

STATE

SCHOOLING FOR MAORI:

THE CONTROL OF ACCESS TO KNOWLEDGE

Judith A. Simon

Education Department,
University of Auckland

Introduction

In almost every crisis index associated with Maori education, Maori pupils as a group are shown to perform worse, receive fewer opportunities and benefit least in comparison to their Pakeha counterparts.

There is an abundance of statistical evidence today that shows the overall educational performance of the Maori to be considerably below that of the the non-Maori population. Statistical evidence also locates the majority of Maori within the lowest socio-economic classes in New Zealand society. For that reason a number of educationists argue that Maori educational under-achievement should be recognized and addressed as a problem of class rather than one of 'race', ethnicity or culture. They point out that a focus on 'race' or culture as the source of the problem diverts attention away from inequalities within the economic system and the privileges of those who have profited within it. In a similar vein, however, one might claim that a focus only upon class can divert attention away from the significant roles played by 'race' and ethnicity in the production and reproduction of these inequalities. In fact, neither approach on its own is adequate. Rather, I would argue, full understanding of the problem of Maori educational under-achievement is best sought by focusing on the ways in which the issues of social class, ethnicity and 'race' have intersected and influenced one another throughout the Maori encounter with European-style schooling. Specifically, it is necessary to examine together the way schooling, historically, has contributed to the development of Maori as primarily a labouring class within New Zealand society and the role of racial ideologies in securing that end.

In the discussion to follow I want to show how in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the aims of the State, in making provisions for the schooling of Maori, were in direct opposition to those of Maori seeking access to European knowledge - that while Maori were seeking this knowledge in order to increase their life-chances, the schooling provided was aimed at limiting those life-chances by controlling both the amount and type of European knowledge made available to Maori, this control being largely rationalized through racial ideologies. Thus the nature of the schooling provided for Maori was to contribute significantly to the eventual reduction of Maori to labouring class status.

From the time of contact with Europeans, Maori showed a keen interest in gaining access to European technology. By the 1830s, however, Maori were seeking access to not only European technology but, more significantly, to the thinking and knowledge that produced that technology. Largely for these reasons they turned to the mission schools. There are numerous reports from travellers and traders of the 1830s and 1840s, as well from as the missionaries themselves, that refer to the intense enthusiasm with

which Maori responded to the mission schools. They also testify to the remarkable competence displayed by Maori in acquiring the skills of literacy and numeracy at that time. The enthusiasm of Maori for schooling also led them to set up their own schools during this period. As one writer of the period, a trader, explained:

If one native in a tribe can read and write he will not be long in teaching the others. The desire to obtain this information engrosses their whole thoughts and they will continue for days with their slates in their hands. At this stage the interest by Maori in Pakeha knowledge largely reflected their desire to enhance their traditional way of life. After the Treaty however this outlook was to be progressively modified as Maori came to perceive European knowledge as necessary for coping with the increasing encroachment of European society upon Maori sovereignty and resources. Ward sums up the situation when he states that:
s co-equally with the Westerners.

To satisfy this thirst for European knowledge Maori enthusiastically contributed land and financial support for the establishment of schools during both the missionary period and the later period when the government set up schools for Maori. Maori, therefore, had very clear ideas of what they wanted from Pakeha schooling. At the same time, however, the providers of that schooling, had their own ideas of what Maori should be taught in the schools and both the missionaries and the government controlled the amount and the type of knowledge made accessible to the Maori in accordance with their own agendas.

Schooling provided for Maori

Provisions for European-style schooling for Maori moved through several stages in the nineteenth century. The first schools were village day schools run by the missionaries from 1816 until the mid 1840s, by which time the Treaty of Waitangi had been signed and colonization begun.

In the next stage (1847-1867) the government provided subsidies to the mission schools if they met with certain conditions which included providing industrial as well as religious training and instruction in the English language. The schools were also required to be subject to government inspection.

The third stage of schooling for Maori began with the Native Schools Act 1867. This signalled the beginning of a system of 'Native Schools' - village day schools - set up by the government ten years before the public schools system was established. Once again, Maori, in most cases, provided land and finance to support these schools. At the time these schools were set up the mission boarding schools were reorganized as secondary schools and again subsidised by the

SCHOOLING FOR MAORI FROM 19C

1816-1840s

MISSION DAY SCHOOLS

Literacy in the Maori language

Maori also setting up and running their own schools

1847-1867 MISSION BOARDING SCHOOLS SUBSIDISED BY THE GOVERNMENT

(If they met with certain conditions)

1. Religious training
2. Industrial training
3. Instruction in the English language

4. Subject to government inspection

Some of these schools were endowed by Maori.

A few independent Maori schools also operated during

this period.

1867-1969 GOVERNMENT-RUN VILLAGE PRIMARY (Native Schools SCHOOLS Act 1967)

(Known as 'NATIVE SCHOOLS')

English the medium of instruction

Scholarships made available for a few students
to attend church secondary boarding schools.

1877>> PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(Education

Act 1877)

From 1877 Maori were also legally entitled to attend
public schools. (The two systems coexisted until 1969 when
the Native Schools system was disbanded.)

Table 1.

government. Scholarships were also provided to enable the 'most
proficient' Maori pupils of the Native Schools to have secondary schooling

at these schools. The intention was to develop an educated Maori elite who
would return, to their villages and spread the gospel of assimilation.
After universal schooling was established in 1877, Maori were legally
entitled to attend the public schools but there is evidence to indicate
that during the nineteenth century at least, there were often social
pressures to keep Maori out of the public schools. The Native Schools
system continued running parallel to the public schools system until 1969.
Both the missionaries and the government set out to 'civilize' the Maori
through schooling. This involved persuading them to give up their
traditional values and customs and adopt those of the European in their
place. In other words schooling was aimed at the cultural assimilation of
the Maori. For the missionaries who perceived Christianity and
'civilization' as virtually inseparable, the object of assimilation was to
prepare Maori for conversion to Christianity. For the settler government

the object as we shall see, was largely related to issues of social control and land acquisition through the establishment of British law.

The assimilation agenda of the government is clearly evident in the requirement that the mission boarding schools should provide instruction in the English language and, indeed in the fact that the schools at this period were expected to be boarding schools.

To understand the concern of the government to assimilate Maori to European values and way of life, it is necessary to recognize that much of this period was one of crisis in Maori-Pakeha relations with Maori and Pakeha (under the new settler government) struggling for sovereignty over land and resources. This struggle which was to lead to war throughout most of the 1860s resulted eventually in the economic and political marginalization of the Maori. Reports of the government school inspectors of this period make it clear that the primary concern in assimilating or 'civilizing' the Maori through schooling was to establish British law and, by that means, to strengthen the power of the settler government. For example, Hugh Carleton, an inspector who was also a Member of the House of Representatives, wrote in 1862 of schooling for Maori aiming at a 'double object - the civilization of the race and the quieting of the country'. He suggested that prizes should be given for 'the best examination' in the book *Ko Nga Ture* - a precis of English law, compiled by order of the government 'for the use of the Native race'. George Clarke, a missionary, who was also Civil Commissioner for the Bay of Islands expressed the belief that '...schools will give the Government an immense moral influence in the country such as is not attained in any other way'.

It is important to note that during both these stages European-style schools were also set up by Maori themselves, independent of both the missionaries and the government. This is testimony to Maori eagerness to acquire the skills of literacy and numeracy and to gain access to 'Pakeha wisdom'. The research evidence indicates that the Maori search for Pakeha knowledge and fluency in the English language during this second stage, was largely because such knowledge was perceived as necessary for dealing with the threat to sovereignty and resources that the burgeoning Pakeha population represented to Maori.

The curriculum of the Native Schools (to begin with) was a limited form of the public schools curriculum and English was required to be the medium of instruction.

Control of Maori access to knowledge

The missionaries, in their early day schools, taught the skills of literacy in the Maori language only and confined the reading material to the scriptures, a policy which reflected their evangelical interests and paternalistic concern for the welfare of Maori. While Maori responded with intense enthusiasm during the 1830s and early 1840s they were soon to realize that such schooling did not offer the insights into 'Pakeha wisdom'

that they sought. One might argue that by withholding opportunities to learn English at this stage, the mission schools indirectly helped undermine the political position of the Maori in relation to the settler government.

The provision of schooling by the government however can be perceived as a deliberate attempt to weaken both the political and the economic position of the Maori in that it set out to control the amount and type of knowledge to be made available to them. Maori, nevertheless cooperated in such schooling to begin with, because it appeared to offer what they were seeking at that time - in particular, oral fluency and literacy in the English language.

Basil Bernstein (1971:363) has identified three message systems through which formal school knowledge is realized: curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. As he explains:
Curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge, pedagogy defines what counts as valid transmission of knowledge and evaluation defines what counts as a valid realization of this knowledge on the part of the taught.

The discussion here is concerned primarily with the knowledge perceived as necessary, and hence 'valid', for intellectual labour within capitalist society - what Poulantzas refers to as 'knowledge-power'. We can assume that it was largely such knowledge that Maori were seeking from European schooling.

Implementation of the assimilation policy in schools involved far more than simply the control of formal educational knowledge. It involved both the conscious and unconscious inculcation of dominant class Pakeha values and ideas through the structure and organization of the education system as a whole as well as the pedagogy and organization of the school. In practice this inevitably involved the invalidating of not only Maori cultural values and practices but also Maori traditional knowledge. Conscious efforts at such inculcation were seen, for instance, in some of the recommendations of the inspectors. The first full-time inspector, Henry Taylor, after criticizing the Maori custom of communal ownership of property, made it clear in 1862 that the notion of individual ownership of property was to be inculcated into the Maori children in the classroom. As he explained:
In the school-room, by a careful and persevering system of appropriation we may gradually train them to a proper perception of and regard of the meum and tuum.

It hardly seems coincidence that this recommendation was made in the same year as the first Native Land Act intended to open the way for the individualization of Native land titles and thus facilitate European purchase of Maori lands. This seems clear evidence of the school programme being planned to support Pakeha economic interests.

While the government agendas of social control and land alienation were assisted through the school in these 'informal' ways, Pakeha political and

economic interests were also served by the control of the amount and type of 'formal' Pakeha knowledge made available to the Maori through the schools. One of the earliest indications of such a policy is contained in an 1862 recommendation by Henry Taylor in which he stated:

I do not advocate for the Natives under present circumstances a refined education or high mental culture; it would be inconsistent if we take account of the position they are likely to hold for many years to come in the social scale, and inappropriate if we remember that they are better calculated by nature to get their living by manual than by mental labour. It was intended therefore that schooling should prepare Maori for labouring class status, this objective being rationalized through the racist claim that Maori were naturally suited to manual labour.

Such arguments were to be employed again and again in the succeeding years. We find repeated evidence that within government policy, the majority of Maori were to be denied the type of schooling that would provide them with access to 'knowledge -power'.

The role of the village Native Schools under the newly-formed Department of Education in 1880, as explained by James Pope, Inspector of Native Schools, was:

Thus in the Native Schools the assimilation agenda continued to take priority. Teachers were instructed to teach the Maori children to read, write and speak English and 'the rudiments of arithmetic' and to 'generally endeavour to give them such culture as may fit them to become good citizens'. The curriculum reflects some of the ideas of the period supporting universal education, aiming to provide 'sufficient' schooling for the securing of the effective social control of Maori while at the same time preparing them to occupy mainly labouring class roles within the society.

Reflecting the paternalism characteristic of humanitarians of that period Pope also addressed himself to the health problems suffered by Maori at that time. Under his guidance, the Native schools became centres for inculcating European ideas on health and hygiene. While this probably benefited Maori physically, it also served to reinforce the notion that European knowledge on health was the only valid knowledge on health. Simultaneously it served to invalidate Maori cultural knowledge relating to health. Thus through its paternalistic welfare programme the school not only reinforced the idea of the superiority of European knowledge in

general - particularly scientific knowledge - but at the same time cultivated Maori dependence upon Europeans as the repositories of that knowledge.

The very structure of the Native Schools system itself, including the place the teacher came to occupy within a Maori community, also served to reproduce the notion that Pakeha knowledge was more important, more valid than Maori knowledge - regardless of the particular values of the teachers concerned. Through all these aspects of schooling, and both consciously and unconsciously, Maori cultural values and institutions were denigrated at the same time Pakeha dominant class ideas and values were promoted.

The government agenda was made very explicit in 1906 during an enquiry into Te Aute College, one of the church secondary boarding schools for Maori boys. Here the principal, John Thornton, who clearly did not endorse the notion of the limited curriculum, had adopted a policy of rigorously coaching his most promising pupils each year for the matriculation examination of the University of New Zealand. This had produced during the 1890s the first wave of Maori graduates, including Apirana Ngata, Peter Buck and Maui Pomare, all three of which were later to distinguish themselves as Members of Parliament. At the Te Aute enquiry officers of the Department of Education brought pressure to bear upon Thornton to give up the academic curriculum and concentrate instead on a technical one related to agriculture. Arguments by the Departmental officers for limiting Maori access to 'knowledge-power' can be seen to be coupled with concern to prevent Maori competing economically with Pakeha.

George Hogben, the Inspector-General of Education countered objections by Maori to a technical curriculum with the claim that it was necessary to make them recognize 'the dignity of manual labour'. W.W. Bird, the Inspector of Native Schools declared that the whole idea of Maori education was to prepare Maori 'for life amongst Maoris' and not to encourage them to 'mingle with European in trade and commerce'. He asserted:

The idea was that [Maori boys] should learn only such trades as they might use on their return to the settlement. That is the whole idea of Maori education - to fit them for life amongst Maoris....If I met a Maori boy in Auckland, I should tell him it was his place to go back to his home and work there as soon as he could.

Emphasis was placed on Maori being educated for life in the rural areas 'with their people'. Yet at the same time Henry Kirk, Professor of Biology at Victoria University and a former Inspector of Native Schools, made it clear that the farming skills to be taught to the Maori should be 'on strictly limited lines' - that it would be a great mistake for Maori boys to be given the training in farming that was available to Pakeha through Lincoln College since they would go back to their villages 'to entirely different conditions'. The object, he argued, should be 'to make the Maori a handyman as far as possible'.

These arguments were all expressed as feelings of concern for Maori interests. Yet together the measures advocated could only serve to limit Maori life-chances in relation to those of Pakeha. They required Maori to be confined to the rural areas but not to farm economically as Pakeha did. Rather, with limited technical skills they were, apparently, to subsist on what land they had, and to be available as 'handymen' for Pakeha farmers. This contention is supported by the fact that until 1929 numerous difficulties were put in the way of Maori receiving the same degree of State financial support for farming that Pakeha enjoyed. The arguments reify the conditions under which Maori live as 'natural' and, in doing so, conceal the role of the Pakeha in limiting the economic opportunities for Maori within such a life-style. It seems apparent that as far as government education policy was concerned, 'knowledge-power' was to be reserved almost exclusively for the Pakeha.

A year after the enquiry, Bird was still asserting that...

[t]he natural genius of the Maori in the direction of manual skills and his natural interest in the concrete would appear to furnish the earliest key to the development of his intelligence.

In 1915 he affirmed that it was Departmental policy to discourage Maori from seeking access to 'knowledge-power' when he stated in his annual report:

...so far as the Department is concerned, there is no encouragement given to [Maori] boys who wish to enter the learned professions. The aim is to turn, if possible, their attention to the branches of industry for which the Maori seems best fitted

Some thirty years later, in 1931, T.B. Strong, the Director-General of Education was to reaffirm this policy of knowledge-control when stating: Whenever I have come in contact with the education of the dark races, Maori, Samoan, Fijian or Indian, I have noted with surprise their facility in mastering the intricacies of numerical calculations. This fatal facility has been taken advantage of in the Mission Schools and even in the schools manned by white teachers to encourage the pupils to carry arithmetic to a stage far beyond their present needs or their possible future needs.

Strong's reasoning reifies the subordinate status of Maori in relation to Pakeha as 'natural' and then cites it as a justification for perpetuating the policy of limiting Maori access to 'knowledge -power'.

Although, since 1928, Native Schools had been officially following the same curriculum as the public schools, it is clear from statements such as Strong's and Bird's, that Maori pupils, whether in the Native Schools or the public schools, were neither expected nor encouraged to reach the standards achieved by Pakeha children.

Departmental insistence that the Maori's 'place' was in the rural areas continued until the beginning of industrial development in the post-war years. In 1931, Strong was also claiming that education 'should lead the Maori lad to be a good farmer and the Maori girl to be a good farmer's wife'. At this stage, however, Maori had been alienated from most of the productive land and hence fulfilment of such an objective was not feasible except in a few selected areas. Furthermore, the onset of the depression was to largely frustrate the improvements in conditions offered by the 1929 Native Lands Amendment Act. Yet the curriculum for Native secondary schools in the 1940s was still oriented to agriculture and rural life with the same arguments employed to justify it.

The ideological dimensions of all these arguments are transparent. In denying Maori access to 'knowledge-power', the curriculum prescribed for them was intended to fit them for manual labour only. Furthermore, it was designed to keep the Maori in the rural areas - but not to enable them to compete there economically with Pakeha farmers, the emphasis in teaching being on limited agricultural and domestic skills.

The whole thrust of this curriculum orientation appears to have been directed towards serving four major functions. Firstly it functioned to

diminish the chances of Maori competing with Pakeha not only in the trades and professions but also in farming. Secondly, it was directed towards requiring Maori to be self-sufficient but at a subsistence level only, thus neither an economic liability nor an economic threat to Pakeha. Thirdly, it supported the development of a reserve army of seasonal agricultural labour during the time when New Zealand's economy relied heavily on agriculture. Fourthly, it was directed at avoiding the possibilities of 'racial' tensions in urban areas and thus to maintaining social control. (Social control was further assisted by the school through the inculcation of Pakeha values and practices, particularly those relating to English law.) Thus the type of schooling provided for Maori, although presented as serving Maori interests was directed primarily at the securing and maintaining of Pakeha economic and political interests.

In the 1930s the assimilation policy in Native education was called into question through both the Maori 'cultural revival' initiated by Ngata and the new educational theories influenced by social anthropology. As a result, policy was changed to permit selected elements of Maori culture to be included within the curriculum of the Native Schools. It was, however, the Department of Education which did the selecting of these elements, thus reserving the right to determine what constituted valid Maori knowledge. Those elements deemed appropriate for inclusion in the curriculum were traditional myths and legends, arts, crafts and music. Maori language was not included.

Twenty-five years later, we find this policy change being explained by Senior Inspector of Maori Schools, E.W. Parsonage, as coming about because of 'the need for a regenerative force and a new approach to the Maori problem'. Fostering 'selected Maori cultural aspects' was 'the surest way of reviving Maori pride in themselves', he says, adding that such pride was essential if the Maori 'was to be lifted from the despondency into which he had retreated'. Parsonage further adds: 'The policy also fully appreciated the fact that the Maori had to be fitted to live under prevailing conditions, where the Pakeha way was dominant'. Thus without questioning the reasons for the depressed state of the Maori, he signals the hegemonic intentions of the policy.

The intentions behind this policy of the 1930s can be seen to be similar to those behind the Hunn Report's 'integration' policy in 1960. They have also been implicit in later education policies of the Department of Education that have advocated the inclusion of 'Maoritanga' or 'Taha Maori' in the curriculum. This is not to deny that these education policies have had the support of some Maori. Such policies in fact have been introduced largely in response to Maori demands for recognition of their culture and, indeed, Maori have in some cases played a part in their formulation. Overall, however, these policies have been under the control of Pakeha. Hence the boundaries of Maori cultural 'content' in the curriculum have been determined by Pakeha and that 'content' then 'filtered' and reified through Pakeha perspectives before reaching the children.

Whilst the above discussion has been concerned with the schooling provided specifically for Maori it should not be forgotten that Maori also attended the public schools. In fact from 1927 onwards increasingly more Maori were attending the public schools than the Native Schools. This means, if course that Maori were subject to the same curriculum as the non-Maori children. One might assume therefore that those Maori attending public schools experienced equality of opportunity with Pakeha children in their schooling. In fact this was not the case. While the Native Schools included programmes for teaching Maori the English language, no such programmes operated within the public schools. Furthermore there is substantial evidence that Maori children in public schools were often subjected to low expectations from teachers who were seldom concerned to improve their educational performances. Maori children in the public schools were largely left to 'sink or swim'. There is evidence also that Maori children in the public schools were also subjected to a good deal of racial discrimination from both teachers and fellow-pupils. Thus the situation of the Maori child was often worse than that of the working class Pakeha child suffering a similar degree of economic hardship.

Practice versus official policy

In spite of the intentions behind the policies on 'Native' education, there are indications those Maori who did manage to succeed within the education system, mostly came through the village Native Schools and the denominational secondary boarding schools. The relative success experienced within the Native Schools, suggests that not all teachers were constrained by Departmental requirements to limit the amount and type of knowledge transmitted to Maori children. It would seem that, on the contrary, some of their number strove to extend the learning of their pupils to the fullest of their abilities. The fact that in some Maori communities the parents were able to wield some control over their schools probably contributed to this situation. Such parents could conceivably bring pressure to bear on their teachers if necessary, to ensure that their children were taught to the scholarship standards that gained them entry to the boarding schools.

Thornton must be seen as an outstanding example of a teacher who subverted the State's efforts to limit the amount of 'knowledge-power' to be made available to Maori. Thornton's explanation of his decision to prepare his students for the university matriculation examination reveals a concern for the Maori that is in marked contrast to that expressed by the officers of the Department of Education:

What led me to this idea was that I felt the Maoris should not be shut out from any chance of competing with English boys in the matter of higher education. I saw that the time would come when Maoris would wish to have their own doctors, their lawyers, and their own clergymen, and I felt it was only just to the race to provide facilities for them to do so, especially in an institution which was a Maori endowment.

Thus individual teachers and Maori themselves were able, to some extent, to subvert the State policies of knowledge-control, enabling a proportion of Maori to gain access to 'knowledge-power' and hence to a greater range of opportunities for their futures.

Policy outcomes and the costs to Maori

Access to 'knowledge- power' was not achieved without cost to the Maori. In the first place, Maori, in their pursuit of Pakeha knowledge, risked losing access to traditional Maori knowledge. Jackson notes that in the 1830s the enthusiasm for the mission schools created an hiatus in Maori cultural continuity. 'By pushing traditional lore and values to the margins', he says, 'the Maori lost much of the traditional system of knowledge and belief and never fully regained it'. Furthermore, the changes in the education system meant that the kainga(village) Maori gained the skills of literacy and numeracy at the expense of traditional practical knowledge needed for everyday living and survival. Thus acquiring such knowledge could undermine the economic independence of the Maori. Jackson notes also that, because prestige came to be attached to those with the skills of literacy, including in many cases slaves, the new learning represented a challenge to the traditional codes of mana and tapu and, hence to the status of chiefs and tohunga. In this it had the potential to undermine the traditional social structure and thus threaten Maori political independence.

The success of the Te Aute students in the field of Pakeha education under Thornton was not without cost. Not only were these students alienated from their traditional cultural knowledge during their time at school but, in response to the school's powerful indoctrination of Pakeha values, some of them were eventually to join forces with Pakeha in denigrating that knowledge along with traditional customs and values. One needs only to read the papers presented at the Conferences of the Te Aute Students Association to appreciate the extent to which these students, through the processes of schooling, had come to adopt the Pakeha dominant class attitudes and values.

While it would be easy to explain this situation simply as evidence of Pakeha success in extending the dominant class hegemony to the Maori, it is important to consider these processes in relation to the particular social

conditions experienced by Maori at that time. Taking account of the fact that the Maori population appeared to be in real danger of extinction, particularly in the face of new 'Pakeha' diseases, survival was clearly the primary concern. This fact, together with Thornton's powerfully expressed social Darwinist beliefs that Maori survival depended upon the adoption of the European way of life, would make the students' responses seem entirely reasonable. The circumstances they faced are well explained in the following excerpt from a memorial tribute to Ngata:

[The] numerical decrease - the loss of the major part of their lands, the wars with the Europeans, and the enormous difficulties facing any people in

the change from one economy and culture to another - produced in the Maori a state of hopelessness and apathy. The future held nothing for them as Maori and there seemed to be but these alternatives: to drift towards inevitable extinction, or to become Europeans as quickly as possible, abandoning any form of Maori culture as being a hindrance in the struggle to survive.

By this stage, therefore, the options open to Maori in regard to Pakeha education were severely limited. Control over their own lives appeared to be tied to Pakeha 'knowledge-power' but gaining access to that 'knowledge-power' carried the risk of loss of access to traditional knowledge. Furthermore, the processes of gaining the 'knowledge-power' involved taking on board Pakeha dominant class values and practices. Inevitably, many Maori who succeeded within the education system did so by these means. To resist or shed those dominant class values while at the same time seeking access to Pakeha 'knowledge-power', was no easy task - but nevertheless was achieved by some Maori. Ngata recognized the importance for Maori of maintaining a tension between their search for Pakeha knowledge and their hold on their traditional knowledge and identity and this is made clear in the words of guidance he wrote down for his grandchild.

Grow up young people in tune with your world,
Learn the skills of the Pakeha for your livelihood,
Learn the language and culture of your ancestors for your inspiration and dignity,
Have faith in God, Creator of all things.

The majority of Maori, however, did not succeed within the education system. By the 1920s, not only was Maori school achievement well below that of the Pakeha, but Maori attitudes to schooling were characterized by widespread negativity or apathy. This was a remarkable contrast to the enthusiasm and aptitude that Maori had displayed in learning the skills of literacy and numeracy in the pre-colonial period when their thirst for Pakeha knowledge was almost insatiable. In the intervening years, Maori had, time and time again, contributed resources in response to offers of schooling that promised to fulfil their aspirations. Those promises, however had seldom been realized, and it had never been the intention of the government that they would.

Widespread low achievement in education, as has been observed, was to a large extent the outcome of the State policy of controlling the nature and amount of educational knowledge made available to Maori children, with opportunities for achievement being further restricted by the pedagogies through which educational knowledge was transmitted. Added to these, were the low-teacher expectations of Maori children, generated and supported by 'racial' ideologies, which led to low educational goals being set by the teachers, particularly within public schools. At the same time the assimilation policy in representing a constant assault upon the traditions, values and language of their ancestors must have served to further weaken morale and self-esteem. It was inevitable that, over time, these low expectations, would come to be accepted and reproduced by the Maori children themselves, especially with their being confronted daily with apparent evidence of Pakeha 'superiority' and Maori 'inferiority'. Maori

aspirations thus became progressively lowered till they reached the stage where Maori themselves seemed to accept that manual labour was their natural vocation and that intellectual labour was the domain of the Pakeha. Over generations these ideas have compounded to be reproduced through the family.

In Gramscian terms, the school can be seen as a means of extending Pakeha dominant class hegemony over Maori children who then reproduce the teachers' perceptions of Maori capabilities and roles within the society. Thus they develop distorted, ideological views of themselves. Larrain reminds us that 'the distortion which ideology entails is not the exclusive patrimony of any class in particular, though ideology serves only the interests of the ruling class'. To the extent that Maori, through the teachings of the school, internalize and reproduce Pakeha dominant class values, they cooperate in their own oppression. They develop low estimations of their own worth as Maori and the low teacher-expectations of their achievement levels tend to become self-fulfilling prophecies. By the 1920s experience of State schooling could represent for most Maori little more than a series of undelivered Pakeha promises. Nevertheless it provided some glimpses of freedom in the humanitarian concern and striving for Maori interests of some individuals working within the system. It must be remembered, however, that the education system is just one of the areas of Pakeha authority that significantly touched the lives of Maori and that the various experiences of Maori within the education system cannot be separated from their other experiences of government and Pakeha settlers - those relating to the land, the law, employment and economic hardship, which left in many Maori a residue of bitterness and anger that remained for generations. While a small minority had reason to emerge with still some hope and positive thinking towards schooling, within the great majority the initial enthusiasm had long since been replaced by disillusionment, apathy or resistance. (Such resistance, however, did at least serve to keep some of their own cultural practices alive.) The school therefore was not the sole focus of negativity but rather Maori negative dispositions towards it were part of a wider resistance to Pakeha authority and oppression in general. The school represented but one site where that authority and oppression were exercised.

Summary and Conclusions

We have seen that over 170 years or so the Maori response to European-style schooling has changed considerably. Whereas Maori in the 1830s, fired with a thirst for 'Pakeha wisdom', displayed both enthusiasm and aptitude in learning the skills of literacy, a century later their responses to schooling were largely characterized by resistance and apathy. During the 1830s, it must be remembered, Maori were sovereign peoples, in control of their own destinies, a situation that was to change significantly in the next decade. While the enthusiasm of the period was never again to be matched in its intensity, Maori continued to seek schooling during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as a means of dealing with the

problems surrounding increasing European settlement. Whereas 'Pakeha knowledge' was sought in the early colonial period largely as a means of coping with and resisting the expansion of Pakeha settlement, this agenda was to be progressively modified so that by the end of the century, it was concerned primarily with improving the position of Maori within the developing society rather than resisting European encroachment. Always in embracing Pakeha schooling Maori were seeking to gain greater control over their own lives - to improve their life-chances. Their disillusionment with Pakeha schooling developed however as its promises failed to be realized. The reasons for this failure stemmed from the conflict between Maori aspirations in regard to schooling and the very different agendas of those providing the schooling for Maori - particularly those of the State. As we have seen, while Maori sought schooling as a means of gaining access to 'Pakeha wisdom', the State in providing that schooling sought to fulfil its assimilation policy. While Maori were seeking to expand their horizons by adding 'Pakeha wisdom' to their existing body of knowledge, the State sought to replace Maori culture and knowledge with that of the European. In seeking to do so, however, the State was also concerned to limit both the amount and type of European knowledge made available to Maori. Such objectives were rationalized through racial ideologies claiming that Maori were more suited by nature to manual work than mental work. That Maori were to become largely proletarianized in the years following World War II when the needs of industry brought them to the urban areas, must be seen as

a logical outcome of the earlier education policies and those directed at land alienation.

With urbanization Maori children have attended public primary schools and large secondary schools. Many of these schools have been multi-ethnic in that the children attending have come from a number of ethnic groups including those of the Pacific Islands as well as Pakeha. At these schools they have been subjected to 'streaming' and standardized intelligence or achievement tests that have placed most of them in the low streams. There they have been subjected to curricula that focus primarily on practical rather than intellectual skills and thus channel them towards a future as manual workers - or unemployed. This has been achieved largely through the '"natural" workings out of the curricular and guidance programmes of the school'. Such schools until the 1980s at least, largely claimed to be 'neutral' establishments in that they did not deliberately favour one group of children above another. Their 'sorting' processes were claimed to be scientifically objective with the students being classified according to their 'abilities' and not according to 'race', ethnicity or socio-economic status. This claim for scientific testing procedures reflects the ideology of technological or instrumental reason. In representing the decisions made on the basis of these tests as fair and objective, it conceals their political nature and the fact that they are biased towards dominant class interests.

While the ideologies of 'race' are no longer officially promoted as rationales for controlling Maori access to 'knowledge-power', they are still in operation within the system. However, during the second half of

this century they have been largely replaced by 'cultural' ideologies. Thus they have been articulated since the 1960s largely in terms of 'cultural deprivation' or cultural 'deficits'.

Since the 1950s numerous education policy changes aimed at reversing the trend of under-achievement in Maori have been formulated. Yet in spite of some genuine efforts from educationists to accelerate the performances of their Maori pupils, gains have been small and there has been little if any evidence in Maori within the State education system, of the wide-spread enthusiasm and fervour for Pakeha schooling that characterized their responses to mission schools of the 1830s. This situation is not to be wondered at. The problem of Maori educational under-achievement is tied to the asymmetry in the social relations of Maori and Pakeha. It is a product of the many injustices involved in the processes by which Pakeha economic and political dominance was achieved - not merely those of the education system alone. Efforts within the education system, therefore, cannot be expected to produce significant changes until the problem of unequal power relations is addressed and Maori themselves secure a significant measure of control over the schooling of their children.

References

- AJHR - Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives.
- Apple, Michael, 1985 (1982). *Education and Power*. Boston, London and Henley, Ark Paperbacks.
- Barrington, John, 1988. "Learning the 'Dignity of Labour': Secondary Education Policy for Maoris" in *New Zealand Journal of Education Studies*, 23 (1): 45-58.
- Bird, W. W., 1928. "The Education of the Maori" in Davey, I. (ed.), *Fifty Years of National Education in New Zealand: 1878-1828*. Auckland, Whitcombe & Tombs Ltd.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Translated by Richard Nice). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, William, 1845. *New Zealand and its Aborigines*. London, Smith Elder & Co.
- Held, David, 1982. *Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas*. London, Hutchinson.
- Hohepa, Pat, 1978. "Maori and Pakeha: The One-People Myth" in King, Michael (ed.), *Tihe Mauri Ora: Aspects of Maoritanga*. New Zealand, Methuen.
- Jackson, Michael D., 1975. "Literacy, Communications and Social Change: A Study of the Meaning and Effect of Literacy in Early Nineteenth Century Maori Society" in Kawharu, I.H., *Conflict and Compromise: Essays on the Maori Since Colonisation*. Wellington, A.H. & A.W. Reed.
- Larrain, Jorge, 1983. *Marxism and Ideology*. Basingstoke, Macmillan.
- Lauder, Hugh C., David C. Hughes and Stephen J. Taberner, 1985. "Education, Class and Inequality in New Zealand: A Preliminary Report " in *Delta* 36: 31-37.
- McCarthy, Thomas, 1978. *The Critical Theory of Jürgen Habermas*. Massachusetts, M.I.T.
- McGeorge, Colin, 1981. "Race and the Maori in the New Zealand Primary

School Curriculum Since 1877" in *Australia and New Zealand History of Education Society*, 10 (1): 13-23.

McKenzie, J.D.S., 1982. "More than a Show of Justice? The Enrolment of Maoris in European Schools Prior to 1900" in *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 17: 1-20.

Metge, Joan, 1964. *A New Maori Migration: Rural and Urban Relations in Northern New Zealand*. London, University of London: The Athlone Press.

Miller, Don and Jan Branson, 1987. "Pierre Bourdieu: Culture and Praxis" in Austin- Broos, Diane J. (ed.), *Creating Culture: Profiles in the Study of Culture*. Sydney, Allen & Unwin.

Parr, C.J., 1961. "A Missionary Library: Printed Attempts to Instruct the Maori, 1815-1845" in *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 70 (3): 429-450.

Parsonage, E.W., 1956. "The Education of Maoris in New Zealand" in *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 65 (1) March, 1956. (Reprinted extract).

Poulantzas, Nicos, 1978. *State Power, Socialism*. London, Verso.

Silver, Harold, 1983. *Education as History: Interpreting Nineteenth and Twentieth-Century Education*. London & New York, Methuen.

Simon, Judith A., 1982. "Policy, Ideology and Practice: Implications of the Views of Primary Schools Teachers of Maori Children". Unpublished MA thesis, University of Auckland.

Simon, Judith A., 1986. *Ideology in the Schooling of Maori Children*. Delta Monograph No. 7. Palmerston North, Massey University.

Simon, Judith A., 1990. "The Place of Schooling in Maori-Pakeha Relations". Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Auckland.

Smith, G.H. and L.T., 1990. "Ki te whai ao, ki te ao marama: Crisis and Change in Maori Education": Section Four of Jones, A. et al, *Myths and Realities: Schooling in New Zealand*. Palmerston North, Dunmore.

Strong, T.B., 1931. "The Education of South Sea Island Natives" in Jackson, Patrick M. (ed.), *Maori and Education: Or the Education of Natives in New Zealand and its Dependencies*. Wellington, Ferguson & Osborn Ltd.

Ward, Alan, 1974. *A Show of Justice: Racial 'Amalgamation' in Nineteenth Century New Zealand*. Auckland, Auckland University Press/ Oxford University Press.

Williams, D.O. 1936. "Land Settlement and Settlement Finance" in Belshaw, H., D.O.Williams, F.B.Stephens, E.J.Fawsett and H.R.Rodwell, *Agricultural Organization in New Zealand: A Survey of Land Utilization, Farm Organization, Finance and Marketing*. Melbourne, Melbourne University Press for NZ Institute of Pacific Relations.

Williams, John A., 1969. *Politics of the New Zealand Maori: Protest and Cooperation 1891-1909*. Auckland, Auckland University Press.

Smith, G.H and L.T. (1990: 127).

Lauder et al. (1985:35).

See Jackson, M. (1975: 28-31).

See Parr (1961) for a discussion of these reports.

Brown (1985:98).

Jackson (1975:29)

Williams (1969: 8).

Ward (1974: viii).

The policy that the public schools should not be 'racially' segregated has been attributed to the humanitarian idealism evident at the time of the Treaty. McKenzie(1982:12) points out however that parliamentarians largely supported the idea of an integrated system because they believed (incorrectly as it turned out) that it would be cheaper to run. McKenzie also discusses the social pressures that kept Maori out of the public schools.

One of the first clear expressions of the assimilation policy was in the Native Trust Ordinance, 1844. The policy at that stage can be understood as a reflection of humanitarian but paternalistic efforts to protect the Maori from the 'great disasters [that] have fallen upon uncivilized nations on being brought into contact with Colonists for the nations of Europe...' Later under the settler government, however, the policy was employed more to protect the interests of the settlers than the Maori.

The object was to take the Maori children away from the 'demoralizing influence of the villages' (Barrington, 1966).

The inspectors were men who were prominent in public life - members of the government, magistrates etc. The first full-time inspector, Henry Taylor, was appointed in 1862.

AJHR, 1862, E-4:17.

AJHR, 1858 E-1:77.

AJHR, 1863, E-9:18.

The school set up by Wiremu Tamihana at Matamata is testimony to this. This school was set in the King Country - the territory of the King Movement - a confederation of Waikato tribes, united through their opposition to the government. Under Kingitanga law, mission schools were allowed to be established in the territory only if they did not accept funds from the government. A report on the school at Matamata in 1862 indicates that the Maori there were anxious to have their children taught English. The mission school at Otaki is another example. Two chiefs who donated land and money to establish this school, were Tamihana Te Rauparaha and Matene Te Whiwhi. Both had been instrumental in attempts amongst Maori to establish inter-tribal unity in order to better deal with the threat to their sovereignty which the increasing Pakeha demands for land represented.

The Native Schools system continued to run parallel to the public school system until 1969.

Poulantzas (1978:55-56).

19 AJHR, 1862, E-4:35.

AJHR, 1862, E-4:38.

The theory underlying the schooling advocated here for Maori is similar to that advocated in Britain by Chadwick and other supporters of the notion of half-time schooling for factory children. As Silver(1983:47) points out, this theory drew on the pervasive opinion that popular education should reach out for only limited objectives. Thus children were to be

given the minimum amount of education to 'satisfy their needs'. As Silver (Ibid:51-52) further observes, this system was an important means of cementing the hierarchy of stations of life. The application of this theory to Maori children differs in two important ways from its application to the factory children in Britain. Firstly the factory children were already within the working class whereas Maori were indigenous people struggling to maintain their sovereignty, and who in some cases had endowed the schools towards that end. Secondly, the application of the theory to Maori was rationalized largely through racial ideologies.

Bird (1928:64)

AJHR, 1880, H-1f:1)

See Pope, Jas. H. 1884. Health for the Maori: A Manual for Use in Native Schools. Wellington, John Mackay, Government Printer.

A detailed account of this enquiry can be found in Barrington (1988).

AJHR, 1906, G-5: 84.

Ibid:94-95.

AJHR, 1906, G-5:101.

The subsistence lifestyle in the 1950s of the community of Kotare, as described by Joan Metge (1964) is clear evidence of this outcome. D.O. Williams (1936:146) explains further:

Although the Maori freeholder could raise money on a mortgage, restrictions imposed by Legislature made the procedure costly; and although advances to settlers were theoretically available to Maori landowners, the prejudice against the Native title was so great that few were able to get assistance under this legislation. At the same time many Maori communities were afraid of losing more of their lands by becoming involved with mortgages...

While Maori, in general, were to be prevented from competing with Pakeha in the trades and professions, when highly educated Maori such as Buck did return to work amongst their people, they were subject to Pakeha derision as having 'returned to the mat'.

AJHR, 1907, E-2:7.

AJHR, 1915, E-3:10.

Strong (1931: 194).

Bird had in fact used a similar rationale at the time of the Te Aute enquiry when he stated as a reason for doing away with Thornton's classical curriculum: 'These higher walks of life, are walks that most Maori boys - I should say ninety-nine out of every hundred - will never tread' (AJHR, 1906, G-5:95).

See McKenzie (1982) regarding Maori in public schools.

Strong(1931:192).

There is a further implication in the arguments presented. Reifying the subsistence life of the Maori as 'natural' provides a rationale or justification for further alienation of Maori land. A subsistence lifestyle need not require as much land as Pakeha-style farming. Thus, using the words of the fictional Maori boy in the 1899 school text-book, (quoted by McGeorge, 1981: 17) it can be claimed that Maori 'have more land left than [they] can use'.

Parsonage (1956:6).

In the study of the attitudes of primary school teachers of Maori children conducted in 1980-81, the majority of teachers were found to hold

views which supported Pakeha dominant class interests (Simon,1982;1986).

See McKenzie (1982) for a good account of the experiences of Maori children in public schools in the nineteenth century.

The first Maori District High Schools did not open until the 1940s, and the curriculum they followed epitomised the 'limited knowledge' policy advocated by the Department of Education for Maori.

See Simon (1990: 118).

AJHR,1906,G-5:32.

1975:36.

Jackson(1975: 36) points out that although by 1850 Maori schools of learning were redirecting attention to the traditional knowledge, they had changed in scale, organization and rationale. 'The Maori had learned the rudiments of the politics of knowledge, he explains, and thus, with the skills of literacy mastered, they were now able to communicate with Europeans on equal terms.

See Te Aute Students Association. Reports of Conferences, 1897-1906.

Journal of the Polynesian Society,(1951:11).

Translation 'suited to these times' by Pat Hohepa (1978:106).

This process can be explained to some extent by reference to Bourdieu's concept of the 'habitus' -the dynamic element of culture embodied in the individual which is 'the basis upon which we are disposed to order the symbolism available to us' (Miller & Branson,1987:217). Bourdieu (1977:82) also explains that the habitus is 'the product of history' which 'produces individual and collective practices, and hence history, in accordance with the schemes engendered by history...'. It can be perceived as the locus of a dialectical relationship between the 'objective structures' of social life and the 'cognitive and motivating structures which they produce and which tend to produce them...'. Bourdieu stresses the importance of remembering that 'these objective structures are themselves products of historical practices and are constantly reproduced and transformed by historical practices whose productive principle is itself the product of the structures which it consequently tend to reproduce'(Ibid:83).

Larrain (1983:28).

Williams (1969:8)

See Apple (1985:50-51).

See McCarthy (1978:41); Held (1982:181).