

Processing biculturalism

Evelyn Shackley

PSYCHOTHERAPIST, BRIGHTWATER, TASMAN

Abstract

This article reflects upon the author's exploration of her process as an overseas trained psychotherapist who was born in Aotearoa New Zealand and has returned after many years away. The author reflects upon her recent encounters with the cultural history of Aotearoa New Zealand as she returns to this country and commences her clinical practice here. Woven throughout the author's writing is her processing of her cultural learning experiences, and the implications this might have for her clinical work. In doing so the author draws on historians such as Anne Salmond, and psychotherapeutic theorists such as Jung, Winnicott, and Klein.

Whakarāpopotonga

He whakaatanga tā tēnei tuhinga i ngā wherawheretanga a te kaituhi i āna takinga kaiwhakaora hinengaro i whakangungua nei i tāwāhi, engari i whānau i Aotearoa Niu Tireni, ā, kua hoki mai. Ka whakaaro ia mō ōna tūponotanga atu ki ngā mahi māori o kō tonu ake nei kua hoki mai nei ki tēnei whenua timata ai i tāna mahi haumaruru. E whiri haere ana i roto i te tuhinga a te kaituhi ko āna takinga o ōna mātauranga wheako whaiaro me ngā tūmomo āhuatanga ka ara ake mō tāna mahi haumaruru. I konei ka huri te kaituhi ki ngā mahi a Anne Salmond, me ngā ariā a ngā kaiwhakaora hinengaro pēnei i a Jung, a Winnicott me Klein.

Keywords: biculturalism; Māori; Pākehā; European New Zealanders; ancestors; inter-generational; pre-verbal; Jung; Klein.

Introduction

In writing this paper I am very much aware that I am just a beginner. This paper reflects my beginning attempts to encounter, grapple with, and make meaning of the history of this country, and its implications for my clinical work. As an overseas qualified psychotherapist, a condition was placed on my scope of practice by the Psychotherapists' Board of Aotearoa New Zealand (PBANZ), I was asked to provide evidence of my competence in relation to

Shackley, E. (2024). Processing biculturalism. *Ata: Journal of Psychotherapy Aotearoa New Zealand*, 27(1), 103-120.
<https://doi.org/10.24135/ajpanz.2024.06>

biculturalism and legal frameworks. I found my subsequent explorations regarding biculturalism a rich source of reflection, both about the culture I was born into and the way I might work in the Aotearoa New Zealand context, alongside my own history and unconscious process. I note that in this paper, I reflect upon encounters between Māori, and settlers to Aotearoa New Zealand who are of European origin. In doing so I acknowledge that there are many who have settled in this country, who are neither indigenous nor of European origin. Given that my own ancestral history is European, my focus is on my learning about encounters between Māori and those of European origin. In doing so I acknowledge and recognise that those who have come to Aotearoa New Zealand from non-European contexts, may offer very different reflections on this history and their place in relation to indigenous Māori in this country. The following are my reflections on this profoundly moving learning experience.

Background

Although I was born in Aotearoa New Zealand and lived here for 45 years of my life, I had recently returned after living in England for 15 years. I noticed a subtle yet pronounced change. For example, when I left, fruit and vegetables were labelled in English. Now they tended to be labelled in both English and te reo Māori. The national radio station announced in both English and te reo, sometimes blending the words into one sentence, sometimes speaking English, sometimes speaking Māori. I also noticed rumblings from some New Zealand European people who seemed angry either at Māori, or about labelling changes that included te reo.

I began to realise that my early experience of Māori culture was limited. I could recall a trip when I was nine years old where my mother ensured we stopped at the Bay of Islands to show me the site of the flagpole Hōne Heke cut down. As my father was English, I did not understand why someone would want to cut down the English flag. As my mother was of Scottish descent, I imagine she was pleased to point it out. My cultural experience was limited to making poi and singing *Pokarekare Ana* at school. And so, I decided to immerse myself in a pool of learning.

Process

I consider that “cultural dynamics” are “the formation, maintenance and transformation of cultures over time” (Kashima, 2014, p. 1). With this in mind I began my explorations by reflecting upon aspects of the cultural history of both Māori and Europeans prior to their first contact with each other, and in cross cultural encounters since Cook’s first encounter in 1769. I reflected upon stories of origin for both Māori and European Christian cultures as I sought to immerse myself in my learning.

For me, the term European New Zealander describes the initial European settlers, who mainly arrived from the United Kingdom and more latterly from other European countries. The influence of my early European settlers is still evident today. In searching for seed providers (Kōanga, www.koanga.org.nz/) I found a charity who saved seeds from both Māori and European. From them I grew tomato plants and parsley from our early Dalmatian gum

diggers, Yugoslav peppers, Italian beans, and English leeks, alongside potatoes that originated from France, Ireland and Aotearoa. I am also aware that just down the road from where I live is a church and cemetery of early German Lutherans from the 1800s.

With these resonances in mind, I began to reflect upon the competencies outlined by PBANZ that seemed relevant to this writing. This led me to begin to attempt to more fully encounter aspects of Māori culture.

Firstly, I attended a series of five 2-hour workshops that educated participants on aspects of Māori culture, history, identity and language, run by Donny Riki in 2022, in order to enhance my understanding. Secondly, I asked members of the Association of Psychotherapists Aotearoa New Zealand (APANZ) for their reading suggestions on biculturalism. I chose books written by Salmond (2017), Stewart (2021), and NiaNia, et al. (2017). As I swam through this information, I paused to reflect and write about my process. I found Anne Salmond's 2017 book, *Tears of Rangi: Experiments Across Worlds*, particularly helpful and movingly evocative. I cite extensively from this book in the writing that follows, as I reflect on my learning.

My reading regarding pre-European Māori society

In reading about a Māori story of origin I encountered some engaging concepts such as hau, ancestors, kinship, and space-time. In this I discovered an origin story that seemed very different to that presented by Christianity, a religion that arrived with the early European settlers, and with which I was familiar.

My reading, particularly drawing from Anne Salmond's 2017 book, led me to understand that for Māori, "kotahi anō te tupuna o te tangata Māori — ko Ranginui te tū nei, ko Papatūānuku e takoto nei — there is just one Māori ancestor, Ranginui standing here and Papatūānuku lying here" (Salmond, 2017, p. 11). The sky father, Ranginui, and the earth mother, Papatūānuku, have several children who become annoyed at being in the dark. One of their children, "Tane-nui-a-Rangi, the ancestor of forests," takes an axe called "Hauhautu" and cuts his parents apart (p. 12). Enraged at this assault on their parents, another of the children, "Tawhirimatea," the "ancestor of the winds (hau)," attacks by whipping up whirlwinds (p. 12). During this chaos the founding ancestors go their own ways, some becoming fish and some becoming lizards. "Only Tu, the ancestor of people, stands tall against Tawhiri's onslaught, earning the right for his descendants to consume those of his brothers" (p. 12). Out of this dark chaos comes light and everyday life.

This origin story evoked in me a feeling of swelling under water, as I encountered concepts, ideas and world views so different from my own. For example, in Salmond's writing I began to consider the concept of hau: "hau emerged at the beginning of the cosmos" and it "drives the whole world, not just human relations. It goes far beyond the exchange of gifts among people" (Salmond, 2017, p. 10). Gift giving is an important currency in relationships, with the gift "intended to keep circulating through networks, carrying hau from one person to another" (p. 133). Hau is also exchanged by "pressing noses" when greeting to exchange breath (p. 15). Salmond (2017) elucidates why a Māori chief, Ruatara, was determined to meet King George III in London: to be seen is "important to Māori, because without [the other] hau cannot be exchanged between groups, tangling descent

lines together through face-to-face greetings between their leaders” (p.64). Most importantly, for me, this concept introduced me to the moving discovery that within te ao Māori, there is a deeper meaning; that all life has hau, therefore “there are no Cartesian gulfs between mind and matter, animate and inanimate beings, people and environment, Culture and Nature” (p.15). Such reflections reminded me of the Buddhist thinking of Thich Nhat Hahn with his words: “Look again, you will see me in you and in every leaf and flower bud” (Hanh, 2021, p. 301). Both are very different from the thinking brought by the Europeans, with which I was so familiar, and about which I reflect later in this article.

Another theme that struck me regarding this origin story is that about ancestors and kinship. It invited to me to extend my worldview as I began to reflect upon different ways people are grouped together in te ao Māori: whānau, hapū and iwi (Salmond, 2017, p. 244). At some stage in my life, I had, I think unconsciously, encountered concepts of whānau and iwi, but hapū was unfamiliar, as were the terms for leaders. People who grouped as extended families were whānau (Salmond, 2017, p. 244). Whilst “people descended from a common ancestor, and bound together by shared use and occupation of networks of gardens, stretches of forest, eel pools, birding trees, fishing grounds and reefs, and shared activities such as fighting and feasting” were hapū (p. 243-244). Leaders I discovered were described as “rangatira, and elders... kaumātua” (p. 244). Finally, “linked networks of hapū” led by an “ariki” were considered “iwi” (p. 244).

As I reflected upon these profoundly different cultural groupings, I found myself pondering more fully on how the Europeans of the time lived. I thought of the one house — one family concept that tended and indeed still tends to exist. I also considered my genealogy research in which I often found my not-so-rich-ancestors in the 1800s sharing a house with others either as being a servant or a labourer, or they had a house and a boarder. I thought of all the National Trust (www.nationaltrust.org.uk) houses that I had explored whilst living in England: the very rich lived with a wealth of servants around them. However, with both my ancestors and the rich, the extended household did not appear to be one of family or genetic connection, more of need.

I also encountered “across worlds” words that woke me to differing qualities in relation to leadership:

Unlike the hierarchical class systems in Europe, there were no structural mechanisms (such as policemen, prisons or the army, punishments like flogging, or the physical discipline exerted in schools) to allow lasting impositions of power. Mana among the rangatira ebbed and flowed, according to their feats in battle, feasting and oratorical contests. (Salmond, 2017, p. 245)

I wondered what it would be like to live in a culture that functioned without such structural mechanisms, but rather utilised relationships to enable boundaries. My wondering reminded me of how I structured my practice in England and how that differed from now in New Zealand. In England, my signed client contract was an echo of my experience. Clients worked weekly and were not charged when I was on holiday (Christmas, Easter and summer holiday), on top of which they had the option of taking off four sessions per year without charge. I quickly found that this structure did not seem to suit the New Zealand psyche. Now,

my verbal agreement (echoed in an email) is that we work at either a weekly or fortnightly pace, and a client tells me prior to 12 noon the day before our planned session if they want to take that session off, otherwise there is a charge. I have found this a much more relaxed and human approach to a working relationship, and I am astounded at the very structured way I used to work.

Salmond (2017) emphasises that “Māori insisted on the existence of parallel ontological dimensions, in which different atua and ways of living could co-exist side by side” (p.117). This meant that “The idea that what was right for Europeans might not be right for Māori and vice versa, and that each might happily go their own way was engrained in the Māori thinking” (Salmond, 2017, p. 82). This was not a concept with which I was familiar; indeed, the possibility that ontological differences could coexist side-by-side was very foreign for me.

I became interested in some words that linked space-time and relationships, as it made me think about my work in England: “In Māori thinking, the past is before us because we can see it: we walk backwards into the future since we cannot look and see what it will bring. This orientation to the world encourages us to reflect on and learn from the past” (Stewart, 2021, p. 66). In my work, I was curious about how clients generally orientated themselves to the future and lacked in-depth knowledge about their ancestors. I had a sense that when clients metaphorically turned around 180 degrees, it usually indicated a major positive shift in their psyche. When I have talked to English clients about pre-verbal and intergenerational trauma, they are often astonished that their ancestral past could have had an impact on them. Indeed, as I reflect on my own personal history, I recognise that similarly, it has been very painful and new for me to reflect on my own ancestral and generational past: my exploration of concepts of *te ao Māori* is gradually opening me more fully to these possibilities.

According to Salmond, Māori cosmologies describe space-time as a spiral, or a vortex. “Standing in the present, one can spin back to the Kore, the Void, where the first burst of energy unleashed the winds of growth and life — and out into the future” (Salmond, 2017, p. 13). This thinking allows the concept of being connected to one’s ancestors in the here and now, whilst considering future generations. For me, this worldview is movingly elucidated in case vignettes written by a Māori healer (Wiremu NiaNia) and a European psychiatrist (Alistair Bush) (NiaNia et al., 2017). NiaNia comments that the way he sees and hears things could be easily misinterpreted by Europeans and categorised as “having hallucinations or being psychotic,” and he goes on to state that “often the wairua side, the spiritual side, has gone unrecognised” (NiaNia et al., 2017, p. 2). His initial work with a young Māori woman called Shannon provided him with a glimpse of her grandmother: “I saw an old lady standing by the closed external door opposite me” and “as I looked at her, I became aware of her name, and I heard and felt a message for her mokopuna (grandchild)” (NiaNia et al., 2017, p. 46). I found NiaNia’s writing and clinical expressions to be deeply moving.

The arrival of European culture

Salmond (2017) suggests that there were two strands of European culture that landed in Aotearoa New Zealand: the Enlightenment and Christianity (2017). She proposes that Enlightenment had two elements: that of “the Order of Things” and “the Order of Relations” (p.36).

The Enlightenment landed in Aotearoa in “1769 when Captain James Cook and his Endeavour companions arrived at Uawa” (Salmond, 2017, p. 21). The Endeavour “was a travelling sideshow of the Enlightenment, lavishly provided with scientific equipment to scan the heavens, collect, and examine plants and animals” (p. 34). This perspective Salmond suggests, was connected to René Descartes who believed “the thinking self — became the eye of the world” and “as the mind’s eye replaced the Eye of God people were separated from Nature, and eventually from each other” (p. 34). This first element, “the order of things” (p. 36) gave birth to scientific measurement and the shape of the grid “used to abstract, divide up and measure space, time and life forms, bringing them under control” (p. 34). This grid:

was hierarchical — based on the old European vision of the Great Chain of Being, with God at the apex followed by archangels and angels, divine kings, the aristocracy and successive ranks of human beings, from ‘civilised’ to ‘savage’, followed by animals, plants and minerals and the earth in descending order. (Salmond, 2017, p. 35)

With this framework the explorers considered Māori lower down the hierarchy and hence ‘fortunate’ to be rescued by European civilisation. It also meant that animals and the earth were objects for the taking by those above them. Indeed, onboard the Endeavour Joseph Banks “invoked the Great Chain of Being and took it for granted that he and his fellow Europeans (especially the gentry) occupied a higher place on the cosmic ladder than the people he met in the Pacific” (Salmond, 2017, p. 37).

The second element was the “order of relations”, where the world was seen “as a living system patterned by networks of relations among (and within) different life forms” (Salmond, 2017, p. 36). This was also present on the Endeavour with “the Earl of Morton’s ‘Hints’, with its emphasis on the legal rights of Pacific peoples to control their own lands” (p. 36). It also seemed to be in the background thinking of James Cook, as he “was less certain about the virtues of a stratified world”, probably helped by his lifelong Quaker mentor (p. 37).

As I digested Salmond’s writing about the Enlightenment several things occurred to me. Swimming around in “the order of things” reminded me of my zoology training where I extracted, stained, and then labelled parasites on glass slides. I acknowledged that I had been no different than the early explorers. I also noticed my disgust at the “Great Chain of Being” as it condoned “owning something” over “relating with something or someone”. I sat with my disgust without judgement and realised the number of pets I had owned in my lifetime. Was owning them justified in the name of relating to them? I descended deeper into my pondering when I considered the number of animals I had eaten in my lifetime, before becoming vegan. Again, was I any different? I considered that “the Order of Relations” appeared to sit more easily with Salmond’s description of a Māori world view, as it did also with my appreciation of Buddhism. This recognition allowed a glimpse of peace to trickle through me.

The second strand of European culture landed with Christianity. The first missionaries were “wary of the “Order of Relations” and “urged that the Church of England (rather than the Dissenters such as the Methodists or Wesleyans) should lead the missionary enterprise

in the Pacific” (Salmond, 2017 p. 63). From this background, in 1807 Marsden “sailed to England to recruit Church of England missionaries” (p. 63). Learning this made me wonder whether the European strands that contribute to Aotearoa New Zealand’s cultural fabric might have reputed to a somewhat different cloth, had a different strand of Christianity been more prevalent?

I then turned to the creation story of European missionaries, as I began to consider the resonances and the differences to my very beginning understandings of the Māori concepts of hau, ancestors, kinship and space-time. On opening my great-grandmother’s bible, for the first time I realised she was a dissenter. The front page is inscribed: “Timaru Wesleyan Methodist Sunday School. Presented to Annie Wilds for regular attendance and good conduct during the year 1869” (*Bible*, 1867). I suddenly felt both relieved and more connected to my ancestor whose parents I wrote about in my dissertation (Shackley, 2017). In her bible under Genesis Chapter 1, I find the words:

And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth. (*Bible*, 1867, Verse 28)

I was struck by how the Bible guided the incoming Europeans to take control and use the land and animals for their needs. I began to imagine that the Māori concept of hau, of mauri, and thus of everything being connected, and of tangata being deeply connected to the whenua (land) of their ancestors, made European colonial activities of domination of the land extremely difficult to comprehend.

Meeting of two cultures

In the early 19th century Māori were, Salmond (2017) suggests, “confident about their own tikanga (ancestral ways), at first Māori gave the missionaries little choice about observing local customs” (p. 98). However, by late 1815, Salmond suggests that with the arrival of more missionaries, “utu balances were radically out of kilter, causing instability and chaos” (p. 100). This was caused not only by Europeans breaking tapu, but also with the introduction of new diseases, and firearms, and unequal distribution of European goods disrupting mana (Salmond, 2017, p. 100).

Salmond goes on to propose that the early missionaries felt “that Māori thinking was fundamentally wrong-headed” (Salmond, 2017, p. 112) and either dismissed them outright or compared them to older European “practices - for example, those of the Greeks, Hebrews or Anglo-Saxons” (p.199). For example, Salmond describes Māori perspectives regarding engaging in sex to strengthen relationships and her perception of how this collided “with Christian ideas about purity, sin and sex outside marriage” (p. 199). At the same time, “Māori practices such as cannibalism, warfare, infanticide and slavery” were not seen in parallel “with contemporary European punishments such as hanging, flogging, and keel-hauling, and warfare, infanticide and slavery in Europe during the early nineteenth century” (p. 112).

I wondered what it was like for the missionaries who held these beliefs whilst teaching Christianity to Māori. As I am interested in language as a way of healing hidden ancestral trauma, I was fascinated to read about an early missionary, Kendall, who found the more he learnt Māori language “the more he felt his own world collapsing” (Salmond, 2017, p. 106). From the missionary’s perspective, Kendall’s interest in Māori language and customs made him “gone native” (p. 144). However, from a Māori perspective, Kendall’s interest in their language and ways of being was “simply to become normal or ordinary, a person like themselves” (p. 144). They might have also acknowledged that Kendall had a “patu wairua — a cataclysmic blow to the spirit” (p. 170).

In 1820 a critical piece of history occurred, which “set the seal on an alliance between northern Māori and the British Crown” (Salmond, 2017, p. 127). Hongi Hika and Waikato travelled to London to meet with King George IV. At this meeting Hongi Hika learnt that the King did not know the missionaries, and that “Marsden and his fellow missionaries were commoners, or tūtūā, not Rangatira” (p. 151).

As I sat with all the information I had so far gathered, the water in which I was swimming seemed to clear a little. For Māori at this time, their belief in “parallel ao (dimensions of reality)” (Salmond, 2017, p. 164) appeared to allow them to hold onto their ways of being and allow the other to have theirs. However, as missionaries believed in one God and one way of being, I began to imagine their stress if they did not convert Māori to their way of thinking. Peace for missionaries, appeared to depend on the other agreeing with their worldview.

Around 1830 two other significant Europeans arrived. One was Henry Williams, who took up the role of missionary leader, he “was battle-hardened, physically strong and fearless” (Salmond, 2017, p. 205). Williams determinedly learnt te reo Māori, on the understanding that it could then allow Christianity to be taught. His thinking differed to Marsden, the earlier missionary leader, who “relied upon European technology and skills to open a way for the Gospel” (p. 217). Williams and other missionaries “doubted whether it was in the interests of Māori for their country to be brought under British control” (p. 217). I gained a sense that some Europeans were aware of their impact, yet the horse had bolted and was resistant to returning to the stable. For me, as I began to consider the horse as greed or fear of familial poverty, then it is easier to recognise the forces that levered the powers of the Enlightenment and Christianity to achieve their goal.

The metaphorical horse ran faster with the arrival of “a British Resident, James Busby” in 1833 (Salmond, 2017, p. 24). His role was to “punish British subjects who committed offences in New Zealand”, yet he “was given no effective power for this purpose” (p. 224). Coupled with this was his education in “the Great Chain of Being” and “the arrow of time” from which he was “eager to assist Māori in making these steps towards civilisation” (p. 227). Yet his maiden speech to Māori in 1833 emphasised that the King wanted them to be his friends, along with his statement that “you will see that I am the friend of the Māori” before concluding with a lesson on “stadial theory” (p. 230). I can only imagine the distress this presented Māori: their importance of relationships contrasted with stadial theory, putting them in a lower category than those who had appeared on their land.

I was struck by an example of Māori asking Williams for permission to grieve the loss of Tohitapu in the “old way, crying and slashing themselves” (Salmond 2017, p. 232). When he refused, they grieved by shooting guns in the air; Williams responded by confiscating the

guns. I cannot imagine this scenario happening twenty years earlier. I felt astonished and saddened at the apparent loss of self-determination.

Threaded through this time was the continuation of warfare. In 1828 Williams attempted, and succeeded, in making peace between two Māori tribes at Hokianga (Salmond, 2017, p. 212). In 1830 Williams walked “alone into the middle of the battle with bullets flying around him, waving a white handkerchief tied to the end of a stick in an effort to stop the fighting: this was the ‘Girls War’” (p. 213). I perceived the arrival of a new shape in warfare. Before the European arrival, Māori would have had complete control in how they interacted between each group. Suddenly the shape of a white man with a white handkerchief appeared. Some Māori became tired of fighting and to the “missionaries’ joy” converted to Christianity along with “learning to read and write”, put down “their songs” and “dances” and ceased “carving and tattooing which the missionaries abhorred” (p. 218). Yet not all had been lost: “many powerful Rangatira resolutely ignored what they had to say, holding fast to tapu practices, and continuing to seek utu for deaths and insults” (p. 218).

He Whakaputanga (1835), the Declaration of Independence (1835), Te Tiriti o Waitangi (1840) and the Treaty of Waitangi (1840)

I realised that something was happening with my writing. Whilst I had a sense of how I wanted to convey my information and I was enjoying writing, the nearer I got to 1840 and Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the Treaty of Waitangi, the more I found myself away from my computer. Two weeks passed before it dawned on me that I appeared to be avoiding something, and I imagined it was Te Tiriti and the Treaty of Waitangi. Sitting with this I realised that deep inside me, I didn’t know how to make these documents function. I did not know how one would come back from attempted genocide by taking over another’s lands, changing their language, beliefs, and ways of being, especially when some of the ancestors of those who took the land believe that they are right in what they did and are proud of the work they did.

I recalled a conference I attended, where one of the presenters was German and old enough to remember World War Two. He made a statement that stuck with me: “If a society doesn’t hold their shadow, they project it on someone else. Germany learnt that the hard way.” (Janus, 2019). I gathered I was facing the old English shadow, a painful truth I was tempted to avoid. Recognising that “A culturally competent psychotherapist will recognise the status of Māori and Pākehā as partners to the Treaty of Waitangi” (The Psychotherapists Board of Aotearoa New Zealand. Te Poari o ngā Kaihaumanu Hinengaro o Aotearoa, 2019 July, p.4), I really took the time and space to unpick and digest the actions that led to Te Tiriti and the Treaty of Waitangi.

I was interested to read about the “Te Paparahi O Te Raki claim to the Waitangi Tribunal, lodged by northern leaders in 1990” as it introduced me to the formal document of “He Whakaputanga (the Declaration of Independence) in 1835” (Salmond, 2017, p. 201). In the claim they “vehemently denied that their ancestors had ever ceded sovereignty to the British Crown. Rather, they had forged a covenant with Queen Victoria” (p. 201). Woven into the claim was the statement that “we did not sign the Pākehā. We signed the Māori version” (p.

202). The outcome of the claim was that “We concluded that in 1840 their ancestors did not cede sovereignty to the British Crown” (p. 203). As I swam backwards in time, I realised that the signatories to He Whakaputanga “included a wide range of rangatira from the northern and southern alliances in the Bay of Islands, from Hokianga and elsewhere in the north, as well as the two ariki from the south” (p. 245).

I gathered the inspiration behind He Whakaputanga was the history of the northern Māori with the French around 1770: there had been unexpected kidnappings of Māori and retaliatory eating of French people (Salmond, 2017, p. 215). With the threat of the returning French in 1831, the “northern Māori found it easy to believe that the ‘tribe of Marion’ intended to seek utu for his death and, turned to the British for help” (p. 216). The day after the French boat arrived in New Zealand “thirteen Rangatira” sought advice from the missionary Henry Williams and endorsed a letter to the English King. In this letter they “begged him to be their hoa (friend) and take care of these islands, so foreigners (tau iwi) could not harass them and take away their country” (p. 216). Salmond (2017, p. 217) points out that it is unlikely that Williams would have been predisposed to welcome the French, having fought in the Napoleonic Wars, whilst the missionaries were unlikely to support the advance of the Roman Catholic faith. The letter was sent back to England, and it was reported that it would “greatly facilitate that formal occupancy on the part of our nation, which we have so frequently and so strongly urged, and on which the future peace and welfare of these colonies will so materially depend” (p. 217).

In 1833 James Busby arrived in Aotearoa New Zealand, with a reply to the chiefs’ letter from Lord Goderich, which Williams translated into Māori (Salmond 2017, p. 228). Lord Goderich acknowledged their letter and the past French threat, whilst hoping that trade would continue with England. He also introduced Busby as being sent by the King “to stay among you as the King’s man, as a mediator [kai wakarite] between Maori people of Nu Tirani and King William’s people living with them as traders. It will be his task to judge all bad deeds that you bring before him” p. 229).

I gathered the English system of control had landed with Busby, possibly initiated from the fear of French invasion and the influence of the missionaries. The entanglement of the two cultures matted with Busby’s behaviour and corresponding Māori actions. Busby set about choosing a flag to represent Aotearoa New Zealand. However, his process left the Māori upset and “many of the rangatira were troubled by the proceedings at Waitangi, the arrival of British warships, and a sense that the Europeans were acquiring too much land and power” (Salmond, 2017, p. 236). From this there was a raid on Busby’s household which escalated into a request to “the New South Wales governor to send a military contingent to support the British Resident” (p. 237). This did not happen, but two Māori chiefs (Titore and Patuone) sent a message to King William IV, “aiming to strengthen their alliance with the British Crown” (p. 237).

The two cultures became more enmeshed when Busby received a letter from a Frenchman, Baron de Thierry, who claimed that in 1820 Hongi and Waikato had sold him land in the Hokianga, and he was on his way to claim it with an army (Salmond, 2017, p. 241). Busby “decided to speed up his plans to set up a kind of parliament in New Zealand” and “drafted a ‘Declaration of the Independence of New Zealand’” (p. 242). Busby asked Williams to translate his draft into Māori, and a copy still survives in Williams’ handwriting

(p. 243). Williams treated both the King and the Rangatira as equals whilst ensuring the sense of “us Rangatira Māori, excluding you foreigners, whether English or French; another sign of an emerging sense of a unified Māori identity” (p. 244). Busby claimed that thirty-five leading chiefs signed this document; however, apparently the only official report that remains is his own. The Rangatira were doubtful if the idea of a parliament could make laws succeed as they had no formal structural power and depended on “an ability to speak eloquently” whilst finding “it difficult to assert absolute authority over their people” (p. 245-246).

After I had waded my way through the context surrounding He Whakaputanga and the Declaration of Independence, I noticed that I had stopped writing yet again. I found I was doing anything and everything to avoid sitting at my desk and write. I sat with my curiosity and wondered if there was anything in me that wanted to avoid this? What floated up was an essay I wrote about Melanie Klein and the struggle I had with the “paranoid schizoid position”:

Many times, I attempted to study only to find that I was displacing onto interesting housework. I struggled, not only trudging through the mists of Klein’s writing to identify key terms, but also to how they related; rather like being in a paranoid schizoid state. Once I had written the bones of the position, my anger miraculously dissipated. (Shackley, 2012, p. 4-5)

I paused at anger, as this was an emotion threaded through my dissertation, that I worked with in relation to the “animus, literally ‘mind’ (also spirit, courage and anger)” (McNeely, 1991, p. 9). I returned to Klein’s work and recalled “that before the onset of the depressive position and in the earliest months of infancy, a paranoid-schizoid position dominates the first evolutionary phase of mental life” (Likierman, 2001, p. 144). In digesting my psychobiography, I knew this was a difficult time for me. My mother and I struggled with my food, and the shape I was left with was ‘swallow it down or die’. Hence it made sense to me that when I came across the same shape of unpalatable information with no easy resolution, in the form of Te Tiriti or The Treaty of Waitangi, I might react by trying to avoid it. This seemed to fit with: “her psyche is not sufficiently mature to process large quantities of anxiety, she resorts repeatedly to primitive defence mechanisms” where “they are easily triggered and charged with indiscriminate aggression” (Likierman, 2001, p. 145). I had a sense that if I could just get through the context surrounding Te Tiriti and the Treaty of Waitangi, then again something would release, and my writing would flow.

I considered the emotions leading up to the 1835 He Whakaputanga and Declaration of Independence. As I understood it, Māori were understandably fearful of being taken over by the French and were used to the English. There was a sense of needing protection yet keeping their independence and sovereignty. For the Europeans the emotion seemed to be greed, with “property” and a belief that changing the other was acceptable (Salmond, 2017, p. 390). All this was thinly hidden under “the creation story in Genesis and the Great Chain of Being” along with “linear time” that orientated towards the goal of civilisation (p. 248-249). Two groups were considered as needing help to become civilised as Salmond (2017, p.249) notes: “Ancient Britons as well as Māori might be described as ‘savages’” whilst many of the

Europeans of the 1830s; “escaped convicts, reprobate sailors and ruthless land-jobbers — were seen as being ‘savage’”.

The themes of independence, property and civilisation started to flow together as Salmond (2017, p. 250) states: “the idea of property emerged in ‘civilised’ societies, this required the emergence of the state, laws and punishment. Sovereignty thus rested on the need to protect private property”. Although the Declaration gave Māori power to make laws and hold “sovereignty over the country”, “Many of the British authorities and those interested in New Zealand, however, did not think that the rangatira were capable of exercising such powers” (p. 250). I wondered if this thought was connected to Europeans who believed themselves higher up the Great Chain of Being.

Around this time, the theme of property was a hot topic both in New Zealand and England. This meant that:

the rangatira were assailed by Europeans eager to buy their land, and treat it as private property as soon as the purchase was finalised. Back in Britain, a war of pamphlets broke out, with those interested in the future of New Zealand arguing about the rights and wrongs of British settlement. (Salmond, 2017, p. 250)

The New Zealand Association wanted to form settlements whilst the Parliamentary Select Committee on Aboriginal Tribes “were less sanguine about the impact of European settlement” (Salmond, 2017, p. 251). Captain William Hobson, arrived in 1837. He embraced “a system of ‘factories’ or commercial settlements (like those in India) as a way of managing the peaceful British settlement of New Zealand” (p. 253). At this the “Church Missionary Society rose up in arms at any suggestion that commercial settlement (whether by the New Zealand Association or in Hobson’s factory scheme) could accomplish ‘the arduous task of raising the New Zealanders to the enjoyment of the blessings of a Christian and civilized state’” (Salmond, 2020, p. 254).

Floating above this tension were three events that appeared to hasten Te Tiriti and the Treaty of Waitangi. Firstly, in 1838 James Clendon “was appointed US Consul to New Zealand, and the following year 80 American vessels visited the Bay. There was also the risk of the French intervention” (Salmond, 2017, p. 255). I sensed that the English squabbling had stretched to quarrelling between countries interested in controlling Aotearoa New Zealand: “The contest was not so much about the rights of Māori, but about which Europeans could do the best job of looking after them” (p. 255). Secondly, Māori had a growing desire for peace, with half the population in 1840 being “mihinare — affiliated with the missionaries” (p. 258). Thirdly, “The New Zealand Association decided to defy Parliament and go ahead with its plans to set up settlements in New Zealand” (p. 259). “The New Zealand Association ship *Tory*” went to Wellington, Queen Charlotte Sound and Taranaki, buying up land even if Māori didn’t agree, often leading to fighting and deaths (p. 260). The British Government responded by sending William Hobson to New Zealand “for the recognition of Her Majesty’s sovereign authority over the whole or any parts of those islands” (p. 259).

I gathered that early 1840 was a maelstrom of activities aimed at quelling Williams, Hobson and Busby’s rising panic at the loss of control to the New Zealand Association. The

missionary Henry Williams attempted to thwart their process by purchasing “the Wairarapa as ‘a sitting place for the natives’” (Salmond, 2017, p. 260). In late January 1840 William Hobson met with Henry Williams and gave him a letter from the Bishop of Australia which instructed “him to do everything he could to assist Hobson with his mission” (p. 261). Hobson met with Busby and gave “him a letter from the British government announcing that the role of resident had been terminated” (p. 261). William Hobson then announced, “he was taking up his duties as lieutenant-governor, that the boundaries of New South Wales had been extended to include those parts of New Zealand to which British sovereignty might be extended, and that from that time on, land sales must be backed by a Crown grant to be recognised as valid” (p. 261).

By 4 February 1840, Hobson drafted an English version of the Treaty of Waitangi, which was “based on British treaties with tribal rulers in West Africa”, updated with feedback from James Busby, and then given to Henry Williams and his son Edward to “translate it into Māori” overnight (Salmond, 2017, p. 261). It is now “almost universally agreed, the two treaties” –the Māori *te Tiriti* and the English translation, — “express very different understandings of future relations between Māori and Europeans” (p. 263). If the rangatira had debated and signed the English treaty, “it would be safe to conclude that they made a clear cession of sovereignty to Queen Victoria”, but they debated and signed “Te Tiriti, “where “the relationship between the rangatira and the queen is very differently defined” (p. 263).

Possibly the way Henry Williams framed Te Tiriti o Waitangi to the Māori, on 5 February 1840, leveraged their familiarity with the missionaries and fear of a French invasion: “the missionaries, fully approved of the treaty” and “this treaty was a fortress for them against any foreign power which might desire to take possession of their country, as the French had taken possession of Otaiti (Tahiti)” (Salmond, 2017, p. 270). On 6 February 1840, signatures or “nose tattoos” were gathered for Te Tiriti (p. 283). However, the draft sent back to England was the English version and “it was certified as the official version of what had been agreed at Waitangi and elsewhere” (p. 283).

Where to from here?

As I am writing this almost 200 years after *te Tiriti* I had hoped that time would have helped the descendants of both parties to process what had happened and enable the agreement of their ancestors. However, the fact that *te Tiriti* was endorsed by Rangatira, but the Treaty of Waitangi was sent back to England as the official version, was a painful indication of things to come.

My questioning reminded me of the competency required by PBANZ to demonstrate understanding “That Aotearoa New Zealand has a culturally diverse population and how that diversity impacts on healthcare service, access and delivery” (The Psychotherapists’ Board of Aotearoa New Zealand. *Te Poari o ngā Kaihaumanu Hinengaro o Aotearoa*, 2019, July). On searching the Eight Key Indicators for health across Aotearoa New Zealand, I found that Māori fared worse than New Zealand Europeans on several indicators (Ministry of Health, 2023). I was also interested in the proportion of people identifying as Māori. StatsNZ *Tatauranga Aotearoa* (2021) stated “New Zealand’s estimated Māori ethnic population was

892,200 (17.1 percent of national population)”. I held this information whilst reflecting on: “Members of powerful groups have the privilege of remaining ignorant (if they so choose) about disempowered groups whilst the powerless have every reason to study the powerful” (Stewart, 2021, p. 118). I wondered if this is painfully implicated in Māori healthcare challenges: that Māori can be ignored and blamed for their situation, rather than seen and embraced for their perspective of the world, and more than this, granted the tino rangatiratanga, resources, sovereignty, and self-determination in health and all matters, that te Tiriti requires.

I then turned to the PBANZ competency: “A culturally competent psychotherapist will recognise: The status of Māori and Pakeha as partners to the Treaty of Waitangi” (The Psychotherapists Board of Aotearoa New Zealand. Te Poari o ngā Kaihaumanu Hinengaro o Aotearoa, 2019, July). When I started this writing, I felt stuck, scattered, angry and frustrated with a sprinkling of guilt at the thought of Europeans coming and taking over Māori land. I did not see Te Tiriti and the Treaty of Waitangi as a partnership. At the same time, I appreciated my guilt had the potential to motivate me to enact rescuer or perpetrator in the drama triangle (Lac & Donaldson, 2020, p. 1). Early in my explorations I realised that I lacked knowledge around the cultural forces that swirled around the creation of Te Tiriti and the Treaty of Waitangi. Having immersed myself in a pool of learning my feelings were eventually dominated by immense sadness: that 200 years on, we continue to struggle to meet each other, with horrific consequences for the indigenous peoples, the tangata whenua of this land. I hold, perhaps in desperation, on to the hope that our increased focus on the climate crisis might provide a container that requires us to build a stronger more respectful relationship with tangata whenua in Aotearoa New Zealand, and with Papatūānuku, Mother Earth.

My explorations not only gave me a better context for understanding the nature of this country, but it also gave me deeper insights into my own history. Following one of the workshops with Donny Riki, I undertook a new piece of work on my ancestral tree. I noticed, in discussion with the tutor, that I had a significant positive body reaction to travelling to Cumbria in England, which I did not have when travelling to my hometown of Christchurch in New Zealand. Wondering why that was, I stepped back and sifted through 20 years of my genealogical work. It dawned on me that I was a first-generation New Zealander on my father’s side. Most of my father’s family, back to at least 1700, were born and raised and lived in Cumbria. It finally made sense to me why every time I reached the sign “Welcome to the Lake District”, followed by the hills, and then the stone walls and traditional Herdwick sheep, that I exhaled and thought “I have come home.”

The same cannot be said for my maternal side. The people I wrote about in my dissertation (Shackley, 2017) came from Deal in Kent, England. Several years ago, I visited Deal to notice my reaction. I found I was sad, and wondered if this was how they felt when they left in 1858. Most of my maternal family were Scottish, and curiously I did not manage to visit their land.

With this knowledge I rewrote my pepehā, with the tutor translating it into Te Reo. I learnt that for Māori clients I would make the therapeutic space safer for them if I could have my ancestors available to discuss. Hence my pepehā is on my therapy room wall.

I paused to ponder how I would integrate my new knowledge with my work as a psychotherapist. I am clear that I work to the depth of pre-verbal trauma and hidden inter-

generational stories, which means that my container includes that of a young toddler, baby, womb life and back six generations of the other side. I gently hold six generations as a boundary, after reading that we hold snippets of 100 percent of our ancestral DNA at six generations but “if you go back eight or more generations, it is almost certain that you will have some ancestors whose DNA did not get passed down to you” (Reich, 2018, p. 12). For me to work in this way, I realise that I need to have worked with my own pre-verbal history and hidden ancestral wounds. I started writing about this in my dissertation (Shackley, 2017) and I expect my insights from future writing, will allow me to work at greater depth. I hope that my way of considering ancestors will assist me in engaging with Māori clients and potentially useful to my clients of European descent. I am reminded that: “In order for deconstruction of colonial hierarchies to proceed, Derrida insists it is necessary to engage with the logic of binary oppositions” (Stewart, 2021, p. 105).

My explorations also made me question the theories that I use in my work. For example, in one workshop with Donny Riki there was discussion on what theory might be useful for working with Māori clients. Even my bread-and-butter Jungian theory of Individuation, which included ancestral space, did not sit quite right. It appeared overlaid by “linear time” (Salmond, 2017, p. 248), from “consciousness” to “personal unconscious” to “collective unconscious” (Stevens, 1990, p. 29). I started to ponder if other theories might be useful to include. Earlier I wrote about an old woman that NiaNia had seen (NiaNia et al., 2017). As I sat with this, I was reminded of the Jungian belief that the psyche can split in the face of overwhelming trauma: “a fragmentation of consciousness occurs in which the different ‘pieces’” then “organize themselves according to certain archaic and typical (archetypal patterns), most commonly dyads or syzygies made up of personified ‘beings’” (Kalsched, 1996, p. 3). I was reminded if a baby feels “impingements” to the “concept of a central or true self” then the “best defence is the organization of a false self” (Winnicott, 1960, p. 591). I was also interested to note Winnicott’s comment about Klein’s work, as I was reminded of anger, frustration, and projection, while I worked through this research:

This work of Klein concerns earliest infancy, and draws attention to the importance of aggressive and destructive impulses that are more deeply rooted than those that are reactive to frustration and related to hate and anger; also in Klein’s work there is a dissection of early defences against primitive anxieties, anxieties that belong to the first stages of the mental organization (splitting, projection, and introjection). (Winnicott, 1960, p. 588)

These theories dealt with the individual psyche splitting in the face of overwhelming trauma, rather than the concept of ancestors (NiaNia et al., 2017) or as discussed in the workshops (D. Riki, personal communication, July 21, August 25, September 29, October 27, and November 24, 2022). I wondered if my ancestral “Ancient Britons” could help (Salmond, 2017, p. 249). I circled around to an older shamanic approach which acknowledged that “many of us today don’t feel totally whole” and soul loss might occur due to “being frightened away, or straying, or being stolen” (Ingerman, 1991, p. 11). Ingerman states the shaman travels to find the lost soul part in “the Upper World”, “Lower World” and the “Middle World” (Ingerman, 1991, p. 34-36). I am interested in her words: “In the Middle World the shaman

can travel back and forth through human histories. Sometimes the soul of a patient has remained in a past moment of his or her life whilst the outer world has continued to move onward" (Ingerman, 1991, p. 36). This gave me the concept of time, but it was still at the individual level.

I started to turn around. I considered the work of family therapy and family constellations. Schützenberger (1998, p. 13) references the work of Frieda Fromm-Reichmann around 1948, who was interested in "the question of psychosis and especially schizophrenia", curiously the emotions of which NiaNia felt he could be accused. Schützenberger (1998, p. 16) uses a process of "short psychodramas" "in which it is possible to ask a dead grandfather to come and talk on the stage". Ruppert (2008, p. 229) outlines his process for "systemic constellations", whereby a person who wants to know more about an issue in her family, works with a therapist and people who represent different people in her family system. These theories resonated with me, and I felt there were some tools that could help me further my work.

Finally, I turned completely around: 180 degrees. I realised that I was of European descent exploring European models. I had read a book about working with mental health from a Māori perspective (NiaNia et al., 2017), but I lacked any knowledge about Māori mental health approaches. I watched my fear of finding out. Fear that I would be blamed for cultural misappropriation: for taking something that belonged to the other. Walking towards my fear, I wondered what would happen if I asked to learn a new cultural approach? Would I be accepted or rejected? Could stepping towards my fear add a richness in the way that I work and also potentially add a bridge across cultures.

Conclusion

I started this exploration aware that I knew little about Māori cultures and the arrival of European missionaries. I decided to immerse myself in a pool of learning as much as I was able, and eventually attempt to swim, being inspired by Jung's encouragement that, "Man's descent to the water is needed in order to evoke the miracle of its coming to life" (Jung, 1959, p. 17).

I swam in both cultures as best I could. I discovered Māori concepts of hau, ancestors, kinship, and space-time. I noted how this differed to the European concepts of the Enlightenment and Christianity with which I was so familiar. The Enlightenment's "order of relations" appeared closer to the Māori concept of relationships and hau. I reflected on both my own behaviour and that of my ancestor, (Annie Wilds) noting that we had similarities to the old European culture, yet both of us were slightly different to it: Annie with a different strand of Christianity, me with my sense of peace gained from contemplating Buddhist teachings.

I explored what happened to the cultures when they met. Two examples stood out to me. Firstly, within 20 years of the missionaries' arrival, that a group of Māori sought permission to grieve in the old ways. Secondly, that language appears to be a key player in culture change. I was interested in the example of a missionary learning Te Reo, and how this impacted on how he perceived the world.

I immersed my head under the water, as I sought to learn about the four documents: He

Whakaputanga (1835), the Declaration of Independence (1835), Te Tiriti o Waitangi (1840) and the Treaty of Waitangi (1840). I recognised my unconscious avoidance at trying to process the information surrounding this time. When I waded out of the water, I realised I had shifted from frustration, anger, and guilt to sadness with a glimpse of hope. I have pondered on how I work as a psychotherapist and identified areas that I want to learn more about. Ultimately, I am just a beginner. Perhaps most of us are.

References

- (1867). *The Holy Bible containing the Old and New Testaments*. The British and Foreign Bible Society.
- Hanh, T. N. (2021). *Zen and the art of saving the planet*. Rider.
- Ingerman, S. (1991). *Soul retrieval: Mending the fragmented self*. HarperOne.
- Janus, L. (2019, June 8–9). *The Collective Psychological Dimension of Pre- and Perinatal Psychology* [Conference Presentation]. Human Baby, Human Being Conference, Bristol, United Kingdom.
- Jung, C. G. (1959). *The collected works of C. G. Jung: The archetypes and the collective unconscious* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Kalsched, D. (1996). *The inner world of trauma: Archetypal defences of the personal spirit*. Routledge.
- Kashima, Y. (2014). How can you capture cultural dynamics? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5(995), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00995>
- Lac, A., & Donaldson, C. D. (2020). Development and validation of the drama triangle scale: Are you a victim, rescuer, or persecutor? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 37(7–8), NP4057–NP4081. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260520957696>
- Likierman, M. (2001). *Melanie Klein: Her work in context*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- McNeely, D. A. (1991). *Animus Aeternus: Exploring the inner masculine*. Fisher King Press.
- Ministry of Health. (2023, December). Annual Data Explorer 2022/23: New Zealand Health Survey [Data File]. URL: <https://minhealthnz.shinyapps.io/nz-health-survey-2022-23-annual-data-explorer/>
- NiaNia, W., Bush, A., & Epston, D. (2017). *Collaborative and indigenous mental health therapy: Tātaihono — Stories of Māori healing and psychiatry*. Routledge.
- The Psychotherapists Board of Aotearoa New Zealand. Te Poari o ngā Kaihauumanu Hinengaro o Aotearoa. (2019, July). *Psychotherapist cultural competencies. Ngā āheitanga ahurea mā Ngā Kaihauumanu Hinengaro*. Retrieved September 12, 2022, from <https://pbanz.org.nz/common/Uploaded%20files/Standards/Psychotherapist%20Cultural%20Competencies%20July%202019.pdf>
- Reich, D. (2018). *Who we are and how we got here*. Oxford University Press.
- Ruppert, F. (2008). *Trauma, bonding and family constellations: Understanding and healing injuries of the soul*. Green Balloon Publishing.
- Salmond, A. (2017). *Tears of Rangī: Experiments across worlds*. Auckland University Press.
- Schützenberger, A. A. (1998). *The ancestor syndrome: Transgenerational psychotherapy and the hidden links in the family tree*. Routledge.
- Shackley, E. J. (2012, March 29). Discuss Klein's and (Winnicott's or) Bowlby's models of early infantile development and relate their ideas to your own psychobiography [Essay]. Bath Centre for

- Psychotherapy and Counselling, BCPC.
- Shackley, E. J. (2017). *Awakening the animus archetype: The cost of poverty for the female foetus* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Middlesex University, London.
- StatsNZ Tatauranga Aotearoa. (2021, November 16). *Māori population estimates: At 30 June 2021*. <https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/maori-population-estimates-at-30-june-2021/>
- Stevens, A. (1990). *On Jung*. Penguin Books.
- Stewart, G. T. (2021). *Māori philosophy: Indigenous thinking from Aotearoa*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Stolorow, R. D., & Atwood, G. E. (2010). *Contexts of being: The intersubjective foundations of psychological life*. Routledge.
- Winnicott, D. W. (1960). The theory of the parent-infant relationship. *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 41, 585-595.



Evelyn Shackley (MA Psychotherapy, DipHIP, MSc Psychology, BSc Zoology) is a humanistic and integrative psychotherapist in private practice in Brightwater, Tasman District. She trained with Middlesex University, London, via the Bath Centre for Psychotherapy and Counselling (BCPC) from 2010-2018. Her dissertation was *Awakening the Animus Archetype: The Cost of Poverty for the Female Foetus*. She worked on placement (2011-2014) at The SWAN Project in Bristol, UK, a charity supporting those with alcohol and life issues. Evelyn enjoys supporting people to be all they can be and is also interested in how pre-verbal and hidden ancestral trauma has shaped their life. She is currently working on a paper exploring how healing deeper ancestral trauma can heal earlier individual wounds. As part of this she has been learning German, to recover a hidden ancestral language. Contact details: psychotherapy2b@gmail.com