

THE TREATY OF WAITANGI: PREPARING BEGINNING TEACHERS TO MEET THE EXPECTATIONS OF THE NEW PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

KEN WILSON

Wellington College of Education
Te Whanau o Ako Pai ki te Upoko o te Ika

*Ko Whārangī te maunga
Ko Waipahihi te awa
Ko Karoriori te marae
Ko Ako Pai te wharenuī
Ko Ako Pai te whānau hoki
No reira, kei konei au, he Pākehā
E tū ana, e kōrero ana i tēnei wā
Tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou katoa*

ABSTRACT *“I know quite a lot about the Treaty but I still don’t know what to do!” This paper addresses the tension created by new demands for beginning teachers to be able to demonstrate their knowledge and use of the Treaty of Waitangi in their first years of teaching in schools. For many years the expectations placed on teachers in regard to understanding and implementing the Treaty have been vague and inconsistent. While many beginning teachers have good understandings in terms of history and content from their teacher education courses, they often lack confidence and direction in translating these into practice. The advent of new professional standards incorporated into the collective employment contracts of primary and secondary beginning teachers requires clearer understandings, not only for the beginning teachers but for their tutor teachers as well. This paper also discusses and compares different versions of the Treaty for there are three that are relevant to any discussion of Treaty issues. Finally, this paper explores ways in which student and beginning teachers may create a framework for such implementations to occur. The focus is on the establishment of a set of understandings that allow the creation of principles linked to each of the articles of the Treaties. This process can provide realistic ways in which beginning teachers can demonstrate that they do meet the dimensions relating to the Treaty of Waitangi in the new professional standards.*

BACKGROUND

Teachers working in the schools and early childhood centres of Aotearoa New Zealand can no longer do so without making personal and professional reference to the Treaties of Waitangi. Where in the past addressing Treaty issues may have been an option for Pākehā teachers, today it is a requirement. A reference to official publications illustrates this.

Curriculum and Official Documents

As a Principle in *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework*:

“The New Zealand Curriculum recognises the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi” (Ministry of Education, 1993, p. 7).

As part of the Principle of Empowerment in *Te Whāriki*¹

“... and of recognising the significance of Te Tiriti o Waitangi” (Ministry of Education, 1996, p. 40).

As NEG 9 in the *National Education Guidelines*:

“Increased participation and success by Māori ... consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi” (Ministry of Education, 2000, p. 1).

And, before that, as Goal 5 in the *Charter Framework*:

“To fulfil the intent of the Treaty of Waitangi by valuing New Zealand’s dual cultural heritage” (Ministry of Education, 1989, p. 12).

Professional Standards

Recently, the Ministry of Education and the teacher unions have agreed to mandatory professional standards for teachers in schools. For our student and beginning teachers these standards contain sets of dimensions that govern their ability to receive and maintain registration. As such, there is an expectation that senior teachers in each school who will administer them and conduct the appraisals can also meet the standards.

In relation to the Treaty these professional standards state:

For Primary –

(The beginning teacher will) “Understand the implications of the Treaty of Waitangi and te reo me ōna tikanga.”

(In addition, the Fully Registered Teacher will) “Demonstrate knowledge of the Treaty of Waitangi and te reo me ōna tikanga” (Ministry of Education, 1998a, p. 10).

For Secondary –

(Beginning Classroom Teachers) “...participate in available professional development ... including opportunities relating to the Treaty of Waitangi.”

(In addition, Classroom Teachers) “... continue to develop understandings of the Treaty of Waitangi” (Ministry of Education, 1999, p. 8-9).

While not set as mandatory standards, the Desirable Objectives and Practices (DOPs) in New Zealand Early Childhood Services perform a similar function for Early Childhood teachers:

DOP 10c

“Management and educators should implement policies, objectives and practices which ... reflect the unique place of Māori as tangata whenua and the principle of partnership inherent in the Treaty of Waitangi.”

and its associated Signpost:

¹ Early Childhood Education curriculum statement.

“Educators and management are conversant with Te Tiriti o Waitangi and can demonstrate a commitment to the Treaty within their service” (Ministry of Education, 1998b, pp. 67-68).

The challenge that these present for our student and beginning teachers is evident in the various terms that have been used in these documents:

Table 1: Comparison of Key Terms in Regulations

| Key terms | Document |
|--|--|
| the <i>significance</i> of the Treaty of Waitangi | Curriculum Framework for Schools and Early Childhood |
| the <i>principles</i> of the Treaty of Waitangi | NEGs |
| the <i>intent</i> of the Treaty of Waitangi | Charter Framework |
| the <i>implications</i> of the Treaty of Waitangi | Primary Standards for Beginning Teachers |
| <i>knowledge</i> of the Treaty of Waitangi | Primary Standards for Fully Registered Teachers |
| opportunities <i>relating</i> to the Treaty of Waitangi | Secondary Standards for Beginning Teachers |
| <i>understandings</i> of the Treaty of Waitangi | Secondary Standards for Classroom Teachers |
| the <i>principle of partnership</i> inherent in the Treaty of Waitangi | Early Childhood DOPs |
| conversant with the Treaty of Waitangi | Early Childhood Signpost |

Teacher Education Programmes

This means that the student and beginning teachers going from our institutions to work in primary schools will need to:

- Deliver a curriculum that recognises the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi while working towards increased participation and success by Māori consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, and
- Demonstrate their understanding of the implications of the Treaty of Waitangi.

Student and beginning teachers going from our institutions to work in secondary schools will need to:

- Deliver a curriculum that recognises the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi while working towards increased participation and success by Māori consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, and
- Participate in available professional development relating to the Treaty of Waitangi.

Further, student and beginning teachers going to work in the Early Childhood sector will need to:

- Contribute to the empowerment of children by recognising the significance of Te Tiriti o Waitangi,
- Implement policies, objectives and practices which reflect the unique place of Māori as tangata whenua and the principle of partnership inherent in the Treaty of Waitangi,
- Be conversant with Te Tiriti o Waitangi and demonstrate a commitment to the Treaty within their service.

ADDRESSING ISSUES OF COMPETENCE

With such a formidable set of requirements for beginning teachers the issue is for providers of teacher education to develop programmes which will prepare them appropriately so it is possible for them to demonstrate their ability to meet the requirements. For this to become reality then those delivering the teacher education must also begin from a clear base of understanding and knowledge. This paper suggests a number of key concepts which may facilitate this. The focus is to allow teacher education staff, students and beginning teachers to develop a conceptual framework by which each article of the Treaty can be linked to a principle which can be applied in the school and centre. Experience suggests that such a process demands both learning and unlearning (Cochrane-Smith, 2000). These concepts are:

1. Contextual concepts
2. Concepts that relate to understanding the Treaty
3. Concepts that underpin the implementation of the Treaty into schools and centres.

CONTEXTUAL CONCEPTS

A number of key issues emerge which can be explored as background when developing an understanding of the contexts which surround the Treaty. Three of these are discussed in turn:

- The issue of legitimation
- The issues of translation
- The issues of political structure.

Legitimation

An issue that is significant for Pākehā New Zealanders is that of identity to Aotearoa New Zealand and the ways in which that identity is legitimated. There are three forms of legitimation that might be considered: that of discovery, that of conquest, and that of agreement.

It is possible to legitimate identity through discovery of an uninhabited land; the concept of *terra nullius*. For those people who were the first-steppers, a special right to claim the land and identity to it as indigenous people is recognised. Once the myths of mainland based pre-Māori Moriori² are disposed of, the legitimate claim of Māori as *tangata whenua* of this land can be seen. To suggest that all New Zealanders are immigrants, whose only difference is their time of arrival, is to deny or trivialise that status.

A second recognised claim to legitimation can be based on rights of conquest. Such rights and customs of conquest are as valid for Māori as for European nations. Throughout history, groups of people have laid claim to new lands and property through armed conflict. In acknowledging this form of legitimation, its potential problems for a peaceful Aotearoa New Zealand must also be recognised. Many of the disputed areas of the world today such as Kosovo, East Timor or Palestine remain in dispute because of the nature of the initial claims to them.³

Finally, the legitimation of identity and belonging that is possible resulting from forms of agreement can be recognised. Again histories show how groups of people have merged, combined, and settled through formal and informal agreements and treaties, sometimes based on the exchange of citizens through marriage or formal treaty.

For Pākehā New Zealanders, the form of legitimation recognised as the basis for identity is crucial to how this identity is seen. First-steps basis cannot be claimed. Nor may many be comfortable with the claim that the right to identify with this land is based on conquest, although there are elements of truth in such a statement. A claim to be Pākehā is validated by the existence of treaties that make such a claim possible and this, therefore, recognises a need to know and understand more about them and their implications.

This view of the Treaty is also recognised by Māori. Judge Durie in his 1989 Waitangi Day address expressed the concept in this way:

... the Treaty of Waitangi is not just a Bill of Rights for Māori. It is a Bill of Rights for Pākehā too. It is the Treaty that gives Pākehā the right to be here. Without the Treaty there would be no lawful authority for the Pākehā presence in this part of the South Pacific.... Our Prime Minister can stand proud in Pacific forums, and in international forums too, not in spite of the Treaty but because of it... the Pākehā are the Tangata Tiriti, those who belong to the land by right of that Treaty. (Durie, 1989, p. 3)

Translation

In exploring understandings of the Treaty it is useful to note how Māori and the early missionaries, indeed any people in early contact, developed strategies to cope with language, particularly vocabulary, difference.

² Refer for example to King, M. (1989). *Moriori: a people rediscovered* for a useful exploration.

³ As an example of how this issue can be trivialised, refer to Minogue in his critique of the Treaty of Waitangi written for the NZ Business Roundtable in which he quotes de Gaulle "Blood dries quickly" to minimise idea of resentment caused through conquest (Minogue, 1998, p. 13).

One strategy is based on the existence of equivalent vocabulary items in both languages. In this way the English word “flax” for instance is seen to be largely consistent with the Māori word *harakeke* although fluent speakers may see additional connotations. Caution is recommended. Many will know, for example, that the Māori word *whenua* can be translated into the English word “land” without also knowing that the Māori word has an auxiliary meaning of “placenta”. When Māori refer to themselves as *tangata whenua* they may mean more than “people of the land”.

A second strategy is the use of transliteration or coining, a process of language adoption where a word becomes absorbed into another language, often undergoing some phonetic transformation in the process. English owes its enormous vocabulary to its enthusiastic propensity for “borrowing” words from other languages. In this way the English words “table”, “motorcar”, and “light” have become the Māori words *tēpu*, *motokā* and *raiti*. And in reverse the Māori word *piripiri* has become the English “biddibid” and so on. This may mean that a word, which appears to exist in the lexicon of one language, may only have been borrowed for convenience as a way of expressing a concept in another for which there was, at that point in time, no equivalent concept or convenient expression.

As a third strategy, I refer to Biggs who describes the “Humpty-Dumpty”⁴ principle of language transfer:

The ... strategy adopts what I will call the Humpty-Dumpty principle and assigns a new meaning from the source language (English, in our case) to an existing word in the target language (Māori). The hope is that by re-defining an indigenous word by fiat, as it were, it will mean what it has been chosen to mean. (1989, p. 304)

In this way, *kupu tuturu Māori* such as *tapu* or *murū* were transformed with new meanings, in this case to mean “sacred” or “to forgive”. The original connotations of, for example, *tapu* to mean “forbidden”, “dangerous” or “prohibited” were ignored.

Political Structure

It is critical to understanding to appreciate how very different the political structures underpinning Māori and European nations were even in the 19th Century. Lord Normanby, the Secretary of State who sent Hobson to Aotearoa New Zealand, expressed the British view:

I have already stated that we acknowledge New Zealand as a Sovereign and independent state, so far at least as it is possible to make that acknowledgement in favour of a people composed of numerous, dispersed and petty Tribes, who possess few political relations to each other, and are incompetent to act, or to even deliberate, in concert. (McIntyre & Gardner, 1971, p. 251)

⁴ From Lewis Carroll “When I use a word”, said Humpty-Dumpty, “it means exactly what I want it to mean, neither more nor less.”

Māori society was a clan or nation-based society in which *iwi* or tribes operated in their various regions linked only loosely to each other through ancestral canoe links or other historical and consanguinial connections (Ballara, 1998). The authority and prestige that belonged, for example to *Ngati Porou* was held by *Ngati Porou*. Should a leader of such an *iwi* attempt to stamp their authority, their *mana*, in the region of another *iwi*, this was cause for conflict. As Ward notes, "Effective sovereignty still lay with individual chiefs and hapu..." (1999, p. 12). The political structural setting was that of a number of independent family-based groups who looked for their authority and sovereignty within the group, who were "linked closely by genealogy and shared customary practices" (Smith, 1999, p. 128).

In contrast, the political structure of Britain, like other European nation states, exhibited a more modernist structure, hierarchically constructed in which the nation's sovereignty was held, however symbolically, in a single person at the peak of a many-layered pyramid. In theory at least, it was possible for a person to speak for Britain. Within Māori, any person could speak only for their own *iwi*.

CONCEPTS RELATING TO UNDERSTANDING THE TREATIES

This paper suggests that if we consider the Treaty of Waitangi to be a fundamental legitimation for Pākehā identity in Aotearoa New Zealand, then a concomitant responsibility presents for knowledge and understanding of the treaties that contrast with, influence, or comprise what is commonly referred to as *the Treaty*.

The First Treaty of Waitangi

This Treaty is not generally well known. It was signed in Waitangi between Māori and a British leader on 28 October 1835 and is the *Whakapūtanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tirene*. This Treaty is in *te reo Māori* of course, and an English translation is provided entitled "The Declaration of the Independence of New Zealand". Henry Williams, a Church Mission Society missionary, whose earlier work was in bible translation leading to Te Paipera Tapu, provided the language assistance.

Historically explained within a variety of contexts, this Treaty has been ignored or minimised by many historians. However, it provides useful insights for linguistic analysis, particularly translation analysis. There are three noteworthy translations:

- The choice of the Māori word *Rangatiratanga* in the treaty title matched to its English equivalent "Independence",
- The choice of the Māori term *mana* for "authority", and
- The choice of the coined Māori term *kingitanga* for "sovereignty".

These translation choices made by Williams are crucial to understanding, not only in themselves within the context of the 1835 Treaty, but more importantly in relation to the later treaties where quite different choices were made.

The 1835 *Whakapūtanga* gave New Zealand its first internationally recognised name as *Te Whakaminenga o Nga Hapu o Nu Tirene*, or “The United Tribes of New Zealand” and the confirmation of its first flag.

The Later Treaties of Waitangi

The case rests on the proposition that, as these later Treaties of Waitangi are significant in legitimating our position here in Aotearoa New Zealand as Pākehā, then there is a need for us to understand what the Treaties say and what they could mean. This knowledge base then allows the development of achievable mechanisms by which the implications of the new professional standards can be located. This is best done by a critical examination of the texts and the contexts of the Treaties themselves. This is not only a deconstruction of the Treaty of Waitangi, but also of *Te Tiriti o Waitangi*.

There are obvious parallels with the *Whakapūtanga* as these later Treaties of Waitangi were also signed in Waitangi, by Māori leaders and a British leader, but on 6 February 1840 following periods of long and intense debate (Orange, 1978). They also contain four parts: a preamble and three articles.

The Preamble/He Kupu Whakataki

The preamble sets the scene. The immediate impact on reading the preamble is the language style. In keeping with the appropriate genre, the language style is legalistic. There are, for example, 117 words in the first sentence of the Treaty. It is written in a style appropriate for the historical and cultural context of the time. It can be noted from the preamble to the Treaty a concern from the Crown to secure to Māori “...the enjoyment of Peace and Good Order...” linking this need as a clear consequence to British settlement and emigration. Taking into account the rate of ship visits to the Bay of Islands and what is known of their crews and likely interests as they enjoyed shore leave, such a concern was very relevant to the Māori of the time.⁶

An impression can also be gained of the prevailing, mostly ethnocentric attitudes of the British of the time that (in the second sentence) refer to the “...evil consequences which must result from the absence of necessary Laws and Institutions alike to the Native population...” Clearly the British missionaries, settlers, and crown were unable to see that laws and institutions did exist for Māori which, albeit different from their European manifestations, were nonetheless effective in sustaining life and culture in Aotearoa New Zealand over many centuries.

⁵ In the original text Northern Māori dialect was used so this term is written as *wakaminenga*.

⁶ Belich (1996) for example, notes in a chronicle of the time a description of a period of three weeks in which 30-35 whaling ships with some 400-500 men visited the Bay of Islands, having been at sea continuously for periods of 12-32 months.

Article The First/Ko te Tuatahi

Article One is the most significant article in that it describes what it was that Māori agreed to give up by their agreement. It presents the first challenge to our understanding as we work to deconstruct both the Treaty and the *Tiriti* and to compare their messages. In the Treaty of Waitangi, Māori agreed to:

“... cede to her Majesty the Queen of England ... all the rights and powers of Sovereignty ...over their respective territories....”

And in *Te Tiriti o Waitangi*, Māori agreed to:

“... *tuku rawa atu ki te Kuini o Ingarangi ... te Kawanatanga katoa o o ratou wenua.*”

The Treaty suggests that Māori give up their sovereignty. The term “sovereignty” is a potent word, suggesting supreme and unrestricted power. We note for example, that in *Te Whakapūtanga o te Rangatiratanga*/The Declaration of Independence “sovereignty” was chosen to be equivalent to the Māori word *kingitanga*, a word coined from “king” to which a Māori suffix has been added to give the idea of “...supreme sovereign power...” (Kelsey, 1990, p. 7). *Kingitanga* suggests the rights, roles and responsibilities associated with a king.

The *Tiriti* however, suggests that Māori give up their *kawanatanga*. This too is a coined word, taken from the word “governor” and having a similar transformation through the addition of *tanga* as a suffix leading to a word like “governorship” or “governance” (Sorrenson, 1989). Unlike *kingitanga*, *kawanatanga* suggests only the rights, roles and responsibilities associated with a governor. Māori of the period knew quite a lot about the concept of *kawanatanga*. There were at least two contacts which Māori had with governors and governorship that significantly shaped their understandings of the term.

Firstly, Māori had experience of James Busby as the British Resident in New Zealand from 1833. Busby claimed to be the *kaiwhakarite* for Māori, to be the point at which issues between Māori and Pākehā might be resolved. By his own admission, however, he had very little power or authority. His small band of police was under-armed and horseless. When the sailors brawled in the taverns of Kororareka, he was powerless to intervene. Indeed there were reports of fights breaking out within the grounds of his own official residence (Belich, 1996).

A further illustration was the “Harriet affair”. This was an incident in 1834 in Taranaki where a ship, the *Harriet*, went aground on the rocks of Cape Taranaki. Several Taranaki tribes plundered the wreck and carried away the cargo. One group from Ngati Ruanui, having missed out on the plunder, attacked the castaways instead, and in a fierce gun battle killed 12 of the well-armed Australian crew and captured a woman and her two small children. Infuriated by the news of the kidnap, the Governor of New South Wales sent one of his warships, the HMS *Alligator*, to exact retribution for the incident. Supported by cannon, the troops attacked a pa at Te Namu and killed a number of Māori, not necessarily those of Ngati Ruanui (Belich, 1996).

The point that relates to *kawanatanga* and the *kawana* is that, when challenged, Busby knew nothing of this decision to attack, or of the resulting attack, until he

was informed by Māori who had suffered. Clearly for Māori, the authority embodied in the *kawana* was no great authority at all.

Secondly, Māori had experience of the *kawana* and of *kawanatanga* as expressed in *Te Paipera Tapu*, the Māori Bible as translated by Henry Williams. Records from the time suggest that levels of literacy among Māori in the 1830s and 40s were astonishingly high (Jackson, 1975). As you would expect from the nature of the teachers, the books mostly read were those associated with the missionaries; the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer. This is significant because in the New Testament there is description of a man who held the position of *kawana*, Pontius Pilate, the word *kawana* being a term coined by Henry Williams.

Māori were quick to see the political nature of the powers of *kawanatanga* exercised by Pilate. Pontius Pilate was an emissary from Rome, representing the sovereignty of Rome. As the Roman governor in Jerusalem he had certain rights, responsibilities, and areas of jurisdiction. Alongside Pilate ruled King Herod. Herod was a Jew, a member of the indigenous people who exercised *kingitanga* over the Jewish people. He also had certain rights, responsibilities, and areas of jurisdiction, in many ways parallel to, and complementary with, those held by Pilate.

This complementary exercise of authority is clearly seen in the stories relating to the arrest and execution of Jesus Christ as portrayed in the Bible. It was Herod who, seeing a need to remove Jesus, initiated the first arrest and then, because of his lack of authority or ability to have him executed, sent him to Pilate. The Māori language description of this in *Te Paipera Tapu* is illuminating, especially in view of the role played by Henry Williams in the translation:

- “6. *I te rongonga o Pirato ki Kariri, ka ui, No Kariri tenei tangata?*
7. *A, i tona mohiotanga no te rangatiratanga ia o Herora, ka tonoa ia ki a Herora”. (Te Paipera Tapu, Ruka, 23)*
- “6. When Pilate heard of Galilee he asked whether the man was a Galilæan.
7. As soon as he knew that he belonged unto Herod’s jurisdiction, he sent him to Herod”. (The Holy Bible, Luke, 23)

The use of the Māori word “*rangatiratanga*” in association with the concept of separate jurisdictions supports the view that Māori derived from the Bible a clear idea of *kawanatanga* and its presence alongside the *kingitanga* held by indigenous authority. It is clear that the “sovereignty” it is claimed Māori ceded under the Treaty is similar to, but not the equivalent of, the *kawanatanga* they gave up under the *Tiriti*.

Article The Second/Ko te Tuarua

If the first article of the Treaties describes what it was that Māori were to relinquish under the new order, then the second article describes what it was that they were to retain. Again it presents challenges to our common understanding.

In Article Two of the Treaty, the Crown affirms to Māori the “...full, exclusive and undisturbed possession....” of their lands, fisheries, and properties. The word “affirms” is chosen carefully because this affirmation was not a favour to Māori in the sense that the Crown was giving something that they did not

already have. While Article One may have signalled a new relationship, Article Two affirms the status quo.⁷ In Article Two of the *Tiriti*, what is affirmed is the:

“tino rangatiratanga o o rātou wenua o rātou kainga me o rātou taonga katoa.”

Williams chose to use the word *rangatiratanga* as an equivalent for “possession”. This was a favourite expression in William’s lexicon of Māori terms. Usually, however, he used it as the equivalent for ideas much stronger than “possession”. In his Māori version of the Lord’s Prayer he used *rangatiratanga* to translate the expression

“...thy kingdom come.”
“Kia tae mai tōu rangatiratanga.”

In the *Whakapūtanga* he used it to mean “independence” and, as we have just seen, in *Te Paipera Tapu* he used it to mean “jurisdiction”. Match this against his use of it to mean “possession”. Possession does not connote great ideas of strength and power. In English tradition it is said: “Possession is nine-tenths of the law”; tenants are referred to as having “legal possession” of a property; the connection between possession and ownership is often casually expressed.

In stark contrast, the *rangatiratanga* that was affirmed by the Crown, encapsulates ideas of real power. *Rangatiratanga* is a *kupu tuturu*, a traditional Māori word. It describes the qualities that are associated with a *rangatira*, qualities of leadership, of guidance and ultimately, of authority (Jackson, 1993). Not satisfied though with the strength of *rangatiratanga* in itself, Williams qualified the word as *tino rangatiratanga*⁸, adding yet more power, authority, and strength to the expression.

In the same sentence, Article Two of the Treaty uses the word “properties” as an extension to describe the things Māori were guaranteed. Article Two of the *Tiriti* however uses a word of wider meaning, the word *taonga*, generally translated to mean “treasures” (Kelsey, 1990). Again there is the anomaly of two statements, in two languages, purporting to express the same meaning yet clearly, through the choice of words, signalling different levels of intensity from the English Treaty to the Māori *Tiriti*. In the Treaty, Māori gave up their “sovereignty”, but were guaranteed their “possession” of various “properties”; in the *Tiriti*, Māori gave up their *kawanatanga*, but were guaranteed the maintenance of their existing *tino rangatiratanga* of their various *taonga*.

Article The Third/Ko te Tuatoru

Article Three confirms the trend. Where the Treaty promises to Māori “...all the Rights and Privileges of British subjects” Williams had a difficulty. The only approximate translation for “subjects” in Māori is the word *taurekareka*, a word which also means “slaves”. Unsurprisingly perhaps, Williams, feeling that the

⁷ Recognised and confirmed by the Crown through the 1835 Declaration.

⁸ The word *tino* is an intensifier used to modify verbs and nouns in a way that augments them.

“...rights and privileges of British slaves...” might not appeal to the assembled chiefs, substituted the word *tangata* or “people” so that the *Tiriti* reads, “... *rite tahi ki nga tangata o Ingarangi*”, “...the same as the people of England”.

Table 2: Comparison of English and Māori Terms in the Treaty and the Tiriti

| | Treaty of Waitangi | <i>Tiriti o Waitangi</i> |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Māori gave up their | sovereignty | <i>kawanatanga</i> |
| while retaining their | possession | <i>tino rangatiratanga</i> |
| over their | properties | <i>taonga</i> |
| as | British subjects | <i>tangata o Ingarangi</i> |

Implications For Our Student and Beginning Teachers

When the implications of the treaties are the issue, there are at least three treaties to be considered: *Te Whakapūtanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tirene*, *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* and The Treaty of Waitangi. Crucial to understanding is the relationship of the Treaty to the *Tiriti*. It is the Treaty of Waitangi, written in English, that has been the document that many of us learned of throughout our schooling and by which we made judgements about the place of Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand (Reeves, 1993). For many of us it was *the* Treaty. Yet it was the *Tiriti* that was debated at length by Māori on the 4th and 5th of February 1840 in accordance with custom. It was the *Tiriti* that received the majority of the 512 signatures received, only 30 are on the Treaty. For Māori, the *Tiriti* is the substantive document, the document by which they agreed to allow the Crown to have certain rights in Aotearoa New Zealand; rights of governance or governorship.

So, how could Aotearoa New Zealand ever have developed as a nation into the 20th and 21st Centuries under such an agreement? Earlier in this paper, the different political structures that existed in this country and in European countries in the 1800s were noted. Māori operated within a political structure of separate, complementary, and sometimes competing *iwi*, each with their own *rangatira* and *mana* exercised within traditional regions.

A model can be developed from this which could have seen Māori maintaining their *iwi*-structure based on their own resources and *taonga* and operating under an overarching and sheltering concept of *rangatiratanga*⁹ under the terms of *Te Tiriti o Waitangi*. Alongside this, Pākehā could have developed a parallel partnership structure, based on their own laws, customs, beliefs, and language, operating by *kawanatanga* under the terms of *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* – the same treaty - requiring negotiation to gain access to the resources guaranteed to Māori.

This did not happen. Pākehā did not base their development in this country by negotiation through partnership, nor honour the promise to maintain *tino*

⁹ This is a traditional concept often expressed in an expression such as “*ki raro i te maru o...*” “under the shelter of...”

rangatiratanga to Māori of their resources (Yates & Issacs, 2000). Indeed today, the *rangatiratanga* described in *Te Tiriti* rests securely with the mainstream government which now allocates to Māori all the 'rights and privileges' of a disadvantaged minority ethnic group living in Aotearoa New Zealand (Mead, 1993).

CONCEPTS THAT UNDERPIN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TREATIES INTO SCHOOLS AND CENTRES

These are the issues to be addressed as we progress towards some understanding of the significance, the principles, the intent, and the implications of the Treaty of Waitangi in everyday work. Once student and beginning teachers have a sound basis of knowledge about the Treaty, it is possible to construct a model by which biculturalism can be implemented within schools and centres. The final part of this paper focuses on the construction of a model by which this may occur. In doing so, it draws on the work of Bishop and Graham (1997)¹⁰ in their study of institutional responses to the Treaty. Bishop and Graham suggest that by understanding the relationships of sovereignty and *kawanatanga*, possession and *rangatiratanga*, properties and *taonga*, and subjects and *tangata*; we can attach a broad principle to each article of the Treaties:

- Article One can be associated with a principle of Partnership
- Article Two can be associated with a principle of Protection
- Article Three can be associated with a principle of Participation

These principles work well for teachers facing the demands of the new professional standards, equally applicable for those who are required to demonstrate that they can meet the standards, and for those senior teachers whose task it will become to do the appraisal. Accepting the relationship of each article to a principle as set out above, a matrix can be developed (see Table 3).

Such a matrix leads to a framework on which a programme can be planned that takes cognisance of the expectations of professional standards. By applying each of the appraisal questions to personal practice, teachers can identify areas where the implications of the Treaty are already being met, identify gaps in their practice, and plan for improvement. Senior teachers can also use these questions as a basis for their appraisal within the framework of the professional standards.

Many teachers applying these principles to their classroom practice find that they already do much to implement the treaties. This can be on a personal/classroom level where teachers give value to *te reo Māori*, where care is taken to ensure that Māori values are considered, and where Māori whānau feel welcomed. Or on a school level the focus can be on systems of decision-making, including the right to make decisions on what things need to be decided, and on how issues for debate are brought out into the open for consideration.

Whatever devices and strategies teachers develop to examine the degree to which their teaching takes into account the implications of the treaties, we know that ultimately these concerns are not just about meeting the expectations of

¹⁰ Further developed in Bishop and Glynn (1999).

Table 3: Appraisal Matrix

| TREATY PRINCIPLE | ARTICLE 1 : PARTNERSHIP | ARTICLE 2 : PROTECTION | ARTICLE 3 : PARTICIPATION |
|--|--|---|---|
| Development of principle | The Treaty guarantees to Māori a share in the power over decision making in our school | The Treaty guarantees to Māori the power to define and protect treasures | The Treaty guarantees to Māori equality of opportunity and outcomes |
| Appraisal questions (Examples only) | What specific systems do I have in my classroom and school to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promote partnerships in decision-making? • receive and value input from Māori? • consult with Māori on my teaching ideas? | What specific systems do I have in my classroom and school to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • acknowledge, promote, and protect those things that are identified by Māori as <i>taonga</i>? • give value to <i>te reo Māori</i>? • support children entering from <i>kohanga reo</i> or <i>kura kaupapa Māori</i>? | What specific systems do I have in my classroom and school to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Māori children achieve success? • the Māori community can participate in all activities? • my Māori colleagues are supported? |

(From Bishop & Graham, 1997, p. 11)

particular sets of professional standards. The standards themselves are just one manifestation of a deeper-level more significant need for schools in Aotearoa New Zealand. That need is to work in a way that might secure a positive and honourable future for the children of this country through a clear understanding of the documents that underpin our status as a nation (Irwin, 1999).

Aotearoa New Zealand is going through a difficult time as we transit from a culture which focused entirely on English language versions of the Treaties to a culture that recognises them as different but parallel documents, both of which need to be referred to as relationships based on real partnership develop. This transitional phase will not be easy. It will be a phase where some Māori push harder against the apparent reluctance of Pākehā to make meaningful change (Jenkins & Jones, 2000); a phase where some Pākehā resent what they see as disruption to their comfortable positions and feel Māori are being excessive and unreasonable in their demands (Christie, 1999).

However, it is a transitional stage where teachers and education have a key role to play; a role that is based on action guided by knowledge as we break through the epistemological racism that is deeply embedded in our culture (Bishop, 2000b; Scheurich & Young, 1997). Action which implements the Treaties not just in the content of teaching programmes¹¹ but also in the process by which teaching programmes are conducted. Action which is action, and not just talk. There is a well-known Māori proverb or *whakataua* which says:

I hea koe i te tangihanga o te pīpīwharauora?

Where were you when the shining cuckoo began to call?

¹¹ For an excellent development of this see Hunter (1999).

The *pīpīwharau* begins to call in early spring. It is the call that signals there is work to be done. It is a call to action. What will our response be?

No reira, tēnā koutou katoa.

REFERENCES

- Ballara, A. (1998). *Iwi: The dynamics of Māori tribal organisation from c. 1769 to c. 1945*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Belich, J. (1996). *Making peoples: A history of the New Zealanders from Polynesian settlement to the end of the nineteenth century*. Auckland: Allen Lane.
- Bible Society in New Zealand (1952). *Ko te Paipera Tapu, ara ko te kawenata tawhito me te kawenata hou*. London: British & Foreign Bible Society.
- Biggs, B. (1989). Humpty-Dumpty and the Treaty of Waitangi. In I. Kawharu (Ed.), *Waitangi: Māori and Pākehā perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 300-312). Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Bishop, R., & Graham, S. (1997). *Nga taumata matauranga o Aotearoa/higher education in New Zealand, paper no. 4. implementing Treaty of Waitangi charter goals in tertiary institutions: A case study*. Wellington: Syndicate of Educational Development Centres of New Zealand Universities.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (2000a). Kaupapa Māori messages for the mainstream. *Set 1*, 4-7.
- Bishop, R. (2000, April). Changing power relations in education: Kaupapa Māori messages for mainstream institutions. Paper presented to the DEANZ Conference, *Supporting the learner through open, flexible and distance strategies*. University of Otago, New Zealand.
- Christie, W. (1999). *New Zealand education and treatyism*. Auckland: Wyvern Press.
- Coates, K. (1998). International perspectives on relations with indigenous peoples. In K. Coates & P. McHugh (Eds.), *Living relationships kokiri ngātahi: The Treaty of Waitangi in the new millennium* (pp. 19-103). Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Cochrane-Smith, M. (2000). Blind vision: Unlearning racism in teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 70(2), 157-190.
- Durie, E. (1989). *Waitangi day address*. Address to the gathering at Waitangi on 6 February. Waitangi, New Zealand.
- Irwin, K. (1999). Māori Education Policy 1989-1998: Lamponing it up. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 34(1), 66-76.
- Hunter, P. (1999). *The Treaty of Waitangi: Frameworks for teaching and learning years 1-13*. Paper presented at the FSSA Conference Social studies on Broadway. Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Jackson, M. (1975). Literacy, communications and social change: A study of the meaning and effect of literacy in early nineteenth century Māori society. In I. Kawharu (Ed.), *Conflict and compromise: Essays on the Māori since colonisation* (pp. 27-54). Wellington: Reed.
- Jackson, M. (1993). Land loss and the Treaty of Waitangi. In W. Ihimaera (Ed.), *Te ao marama 2: Regaining Aotearoa: Māori writers speak out* (pp. 70-77). Auckland: Reed.

- Jenkins, K., & Jones, A. (2000). Māori education policy: A state promise. In J. Marshall, E. Coxon, K. Jenkins & A. Jones (Eds.), *Politics, policy, pedagogy: Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 139-154). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Kelsey, J. (1990). *A question of honour? Labour and the Treaty 1984-1989*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.
- King, M. (1989). *Moriori: A people rediscovered*. Auckland: Viking.
- McIntyre, W., & Gardner, W. (Eds.) (1971). *Speeches and documents on New Zealand history*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mead, H. (1993). The Treaty of Waitangi and 'Waitangi'. In W. Ihimaera (Ed.), *Te ao marama2: Regaining Aotearoa: Māori writers speak out* (pp. 59-62). Auckland: Reed.
- Ministry of Education. (1989). *Charter Framework*. Wellington: Author.
- Ministry of Education. (1993). *The New Zealand curriculum framework*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1996). *Te whāriki: He whāriki mātauranga mō ngā mokopuna o Aotearoa / Early Childhood Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1998a). *Interim professional standards: Primary school deputy/assistant principals, primary school teachers*. Wellington: Author.
- Ministry of Education. (1998b). *Quality in action/ Te mahi whai hua: Implementing the revised statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices in New Zealand early childhood services*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1999) *Professional standards: Criteria for teaching; secondary school teachers and unit holders*. Wellington: Author.
- Ministry of Education. (2000). *National education guidelines*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Minogue, K. (1998). *Waitangi: Morality and reality*. Wellington: NZ Business Roundtable.
- Orange, C. (1978). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.
- Reeves, P. (1993). Te mana tiriti. In W. Ihimaera (Ed.), *Te ao marama 2: Regaining Aotearoa: Māori writers speak out* (pp. 85-86). Auckland: Reed.
- Scheurich, J., & Young, M. (1997). Coloring epistemologies: Are our research epistemologies racially biased? *Educational Researcher*, 26(4), 4-16.
- Sorrenson, M. (1989). Towards a radical reinterpretation of New Zealand history: The role of the Waitangi Tribunal. In I. Kawharu (Ed.), *Waitangi: Māori and Pākehā perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 158-178). Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Walker, R. (1996). Māori resistance to state domination. In R. Peters, W. Hope, J. Marshall & S. Webster (Eds.), *Critical theory, poststructuralism & the social context* (pp. 257-268). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Ward, A. (1999). *An unsettled history: Treaty claims in New Zealand today*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Yates, B., & Issacs, P. (2000, July). *Strategies for treaty implementation*. Paper presented to the Treaty Conference, Auckland, New Zealand.