

### 3. LANGUAGE POLICY

#### 3.1 Education Policy from 1847 to 1871

A facet of Crown policy on amalgamation of the races noted in chapter 1 was the emphasis on the provision of instruction in the English language to Maori attending state funded schools. The Education Ordinance 1847, section 3, stipulated that instruction in the English language was to be a necessary part of the school system. At that stage in the development of the fledgling state's structures, the Crown colony government did not attempt to establish a system of state schools. Rather, a number of existing missionary establishments began to receive government support in the form of financial grants and land endowments derived from the Crown's waste lands. Church of England, Wesleyan and Roman Catholic schools were recognised for this purpose. The government's desire to promote English language education was not necessarily complementary to the aims of the administering religious bodies. They had an interest in propagation of the gospel to Maori and training indigenous ministers for missionary work. Literacy promotion prior to 1847 had always been in the medium of Maori language and this focus was not likely to be affected by the stroke of a legislative pen. Grey, who had proposed and assented to the Ordinance, was generally supportive of the efforts of missionary societies in the work of advancing British notions of civilisation among Maori. Nevertheless he reported to his imperial government superiors that the missionaries were deficient 'in the extent of the means provided for the education of children in the districts confided to their care'.<sup>1</sup>

The situation that arose at Otaki in 1858 is illustrative of church-state tensions. Octavius Hadfield was a Church of England minister based at Otaki who clearly did not embrace all aspects of the government's education policy. In his view 'any scheme whose object is to effect a rapid alteration in the habits and customs of the Natives will prove abortive, and disappoint the anticipations of its authors. This does not arise from the backwardness on the part of Natives to change, ... It arises simply from the inherent difficulty of speedily producing such a change in a people'.<sup>2</sup> Hadfield would not permit government commissioners to inspect the Otaki industrial school. In this stance he was not supported at a major

1. Grey to Earl Grey, 7 March 1849, BPP, vol 6, p 27

2. Hadfield, 'Otaki, 1856' in 'Reports on Native Schools', AJHR, 1858, E-1, p 35

meeting by the Ngati Raukawa and Ngati Toa rangatira Matene Te Whiwhi who had invited him to the area in 1839. Te Whiwhi was a famous Christian missionary and also an important advocate at that time for the establishment of a Maori king. In his view the school was now in an unsatisfactory state. He laid great stress on the fact that the children should be taught in the English language.<sup>3</sup> Thus in 1858 it was not at all inconsistent for a champion of Kingitanga also to argue firmly in favour of English language instruction for Maori children in schools.

Reports from government commissioners and inspectors added to the pressure for a greater emphasis on teaching English in state-funded mission schools. Hugh Carleton (a long serving MHR for Bay of Islands and Chairman of Committees in the House) was a schools inspector in the Auckland province. His view on language policy was unequivocal:

In regard to the teaching of the scholars, I consider that too much stress cannot be laid upon the acquirement of the English language. I believe that civilization cannot be advanced beyond a very short stage through means of the aboriginal tongue. The Maori tongue sufficed for the requirements of a barbarous race, but apparently would serve for little more.<sup>4</sup>

The Board of Commissioners, reporting to Parliament in 1858, expressed itself in more measured tones but to similar effect. They noted the 'great duty' resting on the general government to promote the education of native and half-caste children and urged that the government ought not to be discouraged by past failures 'inasmuch as the very nature of the objective to be accomplished obviously implies difficulties.' They then urged:

That English masters and mistresses should be invariably employed, the teaching of the English language to be made the prominent feature of the instruction.<sup>5</sup>

A response to these requests, both by Maori wishing to engage constructively with Pakeha and by settlers wishing to amalgamate Maori, was the enactment of the Native Schools Act 1858. This Act provided a long term fiscal commitment to education of Maori by providing for a seven year allocation of funding instead of annual appropriations. The 1847 Ordinance's stipulation that instruction in the English language should

3. Te Whiwhi, Evidence to Commissioners, 9 December 1857, *ibid.*, p 57

4. Carleton, 'Further Report on Schools in the Province of Auckland', *ibid.*, p 77

5. 'Reports on Native Schools', AJHR, 1857, E-1, p 55

form a necessary part of the school system was re-enacted as section 9 of the 1858 Act. Only schools administered by the three favoured Christian denominations were recognised, however, and inspectors continued to lament that school instruction in many schools was in the Maori language. The churches also tended to favour the education of small numbers of selected students in their boarding schools, whilst the inspectors sought the establishment of numerous village primary schools for the civilisation of the race en masse.<sup>6</sup> In the latter years of the 1860s the government decided to move away from reliance on religious bodies. 'The provision that all schools must be in connection with one of three religious bodies is arbitrary' wrote the Native Under Secretary in 1865, 'and not unlikely in some cases to defeat the object of the Act.'<sup>7</sup> In any case, many mission schools were abandoned during the wars in the 1860s. The government therefore set about establishing an entirely new structure of schooling with a much stronger emphasis on English language education in schools to be built on Maori gifted land in the near vicinity of their papakainga.

Debates on the Maori Schools Bill, enacted as the Native Schools Act 1867, indicated the importance of language policy in the secular system of village primary schools that was to be established under the legislation. Most members of the House supported the principle that Maori communities should be required to formally request the establishment of a school and that they should endow it with land, but that the language of instruction should definitely be English. For Carleton 'things had now come to pass that it was necessary either to exterminate the Natives or civilize them'.<sup>8</sup> O'Neil agreed with the Bill because in the past 'money has been spent on the Natives in teaching them their own Native language instead of teaching them English.'<sup>9</sup> Richardson in the Legislative Council strongly endorsed the notion that all education carried on in the schools should be in the English language.<sup>10</sup> A minority view expressed by Graham was that the schools 'should first teach the Natives to read and write in their own language'.<sup>11</sup>

Slow progress was achieved under the 1867 Act but rapid developments occurred after McLean's Native Schools Amendment Act 1871 came into force. The cost to Maori in establishing schools was relaxed for those hapu who were able to offer the necessary land but were unable to contribute sufficient money for buildings and teacher salaries. The de-

6. W W Bird, 'A Review of the Native Schools Systems', *Te Wananga*, vol 2, no 1, 1930, pp 8–14; 'Native Schools: Reports of Inspectors', AJHR, 1862, E-4, pp 14–18 (Carleton), p 35 (Taylor); Clarke to Native Minister, 20 December 1862, AJHR, 1863, E-9, p 17

7. Rolleston to Native Minister, AJHR, 1865, E-2, p 2

8. Carleton, 10 September 1867, NZPD, 1867, vol 1, pt 2, p 863

9. O'Neil, 10 September 1867, p 862

10. Richardson, 24 September 1867, *ibid*, p 1051

11. Graham, 10 September 1867, *ibid*, p 866

bates in Parliament in 1871 included a statement of the Native Minister's policy:

The real difficulty with the Natives was, that they did not understand the English language, and in this respect the principles of the Act of 1867 would be adhered to, as nothing would better tend to bridge over the existing gulf between the two races than the education of the Native race in the English language.<sup>12</sup>

Swanson, who later served as a member of the Executive Council in 1876 and 1879, stressed in his speech the importance of 'one common tongue' and wished Native children to speak English in the playground as well as the classroom. He thought that English-speaking children should be enrolled with Maori in the Native schools to assist in that direction.<sup>13</sup> Takamoana (Eastern Maori) expressed similar sentiments about mixing Maori and settler children in the schools and was of the opinion that Maori wanted education in the hands of the government alone rather than under the management of clergymen.<sup>14</sup>

### 3.2 'That Our Children May Be Taught the English Language'

The responses of Maori communities to the Native Schools Acts varied. In some regions of the country there was a great enthusiasm for establishing schools, whilst in other regions with large Maori populations no schools at all were established. As the Act required a formal request from a committee in a Maori community and as land had to be gifted to the Crown before a school would be established, the geographical spread of Native schools gives an insight into the diversity of Maori responses to Crown policy. Hapu in te Tai Tokerau and te Tai Rawhiti were the most enthusiastic about schools. They had been neutral or had fought alongside Crown forces in the recent wars and had been little affected by war operations. Thus in 1871 rangatira at Mangawhare in the northern Kaipara region wrote to Rogan, the local Resident Magistrate. Their letter, as translated, read:

Our first word is to talk about the school. Great is our approval. Let schools be established in these districts that our children may be taught the English language and other branches of education. Let the troubles be confined to the other end of the island.<sup>15</sup>

12. McLean, 13 October 1871, NZPD, 1871, vol 11, p 327

13. Swanson, 13 October 1871, *ibid.*, p 328

14. Takamoana, 13 October 1871, *ibid.*, p 328. See also H and G Lee, 'The Politics of Maori Education: History, Policies, Conflicts, and Compromises', *Waikato Journal of Education*, vol 1, 1995, pp 106–108

15. Parore te [Awha] and others to Rogan, 5 July 1873, AJHR, 1873, G-1A, p 1

In 1876 Wi te Hakiro and 336 others from te Tai Tokerau petitioned Parliament for two types of schools to be established. For older children, who knew only Maori and Maori customs, they should be taught to read and write in Maori. Young children however should be taught only in English and Maori children should mix with European children in playgrounds that should be English speaking areas. The petitioners desired that schoolteachers and their families should be altogether ignorant of Maori language knowledge so as to force Maori children to speak English.<sup>16</sup> From te Tai Rawhiti region an example of a petition in favour of English language schooling arose from a meeting of more than 990 Maori attending a hui at Pakowhai in 1877:

11. The Government should use every endeavour to have schools established throughout the colony, so that the Maori children can learn the English language, for by this they will be on the same footing as Europeans, and will become acquainted with the means by which the Europeans have become great.<sup>17</sup>

Demographic facts concerning the relative size of the Maori to the non-Maori population are no doubt relevant to the shift away from Maori acceptance of schooling in the Maori language. Up until about 1858 Maori comprised the majority of the total population in the whole country and in the North Island they remained dominant in economic, political and social terms throughout virtually all the northern part of the island. The colonial government was well aware of this. Thus in 1852 when rumours first began to circulate about gold to be found in Maori customary lands of the Coromandel region, the government acted with deliberate circumspection. Wynyard, Lieutenant-Governor of the province of New Ulster, wrote to the Governor-in-Chief, Grey, that 'as regards the white population (12,000 by last census) my course, I conceive, as Lieutenant-Governor, is simple enough' but 'with the natives of the province (60,000 in number) the greatest prudence and circumspection will be required.'<sup>18</sup> In the New Ulster region the only significant Pakeha settlements were the Bay of Islands, Auckland and New Plymouth. Self evidently, the lingua franca outside those small settlements continued to be Maori. By the 1858 census the non-Maori population (59,328) had just eclipsed the estimate of the total Maori population (55,539) but in the North Island as a whole the Pakeha population was still a distinct minority (53,056 Maori to 34,094 non-Maori) and was still confined to a few

16. 'Petition of Wi Te Hakiro and 336 others', AJHR, 1876, J-4, pp 1–3

17. 'Petitions of Renata Kawepo and 790 others and of Piripi Ropata and 200 others', AJHR, 1877, J-1, p 4

18. Wynyard to Grey, 25 October 1852, despatch 121, G-8/8 as cited in R Anderson, *Gold Mining Legislation and Policy*, Wellington, Waitangi Tribunal Rangahaua Whanui Series, 1996, p 9 [The despatch is referred to – but not reproduced in – BPP, 1854, vol 9, Command 1779, p xiv] [Note: Under the 1846 constitution, New Ulster comprised the portion of the North Island north of a line drawn east at the latitude of the Patea river-mouth. See 'The New Colony 1840–1847' in M McKinnon (ed), *New Zealand Historical Atlas: Ko Papatuanuku e Takoto Nei* [New Zealand Historical Atlas], Albany, David Bateman/Department of Internal Affairs, 1997, Plate 31.]

settlement areas. Only 16 years later the situation was very different. The 1874 census demonstrated the dramatic inflow of migrants in those few years. There were now nearly 300,000 non-Maori inhabitants (299,514) whilst the Maori population had dwindled to an estimated 48,000. This was the period when the petitions quoted above were written. By 1896 the total Maori population had declined to its lowest ebb at a little over 40,000 whilst the non-Maori population had climbed to some 700,000 and had spread out to all regions of the country.<sup>19</sup> It would not have required access to census statistics for hapu to know from the 1870s that they had well and truly become a minority within their own land.

Given this immense demographic change within such a short period of time, it is not surprising that many Maori leaders wanted English language instruction for their children so that they and their people could engage constructively with the new dominant culture and economy. Thus many requests to establish Native schools under the 1871 Act were dispatched to the Government, along with the requisite gift of land to the Government for that purpose. By 1879, 57 Native schools had already been established. There were then openings and closings of schools as local circumstances changed, but a steady overall increase in the total number of Native schools to 97 in 1907 and 146 in 1940. By 1955 the number of Maori schools had grown to 166.<sup>20</sup> After that date the central government policy of integration, rather than an unwillingness of Maori communities to support Maori schools, led to an increase in transfers of Maori schools to the administration of Education Boards.

### 3.3 Passive Resistance

The eagerness of some Maori for English language education, illustrated by the petitions quoted above, was not uniform in the various districts where Maori still comprised a large proportion of the population. As Barrington noted, the marked enthusiasm for Native schools in the north and the east was in stark contrast to the complete lack of enthusiasm for such schools in the Waikato, King Country and Taranaki districts of te Tai Hauauru. His maps for the location of Maori schools as at 1881, 1900, 1929 and 1956 clearly indicate that although the number of schools increased over time, the geographical spread hardly changed. Almost all schools were established in the far north and along the eastern coastline

19. New Zealand Historical Atlas, plates 30, 31 and 53

20. J M Barrington, 'Maori Attitudes to Pakeha Institutions after the Wars: a Note on the Establishment of Schools', *N Z Journal of Educational Studies*, vol 6, no 1, 1971, pp 25–26; J Simon (ed) and others, *Nga Kura Maori: The Native Schools System 1867–1969*, Auckland, Auckland University Press, 1998, pp 12 and 18 [See also p 24 for comment on an 1872 request for a school at Ahipara]

from Bay of Plenty to Wairarapa. A few came to be established in the region of Whanganui River and around Lake Taupo. Barrington gave weight to what he called the 'steady breaking down of resistance to assimilation and resentment of Pakeha control' when noting the establishment of a few schools in Waikato and King Country.<sup>21</sup> However they were few and far between in relation to the density of Maori populations in the Coromandel, Waikato, and King Country. Barrington also noted the reports by Pope, Inspector of Native Schools from 1880 to 1903, of the long standing determination by Taranaki Maori to resist any government attempt to have a school established in their district.<sup>22</sup> Department of Education officials have stated that no Native or Maori schools were ever established in Taranaki.<sup>23</sup> This is not quite true. In his last report, Pope was able to take pride in the fact that 'Puniho School just outside the precincts of Parihaka District' was opened in 1903 in what was 'hitherto a *terra incognita* to Native-school work.' As a Native school, however, it was not to last for long as it was transferred to the Taranaki Board of Education in 1908.<sup>24</sup> Bay of Plenty was the only raupatu district where Maori requested the establishment of a large number of these schools but Pope's annual reports also note considerable opposition to the schools, and especially that 'Te Kooti's interference injuriously affects attendance'.<sup>25</sup>

It is evident that many hapu living in raupatu districts and war-affected regions adhered to a form of passive resistance by declining to request government-controlled Native schools for their children. This non-cooperation continued over a long period of time. From 1894 schooling for Maori children became a matter of legal compulsion as a result of the School Attendance Act. As a result the number of Native schools increased significantly in the north and east of the North Island. In the main raupatu districts, however, Maori parents did not necessarily obey the edict of compulsory schooling for their children. If they did go to school, it was to Board-controlled public schools that the children were sent. Active cooperation with the government, including the gifting of land to the Crown for a school site, was not forthcoming in most villages of those districts. Adherents from religious and political movements emphasising Maori self-determination and *mana motuhake* generally are notable by their absence from archival records concerning the Native schools and their English language education policies. However, Binney records a well known incident when the prophet Rua in 1906 took children away from the Waimana school and splashed them with water to

21. Barrington, pp 26–27

22. Ibid, p25: Pope to Inspector-General of Schools, 31 March 1896, 'Education: Native Schools', AJHR, 1896, E-2, p11; Pope to Inspector-General of Schools, 31 March 1904, 'Education: Native Schools', AJHR, 1904, E-2, p 1

23. K I Robertson, 'Maori Education', Submission No. 4 from the Commission of Education in New Zealand, 30 June 1960, MA 1, 57/1, vol 7, Education - General and Policy 1960–61, NA Wellington, fol 14

24. Pope to Inspector-General of Schools, 31 March 1904, 'Education: Native Schools', AJHR, 1904, E-2, p 3; Bird and Porteous to Inspector-General, 22 March 1909, 'Education: Native Schools', AJHR, 1909, E-3, p 2

25. Pope to Inspector-General, 31 March 1882, 'Education: Native Schools', AJHR, 1882, E-2, p 3

remove the tapu from them. He asserted that there was no longer a need to learn English because the Pakeha would be sent away shortly.<sup>26</sup>

In the South Island, also, there was a mixed response. An example of passive resistance to Native schools may be gleaned from the evidence presented to the Native Affairs Committee in 1882 concerning the petition of Ngai Tahu leaders Hori Kerei Taiaroa and Ihaia Tainui, the former and then current MHR for Southern Maori.<sup>27</sup> In response to a question from his namesake, George Grey (the former governor), Taiaroa mentioned that there were public school committees at Arowhenua, Waimatamate and Riverton that had declined to admit native children in 1868. When asked whether permanent arrangements had since been made for those children, Taiaroa noted that 'Arowhenua is one of the places at which they declined to accept schools' and at Waimate 'There was no possibility after a while of establishing a school there; – the natives getting scattered abroad'.<sup>28</sup> Moeraki was another settlement that declined a school. Alexander MacKay's evidence to the parliamentary committee included references to his visits to Ngai Tahu settlements as Crown Commissioner in 1867 to explain the recently enacted Native Schools Act and 'to obtain the cooperation of the natives in the establishment of schools under its provisions.' MacKay recorded that he was asked at meetings whether these schools were to be established to fulfil the promises of schools and hospitals made to Ngai Tahu at the time of the Middle Island [South Island] land purchase transactions. MacKay did not think that schools under the 1867 Act were 'a strict fulfillment of the intention' in Mantell's promises to Ngai Tahu.<sup>29</sup>

What is apparent from this evidence is that, in spite of Maori children being refused admission at public schools in 1868, some communities nevertheless refused to cooperate with the Crown by providing land and money to establish Native schools under the 1867 Act. It is evident that Ngai Tahu leaders meeting with MacKay believed that the establishment of schools for their children was a pre-existing obligation that the Crown had yet to fulfil, and that the entire cost of such schools should be borne by the Crown. It would have been particularly galling, therefore, that the teacher salary for the Native school at Riverton seems to have been paid for out of Rakiura [Stewart Island] reserves funds.<sup>30</sup>

What is not immediately apparent in the parliamentary record is why communities at Arowhenua and Moeraki refused to accept a school and why Waimate Maori were 'scattered abroad'. It is worth noting that

26. J Binney and others, *Mihaia*, Wellington, Oxford University Press, 1979, pp 34–35

27. Petition of H K Taiaroa and I Tainui (52/1882), AIHR, 1882, I-2, p 33

28. Evidence of H K Taiaroa, Le1, 1882/6, Maori Petitions, NA Wellington, fols 5–6

29. Evidence of A MacKay, *ibid*, fols 25–26

30. Evidence of H K Taiaroa, *ibid*, fols 6–7

Arowhenua was the birthplace of Hipa Te Maiharoa, a tohunga of the Kaingarara religion. Te Waimatamate [Waimate] was the birthplace of Horomona Pohio who became the secular leader and public spokesman for Te Maiharoa.<sup>31</sup> In 1877, Te Maiharoa led over 100 followers to establish a new settlement, Te Ao Marama, in the upper Waitaki valley. He did this in order to draw attention to Ngai Tahu claims over the lands of the interior and to protest about the paucity of reserves laid out for the tribe after the Crown purchases.<sup>32</sup> Following unsuccessful pleas from Taiaroa urging the community to leave voluntarily, the people at Te Ao Marama were forcibly dispersed by a posse of armed constabulary in 1879. In the course of this police action, the Moeraki leader, Rawiri Te Maire, was detained briefly.<sup>33</sup> Te Maiharoa and his people then made their way back to various coastal settlements but continued to protest against the Crown's broken promises.

It is not surprising that communities with leaders who led religious and political movements to revive traditional Maori beliefs and to protest Crown treatment of Maori were not disposed to cooperate with the government's Native schools system. For many North Island districts, there is no doubt a substantial body of oral history and of written records in te reo Maori not perused by my research assistant. I am sure that records such as Kingitanga newspapers would confirm a strong tradition of opposition or passive resistance to Native schools and their kaupapa of English language education. Such Maori responses to Crown policy tend to surface in government archives only in a tangential manner as with Pope's glee in 1899 that at last schools had been opened at Ruatoki in the Urewera, at Kawhia, and at Te Kuiti in the King Country. Moreover, there was particular glee that there had been a request for a school at Parawera, the former residence of King Tawhiao. Pope's astringent comment on this is worth recording: '*Hakas, poi* dances, and feasting never yet saved the souls alive of any tribe or nation and never will.'<sup>34</sup> Further research into Maori language sources would no doubt unearth a body of information to explain the blank spaces on Barrington's maps where no Native schools were ever established even though there were substantial Maori communities residing there. Further research might also unearth how Maori pupils fared in the board schools in the years after the School Attendance Act 1894 made primary schooling compulsory for all children. One might surmise that children from hapu unwilling to request the establishment of a Native school would not necessarily receive parental support

31. Te M Tau, 'Pohio, Horomona: Ngai Tahu leader, missionary, assessor, land protester', DNZB, vol 1, pp 342–343

32. R Somerville, 'Te Maiharoa, Hipa: Ngai Tahu leader, tohunga, prophet', *ibid*, pp 468–469

33. *Ibid*, p 469 [The meeting house now standing at Arowhenua is named, as I remember it from a visit there in 1992, 'Nga Hapa o Niu Tirani' – 'The Sins of New Zealand: 'Hapa' is Ngai Tahu dialect for 'hara'.]

34. Pope to Inspector-General of Schools, 31 March 1899, 'Education: Native Schools', AJHR, 1899, E-2, p 15

for doing well at school or attending regularly. It is inevitable that in communities that had been at war against British imperial forces a generation earlier, there would have been little cause to join in celebrations such as those for the relief of Mafeking, the surrender of Pretoria and the coronation of Edward VII. Activities such as the observance of Empire Day – and later on the observance of Dominion Day – singing ‘soldiers of the King’, ‘God Save the King’, regular saluting of the Union Jack, and Empire lessons as part of the curriculum would be bound to evoke mixed emotions. Such activities certainly took place in Native schools.<sup>35</sup> No doubt they were a feature of most, if not all, public schools as well. However, officials did not begin to pay significant attention to the educational needs of Maori pupils in public schools until the 1950s and 1960s, when urban migration brought significant numbers of Maori pupils from the rural backwaters into the New Zealand mainstream.

### 3.4 English in Schools, Maori at Home

The fact that there was enthusiasm by tribal leadership in some regions for English language education, and for English to be spoken in school playgrounds, need not entail a negative or an apathetic attitude to Maori language retention within those Maori communities. It is axiomatic, in my view, but perhaps needs to be stated as an explicit assumption of this report, that fluent use and knowledge of the Maori language is fundamentally essential to the preservation and vitality of Maori cultural knowledge systems. The language underpins the culture and helps to define it. The worldview and cosmology embedded in the language provide insights into aspects of Maori culture that are unique to the tangata whenua of this land. Arguably, the Maori language is the only appropriate means of transmitting Maori cultural knowledge. Indubitably, the Maori language is the most appropriate medium for transmitting Maori cultural knowledge. As will be noted below, there are officials and academics who have claimed that loss of fluency in speaking and understanding the language is not essential to the survival of an intact Maoritanga. This is a matter about which the Tribunal may wish to receive submissions, and possibly further evidence, from the parties to the Wai 262 proceedings.

In any case, there is virtually no trace in the available archival records of overt hostility, or even of resigned apathy, concerning the future of

35. I Brailsford, ‘Native Schools: Teachers’ Log Books, July–September 2000’ [appendix 1 attached to this report], pp 2, 4, 7, 9, 41

Maori as the language of communication and cultural transmission within Maori communities. Educationalists such as Pope and Barrington may have seen the establishment of Native schools as an acceptance by Maori of assimilation and of the need for progress towards civilisation. Yet Maori enthusiasm for the schools was entirely explicable for quite different reasons relating to learning to live in a predominantly European world. Moreover enthusiasm for English language teaching was not inconsistent with a desire to retain Maori as the language of tribal knowledge and cultural transmission. A rare instance of a different attitude is to be found in the report by W Baker, Resident Magistrate for the East Cape district in 1862. He claimed that an influential Ngati Porou chief wanted the old language to die out with his generation and he believed that this was warmly supported by other Maori in the district:

Let the Maori tongue die with my generation, as the taste of the fern-root and the mamaku will be lost with the old men who are now passing away. Let the tongues which have tasted of English food only utter the language of the great nation.<sup>36</sup>

The report is a second-hand account, without naming the speaker. It may tell us more about the wishful expectations of the Crown official rather than be a genuine expression of Ngati Porou leadership's desire for the Maori language to pass away entirely with the people of that generation.

In any case, Apirana Ngata, the great Ngati Porou leader of the succeeding generation, was a strong proponent both of Maori absorbing Pakeha ways, and of Maori retaining the cultural treasure of their Maori language. Thus he wrote to Buck in 1929:

There must be a careful overhaul of the things essential to the maintenance of the tribal or racial pride and self-respect, without which individuality must disappear. So it seems to me that language must be maintained. Indeed the English language fails in appeal to those subtle things that influence the mind and heart of them, no matter how well educated he may be.<sup>37</sup>

Buck in reply thought that preservation of the language was essential to preserve the racial integrity of Maori.<sup>38</sup> Ngata, writing in 1936, was concerned to emphasise and criticise the part being played by Maori mothers in influencing cultural knowledge within the family:

36. Baker to Native Secretary, 3 January 1862, 'Reports of Officers: East Cape', AIHR, 1862, E-9, part V, p 5

37. Ngata to Buck, 4 January 1929, in MPK Sorrenson (ed), *Na To Hoa Aroha: From Your Dear Friend*, Auckland, Auckland University Press, 1986, vol 1 (1925–30), p 165

38. Buck to Ngata, 6 March 1929, *ibid*, p 182

She is responsible for the language the child speaks – she indulges their taste towards the Pakeha and his ways, to the neglect of much that is worthwhile in Maori life.

Ngata was concerned to find equality between Maori and Pakeha without one group surrendering their cultural values. He was under no illusions as to the outcome if Maori language and culture was lost:

If culture is lost and there is no desire to regain it there can be no question whatever of the right course to pursue. The Maori must be treated completely as any other unit in the social system and all the method of approach to him as an individual on the assumption that it is desirable to retain his Maori individuality, while developing his efficiency as all ordinary citizens, would be discarded.<sup>39</sup>

Ngata campaigned for most of his public life to assert the paramountcy of English language in the formal schooling of Maori children. At no point, however, did he express any wish that Maori should cease to be the 'subtle' language of Maori individuality, racial pride and self-respect. Moreover, as will be detailed later in this chapter, towards the end of his life in the 1940s he began to actively promote the teaching of Maori language in primary schools. By that time he had become aware that Maori families and communities were no longer able, in the changing world of urban relocation, to ensure fluency in the language for the coming generation of children.

Turning from these brief comments on various Maori responses to Native schools education, I focus again on nineteenth-century Crown policy towards English as the primary language of education, civilisation and progress. After the enactment of the Native Schools Amendment Act 1871, settler politicians continued to press for a rigorous application of the legislation's requirements for English education of Maori. Thus Ormond, a close political ally of McLean, spoke out in 1877 against schools teaching in Maori. He argued that they would never be successful until they began all teaching in English and he praised McLean as 'the originator of the greatest civilizing agency which could be employed for the benefit of the Native people.'<sup>40</sup>

In 1879 administration of the Native schools was transferred from the Native Department to the central government's Department of Education. This was the beginning of a separate administration system within

39. Ngata to Sutherland, 14 September 1936, qMS-1586, Native Correspondence, ATL Wellington, fols 36–37

40. Ormond, 27 November 1877, NZPD, 1877, vol 27, p 516

that department that lasted until 1969. The Native schools, though, were not subject to the regional education boards established by the Education Act 1877 to administer compulsory primary education in state schools. Centralized bureaucratic management saw the appointment of organising inspectors for the Native schools who were career civil servants. By modern standards it is a remarkable fact that just four men – Pope, Bird, Porteus, and Ball supervised the Native school system for over 70 years until the early 1950s. Access to institutional memory was not a problem in the Native schools service. Consistent patterns of administration were maintained for many decades. Throughout all these decades the central role of English as the medium of instruction in all schools – board schools, Native schools and independent schools – was accepted as axiomatic. The overwhelming emphasis on a monolingual education, in a society that always seems to have highly prized monolingualism, was accepted so uncritically that it seldom surfaces in the archival records of Crown policy making and administration. Very little information on the fate of the many Maori children who were a minority in board schools in most parts of the country has been drawn to my attention until the 1950s. In that period integration policies and the Hunn Report 1960 began to highlight the social, economic and educational gaps between all Maori – whether educated at board schools or Maori schools – and non-Maori. There is, on the other hand, a substantial body of information on the stringent insistence over many years on English language as the medium of instruction and the language of the playground in the Native schools where were the majority, or all, of the pupils were Maori. It was only very recently in the country's history, after re-location and integration policies had prevailed during the migration of most Maori from rural to urban areas, that Crown policy began to recognize biculturalism, principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and bilingual education options. A survey of these topics is the subject of the remainder of this chapter on language policy.

### 3.5 The Native Schools Code 1880

The Native Schools Code 1880 set out the framework for the establishment and administration of Native Schools. The code was prepared by Pope and it set the pattern for the role of Native schools as centres of influence for assimilation. Although adaptation policies from about 1930

led to some changes of emphasis, in many respects Pope's code contained the guiding principles for Native schools right through until they finally succumbed to the dogma of integration as the new way forward in the mid-twentieth century. Key elements of Pope's code relevant to this chapter include the paramount requirement that 'The master will be expected to teach the native children to read and write the English language, and to speak it'. Although the master was being appointed to serve in Maori speaking communities no knowledge of Maori language was required: 'It is not necessary that teachers should at the time of their appointment, be acquainted with the Maori tongue.' This was so even though the duties of the teacher would not be confined to school instruction for the Maori children: 'it is expected that the teachers will by their kindness, their diligence, and their probity, exercise a beneficial influence on all natives in their district.' Pope's language policy was rigid for senior classes, but allowed slight flexibility in junior classes:

In all cases English is to be used by the teacher when he is instructing the senior classes. In junior classes the Maori language may be used for the purpose of making the children acquainted with the meaning of English words and sentences. The aim of the teacher, however, should be to dispense with the use of Maori as soon as possible.

In the conduct of the school 'Quality rather than quantity is the thing required. Especially when giving their English lessons should teachers bear this in mind.'<sup>41</sup> When it came to the question of discipline, teachers were admonished to avoid the use of corporal punishment if possible. It seems that this reflected Pope's view of best practice in the teaching of young children. Nevertheless, if it was found to be necessary to inflict corporal punishment, then it was mandatory that a record of each instance should be written up in the log book of school administration that each schoolteacher was required to maintain.<sup>42</sup>

The pivotal role of English language instruction in Native schools was reinforced by an instruction from the Inspector-General of Schools to the Inspector of Native Schools in 1888. This instruction was circulated by Pope to all teachers and read as follows:

The work done in all efficient Native Schools shows that it is quite possible to attain excellent results in the department of instruction specially denoted in the Code by the name of 'English'. The power of using

41. 'The Native School Code', AIHR, 1880, H-1F, pp 1-2. On the wider responsibilities of teachers 'to exert a steady influence tending to the elevation of the people amongst whom they live' by keeping neat and tidy houses and gardens and living 'a useful and blameless life' see J Hislop to Native School Teachers, Circular No. 5, 4 June 1880, E acc, W2536, box 1, Circulars to Native School Teachers, vol 1, 1879-94, NA Wellington. In 1930 Bird thought that the precepts of this circular should still be 'guiding lines to those who would enter upon Native Schools work': Bird, *Te Wananga*, vol 2, no. 2, p 5

42. J Hislop to Native School Teachers, Circular No. 5, 4 June 1880, E acc, W2536, box 1, Circulars to Native School Teachers, vol 1, 1879-94, NA Wellington, fol 2; Brailsford, p 2

the English language is perhaps the greatest boon that the schools can confer upon their pupils, and the best reason for the institution and maintenance of such schools is wanting if they fail in this respect. I am to ask you to be careful in future not to pass any pupil who in your judgment is weak in the English required for the standard for which he is examined. In any other subject you may sometimes overlook a slight deficiency provided that the candidates work in all the other subjects is more than satisfactory; but, on account of the paramount importance of English you will be so good as always to require proficiency in this subject as a condition of granting a pass for a standard.<sup>43</sup>

In his report for that year, Pope remarked that the teaching of English was second only in importance to the work of making Maori acquainted with European customs and ways of thinking.<sup>44</sup> In 1892 the Minister of Education, W P Reeves, added his authority to the necessity of passing in English if a pupil was to move from one standard to the next standard within a school:

The Minister regards the teaching of English as manifestly the most conspicuous object in view in the institution of Native schools. He is convinced that the work done in the best school may fairly be taken as indicating the results the Inspector has a right to look for, and he desires to have it clearly understood that in the future no child that is weak in reading or in English at a standard examination will be allowed to pass.<sup>45</sup>

### 3.6 The Direct, or Natural Method

Any flexibility allowed by Pope for the use of Maori with younger pupils was eliminated after his retirement in 1903. For William Bird 'the Native School Code no longer represented fairly what the schools were capable of doing' and this was especially noticeable because of 'the advance in English language, which had been the result of the direct method of teaching the subject'.<sup>46</sup> The Education Department's wisdom on this 'direct method' was later on published as a pamphlet. The method was based on the assumption that a second language would be learnt more effectively if the first language was not spoken at all. This was seen to be

43. Habens to Pope, 3 February 1888; Pope to all Teachers, 10 August 1888, E acc, W2536, box 1, Circulars to Native School Teachers, vol 1, 1879–94, NA Wellington

44. Pope to Inspector-General, 31 March 1888 'Education: Native Schools', AJHR, 1888, E-2, p 9

45. Reeves to Native School Teachers, 17 February 1892, AJHR, 1892, E-2, p3 [This circular was drawn up after Reeves had completed a tour of 21 Native schools: Bird, *Te Wananga*, vol 2, no. 2, p 12]

46. Bird, *Te Wananga*, vol 2, no. 2, p 18

'natural' because it was being taught as if the second language was really the children's first language and that they were acquiring it in a natural way talking about everyday events in conversational English. 'Facility and accuracy in the use of English' was the over-riding objective, 'not a knowledge of the structure of the language'. Maori children were to be spared detailed grammar, it seems, but they were to be immersed in English:

Do not speak to your pupils in Maori, and do not permit them to speak in Maori to you, or to one another if you can help it. The less they hear of Maori the better it will be for their English. Do not, however well you may speak the language, give orders in Maori, or attempt explanations.

'Blindman's buff', 'I spy' and 'Hide-and-seek' would be a means to introduce new English words and idioms. Cricket, football and tennis could 'afford excellent opportunities for giving readiness in the use of English.'<sup>47</sup>

Bird instigated a number of policy shifts in order to give greater support for the English-only policy. In his 1905 report he drew attention to the fact that the English examination for those seeking scholarships to enable them to attend secondary schools should be in English only. He did not approve of the fact that 'while a boy is forbidden to use Maori in a village school he is expected to translate Maori in his English examination for scholarship.' All Maori pupils, including those such as South Island Maori without full proficiency in Maori language, should be able to compete for the scholarships.<sup>48</sup> In 1906 he sent a memorandum to all teachers:

I should like to impress upon both teachers and Committees the necessity for encouraging the children to talk English on the playground, and to see that this is done as much as possible.<sup>49</sup>

It will be noted that this official policy on English in school playgrounds spoke of 'the necessity for encouraging' English usage. Later in this chapter there will be a discussion of punishments imposed for breaches by children of this injunction to use only English during the entire time they were at school.

47. Education Department, *The Teaching of English in Native Schools: The Direct, or Natural Method*, Wellington, Government Printer, 1917, p6. See Simon (ed), p 81

48. Bird to Inspector-General, 31 January 1905, 'Education: Native Schools', AJHR, 1905, E-2, p 9

49. Bird to Inspector-General, 31 March 1906, 'Education: Native Schools', AJHR, 1906, E-2, pp 11-12

### 3.7 Two School Systems

There was an obvious tension or ambiguity about pursuing the government's policy goal of achieving an amalgamation of the races whilst at the same time administering a separate school system intended specifically – though not exclusively – for Maori children. From an early stage, it was supposed that Native schools would be transferred in due course to the public school system controlled by regional Boards of Education. The transfer should occur as soon as the goal of Europeanisation of Maori pupils was attained or the arrival of a significant number of settler families in a district had the effect of Europeanising the school. If there were a majority of English speaking pupils or if the Maori pupils had made sufficient progress in English to work through all six standards of the state primary school curriculum, then the work of the Native school would be over. This was explicitly set out in the Native Schools Code 1880.<sup>50</sup> Later on, if questions were raised, the goal of eventual transfer to board control continued to be Crown policy – in theory at least. Fowlds, Minister of Education in 1908, stated that 'the end of every Native school is to become a public school; the difficulty arises in deciding when to make the change'.<sup>51</sup> The Pakeha administrators of the Native Schools, as well as leaders of the Maori communities who endowed them, generally tended to find reasons for continuing the existence of the separate system. For Bird and Porteous in 1911, not only were Native schools 'a necessary pioneer of civilization', but they also 'had the effect of breaking down the prejudices of the Maoris to the pakeha and his ways'.<sup>52</sup> Usually, however, the primary reason advanced to justify Native schools was that they enabled Maori to acquire fluency in English. Thus John Porteous, Senior Inspector in 1925, argued that 'the work of teaching the Maori children to speak, write, and understand English, and thus by means of the acquired language become acquainted with European customs and ways of thinking, constitutes probably the principal reason for the existence of Native schools'.<sup>53</sup>

By the late 1920s the Native school system was no longer catering for a majority of Maori children. Native schools rolls continued to grow steadily, but Maori enrolments in public schools grew much more rapidly. In an official paper later published in the *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, Parsonage in 1956 gave the figures as follows:<sup>54</sup>

50. Rule XVIII, 'The Native Schools Code', AJHR, 1880, H-1F, p 6

51. Fowlds, 8 July 1908, NZPD, 1908, vol 143, p 213

52. Bird and Porteous to Inspector-General, 31 March 1911, 'Education: Native Schools/AJHR, 1911, E-3, p 12

53. Porteous, 'Report of the Senior Inspector of Native Schools, Education of Native Children', AJHR, 1925, E-3, p 3

54. W Parsonage, 'The Education of Maoris in New Zealand', E2, 1956/4B, 29/2/97, Maori Education, NA Wellington, fol 6 – published in *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, vol 65, 1956, pp 5–11 [See also 'The Integration of Maori and Pakeha in New Zealand', April 1962, MS-Papers-5220-127, Miscellaneous Acts, Maps, Reports and Other Papers 1955–1962, ATL Wellington, fol 6, diagram 4 indicating that by 1960 there were 30,000 Maori in ordinary state schools.]

Year	Maoris enrolled in Maori Primary Schools	Maoris enrolled in Public Primary Schools
1929	6651	7772
1940	10,258	12,430
1950	13,931	18,699
1955	14,920	21,351

Presumably the fact of large numbers of Maori pupils in state schools was known earlier, but it did not become a focus of Crown policy until the moves towards integration in the 1950s. Parsonage's predecessors had focussed their attention on teaching English language in the education of Maori at Native schools. Some attention was given also to the adaptation policy introduced into Native Schools from 1930. From 1940, the development of state-established and funded Maori High Schools meant that rural Maori seeking secondary education were not restricted to seeking scholarships and gaining entry to the few remaining church-run boarding schools. Yet in both primary and secondary schools, the language policy laid down by Pope, Bird and Porteous prior to 1930 was modified but not rejected. Parsonage's conclusions on the period from 1930 to 1955 were these:

- ▶ The policy of the Maori schools prior to 1930 was in accordance with the prevailing policy of assimilating the Maori as rapidly as possible into the European way of life.
- ▶ The 1930 policy recognised the importance of selected Maori cultural elements and sought to foster these in the schools. The fostering of these cultural aspects has been a definite feature of the Maori schools during the past 25 years.
- ▶ Since 1930 the importance of a thorough knowledge of the English language has continued to be emphasized. While not claiming that all the problems associated with the teaching of English to Maori children have been solved, it can be claimed that modern methods have been freely and successfully adopted in Maori schools. There is a need to study further the special problems encountered in the initial (Infant room) stages of English language teaching.
- ▶ Maori language teaching has been compulsory in Maori post-primary schools since 1935. Maori has also been taught in some Maori primary schools, but lack of qualified teachers has been one of the factors restricting wider teaching in this field. Since 1930 there has

been no official prohibition of the teaching of Maori language in Maori schools. The Maori language has been taught in some Maori schools, and it is still frequently and freely used in the playground.

- ▶ The school is only one of the agencies affecting the Maori child. Other agencies, especially the Maori kin-ship group must accept some of the responsibility for ensuring that desirable elements of Maoritanga will survive, maybe in modified form to meet changing conditions.
- ▶ Teachers of Maori children, whether they be in Public or in Maori schools, have an exceedingly complicated and difficult task in reconciling for the Maori child the different, and often conflicting, claims of both European and Maori cultures. The preservation of Maoritonga is not their only or even their main concern, which should be to provide stimulus, encouragement and opportunity for every Maori child to realize himself as fully as possible in the conditions amongst which he finds himself.
- ▶ The problems indicated are made more difficult by the fact that the majority of Maori children attend other than Maori primary schools.<sup>55</sup>

It is to be noted that 'a thorough knowledge of the English language' remained paramount even though after 1930, at least according to official policy, Maori could be 'freely used' in the playground and began to be taught in secondary schools. The comment about a lack of qualified Maori language teachers was to become a regular feature of official statements.

### 3.8 Debates on Language Policy

#### 3.8.1 Introduction

The pressure to continue attention upon English as the only modern and useful language, and thus to marginalise Maori, came from a number of different directions. These were reviewed in a departmental paper by Parsonage presented to a conference in 1951. The paper referred to a conference in 1936 on post-primary education for Maori. At that conference there were some Maori leaders such as Ngata who strongly supported a continuing emphasis on English:

55. Ibid, fols 11–12

If I were allowed to advise a curriculum for Maori schools, I would say English first, second, third and fourth, and all the rest fifth.<sup>56</sup>

Other speakers at the conference were equally emphatic in their claims that the welfare of the Maori race depended on the teaching of Maori language. The latter viewpoint, however, was not reflected in the positions arrived at by the sub-committee that reported to the Government on both primary and post-primary Native schools:

- ▶ That the Department consider means of inculcating in the native primary schools an appreciation of the value of the Maori language.
- ▶ That the Government consider the best means of promoting the teaching of Maori in the Maori secondary schools.
- ▶ That Maori should be a language for University Entrance and not merely an extra subject.<sup>57</sup>

Thus the position taken in 1936 and carried out in subsequent Government policy was that the education of Maori children in Native schools might extend to inculcating 'an appreciation of the value of the Maori language'. It did not extend to teaching the language as part of the ordinary curriculum for Native schools. If children did take on board the importance of the language, then they would have to learn it outside school hours without reliance on the resources of the state.

It should not be thought that there was no concern in Parliament for the loss of Maori language fluency that began to become known about at that time. Thus D Sullivan, a South Island MP who went on to become a minister in the Savage administration in 1936, spoke to the 1935 Maori Purposes Fund Bill in these terms:

Serious as is the economic problem for so many Natives ... the loss of their native culture in the matter of a knowledge of their own language and their own arts and crafts is even more serious, so that the making of provision whereby they might reacquire their lost knowledge is a very important matter

He went on to speak of the 'terrible tragedy' that in the matter of language South Island Maori 'have become entirely Europeanized – entirely pakehas'.<sup>58</sup> These sentiments did not lead the Labour administration, in which Sullivan served, to implement a policy of language reinvigoration in the South Island or anywhere else in the country.

56. Parsonage, 'Maori Language Teaching in Maori Schools', E2, 1956/4B, 29/2/97, Maori Education, NA Wellington, fol 4 [published in *Report of the Seventh Science Congress (Christchurch, 1951)*, Royal Society of New Zealand, 1953, pp 191–197]

57. *Ibid.*, fol 5

58. Sullivan, 30 March 1935, NZPD, 1935, vol 241, p 763

Parsonage in 1951 found academic support for the English-only policy in primary schools in the views of an educationalist, Dr Butchers, written in 1932 and discussed at the 1936 conference:

A question of interest now beginning to be raised with some insistence is as to whether the time has not come for some relaxation of the basic rule of the (native) schools, namely, that English only may be spoken within the precincts, and that all instructions must be in that language. The suggestion is, however, grounded in sentiment rather than in its practical utility. Some of the older Maoris fear that their language is doomed to extinction unless direct steps are taken to preserve it in the schools. But natural languages cannot be made to obey artificial laws and the ultimate test will undoubtedly be – which language is of the greater practical utility to the Maori? One thing is certain. The prescription that English should be the sole language of the schools was a supreme stroke of genius as a means towards the civilization of the Maori people – in other words, towards their increasing knowledge of and adaptation to the new and all-conquering culture which European immigrants brought to their shores. The school statistics, however, show that 85 percent of the children still speak Maori in their homes, and there seems scarcely any doubt that many decades will elapse before their mother tongue is supplanted there. In the world outside it is different. New occupations, new things innumerable, and new ideas, for which the Maori tongue has no words, compel the use of the acquired tongue which in the end will no doubt prevail. In the meantime the people are gradually becoming bi-lingual. Practical teachers for the most part regard the question as one having an academic interest only, and recommend not only that English should remain the sole medium of instruction in the schools, but that the Native school teachers themselves can do better work if they refrain from trying to learn and use the Maori tongue in their social intercourse with the Natives. Beyond the primary stage it is interesting to note that Maori has been made a subject of the University entrance examination, as well as for the B.A. degree. Also there is quite a considerable body of literature now extant in Maori committed to writing by many ethnological students during the past century, and available for study and translation by competent scholars.<sup>59</sup>

59. Parsonage, 'Maori Language Teaching in Maori Schools'; E2, 1956/4B, 29/2/97, Maori Education, NA Wellington, fols 5–6 [The source relied upon was A G Butchers, *The Education System*, Auckland, National Printing, 1932, p 512]

In line with the view of Butchers, the 1951 departmental paper recorded that the English language had remained the sole language used in the Maori primary schools, though Maori language had come to be taught in secondary schools as a subject for School Certificate and University Entrance. As a BA subject at the University of New Zealand, it was mentioned without any apparent concern that Maori was studied by just 3 candidates in 1949 and 5 in 1950.<sup>60</sup>

### 3.8.2 An 'interesting' subject at university (but not in primary schools)

In chapter 1, it was noted that at the Maori Congress in 1908 Hone Heke MP had strongly argued for the teaching of the Maori tongue in Native primary schools. This plea fell on deaf ears and attention of the congress focussed instead on gaining acceptance for Maori to be a matriculation [University entrance] optional subject. The resolution of the Maori Congress was presented as a memorial to the senate of the University of New Zealand in 1909. The senate carried a motion approving the inclusion of Maori as an optional subject. At the same time 'an interesting discussion' took place on the ethnological and philosophical value of University research into the traditional lore contained in the classical pre-contact form of the language. It was asserted that it was important to preserve knowledge of the ancient and beautiful language as it had been before 'the process of corruption' going on at that time.<sup>61</sup> Maori as an evolving living language of the indigenous population was, it seems, not worthy of attention.

The University senate debate in 1909 and the published views of Butchers in 1932 foreshadowed what became a recurring pattern in later decades. Any Maori initiatives seeking to elevate the social and cultural status of Maori language by having it taught in primary schools were firmly rejected by government ministers and officials. The supreme importance of English in primary schools was stressed time and again. On the other hand at tertiary institutions and in the final years of secondary institutions – where Maori students were few and far between – Maori language could be optional and might be academically 'interesting'. It was not until very recent years that Maori initiatives such as kohanga reo and kura kaupapa Maori achieved government support for Maori language as

60. Ibid, fols 6–7

61. 'The Maori Language', *Christchurch Press*, 25 January 1909, MS-Papers-0189-172B, Maori Purposes Fund Board News Clippings 1909–11, ATL Wellington

it is spoken today being taught at infant and primary school levels. This may be contrasted with Crown policy established by the Native Schools Act 1867. At a time when English was very much the minority language and mission schooling was usually conducted in Maori, a few Maori students at boarding schools and theological college received an advanced English language education. Crown policy from 1867 gave minimal attention to secondary and tertiary education and deliberately shifted the emphasis to village schools so that the status of English was enhanced at the primary level. This was so even in communities where no one used that language in the ordinary course of daily affairs. Educationalists might quibble about the standard of English speaking and writing achieved by this policy, but there can be no doubt that the English language eventually did indeed achieve significant recognition as a result of these efforts. When the tables were turned, and Maori, the language of the indigenous minority, was in need of positive educational promotion if it was to remain an effective instrument of cultural transmission, no equivalent effort was forthcoming from the Crown.

Certainly the tables had been turned by the middle of the twentieth century. As quoted above, Butchers in 1932 cited school statistics that 85 percent of Maori children still spoke Maori in their homes and he thought that their mother tongue would not be supplanted for many decades. The school statistics cited by him may have been for Native school Maori children only rather than all Maori children. More recent research indicates a picture of significant level of language loss from earlier than the 1930s, but also clear evidence that during the rapid migration to urban centres after the Second World War was the period when language loss became dramatic. According to the research of the eminent linguistic scholar Professor Bruce Biggs, the percentage figures for the proportion of Maori school children able to speak Maori were: 1913 – 90 percent; 1923 – 80 percent; 1950 – 55 percent; 1953/1958 – 26 percent; 1975 – 5 percent.<sup>62</sup> For Biggs it was McLean's 1871 Amendment Act that was crucial in instigating this loss of facility to speak the language:

This marked the beginning of the policy of prohibiting the use of Maori in schools ... Maori language became the 'enemy', and generations of schoolchildren were chastised for speaking the language learnt at the mother's breast. Teachers were explicitly discouraged from learning to speak Maori themselves on the grounds that it would lessen their

62. B Biggs, *The Maori Language Past and Present*, p 75; Waitangi Tribunal, *Report of the Waitangi Tribunal on the Te Reo Maori Claim [Te Reo Maori Claim]*, Wellington, Government Printer, 1986, p 13

efficiency as teachers of English. The Education Department declared total war on the Maori language.<sup>63</sup>

With all due respect to Biggs, it must be pointed out that after more than forty years of 'total war', 90 percent of children still spoke Maori. After fifty years of this policy (on Biggs' figures – and on Butchers figures perhaps sixty years) at least 80 percent of Maori children were still Maori speaking. If the 1871 Act was the direct culprit for the loss of language fluency, it certainly took a long time to begin making a serious impact.

The Education Department well knew that the Maori language ability of new entrants at schools was changing rapidly by the early 1950s. In December 1950 a survey was conducted of the 16,142 Maori children at state and mission Maori primary schools and Maori post primary schools. The survey identified pupils who spoke some Maori at home, pupils who understood but did not speak Maori, and pupils who could neither speak nor understand Maori. It noted that 384 new entrants in 1950 could speak Maori only. It assumed that among the 17,647 Maori pupils attending public primary schools (who were not surveyed) 'a somewhat smaller percentage would speak Maori at home by virtue of the fact that these children generally live in a more European environment.' Taking all these factors into account, the survey concluded:

- ▶ Approximately 54 percent speak some Maori at home
- ▶ A further 25 percent understand but do not speak Maori
- ▶ Approximately 21 percent do not speak or understand Maori.<sup>64</sup>

The survey outcome demonstrated a huge drop in Maori language fluency by 1950 as compared with the figures from the 1930s quoted by Butchers in the research noted above. Yet that did not induce a change of policy by the Government.

It must be stressed that this survey was conducted at the time that government policy had begun actively to promote urban re-location. As noted in chapter 2, that re-location included pepper-potting Maori in urban housing with a view to their integration into the mainstream of New Zealand life. The establishment of Maori communal centres and facilities in urban localities did not feature at all in the government's re-location programmes. As Biggs conceded, the slow but sure retreat of Maori as an everyday language may 'have been effected as much by long-continued and increasing contact with English speakers as by the strenu-

63. Ibid, p 74

64. Parsonage, 'Maori Language Teaching in Maori Schools', E2, 1956/4B, 29/2/97, Maori Education, NA Wellington, fols 7–8

ous efforts of the school to suppress Maori.<sup>65</sup> Be that as it may, did the 1950 survey ring any alarm bells in the Department of Education for the future of Maori language? Not at all. On the contrary, Parsonage's paper for the Department in 1951 recommended no action. It was published at a scientific conference, so no effort was made to hide or gloss over the language loss statistics. Parsonage pointed out that there remained diverging views on the desirability of attempting to revive the study and use of the Maori language, just as there had been at the 1936 conference. The opposing schools of thought were canvassed in some detail, but a great deal of comment noted the difficulties and defects of attempting 'bilingualism'. Monolingual education was thought to be more effective and it would be easier if all the students were monolingual. Thus there was good reason to conclude that the supremacy of the English language in schooling should be affirmed:

In conclusion, it might be emphasised that language is not the sole or even the main contribution that the Maori race can make to the national culture of New Zealand, and that even should the Maori language be replaced to an increasing degree by English, it will not mean the extinction of either the Maori race or Maori culture. Language is a medium through which other cultural aspects are transmitted, and it might well be that more effective transmission can be made by using English, at this particular stage in the development of the Maori race. Or again, more might be done to preserve and foster the true cultural value of the Maori language by providing every facility for specially selected Maori scholars to make the most intense study of Maori and related Polynesian tongues, than by depending on all or the majority of Maoris being given what would be relative smattering of the language.<sup>66</sup>

So as in 1909, in 1936 and now in 1951 academic study of Maori at the highest level was to be encouraged but no effort would be made to train Maori language teachers or to teach Maori to primary school children. It is of crucial significance to this inquiry of the Waitangi Tribunal to give emphasis to the statement that, in the Department of Education's view, 'more effective transmission' of modern Maori culture could be made by using English rather than Maori as the medium of transmission. Maori language itself was to be left to become an item of cultural value for anthropologists and philologists. It was considered that neither fluency in,

65. Biggs, p 75

66. Parsonage, 'Maori Language Teaching in Maori Schools', E2, 1956/4B, 29/2/97, Maori Education, NA Wellington, fols 18–19 [published in *Report of the Seventh Science Congress (Christchurch, 1951)*, Royal Society of New Zealand, 1953, pp 191–197]

nor even a 'relative smattering' of the language were necessary for ordinary Maori people.

The Minister of Education at the time was Ronald Algie, MP for Remuera. He strongly defended the position taken by his departmental officials. The Maori Women's Welfare League, the only national pan-tribal Maori organisation until 1962, campaigned vigorously for greater recognition of the importance of Maori language for Maori children. Thus a 1951 resolution of the League stated that 'there is a strong case for teaching Maori in Maori schools' and the League pointed out that 'even children who learn Maori in the home tend to lose their language owing to its absence from the school curriculum.'<sup>67</sup> Algie's response stressed that all teaching in Maori schools was in the English language and that 'from a purely utilitarian point of view, the English language is still of paramount importance in the education of the Maori people'. He gave an unusual – and plainly inaccurate – explanation of the reason for past policies, Algie asserted: 'In the past, mainly through lack of teachers who knew the Maori language, the use of the Maori language in Maori schools was prohibited.' Whatever the reasons for a lack of qualified Maori language teachers, it was plainly the case that that had nothing to do with the prohibition on the use of Maori. As set out above, it was the assimilation policies of the past that led to the policy of English-only in schools. Whilst Algie accepted that Maori language might be of importance 'from the point of view of cultural survival', all he could suggest was the possibility of an increase in the number of Maori teachers able to teach the language in the future.<sup>68</sup> The minister made no commitment whatever to take any steps that might turn that 'possibility' into a reality.

The Maori Women's Welfare League made another effort to influence government policy in 1954. The League built their case around remarks by Her Majesty the Queen during her coronation tour when she urged Maori people to preserve their language and culture. The League argued for the introduction of Maori language as a subject to be taught at the Teachers' Training Colleges in the four main centres. On this occasion Biggs, recently appointed lecturer in Maori language at the Auckland University College, wrote to Algie in support of the League. Algie rebuffed both Biggs and the Dominion Council of the League with identical letters in which he stated:

In replying I must emphasise a point that seems obvious. English is the prime language for all Maori children. This policy has been so well

67. Corbett to Algie, 1 October 1951 (quoting a resolution of 27 September 1951), MA, 28, 7/13, Cultural Matters – Arts and Crafts General, NA Wellington

68. Algie to Corbett, 14 November 1951, MA, 1, 57/1, vol 2, Education: General and Policy 1950–51, NA Wellington

accepted and has operated so effectively that at least half the Maori children beginning school have little or no knowledge of the Maori language. In addition there are many Maori parents who do not wish their children to be taught Maori; some of them indeed hold firmly to the view that it can well be left to Maori parents to give such training if it is thought necessary.

Actually there are more Maori children enrolled in public schools than in Maori schools. To introduce the teaching of Maori into public schools even in the elementary way you suggest, would be very difficult, first, because there are not many Maori teachers serving in public schools and second, because it would not be easy to organise the teaching of Maori to groups, often quite small, within schools.

I cannot accept without considerable qualification your contention that the learning of the Maori language seems to improve a child's command of English. Most authorities are agreed that the quickest and the best way of gaining a command of English is by speaking, hearing and writing English.<sup>69</sup>

Public controversy in 1956, arising from some remarks by Professor Piddington of Auckland University College, saw the Minister of Maori Affairs, Corbett, make the Government's position absolutely clear. He insisted that the preservation of Maori language 'was up to each member of the race' and if children of Maori leaders could not speak their own language then 'that is not the fault of the Government.' In reply a newspaper correspondent pointed out that 'in spite of requests the Minister of Education and other educational authorities refuse to incorporate the Maori language as an integral part of the Training College curriculum.'<sup>70</sup>

The lament that there was a paucity of Maori language teachers, and at the same time the steadfast refusal to provide resources to enable teachers to become competent in Maori, continued to represent Crown policy until recent years. Moreover, if Maori was to be taught at all, then it should be available only as an option in the higher tiers of education. Thus in a 1961 radio broadcast Hanan, Minister of Maori Affairs, supported the suggestion 'that the Maori school system should be gradually demolished.' He then said:

The teaching of the Maori language in all primary and secondary schools is not a practical suggestion as there are very few teachers who

69. Biggs to Algie, 26 July 1954 and Algie to Biggs, 11 August 1954, E2, 1956/4B, 29/2/97, Maori Education, NA Wellington [The same file has a letter, Algie to Earl, stating that Algie was not much in favour of including Maori in the school curriculum because English was the working language. If it were taught, it should only be at secondary level as primary children had little need for it.]

70. Newspaper clippings, *ibid*

could give tuition in Maori. Our understanding of the Maori people would be improved if such teaching could be given.

Such understanding required teaching training, but when he turned to government expenditure Hanan spoke of the moves for an increased commitment to Maori housing – a crucial aspect of implementing the Hunn Report.<sup>71</sup> Not addressed by the Minister was the obvious fact that Maori language teaching for Maori pupils would become much more difficult as a ‘practical suggestion’ once the system of Maori schools was ‘demolished’ – as indeed it was during his term in office.

The beginnings of a change of direction in Crown policy became public in 1970. The Minister of Education, Brian Talboys, announced that the Government was exploring ways and means to implement recommendations from the National Advisory Committee on Maori Education. These recommendations included teaching the correct pronunciation of Maori words and phrases in primary school classes up to standard four for all pupils, and then oral Maori language to be introduced in forms one and two as an option in the same way as French was taught in some schools at that level.<sup>72</sup> Details of new initiatives were set out in a speech by Duncan McIntyre, Hanan’s successor, in 1971. First, McIntyre dutifully praised the Hunn Report as ‘the great blueprint on which the tremendous progress during these last 10 years was based.’ Nevertheless he had become aware that ‘a new look needed to be made at the rate and direction of the Maori people, particularly because of the large movement from the country into the cities.’ He announced a series of measures including:

- ▶ an increase in the number of schools at which Maori would be taught as an optional subject;
- ▶ publication of a new edition of the Williams Maori dictionary;
- ▶ a handbook for teaching Maori at primary and intermediate schools was now available,
- ▶ the *Rangatahi* language teaching books were being revised.

The minister’s view was that:

It is no use having Maori taught in the universities, if Maori parents do not speak Maori to their children, or do not even teach them proper pronunciation. If the Maori people don’t want the language then it will die. But I know there is a very strong desire to have it taught.<sup>73</sup>

71. ‘National news broadcast (2YA); 21 April 1961, MA, 1, 36/1/21, vol 3, Race Relations: General 1961, NA Wellington

72. Talboys, 7 October 1970, NZPD, 1970, vol 369, p 3811

73. McIntyre, ‘Education and the Polynesian Peoples’, MA, 1, 57/1, vol 14, Education: General and Policy 1971–73, NA Wellington, fols 1, 3–4

This was a very significant change of direction in Crown policy in favour of actively promoting the language at last, and doing so at the primary school level.

### 3.9 No Training, therefore a Paucity of Teachers

It is apparent from the archival records that the paucity of teachers available to teach Maori language in the 1950s and later decades, by which time language loss had become clearly obvious, was never an unforeseen surprise for government ministers and officials. It was a consequence of their policies. There was a paucity of teachers because there was a long-term governmental unwillingness to make provision for teacher training. Teaching any language requires not only a sound knowledge of the language itself, but also training in modern techniques to teach that language. When teaching a language that is under threat as a living language then teacher skills are all the more important. This was recognised by some teachers long before the facts of language loss at the time of urban re-location became an acute crisis of cultural survival. A number of requests for teaching training in Maori were put to ministers and officials. This was a point made in 1976 by the Auckland District Maori Council:

In 1930, a deputation from the New Zealand Federation of Teachers met the Minister of Education to ask that the Maori language be taught in our schools. T B Strong, the Director of Education, opposed the deputation with the view that the abandonment of the native tongue involved no loss to the Maori. Even the Maori leaders of the day such as Ngata and others acquiesced to the policy of teaching English only at the expense of Maori.

#### THE FAILED GENERATION

Gradually the policy of assimilation of choking off the indigenous culture began to take effect. In 1900 at least 90% of Maori children spoke Maori as their first language. Today the figure has fallen below 25%. But instead of attaining social parity, the Maori has been debased in the eyes of the Pakeha.<sup>74</sup>

74. Auckland District Maori Council (Dr R Walker), 'submission to the Committee on Secondary Education', 30 April 1976, AAMK, 869, 57/1, pt 17, 1307b, Education: General 1976–79, NA Wellington, fols 1–2

Barrington's report of the 1930 deputation by teacher leaders noted that they explicitly requested that teachers should undertake study of the language as part of their training.<sup>75</sup>

In 1945 a Maori Language Committee held a meeting to discuss the teaching of Maori in schools. The committee strongly recommended that Maori language should be taught in primary schools so that Maori could retain their traditions and culture, as a method of preserving and fostering racial pride and because of the useful mental training required to learn another language. It is worth noting that as early as 1945 language specialists were aware that many Maori children entering primary school were now monolingual and that the only language they knew was English. Thus they wished to promote the teaching of Maori as 'another language'. Recognising Maori requests for this development in schools, the committee called for Maori language and arts and crafts to become approved subjects at teachers training colleges, and to be compulsory for Native schools teachers. Additionally they wanted a chair in Maori studies established at one of the university colleges, and a school textbook introduced for Maori language.<sup>76</sup> Prior to making these recommendations the committee received a number of written comments from members who were unable to be present. Ngata and Bird were among those who submitted detailed comments. The views expressed late in his life by Ngata are particularly important and deserve to be highlighted. As noted above, Ngata through most of his career had championed Maori absorption of European skills and had insisted dogmatically on the utmost importance of all Maori children being taught in English only at schools. That was still his view in 1938 but he had become aware of the level of language loss. Thus he wrote to a correspondent that the education scheme should be aimed at a 'generous command of English' to enable Maori to understand the technical language of machinery and the fundamentals of modern science. Yet in the same year the Poroporo Native School log book recorded a visit by Ngata when he advised the pupils to 'stick to the Maori language' because 'a Maori who couldn't speak the language was neither a Maori nor a pakeha.'<sup>77</sup> He had become acutely aware of language loss by 1945 and he declared he had changed his mind on the English only policy:

I confess I have never seriously approached the problem from the Primary School angle, probably because of an objection our people

75. J M Barrington, 'Maori Schools Policy: A View from the Schools', *N Z Journal of Educational Studies*, vol 20, no 2, 1985, p 153 [citing *Evening Post*, 5 December 1930, p 3]

76. Maori Language Committee Report, October 1945, MA, acc, W2459, 19/1/605, pt 1, box 192, NA Wellington

77. Ngata to Houston, 16 April 1938, qMS-158b, Ngata correspondence, ATL Wellington, fols 14-18; Barrington, 1985, p 158

here had to Pakeha teachers getting down to pidgeon [sic] English levels in 'Communications' with their pupils. Present day parents are convinced that something needs to be done to make good neglect in the home training. I believe now when so much Maori Culture – such as it is – is finding its way into the schools, the non-Maori-speaking youngsters become rapidly conscious and ashamed of their ignorance of their native tongue. The 'action-song' is helping to bridge a gap and the haka – in lieu of physical drill – invites a more intimate knowledge of the language. There is a psychological angle to the matter, which the Committee would do well to study.

If the teaching of Maori is to begin at Standard 1 the quality and efficiency of the teaching staff are most important. ... I suppose if a good knowledge of Maori paved the way to promotion, a good staff would be evolved over the years. Somebody will produce a yardstick to measure them by.

He then advanced a number of justifications that might be put forward in support of teaching Maori from standard one, and concluded:

Lastly there [is] something in the sentiment of preserving a culture which belonged to the country. With that goes the assertion that New Zealand would be all the richer for a bilingual and bicultural people.<sup>78</sup>

It is apparent that Ngata was acutely aware of the new issues raised by the fact that there were by 1945 a significant number of Maori children unable to speak their mother tongue. It is remarkable that he was willing at the age of 71 years to 'seriously approach the problem [of teaching Maori] from the Primary Schools angle' for the first time.

Bird, on the other hand, continued to vigorously propound the views he had always put forward since his appointment as Senior Inspector in 1904. The only way to teach a language was the natural or direct method and the only language to teach was English.

The idea of beginning with S.1. raises a hurdle at the outset and I should have been glad to hear how it is proposed to carry this out. It requires consistent Maori speakers as it must be taught by the Natural or Direct method – not from books, though at a later stage a reading work is required. I am not aware of there being such teachers in the schools – there may be some – but not many. I found that some Maori parents object to their children speaking or learning Maori and many Europeans

78. 'Extracts from correspondence submitted by members who were unable to be present'; MS-papers-0148-028A, Maori Purposes Fund Board 1945–50, ATL Wellington, fol 1 [See also Ngata to Fraser, 7 June 1947, MA, 1, 57/1, vol 1, Education: General and Policy 1945–50, NA Wellington on the need for Maori language textbooks for use in schools.]

whose children were [at] the Native Schools had very strong objections on this very score. A course of conversational lessons graded for each class or division – illustrated if possible – is necessary for the teacher. As language comes before grammar – as grammar is [not] required till later and this finds its place in the Secondary Schools. Indeed I have an idea that the ordinary Maori child in the primary classes knows more Maori than his European teacher knows or can teach him. ...

I have heard it stated that the old scheme of insisting (as far as possible) that the Maori children when at school should speak English and not Maori was quite wrong – bad in fact as it sounded the death knell of Maori in many cases. It has been said that they were punished for speaking Maori. That carries a wrong implication as far as my experience goes – they were discouraged of course. And then you know that from the very first the law required that the children should be taught English and that the school should be conducted in English you realise what a wise provision was thus made from the very outset. For all the troubles that arose between Pakeha and Maori in the old days arose from the fact that neither understood the other through the veil that lay between them. Just imagine what would be the state of things had the Maori not been taught English. And to teach him in the few hours during which he was at school it was essential that he should use English during the whole time he was there.

That is absolutely sound teaching AS ANYONE knows who has had anything to do with teaching and learning foreign languages, – the foreign language and nothing else is used between teacher and pupil and in the school to which the pupil has gone for the purpose. And finally if the result has been to make the Maori lose his language, don't forget that in its place he has the finest language in the world and that the retention of Maori is after all largely a matter of sentiment.<sup>79</sup>

The last sentence is the most telling. This makes explicit the lack of concern for Maori language as the language of Maori cultural knowledge systems. Such concern was 'a matter of sentiment'. One might comment that the notion of English as 'the finest language in the world' could also be described as 'a matter of sentiment'.

The recommendations of the 1945 committee were not implemented by the government. As Parsonage's 1951 report illustrates, Bird's views were still the mainstream commonsense position as far as the govern-

79. Ibid, fols 3–4

ment was concerned. Parsonage was content that 'Maori is not a recognised subject at the Teachers' Training Colleges. It may be studied to a limited extent by members of the Maori Club at each College.' He did not suggest that this situation should be changed. Rather, among 'the special problems which might arise' if it was considered desirable to revive the study and use of the Maori language was 'the difficulty of providing sufficient adequately trained teachers for the various age groups.'<sup>80</sup>

It was not only Ngata who, late in life, had second thoughts on the merits of the English-only language policy for primary schools. Ball, the senior inspector who put so much effort into implementation of the adaptation policy from 1930 onwards, spoke frankly to visiting Australian educationalists in 1966 (when he was chairman of the Maori Education Foundation). His talk was recorded by one of the visitors as follows:

The Hunn Report, 1960, had revealed, perhaps more than anything the extent of the Maoris' educational backwardness and therefore the failure of the Education Department to provide equal educational opportunity for the Maoris.

What have been New Zealand's major mistakes according to Ball? One of them was that since the Treaty of Waitangi, 1840, many things have been done for the Maoris but seldom have they been done with Maoris.

...

The second major problem – and it flows from the first – said Ball, is that the majority of Maori children have begun primary school with a distinct lack in their knowledge of English and often ill-equipped in their own language. But even had they been equipped in their own language, it would not have aided them because from 1871–1931, English was the only language in Maori and Board schools. Maoris were not only denied their language and their way of life, but they were actually punished for speaking Maori in school. Other mistakes may be pinpointed. There has been no systematic research into the problems of Maori education, there has been no special training of teachers who have Maoris in their classes, there has been no special handbook (until Benton's published study) to inform teachers about the special problems of teaching Maoris, there has been no extra source of funds to study and provide for the special problems of backwardness, there has been few special aids, there has been a lack of contact and discussion with Maori parents and hence there has been no knowledge of or real

80. Parsonage, 'Maori Language Teaching in Maori Schools', E2, 1956/4B, 29/2/97, Maori Education, NA Wellington, fols 12 and 17–18

interest in the causes of parental apathy. Teachers colleges have done little to equip teachers and very little or nothing to teach the Maori language to teachers. No one in the Education Department has restlessly asked – why are these children being held up? What are the factors or is there indeed a major factor? Ball said that he was now ashamed to see how little he really did during his busy round of departmental duties, to examine the matter critically. Only in recent years since he had retired, did he seem to have the opportunity of grappling with the problem in any fundamental way.<sup>81</sup>

Ten years earlier, Ball's 'busy round of departmental duties' as senior inspector of Maori schools included chairing the National Advisory Committee on Maori Education. This was established in 1956 following a conference in 1955 that resolved:

1. That the long-term policy of the Government of New Zealand should be the development of a uniform system of administrative control of primary schools.
2. The Committee agrees with the general feeling of the Maori people that the time is not yet opportune for any full-scale abolition of Maori schools. ...
5. That the basic educational needs of Maori and Pakeha are identical.<sup>82</sup>

Attached to the Advisory Committee file from which this quotation is derived there is a draft letter from Ngata to Fraser (Minister of Education) in 1936. The letter indicated that if the aim of the education system was 'to make the Maori a citizen after the Pakeha pattern without any emphasis on culture traits characteristic of the race' then the policy must be the transfer of Native Village Schools to Education Boards wherever Pakeha and Maori are in close contact and even where the Maori school population is dominant. It seems that Ngata's consistent views on the importance of 'culture traits', and his later views in the 1940s on the need to teach Maori language in schools, were overlooked by officials in the 1950s. Ngata's views were selectively quoted from in order to support their idea of moving towards a uniform system of administrative control of primary schools.

When the committee first met it made a number of recommendations on teaching health and hygiene in Maori schools, advising education boards on the education of Maori children, appointing qualified Maori

81. D G Ball, 'Education', University of Adelaide Study Tour, November/December 1966, E, acc W2522, Box 5f, Maori Education – Miscellaneous Papers 1939–77, NA Wellington, fol 9 [emphasis in original]

82. 'Details of the Resolutions and Recommendations Passed at the Conference in 1955', MA, 1, 57/1, vol 7, Education – General and Policy 1960–61, NA Wellington, fol 1

applicants to the lecturing staff of training colleges, and like matters. It is noteworthy that the teaching of Maori language was not even a topic of discussion.<sup>83</sup> By 1957 Ball had been appointed as the Officer for Maori Education in all schools in addition to his long term duties as Senior Inspector of Maori Schools. This was a first step by the Government towards recognising that there were unmet educational needs of Maori in public schools. At that time Ball did argue for Maori language training when he remarked on 'the growing awareness elsewhere of the educational needs of the Maori child and ... that the time has now been reached when consideration should be given to the provision of more specific training in Maori culture and language in some of our teachers' training colleges'. The need for language training was not accepted by the Government, although a lecturer in education and Maori studies was appointed at the Auckland Teachers' Training College.<sup>84</sup> Rather, the focus of the Advisory Committee and Government administration over the next few years came to be preparing for the gradual but steady abolition of the Maori school system in line with the integration policy and then the Hunn Report.<sup>85</sup> Hanan in 1967 was still insisting that it was appropriate to teach Maori language in post-primary education only, and even that was difficult enough to manage in practice:

Many primary school children of both races learn action songs, hakas, weaving and the like. It all depends on the availability of teachers. This is the crux of the matter, especially when it comes to the language. The Department of Education has produced the 'Te Rangatahi' series of language text books for secondary schools and these are of undoubted value. There does, however, appear to be a shortage of suitably qualified teachers. I am hopeful that the Maori Studies courses now available at University level will bring about an improvement before too long.<sup>86</sup>

The 'improvement' was clearly some way off. Nor was it clear that there ever could be a real improvement because the Government still refused to contemplate Maori language teacher training. In 1969 the official response to a Maori Women's Welfare League remit seeking the inclusion of Maori studies in teachers' college curricula was, in relation to language training, a firm rebuff:

(c) There is no intention at present, and it is unlikely that there would be in the future, to establish full scale courses in Maori language

83. National Advisory Committee on Maori Education, 2 November 1956, MA acc, W2490, 57/1/3, pt 1, box 279, Committee on Maori Education 1955–60, NA Wellington

84. 'Report of the Minister of Education', AJHR, 1957, E-1, p 37

85. See, for example, Kinsella to Sheen, 21 March 1966, Acc, 88-131-07/11, Papers on Maori Education and Correspondence 1957–67, ATL Wellington

86. Hanan to Wright, 8 November 1967, MA acc, W2459, 19/1/531, pt 2, box 186, Arts and Crafts: Preservation and Teaching 1962–70, NA Wellington

with a view to equipping teachers to teach Maori language in our schools.

(d) There is no provision within the syllabuses or curricula of primary school for the teaching of Maori at that level of the system and there is therefore no call on the colleges to provide courses to teachers to learn to teach it.<sup>87</sup>

### 3.10 Enforcement of the English-Only Policy

#### 3.10.1 Introduction

Ball's post-retirement reflections, quoted above, suggested that English was the only language permitted in both Native and board schools from 1871–1931, and that Maori were indeed punished for speaking Maori in school. It is apparent that officials had little or nothing to say about the fact that Maori children in board primary schools had always been taught in English only. That policy remained in place until policy changes after 1970 began to allow Maori language to be taught for the first time in a few state schools that had never been part of the Native schools system. The situation in the Native schools themselves, however, was a little more complex than Ball acknowledged. As quoted in chapter 3, whilst English was always to be paramount as the medium of instruction, Pope's Native Schools Code 1880 did permit teachers to use Maori in junior classes. The absolute rule in favour of English-only teaching was most strongly pushed by Bird in the period from 1903 to 1930. He made it a nationwide policy to impose a ban on (or 'discouragement' of) Maori being spoken in the playground as well. Despite the firmness of the Department's policy, however, there is evidence that not all teachers acted in total conformity with it. There is also evidence that 1931 was not as sharp a break in policy and administration as Ball might have wished and that the 'mistake' of punishing children for speaking Maori in school did not suddenly cease in 1931. On the other hand there is a substantial conflict in the evidence as to the manner in which pupils were punished for speaking Maori. The written archives indicate that a variety of punishments were used by teachers to enforce the English-only policy, but they do not disclose a pattern (or indeed more than a single instance) of corporal punishment for breaking the English-only language rule. Recorded oral

87. '1969 Conference: Replies and submissions', MA acc, W2490, 36/36, pt 4, box 131, MWWL 1962–70, NA Wellington, fol 2

testimony, on the other hand, indicates the widespread use of physical punishments – especially corporal punishment – for speaking Maori in the classroom and in the school playground. This testimony suggests that such punishments continued to be inflicted as late as the 1950s.

The official line, supported by the documentation perused, is that there was never an explicit and regularly enforced absolute ban on the use of Maori but rather a policy of positively ‘encouraging’ the use of English. Bird’s 1906 memorandum, quoted in chapter 3, impressed upon teachers and school committees ‘the necessity for encouraging the children to talk English on the playground’. His position had not changed in 1945 when he wrote, as quoted in chapter 3, that speaking of punishing children for speaking Maori ‘carries a wrong implication as far as my experience goes – they were discouraged of course.’ In 1955 the Director of Education was explicitly asked whether there was a departmental regulation which prohibited the speaking of Maori within the precincts of the Native primary school. His reply read:

It is true that until about 25 years ago the speaking of Maori in the playground was frowned upon in Maori schools. The theory was that unless the children used English for all purposes at school they would not acquire an adequate grasp of it, and learn to think in English as well as speak it. However, as far as I can discover, the matter was never actually governed by an official regulation.

During the last twenty years or so the attitude of teachers towards the speaking of Maori has been greatly modified. Though there will necessarily be occasions on which teachers will insist on the use of English, the old ban on the speaking of Maori in the playground has very largely ceased to operate. Further, Maori is now taught as a school subject in most Maori colleges and district high schools, and in the upper classes in some primary schools.<sup>88</sup>

In the 1956 published version of his paper on Maori schools, Parsonage rejected the accusation that there was a ‘firmly enforced ban’ on the use of Maori in Maori schools apart from ‘an admitted single instance.’ He also pointed to 1930 as significant:

There was such a ban on the use of the Maori language prior to 1930, but since that date there has been no such official prohibition . . . whilst the use of the Maori language by the pupils in the playground is still quite common.<sup>89</sup>

88. Beeby to Bailey, 5 October 1955, E, 2, 1956/4b, 29/2/97, Maori Education, NA Wellington  
89. Parsonage, 1956, p 10

Departmental officials might state that the use of Maori was never more than 'frowned upon' in Native schools and that the use of English was only 'encouraged'. Yet there can be no doubt that the message as received by many Maori children was that under no circumstances could they speak Maori at school. The Auckland District Maori Council in 1976 put it this way:

In 1905 Pope's successor Bird urged teachers to encourage Maori children to speak English only in the playground. Taken literally this [dictum] led to the active discouragement of the Maori language. Generations of Maori parents have since claimed they were punished for speaking Maori in the playground.<sup>90</sup>

Articles in the journal of the Native School Teachers' Association, *Te Waka Maori*, provide indications of varying responses by teachers to this crucial issue. One teacher, who wrote an article in 1918 under her own name, strongly supported the official policy of no English in the playground:

Opinions differ regarding the language to be used by Native children in the playground. My own practice is to insist that only English shall be used within the school boundaries. It was very difficult at first to get the rule obeyed, as the children could not understand the benefit that it would be to themselves afterwards: so to impress it on their memories, ten stones had to be brought up from the river near by, each time that a Maori word was used, and 20 stones for 2 words: while the penalty for a full sentence, or careless non-observance of the rule was a bucket half full. The stones were put into muddy places about the yard. The idea soon became popular, and most of the children were ready to run for stones when they forgot and used wrong words. When the holes were all filled the same number of Manuka sticks were cut down in the playground. Putting the best speakers as supervisors also helped. For the last year or two it has been very little trouble to have the rule observed, even by newcomers as most of the pupils take a pride in teaching elementary English to those children who are soon to commence school, and the tiny ones are proud to show how much English they can speak at the beginning.<sup>91</sup>

It should perhaps be mentioned that Bird and Porteous were the association patrons.<sup>92</sup> In any case, respect for the authority of the inspectors

90. Auckland District Maori Council (Dr R Walker), 'submission to the Committee on Secondary Education', 30 April 1976, AAMK, 869, 57/1, pt 17, 1307b, Education: General 1976-79, NA Wellington, fol 1

91. R Clarke, Karioi, 'The Teaching of English', *Te Waka Maori*, vol 4, no 1, 1918, pp 5-6

92. Simon (ed), p 69 [Copy of the foreword to the first issue in 1915 of *Te Waka Maori*.]

may account perhaps for the fact that many teachers used a *nom de plume* when writing to *Te Waka Maori*, especially when they did not support official policy. The Department's 1917 booklet on teaching English did not permit use of the vernacular on any occasion. 'Polyglot' thought that this approach was 'plausible' but 'wrong all the same'. 'Practical' thought that insisting upon English in the playground was 'cruelty to the little ones, who yet know but a few words'. The editor of the journal expressed the opinion 'that the teaching of English should be through Maori' though he regretted that this put him 'up against the directors of our system.'<sup>93</sup> On the other hand, 'Briton' bemoaned the fact there were only 5 hours per day for English, perhaps 8 hours for sleeping and that still left the children speaking Maori for 11 hours a day.<sup>94</sup>

There was a diversity of viewpoints expressed by teachers and clear evidence that not all schools rigorously enforced the English only rule during the school hours. Yet there remains a significant body of recorded and unrecorded oral history concerning the many children who were physically beaten in a number of ways as a punishment for speaking Maori. A woman speaking at a public meeting at Christchurch in 1952 on adult education spoke about being given a dose of castor oil every time her school teacher caught her talking in Maori.<sup>95</sup> The stories gathered by Rachel Selby and published in 1999 are of men and women who attended primary school in the 1940s and 1950s – long after the ban or 'discouragement' of Maori is supposed to have ended. The informants who told their stories to Selby spoke in the course of the interviews about 'supplejack canes', being 'whacked', 'over the piano and whack', being 'strapped', 'hit with a ruler', 'strap on us', 'got a hiding for it', 'a clout around the head', 'out the gate speak Maori – go in the gate speak English', and so on.<sup>96</sup> Selby is impatient with those who suggest that these punishments may not have related to pupils' use of Maori language:

It is at times argued that the children were punished for being disobedient rather than for speaking Maori. It seems too fine a point to argue for children who knew too little of the English language at the age of five to obey both consciously and unconsciously.<sup>97</sup>

The oral histories from former pupils and teachers at Native schools gathered since 1993 by the International Research Institute for Maori and Indigenous Education tell a similar tale. Pupils and teachers – some Maori, some Pakeha in each category – had both good and bad memories

93. *Ibid*, p 75

94. 'Briton', letter to the editor, *Te Waka Maori*, vol 4, no 9, 1918, pp 23–24

95. 'Maori Want Tutors To Help Them Retain Language and Customs', *Christchurch Star-Sun*, 10 October 1952, MA, 28, 7/131 – Cultural Matters – Arts and Craft General, NA Wellington

96. R Selby, *Still Being Punished*, Wellington, Huia, 1999, passim

97. *Ibid*, p 18

of their school days. Yet all of them spoke of punishments for talking in Maori as commonplace. The informants mentioned 'the cane', 'the strap', 'a stick', 'buckets of gravel from the creek', 'whacks on the hand with a strap'. Some had memories of relaxed Maori-speaking time in the playgrounds and discipline only in the classroom, or even Maori language instruction in classrooms (but 'we didn't let on to the inspectors').<sup>98</sup> The Institute's researchers reached this conclusion:

It is apparent that many Native School teachers equated discipline with punishment. Numerous accounts, over the years, indicate that a significant number of teachers resorted to punishing pupils severely for a variety of 'offences', especially for speaking the Maori language.<sup>99</sup>

### 3.10.2 Log book records of 'severe punishment'

There can be no doubt that over many decades a significant number of teachers in New Zealand schools freely resorted to corporal punishment by straps or canes as punishment of pupils. In the archives concerning Native schools there are records of 'severe punishment' written up in the log books that each head teacher was required to maintain. These log books were supposed to contain entries concerning a wide range of matters relating to school organisation, inspector's reports, staff absences, school closures, repairs needed, special cases of illness, bad weather and 'severe punishment'. Not all log books have survived, but many have and they are held in the National Archives. From the contents of these log books, it is apparent that not all head teachers were punctilious in maintaining them. Even so, the log books that are available for scrutiny do describe a very large number of instances of corporal punishment being administered to Maori pupils. The entries usually record the pupil's name, the number of hits or 'cuts' and the offence for which the strap or cane was used. What the log books do not support, however, is the suggestion that corporal punishment was inflicted, as Simon alleges, 'especially for speaking the Maori language'. On the contrary, in spite of the very strong departmental view that the use of Maori should be discouraged, there is just one instance in the log books perused by Barrington of corporal punishment being administered specifically for speaking in Maori. There are a number of possible explanations for the extraordinary discrepancy between oral history on this matter and the written records.

98. Simon (ed), pp 81–85

99. Ibid, p 87

I have no means of ascertaining the plausibility or otherwise of the possible explanations. One might surmise, for example, that the offences specified – which include rather vague terms such as ‘sulkiness’, ‘disorder’, ‘swearing’, ‘bullying’, ‘persistent talking’, ‘persistent whispering’, ‘continual talking’, ‘waste of school time’, ‘impertinence’, ‘insolence’, ‘disobedience’, ‘trifling’, ‘impudence’, ‘misbehaviour’, ‘boisterous conduct’, ‘chattering’, ‘habitual inattention’, ‘rudeness’ – may have included the use of Maori language when committing the punished offence. What is known from the log books is that many children were strapped and caned for offences such as these. What is known from many official sources is that the use of Maori was actively discouraged and/or banned in school playgrounds and classrooms for many years. What is missing from the log books is direct evidence that the infliction of corporal punishment was precisely for speaking in Maori as such.

Barrington’s research into log books covered the period 1930 to 1940. He obtained access to log books still held by head teachers at many of the 94 former Maori schools transferred to education boards in 1968–1969 and still open at the time of his research in 1985. His paper mentions the views put forward by Benton, Penfold and Ramsay about corporal punishment being imposed for speaking Maori, but his research directly contradicts them. Barrington also quoted the view of Parker:

Much is made nowadays of the fact that children used to be punished for speaking Maori at school. That is not denied. However, while at primary school up to 1929 the writer cannot recall any of his contemporaries ever being punished for this reason. In other schools, however, where children were chastised for speaking Maori in the playground, the parents invariably dismissed the incident with the retort: ‘Kaitoa! Mahara koe i tukua koe ki te kura ki te aha, ki te ako ra i te reo Ingarihi! (Serve you right! Why do you think you were sent to school, to learn the English language of course!)’<sup>100</sup>

What one cannot determine from this written record is whether the chastising went beyond admonition and verbal reprimands to various forms of punishment, including corporal punishment. What is clear, as earlier sections of this report have described, is that there were many Maori parents and leaders who unambiguously supported a strong commitment to the English-only policy in Native schools. In any case, despite evidence from many persons that pupils were indeed punished for speak-

100. Barrington, 1985, pp 153–154

ing Maori, in some schools at least, well after Ball's introduction in 1930 of the adaptation policy, Barrington came across only one such incident recorded in a log book. This is perhaps the admitted single instance mentioned by Parsonage. It was at Rangiahua Native School in 1948. The head teacher's entries in the log book record that the strap was being used very frequently – almost on a daily basis – for a wide range of offences. The entry for 26 October read: 'After many warnings am punishing p. classes for talking Maori (lightly)'.<sup>101</sup>

Barrington proposed a number of possible explanations for the lack of similar entries in any other log book of the many he perused:

Does the absence of punishments for speaking Maori in the logs in fact mean that the strap was not used by Heads for this purpose between 1930 and 1940? Ball is confident that this was indeed so. In an interview he told me that 'You would not expect to find it. That all stopped with the new policy after 1930. I put a stop to it'. Wiremu Parker, who worked in the Maori Schools Division of the Department under Ball, informed me that Ball was 'very scathing about the sanctions against Maori applied by his predecessors', and there appears to have been no official regulations forbidding the use of Maori in the schools. However the general absence of officially recorded punishments does not necessarily mean that punishments never took place. Research has shown that in schools where physical punishment is used to enforce discipline, as it was in many of the Maori schools, there is a tendency to under-report the use of the strap or cane in the punishment books. Moreover, the inspectors continued to identify the teaching of English as the primary task of the schools and the belief persisted that the presence of Maori impeded rather than facilitated this aim. One note from an Inspector to a Head in 1932 advised him that a 'judicious discussion with the pupils should enable them to see the advisability of speaking English only in the playground where at present a considerable amount of Maori is used'. It therefore seems entirely possible, given this attitude, that some over-zealous teachers might have resorted to corporal punishment in an effort to ensure the exclusion of Maori, irrespective of what official policy was on the matter. The comment of one Head, newly appointed to Kaikohe in 1936, reads rather ominously in this respect. 'I am experiencing great difficulty in getting the children to speak, I seem to have a job ahead! Maori is fluent (even in the school!) and I am having to take a firm hand to this laxity'. There are other pos-

101. Ibid, p 159 [I assume 'p. classes' means the primer classes – that is, it was the youngest children in the school who were hit 'lightly'.]

sibilities which need to be considered in attempting to explain the absence of records of use of the strap for speaking Maori. Because of official disapproval it is unlikely that any teacher who gave physical punishments to children for speaking Maori would have wished to have these recorded in the log book. Did punishments recorded under such general descriptions as 'disobedience' include some for speaking Maori? Were punishments for this reason regarded as insufficiently severe to meet the 'severe punishment' criteria (use of the strap by the Head teacher) requiring inclusion in a log book? Were punishments for speaking Maori given by assistant teachers who did not draw them to the attention of their heads?<sup>102</sup>

One of the most plausible of the possibilities suggested by Barrington, in my view, was that teachers would not record matters in the log books that might cause difficulties with the inspectors whose duty it was to read them. As Ball's views were well known, and as he was the senior inspector, log books after 1930 may have listed only 'acceptable' reasons for inflicting corporal punishment or may not have recorded the punishments at all even if teachers were intent on following a rigorous English-only policy at their school. I surmised that prior to 1930 during the inspectorial oversight of Pope, Bird (especially) and Porteous there would have been no reason at all to omit mention of punishments for speaking Maori or to gloss over them by using vague phrases. On the contrary, my hypothesis was that teachers wishing to ingratiate themselves with inspectors such as Bird might well have wished to document their own resolute enforcement of the English-only rule in school classrooms and playgrounds. I was particularly pleased that Tribunal staff secured the services of Dr Ian Brailsford to peruse all the Native school log books held at National Archives. These are held in the Auckland regional collection of National Archives. Initially Brailsford confined himself to the pre-1930 period and then he completed his project by reviewing log books in the first decade covered by Barrington (but from different schools). Most of the log books that were available covered periods in the late 1890s, early 1900s, the 1920s and the 1930s His full report is available as an appendix to this report. His findings are quite unambiguous and they flatly contradict my hypothesis.

Brailsford found that there were a significant number of log book entries on the virtues of English-only policies in the schools and the difficulties of implementing this policy – particularly at the beginning of a

102. Ibid, pp 161–162 [footnote numbers and references omitted]

school year after the children had been speaking in Maori only in their homes during the holidays. There are many scores of entries recording corporal punishment for a vast range of loosely defined offences. Yet there are no entries recording corporal punishment being imposed for speaking Maori.<sup>103</sup> Just one entry for Te Kaha Native School, 25 October 1900, overtly deals with punishment for speaking Maori:

Have strictly forbidden children to talk Maori in school, without permission. Any infringement of this rule meets with detention and exercise writing during playtime.

Results less talking, and more attention to lessons.<sup>104</sup>

Thus there was obviously a ban on the use of Maori and there were punishments, but not corporal punishment, for speaking Maori in that school in 1900. The same log book contains a number of instances of corporal punishment for offences such as ‘throwing sand’ and for ‘being a sullen, rebellious little rascal’. But there was no entry to indicate the use of corporal punishment for breach of the prohibition against talking Maori in school. Also prior to Bird’s more emphatic policy, Pamapurua Native School log book in 1899 recorded that ‘The Committee [representing parents and community] wish only English to be spoken in school and playground’. At Te Kerepehi Native School in 1902 the teacher noted: ‘I have tried to encourage as much as possible the talking of English only, in the school grounds, but at this early stage, it is not a rule that can be enforced.’<sup>105</sup> When a teacher noted variations of punishments such as ‘knuckle rapping’ for offences, the inspector was quick to point out that corporal punishment ‘includes the whole family of “knocks”, “raps”, “canes”, “strokes” etc’.<sup>106</sup> So in theory even ‘milder’ versions of corporal punishment of the school children ought to have been recorded, though it may be reasonable to doubt that this requirement was always adhered to. Clear conflict between a teacher and a local community was evident at Wairau in 1899 and 1900. The teacher complained that school work was ‘very much hindered’ by the efforts children were putting after school to ‘haka’ and ‘poi game’ organised by a Maori clergyman, Rev Bennett:

The revival of the ‘Haka’ appears to be quite an evil in the Settlement, for it induces idleness, want of personal cleanliness, neglect of daily work, and other serious evils.<sup>107</sup>

103. Brailsford, p 3 [National Archives Reference Guide No 7, *Guide to Maori Schools 1879–1969*, 18 April 1996, lists holdings in the Auckland Regional Office of National Archives.]

104. *Ibid*, p 29

105. *Ibid*, p 30

106. Te Pupuke Native School, 7 February 1902, *ibid*, p 32

107. Wairau Native School, 29 March 1899 and 2 July 1900, *ibid*, p 38

A little later on, the Manaia log book in 1928 notes that the teacher 'Drilled into the children the necessity for speaking English in the playground and at home if possible.' The pupils were encouraged to participate in a 'Better English Club' which parents were said to be enthusiastic about with the exception of one girl 'living with grandparents who are unable themselves to speak English thus not being able to comply with the main rule of the club.'<sup>108</sup> A post 1930 example of an explicit school rule on English usage was recorded at Matapihi in 1933:

We found when we opened school that the children were in the habit of speaking Maori in the playground. We are trying to change this, and have made a rule that English must be spoken. The children do not seem to take much interest in speaking or listening to English.<sup>109</sup>

Similarly at Parapara in 1934: 'I have started a wholehearted campaign against badly spoken English.' This campaign involved older children correcting the English of the little ones in the playground.<sup>110</sup> The variability of acceptance for Maori arts and crafts after 1930 is illustrated by two entries for Maraeroa in 1936. In March the teacher was expressing pride about 'the success of our Picnic' and that 'The special feature of the day were the Pois and Hakas'. In July however a large party of parents and children left to take part in a cultural event in Whangarei and the same teacher wrote: 'Personally I consider the children's competitions away from home harmful to the physical and moral well-being of the young Maori.'<sup>111</sup>

An overwhelming impression gleaned from perusing the log book entries from 1890 to 1940 is that Native schools were run in an authoritarian paternalistic manner by teachers who, in conformity with the policy of assimilation, were deliberately ignorant of Maori cultural norms and social expectations. In some schools, but certainly not in all, the authoritarianism involved harsh and frequent infliction of corporal punishment upon very young children. Always the proper speaking of English was at the forefront of the education system, though the means to achieve this objective would vary from teacher to teacher. For those who held overall responsibility for this school system there is no doubt that they firmly believed in and tried to implement the successive policies of assimilation, adaptation and then integration. As noted above, Ball in retirement expressed doubts about the omission to train teachers in Maori language and to promote the language in primary schools. However, Beeby, the

108. Manaia Native School, 9 February and 7 May 1928, *ibid*, p 40

109. Matapihi Native School, 17 February 1933, *ibid* p 44

110. Parapara Native School, 29 June 1934, *ibid*, p 58

111. Maraeroa Native School, 26 March and 3 July 1936, *ibid*, p 56

Director-General of Education under whom he served, was not at all apologetic for the policies of integration he had implemented. In an autobiography published in 1992, many years after his retirement, he strongly supported the ideal of equal opportunities for all in education and special assistance to those 'behind the scratch line' as propounded by Fraser as Prime Minister in the 1940s. He thought Ngata's oft-quoted words – 'The most important subjects in Maori schools are first English, second English, and third English' – were consistent with striving for equality of opportunity. He did acknowledge that before 1930 the use of Maori language even in the playground 'was discouraged, or prohibited on pain of punishment in some schools', but he downplayed the significance of such punishment in more recent years:

Recent research has claimed that, even in Ball's day, pupils were still punished in some schools for using Maori in the playground. I have always suspected that adults, Maori or Pakeha, in talking of their distant past, tend to exaggerate their peccadilloes and punishments, but it is quite possible that some native school teachers continued to follow old practices even contrary to changed official policy.<sup>112</sup>

Here Beeby accepted that the 'old practices' from prior to 1930 did include punishments for using Maori in playgrounds. Yet the log books do not bear him out. Rather, the log books tend to support the line that there was never an official policy to inflict corporal punishment as a means of enforcing the English-only policy once children entered the school gates. This was the evidence of the Department of Education to the Waitangi Tribunal in 1985. Yet the Tribunal also heard evidence from a number of highly respected kaumatua who had attended school in the first quarter of the twentieth century. One was Sir James Henare:

We asked him directly about this matter. We told him of what we had already heard about punishment for speaking Maori and that we understood that the Department would say that there was no official policy to that effect. His answer was clear and emphatic:

'The facts are incontrovertible. If there was no such policy there was an extremely effective gentleman's agreement.'

Then he went to give us his own experience with reference to the time and place and the names of teachers and school inspectors concerned. ... Then he also told us of being sent into the bush to cut down a piece

112. C E Beeby, *The Biography of an Idea: Beeby on Education*, Wellington, NZ Council for Educational Research, 1992, pp 206–207

of supplejack with which he was punished for breaking the rule that te reo Maori must 'be left at the school gates'.<sup>113</sup>

The Tribunal concluded from the evidence of Sir James and other witnesses that this was policy in the first quarter of the century – 'because we think it was more than just a practice'. As to the second quarter of the century, the Tribunal concluded that 'departmental policy continued as before'. The evidence of Professor Biggs was noted:

'When I began teaching in 1941, any teacher in a Maori school who allowed Maori to be spoken in the playground, let alone the classroom, was regarded as very liberal.'<sup>114</sup>

### 3.11 Towards Biculturalism

When the final abolition of the Maori school system was first mooted in 1955, the report of a Maori welfare officer in Hastings considered that abolition would see a decline in the teaching of Maori culture. He urged the inclusion of Maori language at least at secondary level in order to promote the basis of that culture.<sup>115</sup> Beeby in his annual report for that year thought it unquestionable that 'in the long run, the Maori schools must be absorbed into the general school system'. In retrospect he was willing to recognise that he 'was far from understanding the full depth of Maori feeling for the schools as part of their own culture and not just as a transition to an integrated New Zealand society'.<sup>116</sup> There were Education Department officials such as Parsonage, Robertson and Lake who in 1960 urged caution and thought that Maori schools should be retained for at least the next two or three decades.<sup>117</sup> Nevertheless the report of the Currie Commission on Education in 1962, following in the footsteps of the Hunn Report on integration, recommended that all Maori schools should be transferred to board control within 10 years.<sup>118</sup> In fact, as noted earlier, the transfer was completed by 1969. Very shortly after the Maori school system had been abolished, the policy of integration fell into disfavour. Nevertheless, the new policies that began to emerge in the 1970s had to be implemented in the context of a fully integrated national state education system.

113. Waitangi Tribunal, *Te Reo*

*Maori Claim*, p 13

114. *Ibid*, p 14

115. 'Report by T. M.R. Tomoana, Maori Welfare Officer, Hastings', 13 November 1955, MA, 1, 57/1, vol 4, Education: General and Policy 1955–1956, NA Wellington

116. Beeby, pp 207–208

117. 'Extract from address by Mr K I Robertson, Senior Inspector of Maori Schools', 12 March 1960; 'summary of Report by Mr W Parsonage, Senior Inspector of Schools, Auckland'; 'Extracts from Report by Mr A E Lake, Maori Schools Offices, Auckland, MA acc, W2490, 57/1/4, pt 1, box 281, Commission on Education 1960, NA Wellington

118. 'Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand 1962', AJHR, 1962, E-2, p 434

New forms of protest by Maori political organisations also emerged in the 1970s and petitions concerning the status of the Maori language as a national language, as well as its position in the education system, began to be presented in a forthright manner. It is true that as late as 1968 Mrs Iriaka Ratana, MP for Western Maori, spoke in the House in favour of Maori parents speaking English only in homes:

Although I know it would not be acceptable to some of my Maori people, my suggestion is that we should speak English more and that perhaps it should be the only language used in the home so that the children will have a better opportunity of making a good start when they reach an age to attend school.<sup>119</sup>

Increasingly however in the 1970s the word 'biculturalism' became fashionable in Crown policy formation. As noted earlier, McIntyre in 1971 had signaled a move away from the Hunn report policies and had acknowledged the importance of Maori language teaching in schools. In that year ministerial approval was given for teaching the language in Form two of primary or intermediate schools with linkages to secondary schools already teaching Maori.<sup>120</sup> By 1973 the term biculturalism had begun to be used regularly. The Auckland District Maori Council in its 1976 submission gave credit for the introduction of this idea to the primary and post-primary teachers' organisations that had made submissions promoting biculturalism in 1967 and 1970.<sup>121</sup> The idea of New Zealand as a nation of bicultural people had been spoken of long before that, however – for example by Ngata in 1945 as quoted in chapter 3.

Biculturalism as a concept included taking steps towards bilingualism with New Zealanders having some degree of proficiency in both English and Maori languages. There had been calls for steps towards bilingualism in earlier years. In 1950, for example, Girling spoke in the Legislative Council in favour of Maori being taught in schools to both Maori and European students: 'I feel that that language is dying out; many Maori children themselves know very little about it. I think the language should be preserved and we should see to it that competent Maori linguists are available to teach the children'.<sup>122</sup> Tirakatene, MP for Southern Maori, also spoke in Parliament about this issue in that same year. He said the time had come for Maori to be included in the curriculum for primary schools. Algie, in reply for the Government, repeated the standard line that 'the teaching of the Maori language in primary schools was not prac-

119. Ratana, 6 August 1968, NZPD, 1968, vol 356, p 1078

120. 'Working Party conference on Maori Education', 13–17 April 1970; 'Memo to School Inspectors and Schools involved from Department of Education', undated in 1971, MA acc, W2490, 57/1/3, pt 5, box 280, Committee on Maori Education 1970–71, NA Wellington

121. Auckland District Maori Council (Dr R Walker), 'submission to the Committee on Secondary Education', 30 April 1976, AAMK, 869, 57/1, pt 17, 1307b, Education: General 1976–79, NA Wellington, fol 2

122. Girling, 18 July 1950, NZPD, 1950, vol 289, p 452

licable because of the lack of literature in that language, and the lack of teachers.<sup>123</sup> It has to be said that Maori MPs continued to offer conflicting views on language policy. Thus Omana in 1957 questioned whether it was right for Maori children to learn their language when they continued to lag behind Pakeha children: 'I think it is right today for the Maori child to speak English. He can easily pick up his own language in later years. Then he would be able to complete with the pakeha child in acquiring higher education and gaining employment.'<sup>124</sup> Paieka, on the other hand, in 1958 thought that the aim of the Department of Education should be to find sufficient suitable teachers of the Maori language and to pronounce Maori words correctly.<sup>125</sup> By 1960 educationalists had at last come to recognise that bilingualism of Maori children was not a 'problem' for teaching English and for addressing the cultural and educational gap that still existed 'after a century of adaptation':

It is not felt that this present day problem is a bilingual one although many people use the term freely in regard to it. In fact it is usually acknowledged that in homes where good Maori is spoken, good English is also heard. Head teachers in the school confirm this view.<sup>126</sup>

Yet as late as 1968 – as quoted in chapter 3 – Ratana was still advocating that only English should be spoken to children in Maori homes. Her young colleague Rata took a very different line in the same session of Parliament. 'One of the strengths of the Maori is his language', he said. 'The traditions of the Maori people have been completely ignored and this has reflected itself in low educational attainments.'<sup>127</sup>

### 3.12 Petitions

From the late 1960s new Maori political organisations such as Nga Tamatoa and the Maori Organisation On Human Rights, Maori academics and some Pakeha supporters began a number of campaigns to enhance the status of te reo Maori in the nation as a whole as well as in the education of children. In 1967 a petition of Dr P W Hohepa and 1,101 others proclaimed that 'the Maori language forms part of our national heritage' and called for the New Zealand Broadcasting Corporation to cease its policy of deliberately mispronouncing certain Maori place names. A petition by P Makene and 1309 others to similar effect was also

123. Tirakatene, 10 October 1950, NZPD, 1950, vol 292, p 3183; Algje, *ibid*, p 3184

124. Omana, 20 August 1957, NZPD, 1957, vol 313, p 1844

125. Paieka, 24 June 1958, NZPD, 1958, vol 316, pp 219–220

126. Robertson, 'Maori Education', Submission No. 4 from the Department of Education to the Commission of Education in New Zealand, 30 June 1960, MA 1, 57/1, vol 7, Education – General and Policy 1960–61, NA Wellington, fols 1, 11–12 [See also fol 10 where Robertson argued that 'the greatest need at the present time is that Maori should be taught in post-primary schools as a living language and not as a classical one.']

127. Rata, 11 September 1968, NZPD, 1968, vol 356, p 1717

presented to Parliament. The Director-General of Education, in opposition to the petition, submitted that 'usage is a very powerful influence in language' and the average citizen in ordinary conversation 'is not likely to be able to avoid a considerable degree of Anglicization.' He was supported by Professor Ian Gordon. The NZBC report concluded that the corporation 'cannot ignore common usage in the pronunciation of Maori place names.' The New Zealand Geographic Board and the Secretary for Maori Affairs on the other hand fully supported any action taken to ensure the correct pronunciation of place names. The select committee had no recommendation to make.<sup>128</sup>

Then there was the Maori Language Petition on behalf of the Nga Tamatoa Council – led on this issue by Hana Jackson and supported by some 30,000 signatories. It was presented to Parliament by Rata on 14 September 1972 and an enduring reminder of the petition and the work of Nga Tamatoa is the annual observance of 14 September as National Maori Language Day. The petition read as follows:

We, the undersigned, do humbly pray that courses in Maori language and aspects of Maori culture be offered in ALL those schools with large Maori rolls and that these same courses be offered, as a gift to the Pakeha from the Maori, in ALL other New Zealand schools as a positive effort to promote a more meaningful concept of Integration.

E hoa maa, teenaa koutou katoa. E piirangi ana maatou kia whakaakongia te reo Maaori, me ngaa tikanga Maaori, ki roto i NGAA KURA KATOA e maha ana ngaa taitamariki Maaori, aa, kia hoatu hoki eenei taonga hei koha ki te Paakehaa, ki roto i oo raatou kura katoa, kia tika ai te koorero he iwi kotahi taatou.<sup>129</sup>

Jackson's submission in support of the petition spoke of the English only policy of the Native Schools Amendment Act 1871 as 'the psychological and cultural annihilation of a people'. While some might describe the policies and the punishment of children for speaking Maori as well-intended 'it is our contention that it is a classic example of white colonialism at work' that was 'built largely on force and based on an arbitrary, unjustifiable belief in the superiority of the British people and their institutions.' Jackson made it clear that she spoke on behalf of the many Maori who could not speak Maori themselves:

128. Petitions 1967/16 and 1967/40, AJHR, 1968, I-3, p 3; Le 1, 1968/4, Maori Affairs Petitions, NA Wellington; B C Gregory and P W Hohepa, 'Letters to the Editor', MA, W2490, 35/2/4, pt 2, 1105c, Maori Broadcasting-General 1958–78, NA Wellington

129. Petition 1972/42, ABEX, W3706, box 72, session 3, Petition of H Jackson, NA Wellington

We, who are the deprived, regard the Maori language as the only real symbol of Maori identity, even though we lack it ourselves. For us to be able to speak Maori is the truest expression of our Maori tanga. It is the substance of Maori tanga. It is our link with the past and all its glories and tragedies. It is our link with our tipuna.<sup>130</sup>

A wide range of organisations and individuals sent in submissions in support of this petition such as the Church and Laity Commission, Citizens Association for Racial Equality, the Polynesian Panther Party, the New Zealand Universities Students Association, Te Reo Maori Society, Metge, Barrington, Biggs, Dewes and others. The Director-General of Education indicated general support for the expansion of teaching Maori in schools at all levels of the school system. He pointed to refresher and in-service courses for teachers, the recent introduction of the teaching of Maori at teachers' colleges, and proposals for training native speakers as teachers.<sup>131</sup> Recommendations of the Currie commission in 1962 to dismantle the Maori school system were rapidly implemented in succeeding years. On the other hand, very few schools – other than those few already doing so in 1962 – had followed up on the commissions's recommendation to introduce Maori language into their school curriculum. As at 1970 just 30 schools taught Maori to 2318 students. By 1974 the Minister of Education, Amos, was pleased to report rapid progress in the availability of Maori language courses in schools. By 1974 there were 103 schools teaching the language to 9036 students.<sup>132</sup> One has to note, however, that there was still a very long way to go towards the goals of bilingualism and biculturalism – if they were indeed the goals to be attained. The Department's report to Parliament containing the 1974 statistics discloses that in that year there were some 2,166 public primary and intermediate schools, 20 special schools, 276 manual training centres, 48 area or district high schools and 233 state secondary schools. The total number of state primary pupils was 473,099 of whom 74,192 were Maori. There were 177,582 state secondary pupils of whom 19,798 were Maori.<sup>133</sup> It can be seen that teaching Maori language to 9036 students in 103 schools was reaching only a very small proportion of Maori pupils, and a tiny proportion of all pupils in 1974.

The focus of Maori petitioners returned to broadcasting in 1978 with another strongly supported petition from H Potatau and 30,576 others for Te Reo Maori Society of Wellington:

130. 'submissions on Maori Language Petition 1972'; *ibid*, fols 4 and 10

131. Dobbs to Clerk of Education Committee, 2 October 1972, *ibid*

132. Amos, 8 November 1974, NZPD, 1974, vol 395, p 5769 [Amos also answered questions from Les Gandar MP on Maori language instruction in Teachers' Colleges and Maori courses in Universities: 16 October 1974, NZPD, 1974, vol 395, pp 5052–5053]

133. 'Report of the Department of Education for the period ended 31 March 1975'; AJHR, 1975, E-1, Tables 1, 4, 9, pp 39, 41, 45

YOUR PETITIONER requests that this House will recommend to the Government that it adopts a policy enabling the creation of a Maori Television Production Unit to facilitate and to ensure the production of programmes in the Maori language and in the English language on or relating to various aspects of Maori culture, art and society so as to maintain and develop a balanced reflection of a New Zealand identity and culture.

KO TO KAI-PITIHANĀ e inoi atu ki tenei Whare Paremata mana e tono ki te kawanatanga kia tautokana te kaupapa whakatu i te Wahanga Maori Mo Nga Mahi Whakaahua Pikitia Irirangi hei mahi i nga tu momo pikitia e pa ana ki te iwi Maori me tona reo, me ona ahuatanga hoki o te ao Maori, hei whakaari, hei whakakitekite ma te Tiwi ma te kaupapa penei ka puta tika ai te ha, te ihi, te mana tuturu o Aotearoa.<sup>134</sup>

The response by the chairman of the Broadcasting Corporation of New Zealand, Ian Cross, was reminiscent of the 'paucity of teachers' response by Ministers and the Department of Education in earlier decades. Cross stated that the corporation 'does not yet employ a sufficient number of Maoris having the required television production skills to establish or maintain a special Maori Television Production Unit'. Proposals for recruiting Maori production trainees and for the broadcasting of an English language programme on Maori life, culture, and history were mooted.<sup>135</sup> No proposals at all were forthcoming with respect to television programmes in te reo Maori.

### 3.13 Nga Reo e Rua

In 1979 senior Maori civil servants and Te Reo Maori Society, assisted by Richard Benton of the Council of Educational Research, began considering steps or strategies to be taken to protect and promote the Maori language and to ask for recognition of Maori as an official national language. This followed a decision of the Supreme Court in 1979 (affirmed by the Court of Appeal in 1980) that a person who was able to speak and understand English was not entitled to use Maori in court proceedings.<sup>136</sup> The committee called itself Nga Reo e Rua Planning Committee and it called for a number of discussion papers to be prepared on the benefits of bilingual education, and on the situation in the schools at Ruatoki and Fernhill.<sup>137</sup> The court decision also spurred eight academics from Victo-

134. Petition 1978/18, ABGX, acc, W3706, box 92, session 4, Petition of H Potatau, NA Wellington [See also AJHR, 1978, I-1, p 4]

135. Cross to Chairman, Petitions Committee, 17 July 1978, *ibid* [See also para 3.54 above for a brief discussion of litigation by Maori on broadcasting issues and Crown responses in the 1990s]

136. *Mihaka v Police* [1980] 1 NZLR 453

137. 'Notes on meeting of Nga Reo e Rua planning committee', 27 June 1979, AAMK, 869, 16/2/1, 627a, Maori Language Committee: Promotion and Protection, 1979–82, NA Wellington

ria University of Wellington to write to the Minister of Maori Affairs calling on him to recognise Maori in 'An Official Languages of New Zealand Act'. They asserted that the position taken by the court was 'archaic and totally unfair to the people of New Zealand and to the Maori language'.<sup>138</sup> There was also a strong push by Maori language teachers for the establishment of bilingual schools in urban areas, and the need to give Maori language and culture 'its rightful place in this country'. 'We, the Maori people have learned all about the Pakeha way of life' these teachers wrote, 'Now it is time for the Pakeha to learn the Maori way of life. Tihei Mauriora!'<sup>139</sup> In 1981 a petition was presented to Parliament by Te Huinga Rangatahi and 2,500 others calling for Maori to be recognised as an official language of New Zealand and urging members of Parliament to show respect and support for the Maori language by pronouncing Maori words correctly when speaking in the House of Representatives.<sup>140</sup>

In 1985 the focus of attention for the efforts to achieve official recognition of Maori turned to the Waitangi Tribunal. A claim lodged by Huirangi Waikerepuru as chairman of Nga Kaiwhakapumau i te Reo (Inc) was heard by the Tribunal at Waiwhetu marae, Lower Hutt. The venue was important for reasons sets out in the Tribunal report. A public statement by Kara Puketapu, Secretary of Maori Affairs in 1982, had called on Maori parents to preserve the language:

The seed that he planted fell on fertile soil and in Waiwhetu in the Hutt Valley the first group of parents gathered together to give their infants an understanding of Maori.

This was the first kohanga reo for pre-school children enabling them to receive immersion in te reo Maori. That first kohanga reo with 10 infants grew by the efforts of Maori parents throughout the land to 416 centres attended by more than 6000 children in just three years.<sup>141</sup>

The major finding of the Tribunal was that te reo Maori was a taonga guaranteed active protection by the Crown under article two of the Treaty of Waitangi. A significant portion of the Tribunal report was then devoted to official recognition of the Maori language. Its first two recommendations urged that 'legislation be introduced enabling any person who wishes to do so to use the Maori language in all Courts of law and in any dealings with Government Departments, local authorities and other public bodies'; and 'that a supervisory body be established by statute to supervise and foster the use of the Maori language'.<sup>142</sup>

138. Mead and others to Couch, 2 August 1979, AAMK, 869, 16/2, 625c, Maori Language Committee 1975–80, NA Wellington [This file also records the Cabinet decision of 17 November 1975 to provide 30 full time equivalent teachers to part-time teaching of Maori language in primary schools. Implementation of that decision in reported on in AJHR, 1977, E-1, pp 20–21]

139. 'Maori language teachers' seminar', Auckland, 14 September 1979, *ibid*

140. Petition of Te Huinga Rangatahi and others (22/1981), Le. 1, 1981/22, NA Wellington

141. Waitangi Tribunal, *Te Reo Maori Claim*, pp 17 and 42

142. *Ibid*, pp 52–61

The Maori Language Bill 1986 was introduced into the House by the Minister of Maori Affairs, Wetere, on 29 April 1986. This was without prior consideration by the Government of the Waitangi Tribunal report that was signed and released the very same day. In the introduction debate it was noted that in previous years there had been unsuccessful attempts by Labour members to introduce Bills to recognise Maori officially.<sup>143</sup> The Bill was reported back to the House the next year. There had now been time to consider the Tribunal report, and the Maori Affairs Committee specifically noted its agreement with the Tribunal that te reo Maori is a taonga guaranteed protection under article two of the Treaty.<sup>144</sup> As mentioned in chapter 2, the Maori Language Act 1987 was then enacted and bestowed a right to use Maori in legal proceedings – though not, as the Tribunal had recommended, a right to use Maori when dealing with Government departments, local authorities and other public bodies. It also established the Maori Language Commission – since renamed Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Maori – to promote Maori as a living language.

### 3.14 Bilingual Schools, Kohanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Maori

Any hint of compulsion to learn Maori in schools was firmly rejected by Couch, Minister of Maori Affairs in the late 1970s and early 1980s (noted in chapter 2). Nevertheless the Department of Education did initiate the establishment of bilingual programmes in a small number of primary schools. These schools were in areas where there remained a significant community of Maori language speakers and Maori was spoken by both children and adults in the homes. Ruatoki was the first community to have a bilingual school officially established in 1977. By 1981 there were three other bilingual programme schools (Tawera, Fernhill, Hiruharama), two schools with a 'Maori Language/Maori Studies Bilingual-type programme development' (Porirua, Matawaia), and a number of other schools making moves towards bilingual education.<sup>145</sup>

In 1984 the Department of Education reformulated its objectives in respect of Maori Education under four major headings:

- ▶ raise educational attainments of Maori;
- ▶ maintain and develop Maori language and culture;
- ▶ encourage greater respect for and understanding of taha Maori among Pakeha New Zealanders;

143. Wetere, 29 April 1986, NZPD, 1986, vol 470, pp 1450–1452; Peters, *ibid*, p 1453

144. Gregory, 9 June 1987, NZPD, 1987, vol 481, p 9337

145. 'Developing Bilingual Schooling in New Zealand', 15 May 1981, AAMK, 869, 16/2/1, 627a, Maori Language Committee: Promotion and Protection, 1979–82, NA Wellington

- ▶ support educational and training programmes established under the Tu Tangata scheme.

As to the first objective, this was strikingly similar to the objective of the Hunn Report 1960 and the Currie Report 1962 a generation earlier. The department observed that those reports 'tended to assume that the difficulties faced by Maori were essentially the same as those faced by Pakeha students and would be overcome in the same way.' It was now admitted that this had been 'a mistaken view' because learning takes place 'in a cultural as well as a social setting'. As a result the department had come to realise that 'greater prominence had to be given to Maoritanga and Maori language if their educational attainments were to improve. The record to date is mixed.'<sup>146</sup> Departmental officials put this statement before the Waitangi Tribunal in 1985. The Tribunal report was severely critical of it:

We think the record to date is quite unmixd. It is a dismal failure and no amount of delicate phrasing can mask that fact.<sup>147</sup>

The Tribunal then posed for itself the question as to how it could be that the department's philosophy seemed to accord so closely with the aspirations of Maori people, yet the results of its policies were so bitterly criticised. The rapid establishment of bilingual schools as requested by Nga Kaiwhakapumau i te Reo was a specific issue that was addressed. The department's procedures at that time stressed that 'the school staff, the parents and the community must support such a proposal before approaching the Education Board' and the Board 'must be satisfied about this support before recommending the proposal to the Department.' The Tribunal was not impressed:

It seems to us that this is not leadership by the Department. Rather is the Department following along only where such support already exists. We urge that the Department take more positive steps and go beyond proposing policy to ensuring implementation.<sup>148</sup>

The Tribunal added that a similar approach was required for kohanga reo and for alternative Maori schools that can cater more appropriately for Maori children.

A review of curriculum by the Department of Education in 1986, after the Tribunal's scathing comments, acknowledged that 'the culture and values of Maori as tangata whenua must be an integral part of the cur-

146. 'Report of the Department of Education for the year ended 31 March 1984', AJHR, 1984–85, E-1, p 7

147. Waitangi Tribunal, *Te Reo Maori Claim*, p 43

148. *Ibid.*, pp 44–45

riculum for all New Zealanders, not something tacked on to courses of study that are in all essential respects derived from Pakeha culture.<sup>149</sup> The department in the next few years also began to respond more positively to Maori initiatives on kohanga reo and kura kaupapa Maori. A government review of kohanga reo in 1988 and 1989 concluded that they allowed children to learn Maori language and culture through immersion and allowed learning to be fostered and supported by whanau in a context where the content and control of learning were in Maori hands.<sup>150</sup> By 1989 government bulk funding through Te Kohanga Reo National Trust amounted to \$22.4 million from both Maori affairs and education budget allocations.<sup>151</sup> It was the view of Gregory, MP for Northern Maori, that funding of kohanga reo should not be seen as a policy of the Government, nor of the Opposition: 'It sprang from the roots of Maori mothers and Maori people at the time'.<sup>152</sup>

In 1989 the Cultural and Social Resources Unit of Manatu Maori (Ministry of Maori Affairs) wrote a detailed critique of a number of Ministry of Education proposals relating to Maori academic achievement and a kura kaupapa Maori pilot scheme. Specific reference to the Treaty of Waitangi was now put at the forefront of Crown policy and applied by Manatu Maori to educational issues:

#### Treaty of Waitangi

1. The Treaty provides the basis upon which authority, control and rangatiratanga of Maori can be negotiated. As this applies to the education of Maori, it follows that decisions about their education should come from the Maori people themselves.

2. Furthermore, the education system is an important mechanism in the promotion and survival of the Maori language and culture, and therefore needs to accord to them the prominence envisaged under the Treaty.

3. In Government's Principles for Crown Action on the Treaty of Waitangi (1989), and Te Urupare Rangapu (Partnership Response) (1988), the Government has made a commitment to redress the imbalance that exist between Maori and non-Maori.

4. These imbalances continue to be evident in the state of Maori attainment, retention and destination in the mainstream education system.<sup>153</sup>

149. 'Report of the Department of Education for the year ended 31 March 1987', AJHR, 1986–87, E-1, p 12

150. 'Maori Education Inquiry – Te Kohanga Reo', 27 September 1989, ABJZ, pol 11/2/1, pt 1, box 26, Kohanga Reo 1989–90, NA Wellington

151. Wetere, Speech to Te Kohanga Reo National Trust, 22 August 1989, *ibid*

152. Gregory, 27 February 1990, NZPD, 1990, vol 505, p 199

153. 'Policy Proposals on Maori Education', November 1989, ABJZ, 7019, pol 11/0, pt 1, box 25, Education – Miscellaneous 1989–90, NA Wellington, fol 1

Manatu Maori recommended that kura kaupapa Maori and whare wananga should be adequately resourced 'as viable and appropriate alternatives for Maori'; that kohanga reo should receive continued support; and that the Treaty obligation to guarantee the survival of the Maori language should be seen to put emphasis on 'linguistic and cultural revitalisation'. An important comment made in this report was that alternative Maori educational centres should be monitored and assessed not only from the point of view of improved academic achievement but also in respect of linguistic and cultural revitalisation. Manatu Maori in 1989, like the Waitangi Tribunal in 1986, was concerned that 'the Ministry of Education's proposals do not appear to us to be pro-active or forward looking enough' and 'do not get to grips with the needs and justification for kaupapa Maori education'.<sup>154</sup>

The outcome of Cabinet debate was that the government initiated a pilot programme for kura kaupapa Maori by establishing six kura and in 1990 granted a further \$2.1 million to develop another five kura. Nevertheless, Manatu Maori remained frustrated with the Ministry of Education and argued for much greater emphasis on total immersion in the language as the most effective approach to rapid acquisition for young children: 'In short the language should be the medium of learning and not just a subject in the school curriculum.'<sup>155</sup> Bilingual education in mainstream state schools was not progressing to meet Maori needs. Most children leaving kohanga reo were entering ordinary state schools. In 1988 there were 11,125 children in kohanga reo nationwide but state primary schools catered for only 3044 pupils in bilingual classes that were established in 67 schools. At the secondary level there were only 18 schools in the whole country with bilingual classes. This indicated, according to an official's paper 'only a token response, in terms of taha Maori within mainstream education':

Although the power of Pakeha (and Maori) veto cannot be ignored it is interesting in the light of 150 years of assimilatory educational policy that concern is already being expressed for those parents who 'are likely to feel aggrieved by the compulsory bilingualism which is being forced upon their children by local schools'

On the other hand, considerable progress had been achieved since 1974 in offering Maori language as an option at secondary schools. Now

154. Ibid, fols 3, 6, 10

155. 'Report of Maori Education Meeting'; 13 September 1990, *ibid*; Clarke to Minister of Maori Affairs, 29 November 1991, ABJZ, 7019, pol 11/5/4, pt 1, box 27, Whare Wananga 1989-91, NA Wellington

37 percent of all Maori secondary students were taking Maori language as a subject.<sup>156</sup>

The Ministry of Education's response was to include a 'Maori Language Factor' in its funding mechanisms. By 1990 \$8.7 million was being paid to a total of 135 schools to employ Maori language teachers, though there remained some ambivalence as to the primary justification for this funding. Smith, Minister of Education stated:

Prime importance must be given to the preservation of the Maori language. The language is unique to New Zealand and an integral part of our society. There is also a well established link between the achievement of Maori children and their ability in the Maori language.

Smith indicated that the government wanted to withhold 10 percent of this funding to establish a contestable fund to support bilingual and total immersion classes in schools.<sup>157</sup>

In August 1990 the government announced an initiative to develop a National Languages Policy. The incoming administration later that year indicated its continuing support for the initiative and established an interdepartmental committee to facilitate work being carried out in the Ministry of Education.<sup>158</sup> Manatu Maori, in a submission on this policy, recommended that the government should resource the further development and retention of Maori language as it was central to the survival of Maori culture. It was also stated that language loss had been a factor in Maori under-achievement in education. Four barriers to achieving an effective implementation of bi-lingual and immersion education policies were identified as:

- ▶ poor access for ordinary members of the public to te reo;
- ▶ paucity in teacher resources;
- ▶ paucity in teaching resources;
- ▶ lack of te reo Maori in mainstream media.<sup>159</sup>

The 1990 change of government administration did lead to significant changes in administration. In 1990 Wetere had written of kohanga reo as an example of an initiative from the Maori community, now being supported by government funding but in time to be fully administered by iwi as an implementation of biculturalism. The transfer of resources to iwi authorities was expected to take place over a period of five years.<sup>160</sup> However the Runanga Iwi Repeal Act 1991 brought an end to those proposals. Maori education and language policies were now to be implemented

156. 'Bilingual Education', undated, ABJZ, 7019, pol 11/16, pt 1, box 28, Bilingual Education 1990–91, NA Wellington

157. Smith, memorandum for cabinet, ABJZ, 7019, pol 11/11/2, pt 1, box 27, Maori Language Factor 1989–91, NA Wellington

158. O'Rourke to Clarke, 3 April 1991, ABJZ, 7019, pol 11/0, pt 4, box 25, Education – Miscellaneous 1991, NA Wellington

159. Submission on a National Language Policy, August 1991, *ibid*

160. Wetere to Phillips, undated 1990; Wetere to Heke, 11 September 1990, ABJZ, 7019, pol 11/0, pt 2, box 25, Education – Miscellaneous 1990, NA Wellington

through the ordinary channels of government departments rather than through specialist Maori units within departments or through devolution to iwi administration. In 1991 Te Wahanga Maori section within the Ministry of Education was disestablished and its work integrated into the operations of the rest of the ministry.<sup>161</sup>

### 3.15 Tino Rangatiratanga

The policy choice to mainstream Maori education administration and policy formation on the promotion of Maori language in schools was directly contrary to the direction suggested by a ministry official, Dick Grace, in 1990. His paper 'Maori Education: Past, Present and Future' noted the fact that the heavy emphasis on teaching English to Maori pupils – and not teaching Maori as it would hinder progress in learning English – continued from the assimilationist policies of the nineteenth century right through the period of rapid urban migration and until the 1970s. He wrote of the 'vast social upheaval' as the proportion of Maori living in urban centres grew from 9 percent in 1936 to 50 percent in 1966 and 76 percent in 1976. He likened this urban migration to the demographic movement of millions of people in western nations caused by the industrial revolution, except that for Maori the upheaval occurred within a generation rather than over one hundred years or more. The difficulty that had to be faced after the policy changes in the 1970s in relation to language revitalisation he put this way:

The system then is faced with what appears to be an impossible task, that of meeting the cultural challenge upon which the survival of Maori society rests, and continuing with the taha Maori education programme for everyone.

Yet the introduction of bilingual initiatives in the 1970s had 'brought new hope for Maori people'. Grace's conclusions were as follows:

Maori educationalists have long been aware of shortcomings in the system that successive administrators have failed to address. The blame for Maori failure in schools has been laid at the doorstep of every Maori home regardless of the numerous reports of research carried out by overseas and New Zealand experts that refute such claims. More in-

161. Clarke to Carter, memorandum, *ibid*

volvement of Maori people in decision-making and a rejection of assimilative, colonial attitudes and practices is called for by people at grassroots level and in Maori organisations. There is a strong movement in favour of an alternative system of education for Maori people based on Maori language and values. While many people regard this as divisive and separatist, those who support cultural pluralism and equity for all picture a growing partnership based on the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi and aroha. In the view of one acknowledged leader in Maori education, the present system is separatist in the extreme because of its obvious, almost total bias toward the majority culture.

Such criticism is difficult to refute in that no meaningful change in structure from the integrative, assimilative stance of the past regime has taken place since October 1989. For example the concept of a Treaty of Waitangi, stand-alone Maori unit to internally monitor the Ministry's performance was abandoned in favour of a Te Wahanga Maori division with marginal effectiveness, now subservient to the Group Manager, Policy Development. This decision effectively reaffirms past practices of denying opportunities for Maori to make decisions at the highest level and implement policies in culturally appropriate ways. Other areas of concern include the powerless position of Maori Board of Trustees representatives in urban situations and the absence of a strong supportive body to provide the expertise for meeting their needs as well as those of Maori teachers. The best possible advice leading to sound policies developed for Government can prove fruitless if a mechanism for the appropriate implementation and monitoring of such policies is not in place. Above all else we must avoid the ad hoc, piecemeal scatter-gun approach to the issues. What is needed is boldness, new ideas and strategies and more power and resources placed in Maori hands, an affirmation of Tino Rangatirantanga.<sup>162</sup>

As noted above, however, government policy moved in the opposite direction to Grace's proposals. Instead of an independent stand-alone Maori unit being created to monitor the Ministry's effectiveness, Te Wahanga Maori division was eliminated altogether. Any monitoring of Maori language policies in educational institutions was left to Te Puni Kokiri which has the task of assessing the effectiveness of all government departments and Crown agencies in their delivery of services that are pertinent to Maori. This monitoring led to the 'Closing the Gaps' reports

162. D Grace, 'Maori Education: Past, Present and Future', 25 September 1990, *ibid*, fols 3, 5, 8-9

by Te Puni Kokiri in 1998 and 2000 mentioned at the conclusion of chapter 2.

Meanwhile, the tino rangatiratanga perspective mentioned by Grace continues to be highly significant even if it is generally dismissed in government circles. An exception is contained in a 1991 file recommending that Manatu Maori should consult with the Tino Rangatiratanga secretariat that had organised hui on rangatiratanga in Rotorua, 1990, and at Ngaruawahia, 1991. The overwhelming call from these hui 'was that Maori people will once again control the Education of their people through structures, goals and strategies that are more appropriate to the needs of Maori people.' Some 300 people attended the first hui and 200 the second hui. One of the officials who were observers at the hui thought it 'was in the main union led and as such was political'. Another suggested that although the participants have been branded as 'radical' they 'were a middle class group of Maori teachers and parents who want to do something about the impacts of Government policies on Maori and Iwi.' She thought the group needed to really explore what it meant by tino rangatiratanga because it was 'dealing more with issues of equity rather than tino rangatiratanga.'<sup>163</sup>

The revised statements of claim for the Wai 262 proceedings do put significant emphasis on the tino rangatiratanga entitlements of the Treaty of Waitangi. The difficulty raised by Ball in 1966 (chapter 3) perhaps needs to be addressed still – many things have been done for Maori, but seldom have they been done with Maori. The Tribunal will be required to consider how the history of Crown policies set out in this chapter measures up to the Treaty guarantees and the principles of the Treaty that are applied by the Tribunal. I have not sought to rehearse in this report the issues dealt with by the Waitangi Tribunal in two recent reports on matters pertinent to language policy and to Crown funding of Maori initiatives to re-invigorate Maori cultural knowledge systems. Both the *Wananga Capital Establishment Report* and the *Mokai School Report*, and the evidence presented to the Tribunal during those inquiries by claimants and by the Crown, are of major importance to this inquiry as well.<sup>164</sup>

163. Taumata-Le Ceve to Wi Repa, 16 July 1991; Tibble to Wirepa, 8 July 1991, ABJZ, 7019, pol 11/21, pt 1, box 28, Tino Rangatiratanga (Education Hui) 1991

164. Waitangi Tribunal, *Wananga Capital Establishment Report*, Wellington, GP Publications, 1999; Waitangi Tribunal, *Mokai School Report*, Wellington, Legislation Direct, 2000

