The Face at the End of the Road: Exploring Māori Identities

Tess Moeke-Maxwell
(Ngai Tai ki Umupuia, Ngati Porou, Ngati Pukeko, Ngati Pākehā)

UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO, HAMILTON

Abstract

In the bicultural context of Aotearoa New Zealand, Māori (people of the land) and Tauiwi (the other tribe, i.e. Pākehā and other non-indigenous New Zealanders), continue to be represented in binary opposition to each other. This has real consequences for the way in which health practitioners think about and respond to Māori. Reflecting on ideas explored in my PhD thesis, I suggest that Māori identity is much more complex than popular representations of Māori subjectivity allow. In this article I offer an alternative narrative on the social construction of Māori identity by contesting the idea of a singular, quintessential subjectivity by uncovering the *other* face/s subjugated beneath biculturalism's preferred subjects.

Waitara

Mai i te horopaki iwirua o Aotearoa, arā te Māori (tangata whenua) me Tauiwi (iwi kē, arā Pākehā me ētahi atu iwi ehara nō Niu Tīreni), e mau tonu ana te here mauwehe rāua ki a rāua anō. Ko te mutunga mai o tēnei ko te momo whakaarohanga, momo titiro hoki a ngā kaimahi hauora ki te Māori. Kia hoki ake ki ngā ariā i whakaarahia ake i roto i taku tuhinga kairangi; E whakapae ana au he uaua ake te tuakiri Māori ki ngā horopaki tauirahia mai ai e te marautanga Māori. I konei ka whakatauhia he kōrero kē whakapā atu ki te waihangatanga o te tuakiri Māori, tuatahi; ko te whakahē i te ariā takitahi, marautanga pūmau mā te hurahanga ake i tērā āhua e pēhia nei ki raro iho i te whainga marau iwiruatanga. Tuarua, mai i tēnei o taku tuhinga rangahau e titiro nei ki ngā wawata ahurei a te Māori noho nei i raro i te māuiuitanga whakapoto koiora, ka tohu au ki te rerekētanga i waenga, i roto hoki o ngā Māori homai kōrero, ā, ka whakahāngaia te titiro ki te momo whakatau āwhina a te hauora ā-motu i te hunga whai oranga.

Keywords: Māori identity; representations of identity, Māori subjectivity; social construction; biculturalism; Other; cultural hybridity

I would like to take a moment to reflect on the very interesting and thought-provoking title of this conference "Tona Kanohi" or "The Face of the Other." What does this mean in the context of providing psychotherapy in Aotearoa/New Zealand I asked myself? I am not a psychotherapist and I have had a relatively short life span as a counsellor in comparison to many of you here today. Nevertheless, in the spirit of biculturalism, I began to think about the face of the Other: how does the Other derive its meaning, its Otherness, in the bicultural context? My thoughts came to rest on a fictionalised Māori client involved in a face to face encounter with a fictionalised non-Māori mental health expert. I imagined the "face of the Māori Other" in the room with the Pākehā clinician, who functions in this context as the primary signifier to Māori (i.e. the secondary signifier) and embodies the difference that is Other, that is, the face that is not me. I imagined the Māori client receiving a "diagnosis" and "treatment" from the all-knowing, all-seeing clinician, a fully realised, rationale, active, masculine, white subject , called into being in the fullness of their position as "expert" and, thereby, juxtaposed in binary opposition to the disenfranchised, partially seeing, partially knowing, passive, female, brown Māori object(ified) client. I would like to think that this bi-product of the colonial encounter is an image from the past, and is no longer applicable to the clinician in the New Zealand (public and private) health sector. Unfortunately, a number of studies in the field of mental health (Moeke-Maxwell, Wells, & Mellsop, 2008; Barnett & Barnes, 2010) suggest that such colonial — and colonising — encounters are only too common.

However, as I am sure that our next keynote speaker, Dr Donna Orange, will agree, we live and work in a time where self-reflexive clinicians and health professionals are being called to resist this hegemonic positioning; we are being challenged, following Lévinas (1969) to "*not* know" the face of the Other, in order to meet the Other in the space where new conversations can emerge and exciting transformative possibilities may flourish (Orange, 2011).

In this article, and the research on which it is based (Moeke-Maxwell, 2003), I suggest that Māori identity is much more complex than its popular representations allow, and that cultural identities of Māori and Tau Iwi are more complex than their binary opposition establishes. As a part of the research, I interviewed 25 women who were comfortable talking about their dual or multiple identities. Through a critical analysis each woman's identity was discursively deconstructed, thus problematising the idea of a singular fixed Māori identity, that is, the heterogeneity between the women's cultural identity markers showed that their innate sense of being Māori did not reside solely in knowing their whakapapa, language or tikanga (tribal values, beliefs and practices) or participating in Māori society. In understanding cultural identity, I employ Hall's (1990, p. 223) definitions, the first of which defines "cultural identity" in terms of:

> one, shared culture, a sort of collective "one true self", hiding inside the many other, more superficial or artificially imposed "selves", which people with a shared history and ancestry hold in common. Within the terms of this definition, our cultural identities reflect the common historical experiences and shared cultural codes which provide us, as "one people", with stable, unchanging and continuous frames of reference and meaning, beneath all the shifting divisions

and vicissitudes of our actual history. This "oneness", underlying all the other, more superficial differences, is the truth, the essence … of the black experience. It is this identity which a … black diaspora must discover, excavate, bring to the light and express.

In this presentation I offer an alternative narrative on the social construction of Māori identity by way of exploring the face of the Other and, in doing so, I contest the idea of a singular, subjectivity by uncovering the *Other* face/s subjugated beneath biculturalism's preferred subjects. In making this point, I also draw on my post-doctoral research. I do so in order to highlight the diversity between, as well as within, Māori participants and to address the question as to how we work respectfully and ethically with Māori clients in a way which seeks not to re-inscribe them with Otherness by embracing their diversity and working with the complexities they bring.

Personal Introduction

In order to set the scene for my interest in Māori identity politics, I want to share something of myself. I was born in 1961. I position myself as genetically inscribed with Pākehā (Scottish) and Māori whakapapa (Ngai Tai, Ngati Porou and Ngati Pukeko) on my mother's side, and Pākehā (Irish) whakapapa on my father's side. My sisters and I are the first generation in our whānau to be born in the urban sector. We left Auckland city and headed to rural Bay of Plenty to live when I was six years old.

I consider myself to be someone who has been discursively called into being in this nation as both ethnically Māori and Pākehā. I always knew that I was recognised solely as Pākehā or simply as a New Zealander or a Kiwi when I was growing up. People were always surprised when they met my Māori mother. I sensed that my misrecognised Māori identity had something to do with being fair and growing up in the 1960s and 1970s. Several DNA [deoxyribonucleic acid] molecules flow through my veins, as well as overlapping and sometimes competing histories, collective cultural memories and life experiences. Born to a Māori mother (with Scottish forbears in the mix) and a fifth generation Irish/Pākehā father, my siblings and I bear a range of phenotypes ranging from dark skin, hair and eyes to fair skin, hair and blue eyes. On a continuum of white to brown, I am somewhere on the pale end of the colour spectrum. But do racial phenotypes really matter? After all, the emphasis now is on cultural (ethnic) identity? Growing up, colour mattered a lot to me; I *felt* Māori, mainly through my connections to spiritual matters; my sensitivity was always heightened to things Māori. Although we weren't raised with fluency in te reo Māori, my siblings and I were aware of our indigenous ancestry. Perhaps our Māori heritage was more to the fore because our mother raised us. My mother has always been and will always be tuturu Māori. By this I mean she identifies as Māori, lives her life according to her indigenous values, beliefs, and tribal customs, and she has passed these things on to us. My mother has a single ethnic identity and cultural world view. Born in the early 1930s in a recently nationalised country, my mother was part of a Māori generation who grew up being actively assimilated under the national banner of "We are one people." I grew up hearing stories about the discrimination she

experienced trying to find a flat in Auckland city in the late 1950s, simply because she was brown, and Māori.

When we moved from the city to the country, I saw first-hand how threatened our new Pākehā neighbours were to have a young, attractive Māori divorcee in their rural neighbourhood. At school my sisters and I suffered bullying because of her corporeal presence in an almost otherwise, white farming neighbourhood. She was made Other or Othered, based on her difference to them: she was brown, as a woman of no independent financial means with children, and a divorcee — and housekeeping for an unmarried farmer. She was completely and utterly taboo. They had no idea she was the granddaughter of a paramount chief and her humility would never permit her to tell them.

Negative references about my mother always included reference to the fact that she was Māori: slurs against her skin colouring were common. My sisters and I became interlocutors in these racist episodes as, although I am "white", they called us into being Other through our strong association with our mother; I was positioned at the intersection between "us" and "them" but, mostly, I escaped the overt personally-mediated racism my mother received; clearly, I was protected by my whiteness.

But then something, perhaps even more strange, began to happen. As I got older I noticed when my older Māori relatives came to visit they asked for my brown-skinned sister. "Where's Joy?" they would ask expectantly, looking over my shoulder. At the time I told myself it was because my sister was brown and more like them. As an adult, in social and employment contexts, I have often felt overlooked in preference for a *brown* Māori, for example, to perform a cultural role. Perhaps it was because I did not have as much reo (language) or as much tikanga (cultural practices associated with being Māori). My point is that, within Māoridom, I was also Othered, a process which I attribute to colourism. I internalised this Othering based on my corporeal presence; I simply wasn't brown enough.

As an adult, I realise that there were probably other reasons why my sister was favoured over me: she has an infectious sense of humour; I, on the other hand, have tended more towards being introspective and analytical. Nonetheless, from my earliest memories, I noticed those occasions when I felt I was either not Māori enough for Māori or too Māori for Pākehā, and, thus, always someone's Other. My sense of difference was amplified when, aged 20, I encountered feminism, and began to identify as a radical lesbian feminist.

This sense of being ethnically invisible (because, phenotypically I am fair) was very disenfranchising. I have many stories about being either privileged, or overlooked because one of my cultural ethnicities refused to match my skin colour. By the time I reached my twenties I knew that the way people physically appeared had something to do with the way they were treated in this country.

Locating the Psychotherapist Within the Clinical Encounter

The theme of this conference, "The Face of the Other" is, according to the NZAP's (2012) website: "based on the experience of the encounter with the other who is not me". I was

excited that this title contains the word "face", indicating the presence of real, embodied, people. The underlying terrain in this encounter requires the clinician to become familiar with the discursive call to their own identities, informed by those national discourses which call us into being, shape us in particular ways, and unconsciously provide us with an innate knowing of who the Other is, that is not me. On the face of it, contained within our own subjectivisation (the way we internalise how we are made subject/ive), I suggest we have an innate knowing of who the Other is, whether we are consciously aware of it or not. This knowing has been encoded in our identity at the time we acquired language. Have you ever wondered why it is so hard to remove negative stereotypes about people based on their biology, religion, and sexuality, even though cognitively you know they are a fiction? I know I have. As health professionals, how might stereotypes about whiteness and blackness uncannily pervade our thinking, only to be neatly erased in a moment of self-preserving amnesia? Judith Butler (1990) has articulated this well:

> The culturally dominated undergo a paradoxical oppression, in that they are both marked out by stereotypes and at the same time rendered invisible. As remarkable, deviant being, the culturally imperialized are stamped with an essence. The stereotypes confine them to a nature which is often attached in some way to their bodies, and which cannot easily be denied. These stereotypes so permeate the society that they are not noticed as contestable. Just as everyone knows the earth goes around the sun, so everyone knows that gay people are promiscuous, that Indians are alcoholics, and that women are good with children. White males on the other hand, insofar as they escape group marking, can be individuals. (p. 59)

How might we begin to resist meeting the Other as if they were human coat hangers already inscribed with our knowing, our meanings attached neatly to their passive bodies?

Perhaps the task at hand is to hold in tension our own subjectivisation: those discursive interpellations that take up our marked and unmarked raced and gendered bodies that call us into being in particular ways, inscribe us with meaning, give us our identities (Moeke-Maxwell, 2003), while simultaneously trying to resist knowing the Other that is not me? I am suggesting that we could hold in tension this sense of knowing the social construction of Self and Other to permit a space of opportunity to not know. How can we begin mindfully to unknow the Māori Other who is not me, in the context of what we know through our own subjectivisation and positioning within the nationalist discourse?

As a Māori health professional, I am aware that another tension exists in this desire to not know the Other that is me. For me, it has always been important to know the Māori Other as *me*, or to seek the commonality of connection as Māori, be it through whakapapa (ancestral links) or through shared cultural values and beliefs reflecting traditional processes of engagement. For example, during pōwhiri, or in every day encounters with Māori, it has always been comforting to be the face that is known: to be viewed as the mokopuna or grandchild of Ngai Tai ki Umupuia, Ngati Pukeko or Ngati Porou. To be

thus recognised is to be embraced; for me, it's like being accepted, taken home. As a model of engagement, the pōwhiri (traditional Māori welcome) is also used in the public health sector to engage and work safely with Māori families (McClintock, Mellsop, Moeke-Maxwell, & Merry, 2010).

Māori know the value of whānaungatanga or relationships which are fostered through the right tikanga (protocols) which are deliberately put in place to facilitate the quality of connection and reciprocity within relationships. For example, through the pōwhiri encounter the kāranga (call) is heard from the wahine (women) to the manuhiri (guests), and a ritual of exchange takes place between mana whenua (the hosts) and guests through whaikorero (oratory), karakia (prayers, incantations) and waiata (songs). The sharing of food and drink is used to end the formal part of the encounter by breaking the formality of tapu or restriction to enable people, and the environment to become noa: it returns back to neutral. Everything has a meaning and a place. Everyone is *known*, leaving no one *unfamiliar*. This is a tapu process, imbued with deep spiritual significance.

Central to this cultural process of engagement is the need to establish identity by responding to the imperative to supply information to the following questions: "No hea koe?" (Where are you from?) and "Ko wai koe?" (Who are you?) These are not questions concerned with how important you are in terms of your work, or how much money or status you may have or what your skin colour or religious or spiritual affiliations might be; these are questions concerning whakapapa (ancestry) and links to whenua (the land) and shared history. The focus on individual identity is always in relation to ancestors, kinship groups and the lands they cared for, and continue to care for, which helps to establish the relationship between mana whenua and manuhiri.

The point is that Māori-centred, or kaupapa Māori terms of engagement, place importance on knowing the Other, which produces a tension for the Māori clinician who uses traditional Māori processes of engagement and therapy. As Māori practitioners, how can we know the Other that is me, while respectfully holding in tension the possibility that we also don't know? How do we engage in the encounter with the Other when the Other is also symbolically, or actually via whakapapa, me? In essence, how can we become more mindful about who the Other is that is not me? My doctoral research assists us in exploring this further.

What I am suggesting here is that nationalism and counter nationalism were in the business of socially constructing national communities along lines which require highly specific subjectivities to be reformulated through the newly reconfigured bicultural nation. This preserved the idea of a quintessential Māori identity juxtaposed to Pākehā (representatives of the Crown) and thus it also reinstated Pākehā, the offspring to colonial settlers, as the other Treaty partner.

Three Popular Representations of Māori Identity

In an effort to assist us in beginning to un-know the face of the Other that is not me, I refer to my PhD research where I discursively deconstructed Māori identity by identifying and problematising three popular contemporary representations: the traditional, the assimilated, and the pathologised, in addition to which I posited a fourth, alternative

reading of Māori identity, the hybrid, in order to open up a space to think more laterally about Māori identity.

The first of three popular representations is that of a traditional Māori identity, commonly associated with a positive or secure cultural identity and identified by a strong sense of *being* Māori which is seen as critical to psychological stability (Durie, 1995a, 1997, 1999, 2001). There are many Māori who identify with a singular Māori worldview. Perhaps for today's purposes we can refer to this "traditional" identity as "the face of tuturu Māori". It relies upon essentialising criteria informed by specific cultural identity markers. Cultural capital usually involves fluency in te reo, knowledge of matauranga Māori, tikanga and participation in Māori society. It also, corporeally speaking, is associated with brownness and those phenotypes stereotypically attributed to New Zealand Māori. This identity was sanctioned by the Crown in Treaty claim negotiations which bases its qualifications over who is, or is not considered a real or authentic Māori on historical evidence over whakapapa and significant land markers. In reality, we know that even for people who identify with a singular Māori subjectivity, their identities will vary from person to person, whānau to whānau, iwi to iwi. They will reflect a range of influencing factors like age, geographical placement, gender, racial phenotypes, religious affiliations, social and economic positioning, sexual identity, life experience and so forth.

The second representation of popular Māori identity is that of an assimilated identity, which reflects the subject who has been so successfully colonised that they have forgotten who they are, the ultimate conclusion of colonisation. For today's purpose we shall refer to this identity as "the forgotten face of Māori".

The third representation is that of the pathologised identity, for which read criminal, chronically ill, impoverished, etc. This representation is rather popular with the media; and, unfortunately, we know it too well. This identity is neatly polarised against a tuturu identity, forming an identity continuum: at one end sit those with colonised identities and those situated at the other end are associated with a tuturu or traditional identity. For Durie (1995b, 1997, 1999), this representation would no doubt reflect a notional or compromised identity. I have argued that an assimilated identity sits closely to a colonised identity for they share the same tribal identity disenfranchisement (Moeke-Maxwell, 2003. For today's purposes we shall name the third "pathologised" representations as "the lost faces of Māori".

In my doctoral research I relied upon feminist theory to understand further the specific social construction of Māori women's identity. I offer it here to problematise the discreteness and fixity of Māori identity as is inherent in a traditional reading of identity that refuses to take into consideration the place of gender or racial corporeality in the social construction of subjectivity. Relying on Anthias and Yuval-Davis's work (1989) on women and nationalism, I looked at the unique subjectivity and discursive positioning of Māori women in the bicultural nation. I argued that Māori women symbolically carry the responsibility to reproduce the Māori nation through their reproductive and maternal positioning and are thus responsible for upholding and perpetuating the cultural authenticity of the Māori nation. They are viewed as Māoridom's spiritual cornerstone, reproducing not only the nation, but Māori nationalism, its peoples and cultural traditions.

I relied upon Partha Chatterjay's (1990) ideas to theorise the reliance that biculturalism has on the tuturu Māori women to carry the primordial identity of Māori in order to enable iwi to pursue political and economic initiatives. While Māori men, representing iwi, are mobilising in the corporate marketplace alongside Tauiwi, I suggested that it is Māori women who must uphold the mana of the people, reproducing the Māori nation. Māori men are freed by her primordial status to vacillate culturally in the economic marketplace while the Māori woman is metonymic of the landscape and the past. She must uphold the notion of timelessness and tradition and the unchanged status of tangata whenua, thus reproducing the notion that the spaces she occupies are unmarked by colonisation, colonialism, capitalism and time:

> She provides the frame upon which the Māori national community constructs itself as unchanged over time, permitting the emergence of a newly reconfigured patriarchal alliance between Māori and Pākehā. This strategic positioning of Māori women as traditional forecloses conversations about bi/multi racial women's subjectivity. Many Māori women live with more than one cultural identity and access various degrees of diverse cultural social capital. Some, such as those adopted as infants into Pākehā families, live without whakapapa, while others are also estranged from their whānau, iwi, landscapes, with minimal cultural contact with Māori culture. Many have little Māori language. Yet, they claim Māori as a significant ethnic identity, even when this identity sits uncomfortably alongside other. (Moeke-Maxwell, 2005, p. 501)

An Alternative Narrative of Māori Women's Identity

The fourth and alternative reading of Māori identity, cultural hybridity, first emerged in New Zealand in the 1990s as people positioned with more than one genealogy and ethnicity began to claim their difference (Meredith, 1999a, 1999b, 1999c; Moeke-Maxwell, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2008). This alternative reading or narrative describes those subjects who sit on the bicultural borderlands, oscillating between Māori and Pākehā landscapes, called into being as both Māori and Pākehā. As occluded Other, they do not identify solely as tuturu or traditional; they do not have a singular Māori worldview, despite some being subjectivised with a traditional Māori identity, neither have they forgotten who they are, although some may have reclaimed a Māori ethnic identity during the course of their life; and they do not identify as ethnically lost, although some may well have negative health issues or suffer from impoverishment.

Hybridity is a representation of Māori identity that rests on the presence of more than one whakapapa or genealogy and acknowledges the presence of more than one cultural ethnicity. Being an excess of both Māori and Pākehā gives rise to something new, for it exceeds the Māori/Pākehā Janus interface embedded in biculturalism. I refer to these people as "the many faces of Māori". The Māori population is growing; the numbers of people of Māori decent in the future who are called into being via their dual and multiple whakapapa and plural cultural ethnicities are likely to grow. Our health workforce would be wise to become open to the new complexities and

transformative opportunities these differences will bring.

In order to understand a little more about the social construction of Māori who straddle the bicultural boundary somewhere between white and brown, masculine and feminine, active and passive, I turn to Judith Butler (1993) as her ideas provide a way of showing how subjects become inscribed with gendered identity. I refer to an article that explains my ideas further (Moeke-Maxwell, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2008):

> For Butler, the process of naming, and calling (interpolating) the subject into existence occurs within a discursive process of power that inscribes the subject in specific ways. The law, both real and symbolic, functions as authority that interpolates the subject into subject positions, hiding implications for the social construction of gender ... within the naming process the subject turns to answer the call and in this moment is "subjectivised," becoming the "subject". (Moeke-Maxwell, 2005 p. 501)

There were examples in my research where participants shared memories of events that called them into being as Māori. Within the bicultural context, as we have already discussed, there is a desire for a specific traditional identity which has implications for gendered interpellations of Māori. Māori men and women are invited to take up a tuturu — and gendered — ethnicity. In becoming subjectivised there are certain ideologies, philosophies and cultural obligations that one must participate in to be considered authentically Māori. This may be largely unproblematic for those whose corporeality, that is, their brownness, matches their Māori ethnicity.

The findings in my PhD study showed that sometimes bodies don't fit neatly into a pre-determined construction of cultural identity. Sometimes, when bodies are out of spaces associated metonymically with brown and white bodies, there are violent consequences. Māori who have more than one racial genealogy and accompanying cultural ethnicity are subjected to many interpellations: they occupy many different and competing landscapes; their identities are constantly in flux and up for contestation. Space becomes negotiated as subjects traverse cultural landscapes of belonging. For these people, their temporal and spatial movements do not happen on a linear axis of colonised/assimilated versus traditional identity, as depicted in continuum models of identity. Rather, the oscillating movements are more messy, muddy and awkward; more akin to criss-crossing landscapes, moving backwards and forwards cultural terrain: the subject stitches together the spaces it constantly negotiates and mediates. Thus multiply-subjectivised and multiply-positioned in the nation, the subject has constantly to renegotiate the discursive and often competing calls to identity.

Keeping these things in mind, I looked to the domain of cultural hybridity to help me to understand the many faces of Māori. Homi Bhabha (1994) stated:

> The importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace the two original movements from which the third emerges; rather hybridity ... is the "third space" which enables other positions to emerge. This third space displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives which are

inadequately understood through received wisdom…. The process of cultural
hybridity gives rise to a something different, a something new and unrecognisable,
a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation. (p. 211)

Thinking about hybridity is important as it provides an opportunity to think about
the way colonial culture creates unequal subjects, subjugating those who are in excess of
its requirements. The concept of hybridity provided me with an opportunity to think
about the many faces of Māori women in a way which liberated my thinking about them
from a sense of being misrepresented with a singular Māori subjectivity, un-belonging,
dislocated and alienated from the culture of origin. It provided a way of understanding
how subjects straddle and mediate different and opposing cultures in agentic ways that
were also socially transformative. As Irwin (1992) reminded us, there is a need for
multiple forms of feminisms to respond to the diverse needs of Māori women, and their
situated knowledge (see Harraway, 1991).

These cultural vacillations require careful transactions and negotiation of cultural
meaning and location. Positioned across cultures the Māori hybrid brings what Bhabha
called a new category of cultural location initiating new signs of identity, as well as
innovative sites of collaboration and contestation. My research showed that participants
consciously engaged with their corporeality and plural ethnicity to negotiate the
bicultural borderlands of their often unpredictable and unpredictable lives.

Another point I want to consider is that discursive interpellations are not simply
gender encoded. Bodies that get taken up and inscribed with gender are simultaneously
attributed with meaning through the signification process associated with biological (for
which read racial) phenotypes. There were many stories in my research which depicted
neo-colonial forms of racism. Predictably, where women were brown skinned they
experienced overt acts of racism. However, perhaps what is less well known is that Māori
women, who differed phenotypically to the stereotypical image of a "tuturu" Māori
woman, were also discriminated against by Māori who mistook them for being non-
Māori. For example, one blond-haired, blue-eyed social worker was mistaken by a member
of her whānau on a home-based visit. He assaulted her because he blamed her for causing
his problems which he associated with colonisation. She filed charges against him. In
another case a woman was considered to be very beautiful by her whānau and she was
continually called into being as exotic; she was objectified by the presence of more than
one racial phenotype and it caused her significant trauma. She later married a European
man and took on his cultural identity.

Some women were positioned as interlocutors or communicating conduits between
newly aligned Māori and Pākehā patriarchical relationships within the bicultural nation.
Their dual whakapapa and ethnicity was useful in navigating the Māori/Pākehā divide
but the consequences were occasionally painful. Sometimes these spaces became filled
with anxiety and danger as they got caught in the crossfire between Māori and Pākehā
political and economic agendas. I named these spaces as "bicultural hot spots" or the
points of physical location Māori women traversed to negotiate the partnership.
Moreover, such women were often traversed upon: her back was the bridge over which
people walked the divided and the aligned.

At this point I would like to say a little about phenotypes because biculturalism focuses on the presence of visible cultural ethnicity. There is amnesia about the legacy of Social Darwinism. We all know that difference based on biology is a myth and that skin colour does not equal culture, yet stereotypes prevail about Māori identity based on outdated repressed modernist philosophies. Their legacy remains and is carried in the memory of the presence and absence of whiteness and brownness, which has real consequences for how people are called into being and how they are treated within both national and counter-nationalist communities. Skin colour functions metonymically to mark and place people in certain ways, locating them to particular landscapes in this country. Brown bodies belong in brown spaces and white bodies to white spaces, and bodies viewed as out of place should be especially vigilant for surveillance and punishment are not uncommon.

Strategically Re-essentialising Māori Identity

My PhD research revealed that Māori women of dual or multiple whakapapa were not merely passive victims to the subjugation of their difference within bicultural nationalism, or the various and insidious ways neo-colonialism works to mark and place their bodies materially and spatially in the nation; they were agentic and transformative (Anzaldua, 1987; Larner, 1996).

It was through a common narrative of spirituality that the women in this study became strategically re-essentialised along an axis of spirituality which was resiliency forming. They variously spoke about their engagement with a spiritual force greater than themselves; it connected them to this land as tangata whenua, their tīpuna and cosmology, even when details of their whakapapa were lost to them, as in the case of adoption. Jill was adopted in the late 1950s. She was told she had a European father by what she described as her "racist" Pākehā family. She always felt she was Māori but this confirmation was constantly denied her. When she was an adult she acquired her birth certificate which confirmed her father's Māori paternity but, unfortunately did not detail his whakapapa. Being dislocated and tribally diasporic was difficult. Jill had to find a way to mediate the internal conflict. Returning to the land was her solace. She stated (Moeke-Maxwell, 2005):

> Religion is the Church. Spirituality is my connection with this space, like the space I currently occupy. But it's also my connection, within that space, with other spaces. It's about my purpose for being, my reason for being, my connection with the rest of the world, with the sea, with the bush and in the hills, on the beach, with the animals and with everything that's in [the world]. Whangamata is my turangawaewae, that's my place I go home to. I stand on the beach and I look at the river and I look at the sea and the surf and the islands and I look up at the sky and I look at the hills that are covered in native bush and I look at the pine forests and I look at the jagged mountains. And that's my place there. I am one there and I am met. (pp. 507-508)

Despite an absence of whakapapa, whenua and whānau and a lack of cultural markers Jill's story nonetheless speaks about the deep sense of being Māori, an ancient remembering. By her spirit she is Māori.

The women in my doctoral study had an intrinsic sense of being Māori via their wairua or spiritual beliefs and values despite these being heterogeneous. It was this irreducible essence that provided their strong sense of cultural ethnicity which linked them and their descendants to this land, to their ancestors and Te Atua.

Conclusion

I have argued that there are many faces of Māori. Some will be inscribed with tribal memory: the tattooed faces of their tīpuna etched into their skin, speak. Others may be paled by the conscious resistance and emptying of unwanted discursive callings. Others may be corporeally and ethnically ambiguous, conflicted on the inside and the outside, as can be seen with some Chinese Māori or African Māori or Māori Pākehā. At the very least, we are reminded that phenotypes should not function as shorthand for cultural markers. They do not easily equate. Subjectivisation within the bicultural nation is corporeally specific and there are real consequences for how one is positioned in the reconfigured bicultural nation. The women in my doctoral study showed that life on the cultural borderlands is not always easy. They were required strategically to negotiate a variety of interpellations laden with gendered and ethnic specificities to accommodate the needs of at least two different, competing, yet connected nations: Māori and Pākehā. The bodies, minds and souls of Māori women enunciate and resist the tensions that call and push at her. They may be quite different from both nationalist and counter-nationalist constructions of them; and may be quite different to her genealogical parents. Their/our difference is the "grey" between the brown and white; it contains something perhaps unread, unrecognisable and contestable. Perhaps for today, we could say these people belong to the "uncanny faces of Māori": familiar yet unknown. I suggest that we need to keep the hybridity of Māori women in mind, and extend this to the face of the Other that is Māori in *general*, while we pay attention to gender and other important subjectivising specificities.

So, as health professionals, what can we offer people who are multiply-subjectivised and positioned in the nation? I suggest: a willingness to meet them in a space where the many faces can speak; listening to their voices; and holding them in all their multiplicity, synergy and contradiction.

To return to the question I posed at the start of this article: "How do we work respectfully and ethically with Māori clients in a way which seeks not to re-inscribe them with Otherness by embracing their diversity and working with the complexities they bring?" I think the task at hand for those of us wanting to provide meaningful and non-Othering encounters with Māori is, firstly, to become aware of our own discursive interpellations that have subjectivised and shaped our own identities, our own knowing of self and other. Isn't this what the late Irihapeti Ramsden (2004) asserted in her call to cultural safety when she asked Pākehā nurses to know their own cultures first? Secondly, we could consider the way in which self (clinician) and other (Māori client) are constructed

through nationalist discourses. As such, within the binary reconfiguration of nationalism to biculturalism we are mutually dependant on each other for our identities: we give each other meaning within the nationalist agenda. Thirdly, I suggest that we could continually question which bodies have been and continue to be discursively inscribed and spatially positioned unequally in the nation. Fourthly, we could also be mindful of the unique and often conflicted overlapping historiographies, genealogies, genders, phenotypes, sexualities and familial and personal life experiences which are mediated by the Other on a day-to-day basis; and we could enquire what place the presence or absence of whiteness might occupy in self and other constructions of identity.

There really is no non-fictionalised homogenous face of the Other. Māori and Pākehā are not mutually exclusive terms of identity, for if there was pure difference we would surely would not recognise the Other at all. I think our Māori ancestors knew this; knowing the Other at the gate (where manuhiri/visitors wait to be called on to the marae), yet not knowing them, is resolved in the pōwhiri process. The encounter would never happen if the people at the gate were not recognisable in some way. I am sure my ancestors would not have welcomed aliens on to their marae. In my experience the mana whenua, the hosts at a marae, generally have some prior knowledge of the people or whānau standing at the gate (there is some recognition, a trace of familiarity); the manuhiri presence is whispered on the pae pae and in the wharenui, their presence is mentioned in the kāranga, and in whaikorero, long before the first orator stands to address the hosts providing vital information about where they are from and revealing the purpose of their encounter. It is okay to have some prior recognition of who your manuhiri are: it is okay to know and yet not know.

In the spirit of hybridity, in the clinical encounter with the Other that is Māori, it might be appropriate symbolically to leave the door ajar, to allow a space which invites entry of Other faces, those recognised, unrecognised and even misrecognised, and to welcome the possibility of the arrival of new emergent faces and the departure of old faces as they leave. This liminal space — the door left ajar — holds the constant heterogeneous cultural vacillations of the many ambivalently and diametrically opposed faces of Māori.

I call to these faces now:
to the tuturu faces
to the forgotten faces
to the lost faces
to the uncanny faces;
Haere mai, haere mai, haere mai.

In light of these ideas, it might be appropriate to revisit the title of our conference by tweaking the title "The Face of the Other (that is not me)" to "Encounters with the face/s of the Other that are not quite the same, yet not quite so different to me."

References

Anthias, F., & Yuval-Davis, N. (1989). *Woman, nation, state.* In N. Yuval-Davis & F. Anthias (Eds.), *Woman,/nation,/state* (pp. 1-/17). London, UK: Macmillan.

Anzaldua, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza.* San Francisco, CA: Spinsters/ Aunt Lute.

Barnett, H., & Barnes, A. (2010). *Walk a mile in our shoes. He tuara, ngā tapuwae tuku iho ō ngā mātua tūpuna. Exploring discrimination within and towards families and whānau of people diagnosed with "mental illness".* Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand: The Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand.

Bhabha, H. (1990). The third space: Interview with Homi Bhabha. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference* (pp. 207-222). London, UK: Lawrence and Wishart.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture.* London, UK: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminisim and the subversion of identity.* London, UK: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter. On the discursive limits of "sex".* New York, NY: Routledge.

Chatterjee, P. (1990). The nationalist resolution of the women's question. In K. Sangari & S. Vaid (Eds.), *Recasting women: Essays in colonial history* (pp. 233-254). New Delhi, India: Kali for Women.

Durie, M. (1995a). *Nga matatini Māori: Diverse Māori realities. A paper prepared for the Ministry of Health.* Department of Māori Studies, Massey University, Palmerston North, Aotearoa New Zealand.

Durie, M. H. (1995b). Te hoe nuku roa framework: A Māori identity measure. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society, 104*(4), 461-471.

Durie, M. H. (1997). Māori cultural identity and its implications for mental health services. *International Journal of Mental Health, 6*(3), 23-35.

Durie, M. H. (1999). Mental health and Māori development. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 33,* 5-12.

Durie, M. (2001). *Mauri ora: The dynamics of Māori health.* Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference* (pp. 222-237). London, UK: Lawrence and Wishart.

Irwin, K. (1992). Towards theories of Māori feminism. In R. Du Plessis, P. Bunkle, K. Irwin, A. Laurie, & S. Middleton (Eds.), *Feminist voices: Women's studies texts for Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 1-22). Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

Larner, W. (1996). Gender and ethnicity: Theorising "difference" in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In P. Spoonley (Ed.), *Nga patai: Racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 159-175). Palmerston North, Aotearoa New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

McClintock, K., Mellsop, G., Moeke-Maxwell, T., & Merry, S. (2010). *Pōwhiri process in mental health research. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 58*(1), 96-97.

Meredith, P. (1999a). Hybridity in the third space: Rethinking bi-cultural politics in Aotearoa/ New Zealand. *He Pukenga Korero, Ngahuru AutuMeg, 4*(2), 12-16.

Meredith, P. (1999b). Don't you like kina bey? Et, You're not a real Māori! *Tu Mai, Pipiri,* pp. 4-6.

Meredith, P. (1999c). Being "half-caste": Cultural schizo or cultural lubricant? *Tu Mai, Pipiri,* p. 24.

Moeke-Maxwell, T. (2001). Māori women's bodies speak a hybrid voice. *Te Taarere aa Tawhaki* [*Journal of Waikato University College*], 1, 161-171.

Moeke-Maxwell, T. (2003). *Bringing home the body: Bi/multi racial Māori women's hybridity in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Waikato, Aotearoa New Zealand.

Moeke-Maxwell, T. (2005). Bimultiraical Māori women's cultural hybridity in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education.* 26(4), 497-510.

Moeke-Maxwell, T. (2008). Creating place from conflicted space: Bi/multiracial Māori women's inclusion within New Zealand mental health services. In K. Smith & P. Leavy (Eds.). *Hybrid identities: Theoretical and empirical examinations* (pp. 225-245). Easton, MA: Brill Publishers.

Moeke-Maxwell, T., Wells, D., & Mellsop, G. (2008). *Tangata whaiora/consumers perspectives on current psychiatric classification systems. International Journal of Mental Health Systems*, 2(1), 7.

Orange, D. (2011). *The suffering stranger. Hermeneutics for everyday clinical practice.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Ramsden, I. (2004). Towards cultural safety. In D. Weepa (Ed.), *Cultural safety in New Zealand.* Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand: Pearson Education New Zealand Limited.

Acknowledgements

Tess Moeke-Maxwell is from Ngai Tai ki Umupuia, Ngati Porou, Ngati Pukeko and Ngati Pākehā. She is currently a Health Research Council (HRC) Research Fellow in the Māori and Psychology Research Unit, School of Psychology, Waikato University. Tess is the lead investigator on the Kia Ngawari study; this study investigates the end of life experiences of Māori who live with a life limiting illness or disease and their whānau. The Kia Ngawari study contributes to the Tangihanga Research Programme at Waikato University, which is directed by Professor Ngahuia Te Awekotuku and Associate Professor Linda Nikora. Tess has been invited to sit on two Hospice NZ's Governance Boards to contribute to the development of their NZ palliative care standards and their foundations of spirituality training programme. Tess is also a member of the Accident and Compensation Corporation (ACC) Sensitive Claims Māori working group, and advisory group. Prior to being involved in the Kia Ngawari project, Tess worked as a senior

researcher for Te Rau Matatini, (Māori mental health workforce development organisation). She has provided contract research to the mental health sector since 2004. She is also a registered ACC sexual abuse counsellor who worked in the Bay of Plenty region during the late 1990s and 2000s. She was the contracted Māori researcher for the Ministry of Women's Affairs (2009) study on sexual violation. Contact details: tessmm@ waikato.ac.nz