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Toward evening - we know it is evening - a canoe puts off from the bank of That Side and sets off over the river. In it are Huia and Memory and Sire paddling back from That Side to This, all chanting a paddle song the old one has recently taught them, keeping instinctive time with the paddles, which is one sure time they know - any instinctive rhythm. It is in Maori of course.

Behold my paddle!  
See how it flies and flashes;  
It quivers like a bird's wing  
This paddle of mine....

But as they reach This Side landing an unrest stirs in Huia. Her allegiance to her koro on That Side confronts her feeling for Puppa on This Side. In the crossing of the polished surface of the river is the crossing from the brown to the white, although she's too young to know it, and the emotional racial transition is not polished like the face of the river holding the gray of the sky in her waters and the glamorous gold of the trees; it is something with smudges on it, something with jagged angles. The racial transition is a sunken branch cutting the mirror surface (Ashton-Warner, 1966, pp. 63-4).

Essentially, this paper is a summary of the ideas presented in my doctoral thesis whereby I examined bi/multi racial Maori women's cultural hybridity in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In my concluding chapter, I utilised Sylvia Ashton-Warner's (1966) novel *Greenstone* to highlight bi/multi racial women's hybridity in her portrayal of Huia's coming and going, from one side of the river where she lives with her Pakeha family to the Other, the ancestral home of her people and the place where her Maori grandfather still lives. Ashton-Warner's novel is situated after the First World War. She demonstrates how children of mixed racial ancestries were multiply located across different landscapes and cultures. In *Greenstone*, Hybrid-Huia's corporeal body regularly travels backwards and forwards across the river/boundary separating her two cultural worlds, This Side and That Side. The criss-crossing between This Pakeha Side and That Maori Side is portrayed as a journey/process of metaphoric images and competing landscapes that need to be traversed to make the (cultural) transition to the Other Side possible.
Ashton-Warner's symbolic metaphors allows an entry point into the world of bi/multi racial Maori women in a climate of bicultural nationalism. *Greenstone* provides an illustration of the shifting and problematic relationships between Maori and Pakeha in their quest to survive modernity. The author illustrates the impending demise of old-time Maori and British settlers as they confront the emergence of a specifically bicultural nationalism and citizen. She cleverly constructs Huia as the connecting corporeal bridge of difference upon which the future nation and its people must construct its identity against.

Ashton-Warner's text enables an exploration of biculturalism and the subsequent corporeal and social construction of Maori women's bi/multi racial identity. Her provocative views on biculturalism problematise the universalising assumptions contained within articulations of bicultural nationalism and cultural identity. She engages with a reading of Maori hybridity long before similar narratives emerged during the late 1990s in response to New Zealand identity politics (Meridith, 1999, 199a, 199b). Ashton-Warner's ideas on Maori/Pakeha biracial identity pre-empt the complexities inherent in theorising contemporary Maori women's dual/multiple subjectivity in the color-blind climate of feminist oriented identity politics. Moreton-Robinson (2000) points out:

> An engagement with a politics of difference as multiple standpoints, oppressions, subjectivities, subject positions, identities and locations provides us with a way of understanding the heterogeneous and heteronomous representations of gender, sexuality, ethnicity, race, class and nationality. However, the effect of such theorizing is to make a politics of difference in practice color blind in terms of whiteness and power evasive in that all differences are rendered equally significant. There appears to be no scope for fixity in power relations between women, yet feminists argue that statistically and corporeally men have more power than women do in the world. For white feminists, there appear to be no limits to differences that constitute subjectivity and no limits to the degree to which they can be invented and overcome.

In this paper, I offer a rereading of Maori women's identity by utilising Ashton-Warner's progressive and visionary ideas embodied by the biracial character Huia. By exploring the limitations and complexities encoded in Ashton-Warner's articulation of Maori women's identity, I explore cultural stereotypes and notions of third space. Postcolonial theorist Homi Bhabha (1990) explains hybridity this way:

> (T)he importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original movements from which the third emerges, rather hybridity... is the 'third space' which enables other positions to emerge. This third space displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives, which are inadequately understood through received wisdom... The process of cultural hybridity gives rise to a something different, something new and unrecognizable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation (p. 211).

On one level, 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 of hybridity is hugely emancipatory in that its existence (construction and performance) liberates the subject from a sense of unbelonging, dislocation and alienation, and a partial participation/location within the culture/s of origin. It provides an explanation for the bi/multi racial woman's ability to straddle two different and opposing cultures, providing some understanding of the chameleon-like changes necessary for a hybrid. The 'third space' afforded the subject, who straddles the Maori/Pakeha/Other divide, allows herself insight and wisdom. Without being too utopian, she has an advantage integral to reading/making sense of her cultural differences and ambiguities within the postcolonial nation, and the
challenges she faces. In short, the hybrid opens up a new category of cultural location. Bhabha (1994) suggests that hybridity is inclusive in that it initiates new signs of identity and creative collaborative sites where new contestations can occur.

Through accessing Huia's biraciality, I stretch and expand a quintessential articulation of Maori women's identity in favour of an alternative, more complex reading through utilising a feminist and postcolonial perspective. I highlight how Maori women are socially constructed and positioned spatially within the neo-colonial nation through the deployment of a racial and gendered axis which finds its roots in colonialism. In short, Ashton-Warner enables a reading of Maori women's agency and emancipation through her insightful descriptions of Huia's biraciality, diaspora and cultural hybridity. I support her assertion that Maori women are not merely subject to prescriptive unified racial and gendered identities but are agentic in their quest to construct and mediate meaningful, albeit complex subjectivities.

Presented in two sections, the first, 'This Side, InSide, That Side, OutSide' is a deliberate attempt to contain the flow of my ideas within a seamless body/text that I attempt through utilising Ashton-Warner's novel. My intention is to show how the bi/multi racial female/girl/woman is constructed and positioned spatially within the neo colonial nation. I also show how new cultural and gendered relationships are formed and how the bi/multi racial woman negotiates the tensions that arise between Maori and Pakeha/Other men and Maori and Pakeha/Other women. Using Greenstone, I am able to demonstrate how Huia is positioned as a bi/multi racial hybrid. This rereading demonstrates how the Maori hybrid female becomes discursively positioned to take up a borderland's existence, living between as well as InSide as well as OutSide the landscapes of This Side and That Side contained within her corporeal self. The second and smaller section 'Embracing Maori Women's Hybridity' looks at some of the current issues concerning Maori women's cultural hybridity in the 2000s. Ashton-Warner's relationship to biraciality and cultural hybridity is also highlighted.

This Side, InSide, That Side, OutSide

I first need to elaborate on the essence of this novel and some of the characters in the story. Essentially, Ashton-Warner's text recognises the position of the hybrid through the character 'Huia' who became estranged from her parents when her Pakeha father left to fight in the First World War, and her Maori mother Kaa died soon after she was born. Huia is a bi/multi racial Maori/Pakeha female. Ashton-Warner (1966) describes Huia as "... not even half Maori but only a quarter" (p. 52). Huia is Maori and Pakeha, emphasised in the nurturing relationships she has with both her Maori grandfather and her surrogate father, portrayed in the character of her Pakeha grandfather. Huia lives most of her life as Pakeha in the landscape of This Side. She has white colonial genealogy, cultural history and lifestyle. She lives with her Puppa (who adores her) and his Pakeha wife Mrs Considine (who hates her). They live in a small North Island rural settlement along with Puppa and Mrs Considine's numerous children. Huia's female Maori relatives have all died and only her koro remains. He lives on That Side, the Other side of the river, in the traditional dwelling/landscape of his ancestors. His female relatives all died giving birth, which is attributed to a makutu placed upon the childbearing women of Huia's iwi. The makutu manifests itself in the form of Puppa's illness and Maori women's death either before or during childbirth. Huia is the last female in their bloodline. Both her Maori and Pakeha
families felt the wrath of an angry tohunga who resented the interracial intercourse between a Maori woman and a Pakeha man - Huia's grandparents.

Huia's hybridity is depicted in her constant coming and going across the river en route to her Two Worlds (roots/homes) via the body of water that divides her two cultures/families. Susan Friedman (1998) looks at the homonym routes/roots to express a concept of cultural hybridity, which takes into account the travelling between physical spaces/places of belonging/home when she states:

> Travelling is a concept that depends upon the notion of stasis to be comprehensible. Routes are pathways between here and there, two points of rootedness. Identity often requires some form of displacement - literal or figurative - to come to consciousness. Leaving home brings into being the idea of "home," the perception of identity as distinct from elsewhere. Rootlessness - the sense... of being "always on the run" acquires its meaning only in relation to its opposite, rootedness, the state of being tied to a single location (p. 151).

Torn between her two worlds, her two senses of love for her koro/whanau and her Puppa/family create in her the anxiety that needs to be acted out, and simultaneously contained. Huia's story unfolds. Huia is split between This Side (living in the Pakeha world) and That Side (visiting her Maori great grandfather). Her mother and father had found love for each other in the rural landscape of the Ngati Te Renga Renga tribal people, Huia's people. Not permitted to marry, they would steal away to a small whare in the forest where Huia was eventually conceived.

Huia is defined by the youthful, caring and paternal young male in the story, Togi, as "...the next rangatira of the ngati Te Renga Renga and heir to all its lands" (Ashton-Warner, 1966, p. 30). Ashton-Warner (1966) states that Togi, "[r]eturned at last from the First World War, he keeps both eyes on Huia" (p. 31). Huia is exoticised from infancy, "[h]er skin is almost as white as Flower's but her hair and her eyes give the Maori blood away. She is a very pretty child with a full top lip and eyes like canoes tethered at an angle" (Ashton-Warner, 1966, p. 32). Huia loves her Puppa and identifies with him in his corporeal pain/anxiety. Ashton-Warner (1966) describes Puppa:

> He has one of these aquiline turned-down noses you find in the aristocracy, while behind his glasses his eyes can only be described as English blue. Possibly the term "English" can account for the whole impression; his face has the fine complexion and coloring often bred in the English climate, a fresh but fragile face (p. 15).

Puppa is portrayed as a weak, dismembered and broken remnant of an aristocratic Englishman, which is highlighted in Ashton-Warner's (1966) description of him when she states, "[b]ut look at his locked body. Rheumatoid arthritis as we know it but according to the Maoris in the valley it is the "limb-withering" curse of the tohunga makutu" (p. 15). Again, Ashton-Warner (1966) illustrates that:

> He is locked at the hips too so that his whole thin body is a zigzag drawing of what a man's body should be, but you only see this when he gets up on his crutches, a far from graceful performance (p. 16).

Further, Puppa's wife (Huia's surrogate mother) is referred to by Huia as "Flower's Mumma". Transferring the 'mother' to her young Pakeha relative enables Huia to distance
herself from a maternal relationship to the woman who has the responsibility to care for her, yet hates her. Ashton-Warner (1966) demonstrates the surrogate mother's ambivalent attitude towards Huia when she states to Puppa, "[t]he less I see of that brown rat the better" (p. 22). She further expresses contempt for Huia in her statement to Puppa, "[d]you expect me, a trained teacher, t'recognize a dirty little Maori?  D'you expect me, a respectable woman, t'bow and scrape to a savage?" (p. 23). Ashton-Warner demonstrates that a modernist preoccupation with eugenics continues to find its expression in notions of brownness/native/Maori and whiteness/civilised/Pakeha.

As stated, Huia's biological mother, Kaa is dead. In fact all Maori women are corporeally absent from the story. The prevailing memory of Kaa portrays her as a woman whose sexuality/femininity was out of control. Strong images of Huia's koro appear every so often, representing the last of his people: the withering lands subject of/to colonialism. His desperate need for Huia to reproduce the Maori race/iwi is etched in his every action towards her. His image is of an emasculated noble savage. Koro is constructed as the dying chief/man. His eyes are constantly looking to Huia to be the new hope/healer for his people's revival. It is up to her to end the curse placed on Maori women during childbirth that results in their death. She must save the Maori from extinction.

**River/Land Crossings**

Colonisation, imperialism, assimilation and colonial processes positioned Maori as the disenfranchised Other to the normative white masculine rational subject (Awatere, 1984; Irwin, 1992; Kelsey, 1984; Orange, 1987; Sinclair, 1989; Smith, 1998; Walker, 1987, 1990). The invention of the New Zealand nation and its national community meant that a specifically white mono cultural nationalism assimilated Maori within its desire to create an imagined community built through notions of sameness (Anderson, 1991). However, this was only achieved through the expulsion of difference which was generated through the repudiation of Maori difference (Mohanram, 1999). In fact, in order for a white national identity to emerge, it needed the brown body to formulate its 'self' against (Yeatman, 1995). In a signifying chain of meaning, Pakeha could only come into existence as the white/right/rational/universal subject without properties if Maori were to carry significations of difference (Hall, 1997). Ann Stoler (1995) states:

Nationalist discourse drew on and gave force to a wider politics of exclusion. This version was not concerned solely with the visual markers of difference, but with the relationship between visible characteristics and invisible properties, outer form and inner essence. Assessment of these untraceable identity markers could seal economic, political, and social fates. Imperial discourses that divided coloniser from colonised, metropolitan observers from colonial agents, and bourgeois colonisers from their subaltern compatriots designated certain cultural competencies, sexual proclivities, psychological dispositions, and cultivated habits. These in turn defined the hidden fault lines - both fixed and fluid - along which gendered assessments of class and racial membership were drawn (p. 8).

The insidiousness of colonialism can be metaphorically related to the narrative of the river as characterised by Ashton-Warner. Throughout the text she symbolically alludes to a river that is both mysterious and forceful. The author's thoughts on bi-culturalism were most likely inspired through her own experiences of living near the Whanganui River. No doubt Ashton-Warner's relationships with Maori acted as a precursor to the ideas on cultural hybridity portrayed in *Greenstone*. Certainly, her insight into Huia's world/s would suggest a personal
experience of Maori cultural difference, which she highlights in her narrative of Huia's cultural vacillation. She provides an inspired gendered reading of Maori identity which was probably informed by her early exposure to biraciality and cultural hybridity through her observations and experiences/merging of/with local tangata whenua. During her formative years, Ashton-Warner travelled between rural Maori landscapes and Western landscapes. The combination of competing landscapes provided the criss-crossing of cultural experiences, which ensured her interest in both Maori and education. Situated as an interlocutor, and positioned on the fringe of modernity, the insights she gained during this period of her life enabled a clever and provocative reading of colonialism which would pre-empt post colonial articulations of Maori cultural hybridity nearly half a century later (Meridith, 1999, 1999a, 1999b).

Ashton-Warner's (1966) attempt to invoke a cautionary relationship between biracial Huia and the river highlights the discursive tensions Huia confronts in the colonial relationship, "[t]he racial transition is a sunken branch cutting the mirror surface (p. 64). These tensions find their roots in a sense of alienation and dislocation which accompany the cultural diaspora highlighted in Greenstone via the use of dominant binaries; pre-colonialism/colonialism, modernity/post-modernity, rural/urban, brownness/whiteness, masculinity/femininity, all encapsulated by imagery contained in, and between, ThisSide and ThatSide. I argue that the sense of mystery and force that Ashton-Warner attaches to the river finds its origins in the colonial condition whereby the discourse/s of colonialism masquerade normatively as progress and development while upholding the imperatives of individualism, imperialism and capitalism symbolised in Pakeha nationalism, practised in mono culturalism and signified by white bodies. Symbolically, a baby of potential prosperity suckles at the breast of colonialism while cradled in its discursive arms of progress. The river's mystery is realised in New Zealand's future body. Whose body is being suckled? Whose body will grow/develop normatively in the new nation and who will benefit?

Simultaneously, river/colonialism must conceal the violence it levies at a communal Maori people in its forceful colonising trajectory. Ashton-Warner recognises that the brown tribal body must forgo its collectivity, its communalism and its tribal resources if colonialism is to prosper in Aotearoa/New Zealand. It is into this difficult landscape that Ashton-Warner posts Huia. It is amongst the treacherous and dichotomous terrain of capitalism versus collectivism, individualism versus tribalism, whiteness versus brownness and masculinity versus femininity that Hybrid Huia must live. To survive, she must find a way to move beyond, her biracial and bicultural difference. She must evolve beyond the respective racial and gendered cultural prerequisites contained within notions of Maoriness and Pakehaness embedded deep within colonial nationalism.

Huia has to negotiate the essence of River Colonialism's current in order to make her Maori and Pakeha/Other border crossings possible. On route to her biracial roots and respective bicultural landscapes she is confronted with the undercurrents informing and directing River Colonialism (Mc Dowell, 1997). There is an undercurrent of fear operating in the traversing over water (Ashton-Warner, 1966, pp. 63-4). How deep/engulfing is it? How swift/violent is it? Will Huia drown, be swept away? Will the 'New Race' become extinguished before the colonial offspring have a chance to thrive? Danger lurks as the children (future nation) manage to negotiate the unknown, possible danger. River colonialism's origin, its point of departure, symbolises the beginning of colonisation. Its flowing river/body carries within it a
new history of Aotearoa, as it moves silently into the future, seen, yet unseen, known, yet, unknown, recognised, yet unrecognised.

River Colonialism moves, swiftly, cold, with purposeful intent, a forceful passion; seemingly natural, it almost appears disinterested. It innocently masquerades itself appearing as if it is a detached observer of all that is performed on both Sides of its banks/borders. Yet it laughs into the wind at the foolishness of its prisoners as both This Side and That Side are incarcerated by its desire to be the author of their performances, the master of their dance! I argue here that colonialism calls both Pakeha and Maori subjects into being (prescribes identity) through its discursive practices (ie., such as the discourse/s of education), by recognising, naming and placing subjects according to their race, gender and class. Judith Butler (1993a, 1993b) illuminates the place of discourse as interlocutor in the social construction of gendered subjectivity when she suggests that subjects, once called into being, perform the very subjectivities they are subjectivated with. Thus, individuals are subjectivated with highly specific identities according to their gender, race and class specificities.

Nationalism's colonial agendas must ensure that the reproduction of its 'self' is recognised in the ongoing production of its national body, signified in white dominant Pakeha culture. But in order for the colonial nation to reproduce itself it must firstly have a definable body to reproduce itself against (Mohanram, 1999). Hence, dominant subjects (colonial/Pakeha/white/male) require subjugated identities to form their difference against (colonised/Maori/brown/female). Like mainstream New Zealand nationalism, River Colonialism, needs a di-vision (This Side and That Side) to flow through, in between its body, to determine identity. New Zealand nationalism relies upon an identity that is formed through notions of sameness which is forged through Pakeha difference to Maori (Anderson, 1991). It survives on the division between Maori and Pakeha cultures and their respective brown and white bodies. To survive, the separate landscapes/bodies must not, cannot, will not touch. To touch, to merge would surely bring a withering, a drying-up, a winding d-o-w-n to River/neo colonialism. River winds down towards and past the present (This Side and That Side) towards its confident (perhaps unstoppable) future trajectory. It is a constantly changing yet consistent current/flow. River/colonialism ensures This Side/Pakeha/white and That Side/Maori/brown are kept separated, condemned to view each other across a deep divide of make-believe (and yet real) difference (Lloyd, 1991).

The shift to bi-culturalism was effected through Maori counter nationalist efforts to argue for Maori sovereignty during the 1970s and 1980s (Awatere, 1984; Mohanram, 1999; Yeatman, 1995; Walker, 1990). As such, Maori were reinscribed through a representation of themselves as the native, intimately linked to the landscape of Aotearoa (Awatere, 1984). This was done in an effort to achieve emancipation through economic development initiatives and advancement in a competitive market driven economy alongside Pakeha (Sharp, 1995). In the current time, this desire is manifested in iwi corporate development. This is achieved through the auspices of the Waitangi Tribunal's recommendation to award a share of a fiscal envelope to iwi as a re-recognition of past wrongs (of raupatu) carried out in the name of the Crown, which may (or may not be) sanctioned by the Government (Pearson, 1996; Sharp, 1995; Te Whanau, 2001). Underpinning this, Maori must re-present themselves through their whakapapa, thus highlighting their unchanged status as the nation's tangata whenua. (Mohanram, 1999; Te Whanau, 2001). Chatterjee's (1989, 1993) ideas on Indian women
and nationalism enable me to argue that the task of reproducing the Maori national community became the responsibility of Maori women, epitomised in their reconstruction as traditional. Maori women were, and continue to be essentialised as the cornerstone of Maoridom via their links to their gendered corporeality. They are imagined as synonymous with nature/reproduction and timelessness/spirituality. Conversely, Maori men are liberated disembodied agents who can vacillate across cultures enabling them to negotiate the changing terrain of the material/market place.

I suggest that Maori counter nationalists efforts during the 1970s and 1980s reinvoked Maori as the essentialist Other through employing a narrative of difference to Pakeha. A quintessential Maori identity was invoked to resurrect the Treaty of Waitangi, the nation's founding yet forgotten treatise between iwi/Maori and the Crown/Pakeha. This revamped configuration of Maori identity, when reflected back to Pakeha, mirrored Pakeha rationality, progress and development; this identity was symbolised by corporeal whiteness. By extension, it also highlighted Maori difference to Pakeha through invoking Maori culture as traditional (unchanged over time) while at the same time it argued for Maori self-determination and ability to act alongside Pakeha in the market place. Maori identity is signified by corporeal brownness. Within this move, the racial tensions of the 1970s and 1980s became somewhat placated as Maori men/iwi forged new relationships with Western/Pakeha men in the market place while women carried the responsibility to reproduce the essence of Maori culture (Chatterjee, 1989, 1993). The Crown/Pakeha needed to defuse the tension in the nation, while iwi/Maori needed to position themselves as corporate players in an environment of capitalist neo liberalism (Mohanram, 1999). Both were locked into a market driven relationship. Within this new patriarchal alignment, the bi/multi racial woman has found herself unrepresented in narratives of what it means to be Maori woman in the early 2000s.

In my PhD research I conceptualised a bicultural research model 'Bi/multi Racial Kaupapa Maori Research Methodology', which drew upon Maori theorists articulations of Maori research (Bishop 1998; Irwin, 1992; Smith, 1999). This model enabled me to undertake qualitative research with twenty women who position themselves as bi/multi racial through utilising the spirit of a kaupapa Maori research philosophy sensitised to a feminist Life History methodology (Middleton, 1993, 1996). Through Ashton-Warner's character Huia, I am able to demonstrate how bi/multi racial women's voices differ to those women positioned solely as Maori or Pakeha. The symbolic associations linked to Huia enables a gendered analysis of contemporary Maori women's cultural hybridity (Bhabha, 1990, 1994, 1994a, 1994b; Meridith, 1990, 1999a, 199b). Through Huia, Ashton-Warner exemplifies my assertion that the subjectivity of bi/multi racial women is different from women who position themselves with a traditional Maori subjectivity. Further, Huia's character shows that bi/multi racial women's subjectivity is different to Pakeha/Other women by virtue of their Maori corporeality and cultural hybridity. Ashton-Warner highlights how bi/multi racial Maori women become located in multiple landscapes and become subjectivated with plural cultural identities.

Ashton-Warner's (1966) articulation of Hybrid Huia provides a rare opportunity to read biraciality and cultural hybridity through a Pakeha/female lens. Through her diasporic positioning as a Pakeha female criss-crossing the Maori/rural landscape of the Whanganui river, as well as observing and associating with Maori, Ashton-Warner's sense of dislocation
produces her own particular experience of cultural hybridity. This postcolonial experience intrudes upon the historical landscape of the text and uncannily disrupts the neat cultural borders popular after the Second World War concealed in New Zealand's national rhetoric of 'we are one people' (Sinclair, 1986). Ashton-Warner's ability to play with time exposes a dual cultural positioning via Hybrid Huia allowing a reading of the third space to emerge. (Bhabha, 1990, 1994, 1994a, 1994).

Hybridity exists in the in-between spaces between the colonised and colonial culture. Bhabha (1994) claims the third space holds the possibility of emancipation in that this liminal space can provide room for the hybrid subject to act outside the colonial authority. This he suggests enables the hybrid to have some agency over their own emancipation by turning the colonial gaze back to the coloniser. In this space, bi/multi racial Maori women, like Huia, are able to perform their excess difference in ways that are unrecognised by the colonial authority. Like other bi/multi racial women, Huia usurps the bicultural imperative for pure Maori and Pakeha subjects. Huia is the excess that exceeds the colonial relationship.

Ashton-Warner opens up an uncomfortable terrain when she invites the reader to journey into Huia's body/soul. The bi/multi racial woman's identity is a familiar yet foreign landscape. The language, representations, characters and cultural symbols Ashton-Warner appropriates/employs are provocative in their ability to disrupt the boundaries between the conceptual categories of Maori and Pakeha. In essence, she questions who gets to be Maori and Pakeha in the post colonial nation and pre-empts current articulations of Maori identity and authenticity.

**InSide-ness**

My efforts at engaging the text are directed towards pushing against the words, imagery, symbols and metaphors evoked by Ashton-Warner to explore the possibilities and limitations of the third space as a place of possibility, agency and emancipation. My desire in positioning myself on the bi/multi racial borderlands, located between Maoriness/Pakehaness and brownness/whiteness, is to create a space where my own Maori/Pakeha racial and cultural formations greet Ashton-Warner as narrative provocateur. The intention is to excite a reading of *Greenstone* through deploying a lens of liminality and narrative representation informed by a feminist, bi/multi racial Maori, and post colonial conceptual lens.

The bi/multi racial woman has a unique role in the New Zealand nation, and in the Maori community/nation. Located on the border between Maori and Pakeha/Other cultures, her corporeal racial difference positions her in the nation as hybrid. Bi/multi racial women have to negotiate new forms of colonialism that emerge amidst newly formed bicultural relationships, between corporate iwi/Maori and Pakeha men (Chatterjee, 1989, 1993; Mohanram, 1999). This newly reconfigured flow of power is symbolised by the river flow in Ashton-Warner's (1966) novel. In her plurality of cultural difference the hybrid is positioned with the skills to operate in multiple discourses, her conversations collapsing the binary myths upon which colonialism/river sustains itself (Anzaldua, 1987). Linda McDowell (1999) states:

> Instead of the identities of 'oppositional' or 'minority' groups being constructed as different from a 'norm', it is now asserted that all identities are a fluid amalgam of memories of places and
origins, constructed by and through fragments and nuances, journeys and rests, of movements between. Thus, the 'in-between' is itself a process or a dynamic, not just a stage on the way to a more final identity (p. 215).

Speaking and listening in her multiple voices, the bi/multi racial woman hears multiple conversations via her spatialisation and location as Maori and Pakeha/Other in both the New Zealand national community and the Maori national community (Bhabha, 1994a, 1994b; Meridith, 1990, 1999a, 1999b). The bi/multi racial woman responds in multiple voices, interpreting, translating, negotiating and mediating between That Side and This Side through the conduit of her InSide corpo/reality (cf. Foster, 1996). With her "eyes like canoes tethered at an angle", Hybrid Huia has the advantage of seeing both sides of the river simultaneously as she criss-crosses between competing landscapes. Her peripheral vision (seeing with two sets of eyes), gives her insight, advantage and power (Ashton-Warner, 1966, p. 32). By the nature of her InSide-ness, the bi/multi racial's corporeal body functions as a place that cannot be fixed, tied or incarcerated to That Side, This Side or any Other Side.

Her InSide-ness (sense of coherence/stability) is possible as she mediates the OutSide-ness (cultural contradictions) etched on her corporeal skin. The bi/multi racial woman's racial residue/difference masquerades ambivalently signifying either Maori or Pakeha culture, but never both (Bhabha, 1994a, 1994b). Because she is more than This Side or That Side, an excess of both, she moves beyond the binary categories embedded within Maori/race/brown and Pakeha/de-raced/white homogeneous articulations of identity (Bhabha, 1994a, 1994b; Butler, 1993). Ashton-Warner's (1966) novel recognises (through the makutu placed on the pre-colonial child bearing Maori women) that as soon as Maori women come into representation via the symbolic birthing process, the mother/landscape dies - is taken away. Thus, Maori are abandoned, left emasculated, disenfranchised and agency-less (Awatere, 1984; Walker, 1990). Traditional Maori women function as a metaphor for the land symbolised in the earth mother Papatuanuku and emphasised in the dual meaning of the word whenua which means both land and placenta. The message is clear; old-time landless Maori cannot survive in this new colonised Aotearoa.

Positioned between Maori and Pakeha/Other cultures, the bi/multi racial woman functions as the new body/landscape upon which the Pakeha nation and the Maori nation constructs its identity. Symbolically, her body is the corporeal landscape where both Maori and Pakeha can exist separately, yet remain connected. Her corporeal difference plays a critical role as the body that gives identity/meaning to the reconfigured, tribal and settler cultures. By extension, her difference (racial impurity) provides the borders that give Pakeha/Other men, Maori men, Pakeha/Other women and traditional Maori women their cultural meaning in the bicultural nation (Gilman, 1985; hooks, 1997; Mohanram, 1999; Moreton-Robinson, 2000; Williams, 1997). The nation's culturally pure subjects subjugate her difference by denying her existence, yet both the Maori and colonial nation desire her cultural 'impurity' to construct themselves (via the conduit of the authentic - traditional Maori woman's body) as a culturally alive and thriving organism (Mohanram, 1999). After all, dead cultures don't speak. Dead cultures cannot compete in the worldly matters of corporate development. The bi/multi racial Maori woman's corporeal body provides the departure from all that is essentially essential to Maori and Pakeha culture. In a signifying chain of cultural meaning that is founded upon notions of sameness and difference, she is the difference that Pakeha and Maori construct their respective difference against (Hall, 1997). She is the difference
that must be subjugated in order for Maori to come into representation. The bi/multi racial woman acts as the uncanny interlocutor that calls both Maori and Pakeha into being thus permitting a new patriarchal alliance to emerge and sustain itself against. Freud (1919) illuminates that the uncanny is a place which is familiar and desired, yet it simultaneously arouses dread and terror. The biracial woman, in her ability to carry the mark of difference/duality (Maori and Pakeha biraciality), functions as a place, which is recognised/known, and signifies that which is familiar/home. However, the desire to return to that which is familiar/home (a primordial past, a pre-colonial time, racial purity) haunts and evades the unsatisfied observer. The desire/necessity for the bi/multi racial woman's body of difference must be denied in order to ensure that the recently placated cultural tensions of the 1970s and 1980s remain indefinitely. Contained within the capacity to carry a double semantic, the biracial woman becomes a corporeal site that invokes ambivalence. Her femininity and Maoriness is recognised/known/familiar. But it is her biraciality and cultural hybridity which is unknown/alien/fearred. The biracial woman produces an uncanny response in the nation in that her presence (excess of difference) provokes that which ought to be repressed - evidence of racial impurity caused through corporeal/social intercourse between Maori and Pakeha.

Pathologised Other

Bi/multi racial woman can only come into representation through the dominant narratives available to her, either as the traditional Maori woman or its poor cousin, epitomised in the construction of a colonised/pathologised Maori woman's identity (cf. Gilman, 1985). This is evidenced in the passage where Huia's father associates her brown corporeality with her badness. Ashton-Warner (1966) writes:

And when her father speaks to her and tells her to be a good girl and a credit to her mother she hangs her black head in a manner not witnessed before. "If you don't behave yourself," gently enough from Daniel, "I'll send you back to the pa. It strikes me, young lady, that you've got more of your great-grandfather's melancholy in you than is good for you. You seem to have more Maori in you than appears in your face. Now pull yourself together, my lady, and behave yourself. If I come this way again and find you misbehaving I'll take down your pants and smack your bottom and send you back to the pa" (p. 81, Emphasis added).

Drawing from the above quotation, Ashton-Warner invokes two dominant cultural representations of Huia to highlight the tension between stereotypical narratives of Maori and Pakeha identity. The author indicates the embodied place of race/color in cultural stereotypes through using statements like "...she [Huia] hangs her black head..." , where Huia's black head emphasises Maoriness/badness (Ashton-Warner, 1966, p. 81). Huia's black/Maori head is symbolised in pathological terms; she is constructed as melancholic/lazy, out of control, and has bad behavior. Butler (1990) expands on this:

The culturally dominated undergo a paradoxical oppression, in that they are both marked out by stereotypes and at the same time rendered invisible. As remarkable, deviant beings, the culturally imperialised are stamped with an essence. The stereotypes confine them to a nature which is often attached in some way to their bodies, and which cannot easily be denied. These stereotypes so permeate the society that they are not noticed as contestable. Just as everyone knows the earth goes around the sun, so everyone knows that gay people are promiscuous, that Indians are alcoholics, and that women are good with children. White males, on the other hand, insofar as they escape group marking, can be individuals.
Ashton-Warner demonstrates that the more desirable Huia's behaviour, the closer she gets to being positioned as a good Pakeha girl which is associated to white corporeality. She illustrates that Huia must be a good/Pakeha if she is to progress and become liberated from modernity. If she is not good (like a Pakeha girl), her father's intention is to incarcerate her in pre-modernity along with her Maori grandfather and his waka. Caught on the racial and cultural borderlands between Maori and Pakeha Huia suffers the effects of racism. It would appear that positioned thus, she lacks the agency to be her 'self'. For as the author demonstrates in this passage, as soon as the bi/multi racial woman comes into representation via these two narratives, she is positioned without agency. Relegated to the landscape of a traditional Maori women's subjectivity (with all the cultural norms and regulations that seek to regulate and control her body), Huia is without agency to be positioned in alternative landscapes and cultural contexts. A traditional Maori identity requires that the specificities of her multiple identities are excluded (Collins, 1999). For the bi/multi racial hybrid, either/or cultural stereotypes deny the subject her unique experiential differences as female, Maori and Pakeha/Other.

In short, the contemporary 'Maori nation' (the Maori 'half' of bicultural New Zealand), promotes itself as a traditional homogeneous national community which has the responsibility to protect the needs of its disparate members by ensuring that iwi develop normatively/rationally through the conduit of the capitalist corporate economy. The newly reconfigured, upwardly mobile iwi/corporation conceals the fact that the discursive processes of colonialism have historically disenfranchised all Maori, including those not represented by their iwi (Te Whanau, 2001). I return to Huia's story to further illustrate these dilemmas.

Huia is caught between her koro's desire of her (which is focused on her saving the Maori community/nation from extinction) evidenced in the ancient teachings he gives her, and her Pakeha Puppa's attachment/desire of her. A symbolic war is waged InSide her corporeal body as it shifts and changes landscapes to accommodate the needs of the emasculated paternal figureheads, symbolising pre colonial times epitomised in the dying koro/noble savage and his counterpart, the dying British patriarch (cf. McDowell, 1997, 1999). Neither can survive the new world that has intruded upon them and which has ended their respective 'glory days'. Hybrid-Huia is the Maori nation's only hope of surviving the ravages and changes of colonialism. She is the one whose spirit is fed by the wise old Maori man; she is the promise that her people will return to Aotearoa through her reproductive potential (cf. Anthias and Yuval-Davis, 1989). Positioned as interlocutors in bicultural hot spots the bi/multi racial woman is torn between loyalties to Maori and Pakeha communities, and the men and women who represent these communities (Moeke-Maxwell, 2003). The hybrid gets burnt on the fringes of modernity and colonialism.

**White Women, Bi/multi Racial Maori Women, White Men**

But, what is this? Huia's heart is tuned to her Pakeha grandfather, "... her mind is full of Puppa and the touching image of him. Is he all right? she wonders" (Ashton-Warner, 1966, p. 64). Huia finds herself caught between the white man and his wife. The ailing white patriarch is juxtaposed against the strong white Pakeha woman. Ashton-Warner (1966) writes "Mumma, he's at the door," from the children diving under tables and beds. Not
"Puppa, he's at the door"; in the final count it is she who is the protector as well as the breadwinner (p. 75).

Huia's desire is to protect her emasculated grandfather from losing his power to his wife's strong, articulate, able bodied, highly reproductive, white, educated authority. Huia rushes to intervene, to disrupt the beating Puppa receives from his wife. A dichotomy is formed in this story between the prolific prowess of the white woman (she produces baby after baby thus creating the new colonial Pakeha national community) and the Maori woman who dies during her reproductive moment. Caught in-between these polarities stands Huia, full of reproductive potential. She challenges the dominance of Flower's Mother (the Pakeha nation) to stop killing Puppa (former British dominance) when she states, "Don't hit Puppa, Flower's mother" (Ashton-Warner, 1966, p. 65). Huia presents as the future, a synthesis of Maori, British colonial and Pakeha history, an antithesis to the gendered and racial war that is being waged on the belly of Papatuanuku.

The white British man's metaphoric castration is laid at the feet of his Pakeha wife, the white woman. But, remember, his withering has been caused by the tohunga's makutu. His immobility/paralysis finds its origin in the curse he bears. His Pakeha wife's anger towards him is inflicted as a projection of her own sense of castration/lack of power. His body is immobilised, ugly, broken. The white Pakeha woman violently beats against his brokenness. She is angry; why does she have to be responsible for producing (giving birth) and reproducing (working, parenting, teaching, nurturing) the new nation of his white children? (Anthias and Yuval, Davis, 1989). Silently, he dreams about the day his mobility (agency) will return. But his children, the future nation, know it never will. His corporeal body, symbolic of his once proud British culture, can never be again. His aristocratic blood line cannot prosper in this new landscape. The decline of British nobility/authority is symbolised in his withered legs. In the landscape of Aotearoa, he lacks his own turangawaewae, a place where he can stand.

Huia functions as an interlocutor not only between brown and white peoples and landscapes, but also between white men and women (Mohanram, 1999). The white woman has derision towards her, hatred and jealousy. It is Huia's responsibility to be (perform) the brown body, the dirty body and the pathologised body upon which the white woman constructs her own sense of gender/identity. Further, Ashton-Warner makes it is obvious that Huia is positioned to save Maori from the plight of colonialism/extinction. But what is less obvious is that she is also positioned as the one to save white men (the dying patriarchy) from white women, who function as the female authority, the reconfigured dominant cultural signifier. Somehow it is Hybrid Huia's brown/white corporeal presence that is needed to interrupt the violent conversations between white/Pakeha men and white/Pakeha women. It is her body that is needed to placate the tension between the power/authority of the white woman over the white man, and to simultaneously reflect the white man's authority over the white woman and brown Maori Others. But, the white man is withered/emasculated and entirely dependent on the white woman for survival. The virility of the new colonial nation depends on the white woman's gendered performance (reproduction and domesticity) that not only provides the nation with labor but also demarcates the boundaries between the public and private worlds of its citizens. The colonial nation is crippled, illustrated in the f/ailing patriarch, Puppa. Maori have used the only resource left to them to retaliate against
their colonialist perpetrators, makutu. It is up to Huia to bridge the gap, traverse the river, heal the divide, remove the makutu.

Huia's brown/Maori grandfather is portrayed as being stuck on the Other side (That Side) of the River, where he is incarcerated by his traditionalism, abject isolation, disenfranchisement in his withering culture. There is a sense that he is corporeally trapped in the past along with his dying women/nation. Tied to the flora and fauna of his traditional home/landscape, he is immobilised, nativised, fixed (Appadurai, 1984). Similarly, on the Other side of the river (This Side) the white children (new colonial nation) are tied to their New Zealand rural landscape and cultural traditions. It is only Huia's body/waka that can vacillate between the two points of difference, it is only her mind, soul and wairua that belongs, breathes and is at home in these two different, contrasted worlds and landscapes, now related via the processes of colonialism (Werbner, 1997).

Huia lacks a corporeal relationship with living Maori women. This is no accident. Rather, it is symbolic of the fact that the old Maori world is dead; the bones of its mothers lie deep in the soil of Papatuanuku. This mysterious absence is explained in Huia's future role to reproduce a new nation, a hybrid nation. This new nation must be able to contain the flaxen essence of the traditional past, as well the new woollen fibre of the present. But who is this young patriarch 'Togi', who shows interest and adoration towards the young hybrid, Huia? Healthy and strong (virulent) he desires the small Huia. He protects Huia the baby, cares for her as a toddler, watches over her as a child, and is fascinated by her exotic beauty. Huia's youth/beauty is a metaphor for the new nation's evolution and potential development. She is watched over and coveted by many men; a failing white patriarch, a dying koro and the future patriarchy symbolised in Togi. Eventually, it is Togi who will take over defining and redefining Huia to suit his/nation's desires (Chatterjee, 1993). Her transformative abilities (cultural hybridity) are a source of desire for the white and brown, old and new, patriarchs and act as a constant thread that binds them into commonality. Her body is the affinity they share, the focus of their desire, the necessity of their mutually exclusive future success.

InSide the Outside

Represented without recourse to agency, is Huia condemned to dance like a monkey to the tune of her brown/white patriarchal organ grinders? This phallocentric imagery conjures up her feminine vulnerability and her passive penetrate-ability. Yet is the female Maori hybrid merely a victim in a desirous patriarchal interplay of power or does she find a way to transport herself to another time and another place deep within her 'self'? Bi/multi racial women, like other Maori, seek an affinity in the form of a narrative of wairuatanga which is resilience forming (Kohu, 1997; Tai, 1997; Pere, 1991). Hybrid Huia finds her answer in her regular sojourns back to the ancient (timeless) meeting house, now abandoned in the woods. It is a place that has known life and love. The 'meeting house' is the place that witnessed Huia's conception as the love between her Maori mother and Pakeha father found an affinity in each other and became joined in spirit and one corporeal body. The result of this biracial union - Hybrid Huia. Ashton-Warner (1966) highlights Huia's return to her roots:

It was here in this deserted meeting house that Huia was conceived.... As Togi makes his unerring way along the forgotten track, weaving like a tunnel through massive trunks overlaid with delicate creeper and between the frothing ground ferns, Flower and Sue trail him...
steps upon the veranda of this haunted place, lowers his head for the Maori door opening and penetrates the odorous gloom. And sure enough, just as in one of Puppa's stories, here they find Huia sleeping, tucked in a ball like a forest creature all but covered in hair. You can see little more beyond the hair than two bare feet...

Flower and Sue do not run to the carved panels of the ancestors on the walls with their eerie paua-shell eyes; the gloomy atmosphere terrifies them. They remain together, touching each other, surveying... all but brushing off physically the spirits of the ancestors crowding invisibly around them (pp. 31-2).

Huia, like other bi/multi racial females, locates her corporeality and spirituality within the construction of her own real (and metaphysical), turangawaewae. This is achieved through a re-worldling of themselves via their intimate, spiritual relationships with tupuna. In Huia's case, her whanau of origin are symbolised in the presence of her dead mother and her beloved tupuna. In the absence of the nurturing Maori mother (Kaa), juxtaposed against the presence of the alienating white surrogate mother, her dying brown and white grandfathers, and the new patriarch Togi, Huia finds a place to rest, recuperate. A place to call home. Her discarded, forgotten and abandoned ancestral home provides refuge and shelter from the coming and going to her roots (hooks, 1990, 1997). The meeting house is just that, it is the space where she stands face to face with her tupuna, her history, her future. It is a homespace away from her Maori and Pakeha colonial landscapes, away from the endless river crossings, away from colonial relationships fought with the gendered and racial interplay of power between the old and the new, between the brown/Maori and the white/Pakeha/Other, between women and men. This sacred (resilient) space, is OutSide This Side and That Side. It is InSide. The meeting house is a private place, a silent place, but a space filled with the happy noises of her people as they re-member themselves to her, gather her up into their arms and whisper, "e kare, haere mai."

**Embracing Maori Women's Bi/multi Racial Hybridity**

The problem with post modern conversations is that they work against a cosy universal truth, an unquestionable reality (Young, 1990). Post colonial articulations on Maori women's cultural hybridity can be uncomfortable, challenging and for some of us frightening in their sense of instability, unfixity. There is a new anxiety over who gets to be Maori enough (Meridith, 1999, 1999a, 1999b). There is a fear that in talking about 'individual' experiences of Maori women's cultural hybridity, the mana of Maori women will be usurped. A post colonial articulation of Maori women's identity presupposes that Maori have arrived in present time. Bi/multi racial subjectivity threatens the idea that Maori are still rooted to their past, confined to their native spaces and confined to the places reserved for the Other. The bi/multi racial woman testifies to the fact that Maori women have been everywhere, are everywhere and have participated in things unMaori (Bhabha, 1994a, 1994b).

In her uncanny familiarity (her female/Maoriness) the bi/multi racial woman metaphorically resembles 'home', a landscape that is recognised and loved. Further, her ability to move across cultures at will destabilises the idea of fixed cultural boundaries and spaces. Her diaspora means she has multiple homes, and enroute, she is out of her racially designated cultural place (cf. McDowell, 1997, 1999). Yet in her difference (Pakeha/Other racial/cultural identity) she is perceived as a threat, that which horrifies and invokes terror in both Maori and Pakeha. Thus terrorised, the observer has to deny the presence/reality of the bi/multi racial woman in an effort to deny her existence. She refuses to be fixed or
located by the new patriarchal demands placed upon her corporeal person. If she is absent from her 'traditional' kitchen, who will take care of reproducing the Maori nation and en culturating future offspring into taha Maori? Who will be metonymic of the marae/traditional landscape if she is out vacillating? Further, who will carry the required difference for Maori to fashion their traditional identities against?

Ashton-Warner (1966) resolves this problem by placing Huia firmly into the tribal landscape of the Te Renga Renga peoples after the death of her Koro. She states:

By the end of the week when the time comes to send the spirit of the old one to Hawaiki it is old Niki who clothes the new rangatira in the ceremonial cloak to speak the last lament and who places in her ears the precious jewel-stones... When at last old Niki is satisfied with it [her hair] and not one strand strays from its place, she fixes a taniko band around her head, low across the forehead above the brows, and in it places the huia feather, the symbol of her rank. The traditional flax puipui is, of course, too big for her, wraps around her waist twice and reaches below the calves of her legs, while the ceremonial cloak of kiwi touches the ground in places. Yet as she stands with the sun on her head and the reflections in her eyes, barefoot before the bier, she is indisputably a rangatira (p. 208).

Positioned thus, Huia is subjectivated with the status/identity of tribal leader. Coming into representation as the Maori nation's future hope, Hybrid Huia is required to forfeit her ability to be represented as anything other than quintessentially Maori. Her bi/multi racial hybrid performance/s and borderlands existence are subordinated to the colonial agenda where her bi/multi racial difference/hybridity is regulated, controlled and ultimately denied. Unable to live with the uncanny tension that Hybrid Huia provokes in the psyche of the nation, the author removes Huia's agency to live her bi/multi racial cultural diaspora. Huia is forced to return to modernity and live in a landscape of timelessness and tradition. Ironically, Ashton-Warner (1966) writes that it is her Pakeha family who get to corporeally move and vacillate cross culturally to other worlds, landscapes and post modern possibilities:

[but when the Considines take off down-river on the last morning of summer they leave one of their name behind them; Huia Brice Considine stands on the landing holding with both hands her greenstone [clasping symbol of traditional landscape] (p, 213).

I am left to question whether Ashton-Warner's articulation of Huia's re-nativised and singular cultural identity is a product of her visionary genius. Did she have insight into the subjugations that bi/multi racial women would face in the bicultural nation during the turn of the new millennium? Or did her own white Pakeha woman's uneasiness concerning Maori women's bi/multi raciality create an uncanny desire to deny Hybrid Huia's hybridity/existence? Is this why Huia's cultural hybridity was ultimately disavowed and negated to the tribal landscape and origin of her residual difference/brownness? Given that Ashton-Warner may have experienced herself as a bicultural (Maori/Pakeha) hybrid at a time when New Zealand was neatly dichotomised into us/Pakeha and them/Maori, what does this have to do with her own agency to reconfigure her identity; an identity that no doubt shifted to accommodate the changing landscapes she would eventually come to inhabit?

Was Ashton-Warner obliged to negate her own sense of Maori/Pakeha subjectivity/hybridity in order to survive as a white Pakeha female at the time Greenstone was written during the 1960s? Was Huia's subjugated difference (cultural hybridity), a conduit in which she could project her own self-imposed denial of difference? Given that
bi/multi racial women are still seeking representation in Aotearoa in the 2000s, what possibility would there have been for Ashton-Warner to live with her own sense of cultural hybridity during the 1960s? In order to be accepted within the mono-cultural nation at that time, it is probable that Ashton-Warner had to find a way to symbolically leave her Maori self/Huia behind. Her Maoriness safely cocooned in the memory/landscape of her youth, she is symbolically free to culturally vacillate/return to the rural landscape of Whanganui at will. No doubt her ability to nurture this identity narrative enabled her to have an internal sense of resiliency/cultural mobility which informed her educational work with Maori and inspired her literary achievements. Like her character Huia, Ashton-Warner found her own Inside the Outside of ThisSide and ThatSide.

Conclusion

In concluding, I suggest that parallel narratives of Maori women's identity are required if we are to genuinely honour the Treaty of Waitangi and give all women of Maori ancestry the right to define themselves (Irwin, 1992). Kathy Irwin (1992) states:

> With the right theory as a tool we can take the right to our tino rangatiratanga, our sovereignty as Maori women, to be in control of making sense of our world and our future, ourselves. We can and must design new tools - Maori feminist theories, to ensure that we have control over making sense of our world and our future. This is a feminist position in which the artificial creation, inflation, and maintenance of male power over women is unacceptable (p. 5).

Future research and professional undertakings on bi/multi racial Maori women must take into account the specificities of her corporeal difference/s, her cultural hybridity and the new and multifarious forms of discrimination that she is subjected to in the nation today. As Moreton-Robinson (2000) indicates, an examination of whiteness is central to this task. A close examination of the place of whiteness within the New Zealand nation and its colonialist discursive trajectories (for example, the education system), must be undertaken to deconstruct the colonial authority invested in the unmarked, disinterested subject (Lloyd, 1991; Moreton-Robinson, 2000).

At all times, we must be aware that even in the absence of the bi/multi racial woman's Maori cultural capital (markers of traditional Maori essence), such as te reo Maori, tikanga, whenua and whanau, she may still identify and even define herself as Maori. In the absence of an alternative identity narrative that can speak to her cultural hybridity, bi/multi racial women may invariably elect to be identified as 'Maori'. In the landscape of Aotearoa, the homespace of her people, she recognises and sustains herself through the relationships she has with her ancestors, finding refuge in the lands they watch over and the lands that watch over her. She feels it in her bones; she feels it every time she identifies a significant landscape as her turangawaewae. She performs it every time she reaches out her hand to another human being to help them understand and manage their difference. Her sense of being Maori is not diluted by the existence of her Other identities. Rather, they give her an internal referent against which she can constantly reaffirm her sense of Maoriness. By her spirit she is Maori.

A spatial and temporal metaphor is deliberately invoked in my concluding remarks to re-emphasise how biracial females (like Huia), and cultural hybrids (like Ashton-Warner), pursue their own sense of emancipation through accessing a dual/multiple cultural subjectivity.
My own identity discursively re/positioned, re/imagined, re/configured, finds its resonance in Huia’s story. Born ‘Teresa Huia Lyons’, I retrospectively deconstruct my present identification as a ‘multiply subjectivated’ Maori Pakeha/Other woman. For me, the name ‘Teresa’ functions as the contemporary name/identity I was positioned with at birth, while ‘Lyons’, the name of my Pakeha/Irish father, represents his ancestry. ‘Huia’, the name chosen for me, symbolises a precious exotic and extinct bird, greatly prized by Maori. As an agent of my shifting subjectivity, I reconfigured my new ‘self’ by relinquishing the name ‘Teresa’, a name I associated with modernity symbolised in the popular culture of the 1960s. By extension, I forewent my paternal/patriarchal name ‘Lyons’ because its white dominance did not sit comfortably in my future trajectory as a female Maori hybrid. However, I retained the name ‘Huia’ which symbolises my turangawaewae, the continuity in my dual/multiple racial and cultural histories linking me to this land, this place, at All Time. Situated between the name ‘Teresa’ (emphasising my entry into modernity via my contemporary positioning as a first generation urban Maori/Pakeha) and Lyons (emphasising the colonial presence in my history and the fixity of this for my future, I retained the name ‘Huia’ (that which denies the legitimacy of modernity and the processes of colonialism). Further, by formally reconstructing myself as ‘Tess’ (a derivative of Teresa) when I was ten years old, I took the pieces back from modernity that suited me and fashioned them to work for me in the present/future, a tool and an accessory embodied in the name ‘Tess’. I then added to this configuration the names/voices of my Maori tupuna ‘Moeke-Maxwell’ that sit protectively (in postcolonial presence) after ‘Huia’ (continuity with the past) and beyond ‘Tess’ (entry into post-modernity). The spirit of my tupuna’s presence comforts me and positions me in this nation in a familiar way, despite my Maori Pakeha/Other hybridity. I am at home in my tupuna and they in me. My corporeal body carries the mark of their presence, connection and relationship to Papatuanuku and to all peoples who live here.

Unlike Ashton-Warner I do not require a fictional/imagined Maori interlocutor /Huia, to narrate my hybrid identity through. My bi/multi racial whakapapa gives me the context to understand and make sense of my cultural hybridity. My dual whakapapa binds me irrevocably to the landscape of Aotearoa and informs the experiences I have as a bi/multi racially subjectivated Maori woman. Unlike Ashton-Warner, the corporeal bi/racial body/waka I negotiate across the new current of River Colonialism contains the residue of racial difference signified in the presence of my brownness. My difference is real, not imagined. The neo colonial racism I experience as a bi/multi racial woman is not fantasy but actuality. However, like Ashton-Warner, my diasporic (real and symbolic) comings and goings to the respective landscape/s of my tupuna/past are not romantic nonsense but a tool of emancipation and survival.

Ko au te mokopuna o Minaora raua ko Hori.
I am the grandchild of Minaora and Hori.

Aotearoa

This
land is joined
everywhere
Seamless
Papatuanuku is not
sutured, stitched
Dividing lines
just make her laugh
until her big
belly quivers
Her breasts shake

Her breath escapes
in one Long
White Cloud
Aotearoa
Her skin stretches
to fit everyone in
She laughs loudly
at the myth that
her Body is
dismembered

Split

Glossary Of Maori Words

Aotearoa: New Zealand; "Land of the Long White Cloud"
Aroha: Love; caring; concern; compassion
E hine: Form of approach to a girl/young woman
E kare: Darling; loved one; term of endearment
Haere mai: Welcome; come here
Hinengaro: Mind; heart; conscience
Hui: Gathering; meeting
Huia: Extinct indigenous bird prized for its feathers
Iwi: Tribe; extended family group; people
Kiwi: Indigenous flightless nocturnal bird; New Zealander
Koro: Elderly man; grandfather
Korowai: Cloak woven of natural fibres and feathers
Kotiro: Girl
Kuia: Elderly woman; grandmother
Makutu: Supernatural power; black magic
Mana: Prestige; influence; authority
Marae: Meeting ground; traditional infrastructure
Mokopuna: Grandchild
Ngati (Nga/Ngai): People of. (used with tribal names)
Pa: Fortified village
Pakeha: New Zealander of European/British ancestry
Papatuanuku: Earth mother; the land
Rangatira: Chief/tan (male/female)
Rangatiratanga: Chiefly; self-government; tribal independence
Rangi: Sky
Taku: My
Tangata whenua: Indigenous person/people; "people of the land"
Taniko: A woven design in flax fibre
Taonga: Property; treasure; artefact
Tapu: Sacred; spiritual ban; forbidden
Tauiwi: White colonial settler; foreigner; immigrant
Te reo Maori: The Maori language
Tikanga: Indigenous knowledge/practice; traditional custom
Tinana: Body
Tino rangatiratanga: Total self-government; national independence
Tohunga: Priest
Tohunga makutu: Priest who uses supernatural power
Tupuna: Ancestor
Turangawaewae: Living place/homeplace; "place to stand"
Tuturu: Authentic; original
Wahine: Woman
Waiata: Song; to sing
Wairua: Spirit
Wairuatanga: Spirituality; spiritual life force
Waka: Canoe
Wero: Challenge
Whakapapa: Ancestry; genealogical links
Whanau: Family; community
Whanaungatanga: Kinship systems/relationships; relative; kin
Whare: House
Wharenui: Meeting house
Whenua: Land; placenta
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