori... our Tangata Whenua and Tagata Pāsifika need that time to come together. In a way, it is inevitably coming with the onset of 2050 approaching very rapidly now, where we will see, as people have said, the browning of Aotearoa. (Pearl)

From this perspective of the bicultural frame, Pākehā mediate the relationship of “relations”, reinforcing Pākehā cultural hegemony. Pearl, like Bronwyn Campbell (2005), does not reject the notion of biculturalism. Campbell instead argues for a more fluid construction, for language that allows for multiple expressions of subjectivity and relationship. So what are these notions of complexity and the intertwined nature of our colonial relationships?

**Turning towards complexity**

Well, Tagata Pāsifika have a different relationship with Māori than, um, Chinese people, you know, or British people, whatever, so there has to be a consideration that they are whanaunga and, you know, where does that all fit in? And so how do we acknowledge all the stuff that we share in common under kind of white supremacy and racism, and then also let’s look at the ways in which we are played off, you know, and let’s look at the ways in which we benefit from the spoils of colonisation and all the opportunities that we have gotten because the British were, like, yeah, we’ll have that, you know. So how do we kind of find ways to look at all this myriad of stuff that all our ancestors hold that are really different through the times. (Tai)

Tai acknowledges the complexities of history, intertwined relationships, and the complexities of power and privilege. Echoing Pearl, Tai brings forward the different relationships of Tagata Pāsifika and the divisions and privileges that play out under a hegemony of white culture. Edward Said promotes the notion that our colonial histories overlap, that our stories are entwined, that a simple binary construction of the powerful and powerless fails to recognise this:

If at the outset we acknowledge the massively knotted and complex histories of special but nevertheless overlapping and interconnected experiences — of women, of Westerners, of Blacks, of national states and cultures — there is no particular intellectual reason for granting each and all of them an ideal and essentially separate status. Yet we would wish to preserve what is unique about each so long as we also preserve some sense of the human community and the actual contests that contribute to its formation, and of which they are all a part. (1994, p. 36)
In discussing Said’s notion of entanglement, Bell proposes that “entangled histories suggests a rich and complex engagement with the past, as well as informing more complex and nuanced contemporary relations than allowed for by binary ‘non-engagements’” (Bell, 2004a, p. 103). This is what Tai is bringing into question, how do we acknowledge this intermingling of our stories in ways that disrupt universalised notions and allow us to engage with rather than deny our history? For Karen Barad, the concept of entanglement moves beyond distinct subjects entwined: “To be entangled is not simply to be intertwined with another, as in the joining of separate entities, but to lack an independent, self-contained existence” (2007, p. ix). This idea foregrounds the importance of attending to difference and divergence, confusing the naming of the singular.

Key informants identify that this “turn towards complexity” was an embodied reality of the group (“arc”), that although a certain framing and language for the group identity was adopted, this language did not reflect the complexity within the group:

*In her research, Huygens (2007, 2011) identifies a key strategy for the Pākehā Treaty movement as being the development of “co-intentional relationships”, a frame or practice for addressing Pākehā power. As discussed previously, these relationships were distinct and separate spaces for Pākehā and Māori to work in. “arc” readily adopted this frame for relationships, and Huygens identifies this as a continuation of movement practice:*

> Young Pakeha/tauwiwi people active in Peace Pacific formed the basis for a new network of activists theorising antiracism and Treaty work. Calling themselves arc..., they have maintained the strategy of co-intentional work in relationships with Maori groups. Peace Pacific has worked in relationship with Tu Wai, and organised, for instance, a decolonisation hui at Waitangi in 2002 with Maori and Pakeha/tauwiwi caucuses. (2007, p. 139)

> It slowly dawned in the “arc” narrative that although they had organised themselves as a “Pākehā” group in partnership with a rangatahi group maintaining a clear and distinct identity, there were many more complexities trying to be embraced by a “Pākehā” identity. Adelaide explains the struggle to come to terms with a language that did not reflect the group experience:
Over years trying to work within a collective and lead a collective space — and it was never a collective Pākehā space, but that was what it was named and framed as — and to try and re-frame or re-address later was incredibly painful and difficult, and all those issues of power and colonisation played out in all their own ways within that Pākehā Tauiwi context, let alone within all the other contexts we were working within what was called the Pākehā Treaty movement. (Adelaide)

For social movements where language is central and there is a contestation over meaning Davis reminds us that “it is not about following a script, but about choosing how to handle deviations from a script” (2002, p. 23), and it is the ability to construct new meanings that leads to “innovative action” and “alternative futures” always in relationship to the past (p. 24). Although turning towards complexity may offer new possibilities, recognising the complexity of entanglement, destabilising simple notions of power, can be “painfall” work. There is also a sense of loss, a loss around the simplicity of the binary as a way for approaching the work. Dealing with complexity is hard work:

We were really good at deconstructing and critical analysis, so, I mean, I think that that gives me a richness and those are the learnings I take and bring with me everywhere, but there is also a sense of sadness and pain, like it would be much easier if it was that nice simple black and white stuff. (Adelaide)

Adelaide’s recognition of the struggle and difficulty of facing complexity connects with the “hard work” of decentering our “knowns”, as discussed in Chapter 5. It would appear that attempts to unfix meaning are a part of the emotional work of a decolonisation practice.

Separate practices

Key informants turn towards complexity and their intertwined relationships and stories, disturbing notions of dichotomy in language and practice. However, they also recognise the need and possibility for separate spaces, for constructions that acknowledge distinctions. This may be an embrace of contradiction, fluid movement or tension unresolved:

I feel like I can’t work in those black and white ways, it is not Māori and Pākehā, it is, and there is one space that really needs to engage in that, but there are other spaces that we need to engage Pākehā. (Hinengaro)

This movement between spaces, between separation and the intertwined, may hold the possibility of deconstructing the rigidity of a power/powerless binary. As we saw above, recognising complexity within the group complicated group practices. Tai and Esmeralda
express the conflict with the group practice of caucus and the uncertainties it raised for those with plural identities and a sense of “shift” in the way they wanted to work:

*Relationship is to me the crux of everything, and so the caucusing — and they all have their important time and they are all very important in their right moments — but it is not as black and white at all anymore for me.* (Esmeralda)

However, while turning towards complexity, third-generation participants also recognise the importance of co-intentional frames; the troubling of an oppositional binary did not fully reject co-intentional practices, but rather identified that context was important. Third-generation participants also recognised why these practices existed and that “complexity” did not negate the long-term goal of Māori self-determination. Above, Campbell (2005) brought to our attention the possibility of transforming the language of biculturalism from embattled separation to relational possibility. Key informants hesitated to outright negate bicultural politics, preferring rather to renegotiate the relationship. Jay Johnson (2010), an indigenous researcher, expresses his support for the full realisation of biculturalism as binationalism:

*The relationship between Pākehā and Māori has frequently been reduced to its primary “imperial binary”: coloniser/colonised. This binary relationship is not a simple opposition. Rather it consists of several relations, some more oppositional than others, but the primary relationship is one of domination.* (p. 285)

Johnson troubles the binary relation, but also brings to attention the primacy of a relationship of domination. In recognising the primacy of dominant culture and often the invisibility of dominant culture to itself (Kirton, 1997), key informants also engage in practices that enable them to identify this power and challenge:

*I understand the need for it and the history of it, and people who have a problem with caucusing obviously don’t have an understanding of the need for that, so that obviously points out their lack of analysis. In certain situations I would probably want to caucus if I was trying to talk about my identity and being Pākehā in a way that I felt could be culturally unsafe for others and for myself to tease out problems or if there were issues of conflict, you know, for safety purposes.* (Esmeralda)

Esmeralda acknowledges the need for caucus in some situations and acknowledges this need as relevant to “safety” for others. She positions some of the processing that Pākehā need to do, to look at their own culture as unsafe for those of other identities. Tai also raises this issue, clearly identifying the work that Pākehā were doing as “their own” work:
So I think there was a lot of ancestral stuff going on for a lot of Pākehā people in arc. Or maybe that was just my perception. Or maybe all the ancestors were floating around. And I was, like, woah, this is a bit intense. But whatever happened, I felt like there was a lot of Pākehā processing what was happening and needed to be happening. And for me, I was just, like, ohhh, this, youse have to go and do this. This isn’t a space that I can be in, kind of thing. (Tai)

While some work needed to happen in separate spaces, clarity about the implication of separate practices was needed. Although Tai is clear about the work he does not want to be around, he is also clear that in setting and defining spaces, clarity is required and complexity needs to be recognised, not just assumed:

*I think of a caucus now, and I think it’s, I think it’s really important, and I think it needs to be really clear what it is and why. And so you have women’s caucus, and what’s that for, and who does it include, and who doesn’t it include, and we talk, you know, “Where do the trans people go?”* (Tai)

While “turning towards complexity”, key informants have rejected an outright deconstruction of the politics of colonial power. Sylvia Walby (1992) argues that the fragmentation of class, race and gender from a postmodern/poststructuralist perspective has “gone too far”, that a structural analysis of power is also necessary in understanding the force that “race” as a social boundary maintains (pp. 32-33). Walby’s concerns resonate with Smith’s (1999) argument (discussed in Chapter 5) for a recentering of indigeneity as a challenge to the fragmentation of colonisation. In the previous chapter, Stewart-Harawira (2007) critiqued poststructuralism for its potential to hide the indigenous experience. Postcolonial theorists themselves also challenge a full fragmentation; Annamarie Jagose, referencing Homi Bhabha and Gloria Anzaldúa, recognises that “the attempt to project a postcolonial politics as the undoing of differences and distinctions is itself... to represent the very condition of the colonial relationship” (1993, p. 212). Tai captures the fundamental importance of the idea that through all challenges of complexity, conversation must return to the land, to colonisation:

*What grounds everything for me is land stuff, and in Aotearoa it is land stuff and colonisation. It’s just, like, everything must refer back to that or else it has no substance for me.* (Tai)

The project for key informants appears to be to recognise difference and complexity and to undo the language of a colonial power/powerless binary where it does not serve liberation, and instead becomes a discourse of control. This reminds me of the potential in social movements for discourse to become normalising (Benford, 2002; Davis, 2002; Polletta,
2004), whereas turning towards difference makes space for “reflexive and conjunctural theories” (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 22).

**Intersections**

_I think everybody’s stuff was really valid; it was just the times they were. So I don’t really know what we were trying to do, but I know that we were trying to make space for our realities, I guess. And maybe we didn’t, no, we didn’t always do that in the best way, but I think that’s what we were struggling for, even if we couldn’t put voice to it then. We were kind of going, “Nah, that doesn’t work for us. You have to help us find something that does.”_ (Tai)

Earlier Tai posed the question: “So how do we kind of find ways to look at all this myriad of stuff that all our ancestors hold that are really different through the times?” — this resonates with the request above for a space that fits our realities. How do we find this space if we are “moving away from universal formulaic paradigms” (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 39) and creating the “reflexive and conjunctural theories” (p. 22) that Casas-Cortés et al see the capacity for in social movements. If we are transforming our epistemology, or in Sebastian’s words “working our methodology”, to walk while questioning (Casas-Cortés et al., 2008, p. 39), disrupting our universal “knows”, what might these transformations/new paradigms look like? What do socially just relationships do to power binaries?

Key informants have brought forward in their stories the need to turn towards complexity, acknowledging entangled histories and relationships, resisting an oppositional binary while also insisting that this analysis of power “come back to the land”. As the image at the beginning of this chapter depicts, we are standing on the edge of the foreshore, looking out to sea, reminding ourselves of the position of Tangata Whenua, demanding justice while looking to the tidal zone of transition, which represents the complexity of relationship. The challenge from the previous chapter was to embrace an agonistic relationship between concepts, to recognise that the “tension between” does not need resolving, but may be a fertile ground for producing new concepts. Lachman, in discussing Edward Said’s “counterpoint theory”, also positions a frame for tension and contradiction to exist in conversation:

> It promises no overarching resolution, teleology, or synthesis: instead, counterpoint theory values the dynamic interplay of tensions and contradictions. Rather than simply overturning the established canons and hierarchies, counterpoint opens a dialogue with previously marginalized voices. (Lachman, 2010, p. 164)
By embracing the relationship of tension, we may be able to acknowledge the “space between”, making space for difference and new paradigms and maintaining the focus on land and the injustice of colonisation. Walby supports this approach, arguing that we do not need to return to a universalising “meta narrative” to avoid complete fragmentation. She describes a space “in between”: “We do not need to abandon the notion of causality in the face of the complexity of the social world” (1992, p. 48).

One possibility may be intersectionality, a theory developed by “women of colour” in response to white feminist universal claims that gender was the primary category for all women’s oppression. Intersectionality was first proposed by Kimberle Crenshaw (1989); the theory proposes a matrix of oppression rendering “gender, race, class, ability, sexual orientation, imperialism” among others as social and cultural categories that intersect and form a matrix of multiple experiences of subjugation (McCall, 2005). Although intersectionality does not propose a primacy of oppression (Carbado, 2013, p. 812), it could be a tool or model to understand the complexities of power and privilege in the context of Aotearoa. As Anna Yeatman (1993) argues, it is undesirable to find a movement that can represent and stand for all various needs for liberation: “It is impossible to find a practical bearer of this subjectivity, ie. a social movement which can stand in for and represent all the various and distinct issues of emancipation” (p. 228).

It may be possible to incorporate the matrix into our discourse and models as a movement, recognising the complexities of privilege and marginalisation and the intersections and interplays of power on the subject and the intersubjective. This concept could bring into focus the primacy of indigeneity and the collective rights of Tangata Whenua in Aotearoa (Johnson, 2010). Intersectionality, as Jennifer Jihye Chun, George Lipstz and Young Shin (2013) argue, makes it possible to recognise the complexity of power. It “provides the possibility to invent and inhabit identities that register the effects of differentiated and uneven power, permitting them to envision new social relations grounded in multiple axes of intersecting, situated knowledge” (p. 917). Chun, Lipstz and Shin position intersectionality as particularly applying to social movements where a “paradigm shift” is needed for social change work that “entails more than giving voice to the voiceless” (2013, p. 919). The concept could provide those with plural and diverse identities an opportunity to engage in movement discourse, echoing Tai’s words from Chapter 4 describing the need for an “access way”, for frames that engage.

Through developing the ideas of tensions and intersections, previous chapters come into conversation. Maybe a “relational way of working” is not only the relation of subjects but also
the relation of concepts and positions — where difference is not merged but is entangled. Rather than an “either/or” approach to meaning, meanings can be held in conceptual relationship. Perhaps through the potential for intersections, we see an opening up of meaning, in conversation with notions of “hybridity” (Bhabha, 1994; Meredith, 1999b; Moeke-Maxwell, 2005) and “multivalent recognition” (Snyder, 2012). Perhaps we may progress the idea of the “both/ and” rather than the “either/or” approach to social identities (Chun et al., 2013, p. 921) and may see tension as an agonistic relationship without the need for consensus, remembering that:

if you don’t have a good understanding, grounding of colonisation in Aotearoa, then your feminism for me is white feminism, your gay and lesbian rights is white gay and lesbian rights. (Tai)

In recalling the “Borderlands” proposed by Gloria Anzaldúa (1987) as a spatial possibility for “radical hybridization”, Jagose (1993) proposes that the border “is a legislative line which insists on demarcation and separation. Yet equally it is an interface, a conjoining of the categories it distinguishes” (p. 212). I propose that in the Aotearoa context the border may be the coastline, that any project that embraces complexity must hold to what is both separate and what is in relationship, where power and difference define and intertwine.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I have attempted to outline the discursive tensions in an analysis of power, how power operates and how to conceive of power. I have shown how key informants problematise a binary relation of power through turning towards complexity; I have also demonstrated how key informants work to maintain a focus on the primacy of colonisation. My aim has been to position these tensions as productive spaces that allow us to reflect and refine our practice, contending that more nuanced constructions may allow us to make creative links between different positions. This move towards more nuanced constructions surfaced in previous chapters in response to the research question, "What dialogue, tensions and convergence do these "knowledges" generate?" A decolonising knowledge-practice starts to emerge, a practice of holding concepts in respectful relationship, disrupting our "knowns", and opening up meaning. Like other knowledge-practices developed by social movements, this work is unfixed, conjunctural and situated.
The overarching theme of this chapter has been to explore the tensions in key informants’ narratives as they identify a need to unfix meaning around concepts of “power” in the context of socially just relationships. The recognition of a disjuncture in concepts of power and the use of language leads us to turn towards complexity, approaching an intersectionality conditioned by a “return to the land” and making space for relationships between concepts and positions. Calling for the potential to position the relationship between concepts as agonistic, I am left with the words of Adelaide as she positions tensions as opportunity to create space and new meanings and to acknowledge Tangata Whenua for this opportunity:

This work and Treaty is about embodying peace... creating new spaces and allowing for new conversation. I think it allows for New Zealanders in Aotearoa to redefine ourselves internationally in terms of our relationships firstly in the Pacific and more broadly, and I think that we are very lucky, because again in most of this work... has been informed by Māori and their struggle and fight for self determination (Adelaide)
Chapter 8 Contributions

Recently I returned to live on the shore of a rural estuary. My motives for doing so are complex. Such a location enables my wife and me to replenish ourselves in a more direct relationship with the natural world - the sea and its creatures, the bush and birdlife, the unspoiled landscape. But there is more than this going on. I am also returning to the shapes encoded on my psyche in childhood when I grew up alongside identical land forms and seascapes. And, when I look down the estuary, between the hills to the ocean beyond, I see more than a view that is beautiful and invigorating in its constantly changing aspects of light and colour.

I see also the elements capable of sustaining the gift of life. And, in the coming and going of the tides, in the rise of mist and the fall of rain, I see a reflection of the deepest mystery and pattern in all life: that of arrival and departure, of death and regeneration. (King, 1993, p.94)

The estuary: “meanings” and “knowledges” in dialogue and tension

I have used an image of the estuary as a guiding metaphor to remind myself of the tensions of this research and of the unfixed meanings and decentered knowing co-produced in relationship. The excerpt above reminds me of what is ever changing and of what, through the coming and going of the tide, may be regenerated.

The overarching themes of this research are embedded in socially just relational encounters; it is within relationship that we can come to recognise the need to unfix and decenter our “meanings” and to compose our differences as generative dialogue. Hinengaro suggests a relevant summary:

[It] is about questioning ourselves, it is about questioning our identities, our relationships with each other, with the land, our history. (Hinengaro)63

The process of continually questioning ourselves can “unfix” our identities, relationships and history, where rigid meanings do not serve a decolonisation practice. These themes have played out in each of the chapters of the thesis, supported by social constructionist and feminist poststructuralist notions of knowledge as situated, partial and subjective. My analysis of key informants’ stories brought forward two main concepts, both of which emerge in the

63 Quoted in Chapter 4.
context of socially just relationships, and these overarching arguments have been developed through engagement with the literature:

**The unfixing of meaning**: Within socially just relationships we have the opportunity to decentre our knowing, to disrupt our meanings, categories, and assumptions of each other, to turn towards vulnerability and responsibility. Key informants problematise simple binary constructs of identity politics, and in doing so argue for an unfixing of oppositional meaning and categories, calling for more fluid relational constructions. And by recognising the nuances of power and the complexities of group and individual experiences, the entanglement of histories, key informants also call into question rigid or fixed concepts of power, and of our colonial relationships. Again, they call for concepts that can address colonisation and dominant cultural power while responding to entangled relationships.

**The generative capacity of tension**: The process of “questioning” fixed categories and established meanings is not a full rejection or contestation. For key informants, their own meanings and knowledge sit in tension and contradiction within themselves, and at times with movement discourse. Acknowledging difference and the interplay of tension in agonistic relationships means that consensus is not necessary. Living and working in socially just relationships, responding to our entanglement, we have the potential to transcend a western imperial ontology, to compose new possibilities, to regenerate ourselves with “new ways of being”.

**Contributions to concepts of socially just relationships**
The preceding chapters have explored how these concepts of unfixed meaning and generative tension are as embedded in socially just encounters. Considering the entanglement of relationship, I do not propose causality, do not debate whether relationship or decentering comes first — in key informants’ narratives these notions are intertwined and interplay. In decolonisation practice, unfixed and decentered meanings flow from, and are critical to, socially just relationships. However, considering a response to my final research question “How do these “meanings” and “knowledges” contribute to concepts of socially just relationships?”, I suggest that significant contributions can be harnessed from this exploration of knowledge-practices, from the meanings held by a third-generation of their decolonisation practice.
The meanings that I brought forward in key informants’ narratives of their decolonisation practice in Chapter 4 highlighted how they apply their “knowledges” for decolonisation (the macro) to the microcosm of their relationships. A critical analysis of power relations becomes a performance of collectivity and care and attention for each other, positioning the “process” of being together as central: “if the process is right, it actually doesn’t matter what is inside it”\textsuperscript{64}. Knowing one’s own story in the picture of colonisation helps key informants to develop a critical consciousness about relationships, as did recognising the complexities of emotional engagement for self and others.

In Chapter 5, we saw that to hold a position of humility and uncertainty, to be unsettled by an inability to know the “other” are conditions for the embodiment of socially just relationships. By recognising vulnerability and turning towards the precarious in others, we have potential to be liberated from the confines of our own thinking. In giving attention to conscious and compassionate relationships, and in accepting our responsibility for others, we can disrupt the colonial mindset, the internalised coloniser, and come into contact with socially just encounters. Socially just encounters require a transcending of Western individualism and an attention to how we be together, to collective group process.

Chapters 6 and 7 challenged that an agonistic positioning of tension and differences in our relationships — where one position does not have to dominate the other, but they can be held in respectful and reflexive dialogue — could be the performance of socially just encounters. This composing of tension as generative, requiring a reworking of our methodologies for social change could provide new possibilities for transforming dominant culture. For key informants, socially just encounters recognise the specificity of identity work and embrace nuanced understandings of power. Oppositional binary constructions are troubled in socially just encounters; a space is created in-between, allowing for complexity. However, socially just relationships avoid fragmentation by maintaining a vision for, a dialogue with, the wider social change agenda, in this case decolonisation.

Although I do not propose a normative model, these conditions inform and are informed by concepts of socially just relationships: requiring creativity and reflectivity, making mistakes and getting it wrong. Where things are “broken”, with humility and courage, we will

\textsuperscript{64} Pearl quoted in Chapter 4
eventually be “developing— these bodies of being, or ways of being — that will walk us out of that”65.

Further contributions of the findings
Overall, by addressing the generative tensions of meaning making that develop within socially just relationships in a social movement, I have identified some important strands that speak to different audiences, which are discussed below.

The Pākehā Treaty movement
This research has highlighted the potential to extend our care and attention for the Treaty relationship to all our relationships, through “working our methodology”. This new way of being in relationship with Tangata Whenua can also be a new way of being with all others. A decolonisation practice for “decentering our knowing” can be extended to a focus on our relationships as a movement. This care for socially just relational encounters can disrupt our “knowing” of each other, turning towards what cannot be “known”, recognising vulnerability and responsibility. Collectivity and care for relationships become not only a challenge to individualism, but the only way to be in this work with each other.

The stories of third-generation members in this research challenge us to open up meanings, to unfix our positions, and in doing so to generate new and responsive knowledge-practices for our changing society. If we compose our differences as agonistic conversations where we do not need to resolve tension, we may generate understanding and new possibilities. This dialogue may allow us to regenerate and to further our decolonisation agenda.

Social Movement Studies
This research has been strengthened by the influence of social constructionism on Social Movement Studies, and its attention to meaning making. Casas-Cortés, Osterweil and Powell (2008) as activist scholars opened the opportunity to explore meaning making as knowledge-practices and blurred the distinction between academic theory and place-based knowledge. In congruence with this theoretical approach, the attention third-generation Treaty workers pay to situated knowledges and the conjunctural theories they develop have generated the substance of this research. This research supports a social constructionist approach to social

65 Sebastian quoted in Chapter 4
movements and encourages the discipline to see theory as developing from within, rather than being applied to, social movements.

**Peace and Conflict Studies**

Fetherston (2000) appealed to Peace and Conflict Studies to abandon a preoccupation with objective knowing. This research has developed this appeal, situating knowledge as partial, subjective and relational. I argue for a reimagining of Peace and Conflict methodologies, for a “decentering of knowing” in peace research and an “unfixing of meaning and theory”. I contend that we do not need to apply our theories and expert knowing to diverse communities and diverse places, that by decentering our knowing, we will be able to reveal place-based, community-based knowledges and practices. And by developing research practices that allow for relational and insider approaches, we may reveal other possibilities and futures. I hope that the contribution of this research method to Peace and Conflict Studies and the detailed description of this methodology can act as a signpost to others in the field who may want to engage in insider and relational processes. I argue that the “process” of peace research needs be peaceful and relational, as the learning from Aotearoa is that peace is all about relationships.

**Reflections on limitations and further research**

I continue to sit with discomfort over this research endeavour. Although this has been a relational process, I have constructed individual interviews with participants in a cross-cultural group. Through the academic process, my interpretation and analysis have shaped the voices of others, others who I cannot “know”. I represent and reduce rich and nuanced stories, experiences I can never claim to understand. Through all the efforts I have made for an ethical approach and for accountability, I have never been able to feel comfortable with this role. This discomfort has been both paralysing (at times) and productive, allowing me to continually question my power, and the politics of representation in academic research. These reflections lead me to want to explore the possibility of collaborative research approaches for such cross-cultural endeavours.

In selecting and arranging narratives, I consciously and unconsciously privilege and marginalise different participant voices. In choosing who speaks to what theme or analytical position, there is an element of being a conductor, the only active agent in a passive conversation. Although I may be critically aware of this position of power, there also may be
consequences beyond my understanding. I may simply reproduce the binary constructions participants contend, or further marginalise perspectives from those already occupying the margins in this work. Reflexivity and relational accountability can only go so far in creating consciousness of this process, given the sacredness of the “unknown”. Owning my subjectivity, exposing my positionality through my own storytelling, has hopefully positioned in the mind of the reader the influence of my role as researcher.

A significant limitation in this research has been the use of individual interviews. Although I have positioned participant voices in dialogue with movement discourse, this has been a passive conversation defined by my interpretation (as stated above). I can only imagine the insights, reflections and dialogue that could have developed through a different research process. Informants themselves reflected on the potential for a group interview scenario. The limitations of this research support the future pursuit of group and intergenerational dialogues.

Further areas of inquiry have arisen during the research process. While I have proposed processes such as “unfixing meaning” and dialogues of “generative tension”, I cannot fully imagine what the “new possibilities” these processes may produce could look like. What might an unfixed identity politics look like? How might recognising entanglement transform our language and discourse as Treaty educators/workers? What might a conscious acknowledgment of the spiritual look like in cross-cultural endeavours? Could we articulate a model for decolonising relationships? Or a group process based on a “relational way of working”? In all of these questions, there appears to me to be an inherent need for dialogue and collaboration. I believe (supported by the research) that responses to these questions could only develop through collective processes.

The call suggested by this research for relationships that are generative and generous fits within a context of Treaty movement activists working to transform the oppressive dominance of our colonial story and mindset. It is my hope that by producing conversations such as these — by expanding and unsettling our understandings of each other — we are inspired and regenerated in our work for change. I hope that through these relational encounters we create new meanings and imagine new possibilities. As we look to the place of waters meeting, we are “happily unsettled”.
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Appendix A

A guide for interviews

In recognition of the way we have always worked in co-creating agendas I offer these questions as a guide for what I am interested in exploring with you. I would also like to invite you to bring your our ideas, interests, themes and questions to the conversation. We will take some time at the beginning to review and revise the so called ‘agenda’ of our meeting.

These questions have 3 areas of inquiry:

1. Meaning making about Te Tiriti o Waitangi
2. Identity in relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi
3. Ideas about relationships and process

I will provide pens and paper for sketches/elaborations/diagrams/maps/doodles as part of the interview process.

Introductory questions

Mihi

Introduction to each other in relation to: ethnicity, gender, age, sexual orientations, generation within in the movement, spiritual/religious orientations, political and group affiliations...

Co Create agenda- what would you like to bring to this process/conversation?

When did you first become aware of Te Tiriti o Waitangi?

When, how and why did you become involved in Treaty work?

How do you describe your involvement in Treaty work in the present?

How would you describe ‘mainstream’ views of the Treaty?

Meaning making

When you first came to this work, what ideas did you hold about the Treaty?

What does the Treaty represent for you now?

Have your ideas about the Treaty changed over time? If so in what ways?

What has influenced your ideas about the Treaty:

Philosophies/theories/discourses  \(\text{when and how were you exposed to these ideas}\)

Relationships with Tangata Whenua

Involvement in groups/organisations \(\text{what groups have you been connected to}\)
Relationships with individuals/colleagues

Workshops/Hui (what workshops have you done? Who with?)

Events/Hui/Activism/Protests (can you describe particular events?)

Other influences?

For this research I have used the definitions “Treaty work”, “Treaty movement” and “third generation”. What is your response to these definitions?

Do you hold a sense of ‘collective identity’ in your work? If so could you describe it?

Can you describe/explain what ‘arc’ was?

Identity

How has Treaty work influenced your identity? Have these ideas changed over time, if so in what ways?

How do you define your own sense of belonging or ‘place to stand’ in relation to the Treaty?

A common practice in Treaty work is to caucus Pakeha and Maori. Where do you stand in relation to these definitions?

What does Tangata Tiriti mean to you? When and where did you become aware of this identifier?

How do you define the terms: Pakeha? Tauiwi?

Relationships

How has working in a Treaty context influenced the ‘way’ that you work? How have your ideas about group process developed? Could you give an example of a group and the way that it worked?

Have ideas about the treaty changed your relationships with others? In what ways?

When and how did your ideas and awareness of relationships develop? Have they changed over the time of your involvement in treaty work?

How has your involvement influenced your ideas about relationships with Maori and/or other cross cultural relationships?

What difference has treaty work made to your view of justice and peace in Aotearoa? What do you understand by these terms: justice and peace? What do you see as the major cross-cultural differences in these terms?

Closing and reflection on process
Appendix B

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage, I know that:–

1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary;

2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;

3. Personal identifying information [audio-tapes] will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which they will be destroyed;

4. This project involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions that will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. In the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable, I may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind,

5. I am aware of the feedback procedures available for reflections on the research process. I will have the opportunity to check a transcript of the interview to ensure that my words are accurately depicted and that I have the option of remaining anonymous if I do not want to be identified by my actual name.

6. I understand that this research has been funded by a Loxley Award from Quaker Peace and Service Aotearoa New Zealand.

7. The results of the project will be published and available in the University of Otago, Dunedin New Zealand library.

I wish to remain anonymous, (please tick here).

I do not wish to remain anonymous, but do wish to check the thesis before publication, (please tick here).

I do not wish to remain anonymous and do not wish to check the thesis before publication, (please tick here).

I agree to take part in this project.

Signature: .................................................................

Date: ........................................

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
Appendix C

Freedom Roadworks

Through the writing and the reading that have informed this research it has become clear that there is another story to be told about first- and second-generation Treaty workers who have informed third-generation identity formation. The people of Freedom Roadworks are some of the more significant informers of my thoughts and work as a Treaty educator and activist. Freedom Roadworks is a cross-cultural whānau\(^{66}\) group (made up of Māori, Pāsifika and Pākehā families) based in Ōtepoti/Dunedin, who have collectively home-schooled their children as part of their strategy for decolonisation. They are active in national Treaty movement politics as well as in their local community(ies). I understand their whakaaro\(^{67}\) of colonisation as an opening up of the binary of coloniser/colonised as they ask us to recognise the “losses”, the complex emotional work, of both the coloniser and the colonised. Below is an excerpt of their position on colonisation, taken from an educational resource:

**Colonisation is a process of losses and gains: settler peoples have gained new lives on new land, but both the coloniser and the colonised have lost:**

- ancestral lands, stories of ancestors, ancestral languages, connections with ancestral places
- a sense of place/home and a sense of well-being.

**Colonisation tells us there is only one way of doing things: the way of the dominant majority.**

**Colonisation is about ALIENATION & ISOLATION from the land and from each other.**

**Colonisation is about fragmentation, so that we don’t see the whole picture.**

**The violence of colonisation stays in the land.**\(^{68}\)

Freedom Roadworks’ process for decolonisation recognises the losses within and without, the losses wrought by the violence of colonisation for Tangata Whenua and the losses experienced by settler peoples. Suzanne Menzies-Culling explains: “We believe that holding the unacknowledged pain inside takes a lot of energy and makes us unable to move forward in relationship with ourselves and with others, in this case Tangata Whenua”\(^{69}\). In this shift from an oppositional binary, Freedom Roadworks locates the problem within the process of

---

\(^{66}\) Family.

\(^{67}\) Understanding.

\(^{68}\) These understandings about colonisation and the process of decolonisation are based on the work of Suzanne Menzies-Culling and Marie Laufiso — Freedom Roadworks / Beams ‘n’ Specks Workshops, 1991, Otepoti Dunedin.

\(^{69}\) Personal communication — Suzanne Menzies-Culling (July, 2013)
colonisation, and the solution in relationship with Tangata Whenua. This is not an escape for Pākehā from recognising the violence of the colonial story, but a demand that we know and confront our own stories of loss so that a relationship can be realised historically and into the future.

The kaupapa that Freedom Roadworks proposes echoes Ofelia Schuttes’ (1993) call to recognise the “alterity within and without”. It is also a reprieve from — and a challenge to — the politics of Pākehā guilt and denial (Bell, 2004). The significant learning that they offered to many third-generation Treaty workers provided a context that resonated because it connected with real, lived experiences for those young people and possibly provided a frame for developing the third-generation challenges and perspectives explored in this thesis. Third-generation challenges have not developed in isolation, but in relationship to what has come before.
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