5

The Silencing of Māori Men

Deconstructing a "Space" for Māori Masculinities

Brendan Hokowhitu

Abstract

This article theorises Māori masculinities in terms of the notion of "space". I suggest that through colonial social construction, the notion of Māori masculinity has been afforded a narrow space that, in part, has led to the extremely dysfunctional Māori masculine archetype often performed in contemporary society. Historical and sociological analyses are provided, which deconstruct this limited space through the notions of "silence" and "communication". Throughout these analyses, I pay particular attention to two constraining discourses surrounding Māori masculinity: the "humble Māoriman" and the "violent Māori man". I suggest that these two imaginary pillars have been central to the construction of the narrow space from which the diversity of Māori masculinities has struggled to be liberated. In doing so, I provide the groundings for an understanding of a space where Māori masculinities can "breathe" and find voices that lay beyond limited colonial constructions.

The Western feminist movement undoubtedly catalysed the metamorphosis referred to by Anthony Clare (2000) as "masculinity in crisis", which initiated the postmodern fracturing of traditional performances of men in work, education, family, sexuality and health. Typically (and unsurprisingly), the analyses of this crisis have focused on the debilitation of North American and British white, middle-class and straight masculinities (Edwards, 2006). Interpreted otherwise, this could be perceived as white men attempting to hold on to their power as their historical strongholds implode. Regardless, "the study of masculinity remains marginal within the analysis of race and ethnicity" (Edwards, 2006, p. 64).

According to Tim Edwards (2006), racialised and ethnic studies of masculinity have generally focused on the "emasculation" of men of colour via Western imperialism and colonisation. Emasculation, in Fanonian terms, refers to a psychological condition that becomes entrenched in colonised men through imperialisation (Fanon, 1967). The masculine indigene "internalises" his subjectivity as lesser, or less human, than the civilised coloniser. In contrast to the singular stationary psychological masculine entity as depicted by the theories of colonised masculine emasculation, I define Māori

masculinities, in particular, as "pluralistic" and "in process". While it is true that part of the colonising project was to fix colonised subjectivities by defining their culture as primitive and, consequently, unenlightened and static, which has, in part, led to the problems we see facing Māori men today (including the internalisation of an inferiority complex by some), it is also true that there are many forms of Māori masculinity that reside beyond these limitations. Key, then, to overcoming stereotypical notions of Māori masculinity is the creation of a "space" where the pluralism of Māori masculine performances can be given room to breathe.

Generally, Māori masculinity (in a singular, stereotypical sense) is archetypically considered hyper-masculine in some regards but lacking in others. In regard to hyper-masculinity, while a general masculine trait may be "assertiveness" or "muscularity", in the supposedly hyper-masculine Māori man these traits manifest as aggression, violence and an imbalanced reliance on physicality and passions. In terms of lack, Māori masculinity is depicted in the dominant discourses, at least, as emotionally immature, lazy, unintelligent, inarticulate in voice, and wanting in communication skills in general. It is true that for most of New Zealand's colonial history, generic Pākehā masculinity has, upon historical reflection (Phillips, 1987), also been hyper-masculine and lacking in these same attributes, but seldom have there been resilient challenges to its hegemony because of its normalisation as the "Self" in the allegorical triangulation with Māori and women. That is, Pākehā men have maintained power by defining what they are not (and therefore what they are) through the constructions of "Others" such as Māori and women. For instance, constructions of Māori savagery inherently define Pākehā as civilised.

Prior to moving on, my use of the term "Pākehā" must be qualified because, in recent years, it has been controversialised by right-wing misinterpretations of the word and its origins as having derogatory meanings such as "evil spirit", "pig", and "flea". Such misrepresentations aim to distance dominant white New Zealand culture from falling under Māori definition, and to augment the cultural divide between Māori and Pākehā. In actuality, the word "Pākehā" stems from precolonial words such as *pakepakeh* and *p kehakeha* (and the like), common to certain parts of the Pacific, referring to "Imaginary beings resembling men, with fair skins" (Williams, 1975, p. 252). From this largely innocuous scopic understanding of the word and its transference onto the white colonists invading New Zealand, the word "Pākehā" has evolved throughout colonisation to commonly refer to a "New Zealander of European descent" (Moorfield, 2005, p. 108), forming the inverse cultural construction of the word "Māori" in the binary relationship that has defined New Zealand bi-ethnic relations for 160-plus years.

Historically, Pākehā masculinity and its embroilment with the "modern" and "enlightened" European man (who was secular, liberal and free of will) meant that many Pākehā men enjoyed the fluidity of "masculinities". Yet, it is only relatively recently that a number of class-determined Pākehā masculinities have moved away from the dominant "rugby, racing and beer" masculine prototype towards a masculinity based on the values of the "new man" or the "new lad" (see Clare, 2000, for further reading on the new man/new lad). That is, while New Zealand's working-class masculinities (including the skewed population of Māori men who are located to the working class) have remained tethered to traditional "Kiwi bloke" traits, middle- and upper-class New Zealand men are transforming.

One of the key transformations has been the shift away from British stoicism (e.g., the inarticulate and tough rural persona epitomised by former All Black Colin Meads) towards a more communicative and gentle masculinity. Working-class masculinities, however, remain represented, at least, as reproducers of "Kiwi bloke" vestiges, and resistant to and resentful of the transforming masculine ideal, viewing it as "pseudo". Such a phenomenon is evident in television adverts that reinforce traditional "Kiwi bloke" masculinity, but only for working-class men. A classic example of this occurs in the "That man deserves a DB" advert for Dominion Bitter. In this advert, three icons of New Zealand manhood—a "Digger" dressed in an army uniform, an ex-All Black, and a working-class man—are given the power to award beer to those they see as deserving. A humble truck driver is rewarded for a heroic manly act, and a Māori man is rewarded for setting up a try in rugby. Yet an image of the "new man", clad in a suit and shown reading the paper in a toilet, is mocked as his beer mug's handle breaks, causing him to spill his beer (Hokowhitu, 2003). While New Zealand masculinity is undoubtedly more complex than this advert portrays, such a representation demonstrates that only certain New Zealand masculinities (including the Māori male rugby footballer) will be hegemonically rewarded for holding on to "Kiwi bloke" culture.

The above discussion highlights that differentiators, such as ethnicity and class, determine men's access to the fluidity of masculine transformations. In this regard, Māori men have faced a double-edged sword in that they have had to contend with the limiting discourses based on racialised binaries and working-class constructions. The article that follows thus examines and deconstructs the "space" in which the dominant construction of Māori masculinity has been confined.

Theorising Māori Masculine Silence

So what does this have to do with counselling? I asked myself the same question when first approached to write an article for this special issue. Admittedly, I was perplexed

because of my lack of experience with counselling in general, let alone as an academic discipline. However, I thought about my research, which predominantly deconstructs the social processes that serve to limit Māori masculinity, and I realised that the construction of Māori masculinity as "physical" (see below) has had an immense impact on Māori men's ability to communicate. Given that oral communication, I assume, must be the cornerstone of Western counselling, I have found myself having a lot to say on the subject! The title of this article refers to "silencing" because it examines not only the broader silencing of Māori masculine cultures with the advent of colonisation (largely dealt with in the section to follow), but also the actual manifestation of a "voicelessness" in Māori men. This lack of voice can be seen in two archetypal traits of Māori masculinity, "staunchness" and "humility", which I use to frame the theorisation to follow.

First, I must highlight that I do not nobilise Māori masculine silence and, in particular, humility. While humility is a trait to be revered, for Māori men it is but one product of a hybridisation of Māori culture with the stoicism of British masculine culture. The British culture that Māori culture became hybridised with was founded on an oppressive class system, where people learnt submission and not to go "beyond the pale"—that is, not to go beyond one's class. Put simply, it suited the purposes of colonisation for Māori to be submissive and, accordingly, some forms of Māori masculinity have been constructed as humble and quiet. The image of the unassuming and simplistic Māori has its roots in the precolonial "noble savage" construct, however, which nobilised the savage based on an allegorical construction that depicted industrialised Europe as immoral and in decay (Smith, 1999). The Māori "noble", then, was moral, but only in his simplicity, naiveté and subservience to morals. The notion has transformed throughout colonisation to mean quiet, humble, accepting and submissive. As a replication of British classism and the noble savage, therefore, the humble Māori man is accepting of his fate, is content with "his lot", and will not challenge "the greater good", benefiting the hegemony of colonisation.

The construction of the humble ideal of Māori masculinity has been crucial to Māori masculine subservience and the subjugation of subversion because of its positioning against the violent Māori savage archetype. The ignoble savage is violent, physical, staunch and silent, epitomised by "Jake the Muss" in the film *Once Were Warriors*. As a symptom of the ignoble savage, the Māori male deviant is confined by a highly dysfunctional space where many Māori men locate themselves, are located to, and struggle to break free. The naturalisation of this space, that is, the normalisation of Māori masculine deviance, in a sense "permits" Māori male violence in general and, in particular, child abuse (i.e., the highly publicised deaths of Māori children at the hands of Māori

men), physical and sexual violence against women (particularly against their partners), and physical violence against other men (particularly Māori men). Essentially, Māori masculinity has been displaced into a dysfunctional space where performances of deviance are normalised and considered by both perpetrators and those with the power of surveillance to be "natural". In the American and European context, David Marriott draws a similar conclusion, suggesting it is "impossible to separate black men's angry-anxious concern about being reduced to type—black types: imbecilic, oversexed, criminal, murderous, feckless, rapacious—from the many, and conflicting, ways in which black men were and continue to be stereotyped" (2000, p. viii).

Once Were Warriors centred on the socio-pathological violence of Māori father Jake Heke (a.k.a. "Jake the Muss") and its effects on his immediate family. The film provided a bleak yet realistic description of the violence within urban Māori life, and some resolution to the violence (i.e., the return to *tikanga Māori* and tribal home-lands). Unfortunately, as its name suggests, the film intimates that the inherent ignoble savagery of Māori men was, in precolonial times, appropriate behaviour for a noble warrior culture but has, in "modern" times, become a naturalised symptom of Māori urban dysfunction. Jake's stereotypical figure has served to further normalise the violence of Māori men, but the representation is not "untrue". Indeed, growing up in my home town of Ōpōtiki, I witnessed many scenes seemingly scripted straight out of the *Once Were Warriors* screenplay.

This article does not deal with truth or untruth, however. Rather, it looks at the representations of Māori men that have become privileged in colonial discourses, and how such privileging has, in turn, led to the silencing of Māori men. Films such as the aforementioned "take the violence of the Māori, real or imagined, seriously. The effect of this is to question the morality of Māori culture and society, more specifically Māori males, especially fathers and leaders" (Cleave, 1992, pp. 27–28). The obsession with the Māori male as deviant by the news media, for example, further privileges the "Jake the Muss" phenomenon, so that reality becomes confused with image. Māori men are constantly represented as deviants, that is, as rapists, wife beaters, child abusers, gang members, criminals and, generally, members of society who are not to be trusted. These are perhaps not "untruthful" depictions (in the sense that, indeed, there are Māori men who are violent criminals), but their privileging as "Māori" problems, as opposed to individual problems, is problematic. This is not to say that Māori culture cannot be part of the solution, however. Rather, it questions why the actions of a Māori child abuser automatically symbolise a "Māori problem", whereas Pākehā child abuse, murder and crime is never portrayed as a "Pākehā problem"; rather, Pākehā crime is denormalised by depicting the perpetrators as outliers of society.

At the heart of this performative dysfunction is the colonial construction of Māori men as "physical beings" (Hokowhitu, 2004). Through a false mind/body duality (see "Historicising the silencing of Māori men" below) a skewed emphasis on the corporeality of Māori masculine culture is produced. The colonial construction of Māori masculinity is not merely physical; it is hyper-physical. The binary disjuncture is effected in the lack of the mind, the intellect, and its capacity for mature communication. This hyper-physicality is constantly reinforced through the privileging of Māori masculine physical performances, such as those portrayed by the Māori sportsman, the manual labourer, the warrior in the armed services, and the staunch physically violent deviant.

In contrast, Māori masculinity is seldom portrayed as inhabiting the realm of "the mind", meaning that Māori masculine intellectual creative energy has been devalued and a mature Māori masculine voice debilitated. This debilitation of voice, or the construction of voiceless Māori men, in particular, has led to an overreliance on a corporeal communication that mitigates the dysfunctionality described above, especially in dealing with intimate and complex relationships with partners, children and other whanau members. The Māori masculine paragon "Jake the Muss", for example, has an inability to find a mature voice to deal with the complexities of his home life that, in turn, leads to violent rampages. As a being nearly entirely governed by his passions, Jake is unable to find ways of expressing himself other than through his hyper-physicality. Indeed, everything about Jake is physical: his violence, his sexuality, his being, even his nickname, "the Muss". From slurping oysters to smashing down Beth, Jake emanates an uncivilised physicality, void of mature expression. When Beth suggests to Jake that he "talks with his fists", she provides a succinct analysis of a colonised Māori masculinity, devoid of mature communication and overreliant on physicality.

This counter-positioning of the two Māori masculine archetypes (i.e., the humble Māori man and the violent savage) has allowed for a "divide and rule" spacialisation to develop. In the bounded space of colonised Māori masculinity, the humble Māori man is juxtaposed with the ignoble savage in an interdependent binary that serves to set the confines of dominant constructions of Māori masculinity. Importantly, both ignoble and noble Māori masculinity are largely voiceless, whether that is humble or staunch. The interdependent binary (i.e., where two points rely on their counter-positioning with one another to produce the desired effect) has provided the two imaginary pillars that allow for the construction of the narrow, linear passageway from which the diversity of Māori masculinities has struggled to be liberated.

Since the Civil Wars of the 1860s Māori men have struggled to find a voice that is assertive, yet not violent; constructive, and yet not submissive. When Māori men do

become assertive in the Pākehā world, savage discourses are often called upon to mis-locate that assertion. However, the assumption of gentleman-like British qualities (i.e., stoicism) associated with Māori patriarchy (see Hokowhitu, in press) has led to a degree of submissiveness within Māori masculinity, which partly explains why Māori women have taken such a skewed lead in the Māori rights movement. In essence, the subversive, constructive, creative, typically feminine voice of Māori men within the colonial setting has been largely silenced, leading to a profound void and anger that resonates in the social problems Māori men act out today.

The interdependent binary has never been as apparent as it is in the film *Crooked Earth*, where a character of colonised Māori masculinity is pitted against the image of an unassimilated Māori male desperado. The former is a "clean-cut" ex-army officer who has "the support of his people", while the latter is a longhaired and frenzied, horse-riding, gun-wielding outcast who attempts to build an economic empire by growing and selling marijuana. Naturally, both characters are violent and physical, yet one, the hero, employs his physicality in the service of the colonial powers and is rewarded for his nobility, while the other, the anti-hero, uses his physicality to oppose colonial law, and ultimately becomes a failed and embittered figure. Importantly, the juxtapositioning of the two archetypes determines the limits that "imprison" the pluralism of Māori masculinities. In this narrow corridor of "good" or "bad", moral or amoral (i.e., colonised or savage), the options for Māori men become simplistically polarised, producing a suffocating space.

Significantly, this theorisation proposes that Māori male perpetrators of violence should be held accountable for Māori male dysfunction. That said, I wish to avoid suggesting that the Māori male child abuser, for instance, should not be held culpable for his actions and that it is merely the systemic "fault" of colonisation. On the contrary, it is the descriptions of Māori culture as naturally and inherently violent, unintelligent, lazy, anti-liberal and immature that systematise the dysfunction described above, for if it is an individual's culture that is to be held accountable, then the individual deviance is excused and naturalised. In contrast, the present theorisation suggests that the narrow construction of Māori masculinity can be dissolved and deconstructed, and that Māori men must play leading roles in the incorporation of alternative masculinities within their culture. Yet to do this, the narrow construction needs to be historically and sociologically understood to begin to erode the notion that Māori masculinities are neither genetically nor culturally inherently quiet, staunch and/or humble, nor are they determined by dysfunction.

Historicising the silencing of Māori men

The most salient image of Māori masculinity I have seen is a late 19th or early 20th century photograph of a group of Māori men and children outside a whare. Some of the men have their arms around each other, while others cuddle their children or casually laze on each other in open displays of friendship and caring. The image is so striking because it contrasts starkly with the dominant discourses surrounding Māori masculinity today. It suggests a loving and caring masculinity and, therefore, the existence of Māori masculinities beyond the narrow space prescribed through colonial constructions. The photo, in turn, also speaks of the violent turmoil of colonisation that has resulted in the silencing of the creative, caring and expressive forms of Māori masculine cultures. The nurturing Māori father, for example, does not co-exist in the space delimited by colonial construction.

Colonisation has involved a profound silencing of an alternative worldview, invoking a debilitation and loss of voice underpinned by Māori epistemologies. The silencing of one worldview and its eclipse by another still resonates in a culture reeling from the loss and struggling to find a voice to fill the silence. Māori culture was, prior to colonisation, an oral culture. Thus, Māori masculinities were infused with an oral culture that manifested in many forms, such as the formalised oratory rituals of *whaikorero* and *karanga*, chanting (e.g., *karakia, mōteatea, pātere, waiata*), the recitation of genealogies and cultural narratives (*whakapapa*), *mihimihi*, narrative forms (*kōrero*), and general discourse (*kōrero*). Like other facets of Māori culture, oral culture was inherently connected to a broader Māori epistemology that, in its ritualistic forms especially, required spiritual and genealogical knowledge. Māori oral culture, therefore, provided the mouthpiece for the expression of a cosmos.

Prior to the broader silencing of Māori culture, Māori men were not voiceless. Indeed, the hyper-physicality, and the emotional and intellectual lack described above, would have been viewed as character flaws. Māori people, in general, sought holistic balance in their lives. Accordingly, Māori men were talking enthusiasts. Early missionaries and travellers to New Zealand typically described scenes where oral culture abounded in all the forms described above. A very early missionary, the Rev. Yate, for example, describes a culture where oral discourse went beyond the sensibilities of British culture: "Their most delightful recreation is talking, and telling wonders; which exercise occupies most of their idle hours, and many of those which are shrouded in darkness and ought to be devoted to sleep" (1970, p. 112). Similarly, Edward Gibbon Wakefield corroborates many other early accounts that describe Māori as flamboyant talkers: "Nothing can remind one more forcibly of the monkey

who has seen the world, than a Māori thus relating news. He is an incorrigible exaggerator, and swells each minute circumstance into an affair of state" (1845, cited in Best, 1976, p. 120).

Ironically, the early representations of Māori men cited here, like many others, portrayed them as lacking the qualities of the civilised European male. They had women-like characteristics—they talked a lot, were animated, and did women's work—while they lacked a stoic disposition because they were overemotional and whimsical (Hokowhitu, 2003). The irony is that many of these qualities are now considered to be signs of masculine maturity in the realm of the feminised "new man". Being logical, disciplined, rational and competitive are "now seen as the stigmata of deviance.... [Whereas] the very traits which once marked out women as weak and inferior—emotional, spontaneous, intuitive, expressive, compassionate, empathetic— are increasingly seen as the markers of maturity and health" (Clare, 2000, p. 68).

Unfortunately, through various colonial methods, violent attempts were made to silence Māori culture in general, and the animated, emotional and communicative aspects of precolonial Māori masculinities in particular. Coercive power techniques, such as the 1907 Tohunga Suppression Act, and the silencing of Māori language within Native Schools via the 1880 Native Schools Code (Simon, 1998), attempted to enforce a cultural divide between one generation of "savages" and the next generation of "brown-skinned citizens". This was first attempted by banning *tohunga*, Māoridom's most valuable knowledge holders, and later by literally silencing a language. Māori epistemologies were illegitimated by colonisation and, in the minds of Pākehā then, were justifiably spurned. In the meantime, Māori themselves also looked to Pākehā methods to halt the annihilation of their people in the face of genocide.

Key here is the profound silencing of a Māori worldview and, in turn, the hybridisation of Māori masculine culture with British masculinity, which, for different reasons, has manifested in the silent forms of Māori masculinity we see today. In particular, the collusion of Māori masculine culture with British masculinity produced a stoic Māori patriarchal figure that supposedly represents "traditional" Māori masculinity, but in reality performs a hybridisation of culture comprised of Māori and Victorian masculinities. The imperial system that Māori men inherited afforded them power simply because they were men, and it does not appear as if Māori men were entirely resistant to embracing this privilege. Many Māori men assumed those British masculine qualities that would abet their integration into the dominant Western culture. The silent, stoic Māori patriarch served the useful purpose of aligning Māori culture with that of their invaders. It enabled a small segment of the Māori population insights into the world of their oppressors. This is not to say, however, that Māori

male leaders shed their *tikanga Māori* and merely adopted wholesale the attributes of their Pākehā brethren. What is key to comprehend here is that one form of Māori masculinity (i.e., the Māori gentry) adopted a British stoicism that added to the increasing silencing of Māori men (see Hokowhitu, in press, for further reading).

The consumption of Pākehā masculinity by Māori men in general served to assimilate them into the violent, physical, stoic, rugged and sport-oriented "Kiwi bloke" culture that has pervaded New Zealand society for most of its colonial history (Phillips, 1987). Yet this assimilation did not include indoctrination into the full gamut of colonial masculinities. The Māori male, like various "Othered" groups, had merely conditional access to the white man's world. For example, as a warrior in the service of the British army or in rugby: "They showed themselves to be good at those things which Pākehā men [were also] proud of. Māori were good at war and they were damn good at playing rugby, so they took on a special status of being Kiwi males with a slightly exotic flavour" (Jock Phillips, cited in Schick & Dolan, 1999, p. 56). Māori men were only allowed access to these arenas, however, because success within did not oppose the dominant discourses underpinned by silent physicality.

The developing Māori masculine discourses of silent physicality also translated to mean "practical mindedness" once the need for a manual workforce was realised. From the 1860s through to the 1940s, educational policies reflected "a narrow and limited view of Māori potential and the role of Māoris [*sic*] in New Zealand society" (Barrington, 1988, p. 45), subsequently meaning that Māori children were channelled into non-academic areas which, in turn, prevented them gaining intellectual qualifications and subsequent white-collar employment.

In 1866 the Inspector of Native Schools, James Pope, outlined what he thought a Māori masculine education should entail: "Māori boys could be taught agriculture, market gardening, stock farming, poultry keeping and bacon curing" (cited in Barrington, 1988, p. 47). In 1906 William Bird, now Inspector of Native Schools, declared that Māori were unsuited to academic subjects and unable to compete with Europeans in trades and commerce: "The natural genius of the Māori in the direction of manual skills and his natural interest in the concrete, would appear to furnish the earliest key to the development of his intelligence" (cited in Simon, 1990, p. 98). By 1913, William Bird could outline the success of his vision: "In none of the secondary Māori schools is there any attempt or desire to give what is usually understood by a 'college' education.... The boys school in English and manual training—woodwork, elementary practical agriculture and kindred subjects and that is all" (cited in Barrington, 1988, p. 53).

Unlike Pākehā men, who enjoyed a normal spread throughout occupational strata,

by 1965 "nearly 90 percent of Māori men [were] employed as farmers, foresters, labourers, transport operators, factory workers, or in other skilled and unskilled occupations" (Watson, 1967, p. 6). The "physical education" and consequent assimilation into limited physical employment ensured that the colonised forms of Māori masculinity reified the physically silent archetype that has evolved.

The silencing of Māori epistemologies, the hybridisation of Māori masculine culture with British stoicism, the confinement to manual labour through "physical education", combined with a general discourse that described Māori men as inherently "of the physical" (as opposed to "of the mind"), has led to a highly constrained form of masculinity. These discourses and colonially imposed limitations have, over the past 170 years, indoctrinated Māori masculinity with a silent physicality now thought to be "traditional" Māori masculine culture. In turn, the "truth" of the dominant discourses is reified by the constant exposure to examples of Māori masculinity that reflect these limitations. Through the corporeal reification of Māori masculinity on the work site, on the battlefield, and on the rugby pitch (for further discussion of Māori masculinity and sport, see Hokowhitu, 2004), the creative, constructive and feminine voice of Māori men has been obscured. In essence, and I recall Beth Heke's words here, a healthy and balanced Māori masculine voice has been silenced and eclipsed by a hyperphysical and inaudible masculine space.

Conclusion

I began this article by referring to "masculinity in crisis" and, indeed, Māori masculinity is in crisis, but for very different reasons than the crisis of white masculinity. Māori culture in general faces the deconstruction of "traditional" culture, including gender roles, as it struggles to find voices that are non-essentialist and yet do not merely conform to Western epistemologies. The pressure on "traditional" forms of Māori masculinity is never so apparent as when Western feminism collides with so-called Māori patriarchy and speaking traditions. Western feminism is grounded on the unequivocal revocation of gender discrimination, but the Western view of the world does not encapsulate the complexity of Māori culture.

To universalise the conception of "rights" and "equality" reinvokes imperialism. It must be Māori who determine the functions of their gender roles, as opposed to being expected to merely align with Western liberalism, for there is much to the *paepae* (literally, the space provided for the *tangata whenua* [local] orators) debate that escapes Western notions of equal rights. The deconstruction of the limitations of the singular Māori masculine stereotypes must come from Māori also. Key to this deconstruction is the debasement of the fixating notions surrounding tradition itself that have served

to shackle the dynamism of Māori masculinities. Eventually, the supposed traditions of Māori colonised masculinity will necessarily implode.

First, though, it must be pointed out that this article has thus far primarily focused on the deconstruction of Māori masculine performances of dominant discourses. But this does not tell the full story. It is not surprising that the dominant constructions of Māori masculinity do not include the talkative, flamboyant, creative, feminine and deeply humorous performances of masculinity by Māori men, because usually such displays are seen only by those who are trusted. From personal experience only, it seems that Māori masculine performances subjugate creative expression in contexts where trust is not evident, only releasing a creative voice where that voice cannot be misinterpreted. To put it plainly, the performance of Māori masculinity in a setting framed by a Pākehā epistemology will differ markedly from the masculinity performed within the Māori world. To me this speaks to the division between Māori and Pākehā, effected by colonisation.

If this analysis is authentic, then breaches of trust will need to be amended if the full range of Māori masculinities is to be unveiled. Here I hasten to point out that decolonisation is not solely an indigenous project. Rather, trust must be repaired for the relationship to flourish. It also suggests that counsellors will have to go an extra mile in building trust with Māori male clients. To do this will require, first and fore-most, a basic understanding of the Māori world and the incorporation of these con-cepts within one's counselling practice, for if the context is totally consumed by Western epistemologies, then it is likely the "guards" will not come down. Changing one's practice could be as simple as attending introductory language classes so at least one can pronounce Māori names correctly. Also the co-introduction of oneself with a client should involve an attempt to make connections between the counsellor's own personal history and the client's through an informal *mihimihi.*

The implosion of dominant discourses surrounding Māori men will not easily be effected, yet Māori men need only turn to understandings of the dynamism of their own culture to realise they are not bound by the constricting notions of traditional masculinity that have pervaded colonial history. Go to any book on *whakatauki,* *tikanga* and epistemological narratives and you will find that the holistic nature of Māori epistemologies (i.e., the non-compartmentalisation of the spiritual, mental, emotional and physical realms) determines forms of masculinity where the balance between these realms is constantly sought. Undoubtedly, the suppression of the mental, emotional and spiritual aspects of Māori men have caused many to be unwell and have led to the dysfunctional masculinity described above. Simply, the answer to healing the suppression of Māori men lies within *tikanga Māori.*

Here it is important for Māori men, and for those who work with Māori men, to comprehend the notion of "space" in relation to *tikanga Māori*. Colonisation, if anything, has been about the invasion of, and power to limit and define, space. This colonial interference can include the construction of land as an economic base as opposed to a spiritual forebearer, the eclipsing of epistemological space by another, or the confinement of indigenous masculinity within the space defined by dominant discourses. Yet the fact that this space is a construction also means that it can be deconstructed to enable a fluidity in masculinity that will aid Māori men in attaining balance. To work with Māori men effectively is to allow them to broaden the limits imposed on them, to have them recognise that the limits are imaginary and that they can be transcended. Historical understandings of the processes of colonisation that have debilitated a highly communicative oral masculine culture are also key to comprehending the effect of, for example, British stoicism on the immobility of colonised Māori masculinity.

To end, it is important for Māori men to realise that the search for balance lies within their own culture and beyond the space defined for them by others. Many Māori men already locate their masculinity beyond this space, affirming that the imagined space of dominant discourses can be transcended. Composers, writers, artists and filmmakers such as Pei Te Hurinui Jones, Ralph Hotere, Selwyn Muru, Muru Walters, Paratene Matchitt, Witi Ihimaera, Hone Tuwhare and Don Selwyn, along with intelligentsia such as John Rangihau, Hirini Melbourne, Ranginui Walker, Mason Durie, Hirini Moko Mead, Timoti Kāretu and Graham Smith, have created inspirational spaces for other Māori men to engage with. The Don Selwyn directed film, *The Māori Merchant of Venice*, displays an ensemble of Māori male actors who demonstrate the poetic, intelligent and highly refined nature of Māori language and culture within a Shakespearian musical drama. Māori men in Shakespearian garb reciting verse in the Māori language inherently problematises and subverts the muscle-bound "Jake the Muss" paragon by speaking of a space beyond the silent physicality in which Māori masculinities have been imprisoned.

References

Barrington, J. M. (1988). Learning the "dignity of labour": Secondary education policy for Maoris. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 23*(1), 45–58.

Best, E. (1976). *Games and pastimes of the Maori.* Wellington: A. R. Shearer, Government Printer.

Clare, A. (2000). *On men: Masculinity in crisis.* London: Chatto and Windus.

Cleave, P. (1992). Revisiting the warrior. *Illusions, 18*, 27–31.

Edwards, T. (2006). *Cultures of masculinity*. London: Routledge.

Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks*. New York: Grove Press.

Hokowhitu, B. (2003). Māori masculinity, post-structuralism, and the emerging self. *New Zealand Sociology, 18*(2), 179–201.

Hokowhitu, B. (2004). Tackling Māori masculinity: A colonial genealogy of savagery and sport. *The Contemporary Pacific, 16*(2), 259–284.

Hokowhitu, B. (in press). The death of Koro Paka: "Traditional" Māori patriarchy. *The Contemporary Pacific* [Special issue: Pacific masculinities].

Marriott, D. (2000). *On black men*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Moorfield, J. (2005). *Te Aka: Māori-English, English-Māori dictionary and index*. Auckland: Pearson.

Phillips, J. (1987; revised 1996). *A man's country? The image of the pakeha male: A history*. Auckland: Penguin Books.

Schick, R., & Dolan, J. (1999). Masculinity and *A Man's Country* in 1998: An interview with Jock Phillips. In R. Law, H. Campbell and J. Dolan (Eds.), *Masculinities in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 46–63). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Simon, J. (1990). *The place of schooling in Maori-Pakeha relations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland.

Simon, J. (1998) *Ng Kura Māori: The Native School system, 1867–1969*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed.

Wakefield, E. G. (1845). *Results of the New Zealand inquiry*. London: Spectator.

Watson. J. E. (1967). *Horizons of unknown power: Some issues of Maori schooling*. New Zealand Council for Educational Research. Wellington: Government Printer.

Williams, H. W. (1975). *A dictionary of the Māori language* (7th ed.). Wellington: A. R. Shearer, Government Printer.

Yate, W. (1970). *An account of New Zealand and of the Church Missionary Society's mission in the Northern Island* (3rd ed.). Shannon: Irish University Press.