

Ngā Ao e Rua | The Two Worlds: Psychotherapy, Biculturalism, and Professional Development in Aotearoa New Zealand

SUSAN GREEN and KEITH TUDOR (Editors), GRANT DILLON, ANDREW DUNCAN,
JONATHAN FAY, CREA LAND, MARGARET POUTU MORICE
and WIREMU WOODARD, Auckland, Aotearoa, New Zealand

ABSTRACT *This article describes the history, philosophy, and development of Ngā Ao e Rua, an organisation of indigenous and non-indigenous therapists, psychotherapists, counsellors, and health care providers working in Aotearoa New Zealand. The article, co-authored and edited by members of Ngā Ao e Rua, traces its beginnings and its development over the past ten years. The article discusses the development of a bicultural process reflected in an organisational structure whereby members meet separately as Māori and as Pākehā and Tau Iwi (non-Māori), and then together, and the personal and political learning that has derived from this. The article complements one published in this journal two years ago about Waka Oranga, the rūpu or organisation of Māori psychotherapists and psychotherapy practitioners (Hall, Morice, & Wilson, 2012). Copyright © 2014 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.*

Key words: Ngā Ao e Rua; the New Zealand Association of Psychotherapists; Māori; Pākehā; Tau Iwi; biculturalism; Waka Oranga; registration; wairua

INTRODUCTION – SUSAN GREEN AND KEITH TUDOR

This year Ngā Ao e Rua | The (Meeting of the) Two Worlds, an organisation of indigenous and non-indigenous therapists, psychotherapists, counsellors, and health care providers working in Aotearoa New Zealand, celebrates ten years of its existence. To mark this anniversary, we decided to draw together the history (or histories) of the group by editing an article based on an open invitation for contributions and a close reading of the minutes of the meetings of the group (2004–2014). The result is an article which comprises individual contributions about its beginnings, its philosophy, and its evolving structure and organisation,

*Correspondence to: Keith Tudor, Auckland University of Technology, Private Bag 92006, Auckland 1142, Aotearoa New Zealand.
E-mail: keith.tudor@aut.ac.nz

as well as a note on the actions it has taken; from the different “worlds” the organisation represents; about conflicts and differences within and beyond the group; on its impact on the personal and the interpersonal as well as the political world in the profession of psychotherapy in Aotearoa New Zealand; and, finally, about its future. While the different contributions are individual, and, inevitably, represent personal views and memories, they also and usefully reflect different strands of thinking within Ngā Ao e Rua (and have been edited only to avoid undue repetition).

BEGINNINGS – MARGARET POUTU MORICE

In my memory, the beginnings of Ngā Ao e Rua were seeded from the cultural clashes experienced at the Annual Conference of the New Zealand Association of Psychotherapists (NZAP), held in Takapuna, Auckland, in April 2004.

There was a sense from some of those who organised that event that something had to be set right about the degree of cultural ignorance so apparent in the behaviour of NZAP members during the Conference and, most particularly, at the powhiri (welcome ceremony) that opened the Conference. The details of what exactly occurred are less important than the fact that cultural insults were suffered by tangata whenua (Māori as the indigenous people of the land), through a lack of knowledge, guidance, and respect. Some months after that Conference, at the invitation of Grant Dillon and Susan Green, a group gathered after an NZAP Northern Branch meeting to gauge the interest in forming some kind of bicultural educative/consciousness-raising group. I happened to be attending the Branch meeting that night and Jonathan Fay and I joined that first conversation. Sometime early on, we invited Haare Williams, the NZAP’s Paiahi (guide), to join us; he gifted the structure of Ngā Ao e Rua | The Two Worlds, based on the principle of partnership enshrined in Te Tiriti o Waitangi | The Treaty of Waitangi, the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand (see the Waitangi Tribunal, 2011). Haare’s vision, and one which was shared by others in the group, was that Te Ao Māori (the Māori world) and Te Ao Pākehā (the non-Māori, Pākehā world) would meet separately to explore, affirm, and strengthen their respective cultural identities and then come together as Ngā Ao e Rua to grow biculturally. This structure has informed meetings of the group ever since. This was reported in the NZAP *Newsletter* as early as August 2004:

Haare Williams ... is ... engaged in discussions with our representatives about his continuing role in relation to the Association. He has agreed to help us develop partnership with tangata whenua through a variety of regional and national initiatives and has recently proposed forming a Te Ao Maori group composed of Maori therapists, healers, counsellors and educationalists and conducting a series of face-to-face meetings with NZAP representatives in the Auckland region. (Manning, 2004b, p. 9)

The first written reference to “Ngā Ao e Rua” was in an eponymous article written by Haare for the NZAP *Newsletter* in May 2005 which he subtitled: “Moving in two worlds”.

For me, then, the philosophical foundations of Ngā Ao e Rua are rooted in the bicultural experience of Aotearoa New Zealand (see also next section), and the need for consciousness-raising or, more accurately, conscientisation (Freire, 1968/1970) about biculturalism, which is specific to being a psychotherapy practitioner in this country: Aotearoa New Zealand – which is why those of us who inhabit and who are committed to the bicultural world tend to refer to this country as Aotearoa as well as New Zealand.

Initially, Ngā Ao e Rua hosted two noho marae (marae stays), the first at Papakura Marae, Auckland, in August 2005 and the second at Puatahi Marae, Northland, 2006, both of which focused on an appreciation of Te Ao Māori from an immersive and participatory experience. Following a challenge from a member of Te Ao Māori to the Pākehā group, the first Camp Pākehā was held in a field in Te Henga, in the Waitakere, west of Auckland, in February 2007 (see Grant Dillon's contribution below). From that first camp a group was established which has met, monthly, more or less continuously since then, and has expanded and consolidated its position, as well as its philosophy, within the broader psychotherapy community.

I attribute much of the current, mostly positive focus on bicultural education, practice, and development within NZAP to the existence of Ngā Ao e Rua, whose members, collectively and individually, uphold a vision of inclusivity and justice, affirming Aotearoa New Zealand as a multicultural society within a bicultural nation.

Finally, being part of Ngā Ao e Rua has contributed enormously to my own growth and development, not just as a Māori psychotherapy practitioner but as a woman and a human being, and I am forever grateful for its inception and existence.

PHILOSOPHY AND PRAXIS – JONATHAN FAY

Ngā Ao E Rua is an ongoing, ten-year experiment in biculturalism, structured as a Treaty-informed, group-to-group relationship. Te Tiriti o Waitangi (see <http://archives.govt.nz/treaty-waitangi-te-tiriti-o-waitangi>), signed in 1840, sets out three articles that propose a contractual agreement which brings two dissimilar and unequal groups into relationship. In this agreement, it is proposed that power and responsibility be shared for the care and protection of all the people of Aotearoa New Zealand. Article I proposes a formal *partnership* between the centralised authority of the British Crown and the decentralised authority of the Indigenous Chiefs. In the legitimate, Māori language version of the Treaty, the proposal to share governance responsibilities for both Pākehā and Māori people is explicitly balanced by the commitment to preserve existing sovereign authority within each of these two groups. Article II promises the *protection* of indigenous rights and resources. Article III offers the rights and responsibilities of citizenship to indigenous people in order to secure their *participation* in civil society. 174 years later, the promise of the Treaty remains largely unfulfilled, notwithstanding which Te Tiriti o Waitangi continues to stand as a symbol of biculturalism and a blueprint for its enactment. In spelling out an equitable relationship between indigenous and non-indigenous peoples, Te Tiriti offers a durable political foundation upon which to build a multicultural society in which colonising and hegemonic influences might be reduced and diversity and difference allowed to flourish. Te Tiriti o Waitangi is often referred to as the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand. It is the basis of the legitimate presence of all non-indigenous peoples in this land: if we are not Māori, we are “tangata Tiriti”: people of the Treaty.

The structure and organisation of “Ngā Ao E Rua” or “The two worlds” intentionally parallel the structure and organisation of Te Tiriti as follows: within Ngā Ao E Rua, a Pākehā (New Zealand-born) and Tau Iwi (foreign-born) majority membership known as Te Ao Pakeha seeks to fulfil our opportunity and responsibility to become tangata Tiriti by developing partnership with Māori members, offering protection to Māori members and

actively supporting Māori members to participate fully in the psychotherapy community. The minority Māori membership of Ngā Ao e Rua known as Te Ao Maori likewise seeks a partnership with mainstream, majority members of the psychotherapy community within which Māori can be empowered both to develop their own separate nascent identity and also to participate more fully in the life of the wider psychotherapy community. Thus the heart of Ngā Ao e Rua is the existential and ethical choice to be in relationship and to whakapiripiri – to bind together. Two autonomous, culturally diverse and culturally unique groups, Māori and Pākehā/Tau Iwi, choose to encounter themselves and each other, developing their cultural identities in two separate groups and then binding together as one within the wider context of a unitary psychotherapy community. The group dynamics of this intercultural encounter are not for the faint-hearted: they can sometimes be quite bruising, but they are also consistently capable of stimulating both personal and professional growth.

Te Ao Pakeha comprises both Aotearoa New Zealand-born (Pākehā) and foreign-born (Tau Iwi) non-indigenous members (for more on which see subsequent contributions). The term *Pākehā* is a Māori word referring to the people who arrived and settled in Aotearoa New Zealand during the past two hundred years, originally white Europeans of mostly British origin. In a contemporary context, Pākehā has come to mean, variously, white people; those of European origin or ethnicity; New Zealand-born people of white European ethnicity; and, in a political rather than cultural sense, all New Zealand-born non-indigenous people. Non-white Aotearoa New Zealand-born people would not be considered Pākehā in a cultural sense, but, as non-Maori, might still consider themselves or be considered Pākehā in a political sense. Of course, any identification or self-identification with the mainstream, dominant culture of Aotearoa New Zealand competes with possible alternative identifications with a wide diversity of minority memberships. Over the course of ten years, members of Te Ao Pākehā have explored our own ethnic origins and cultural heritage; our own individual and collective story of decolonisation; how we relate to Māori people and Māori culture; how we can support each other to learn more about Te Ao Māori, te reo Maori (the Māori language) and tikanga Māori (Māori ways and protocol); how the struggle for indigenous rights and equity affects us personally; how we position ourselves politically; and how we can best support and help Māori practitioners empower themselves and advance Māori agendas. Members of Te Ao Māori have explored what it means to be Māori, and to practise psychotherapy as Māori; what a Māori psychotherapy is or might become; and how Māori political and cultural agendas can be advanced through the practice of psychotherapy. In the psychotherapy arena Māori are very thin on the ground, and it has been a struggle for Te Ao Māori to survive, which parallels the wider history of Māori in this land. As other contributors to the story of Ngā Ao e Rua make plain, the mainstream psychotherapy community is not yet a safe place for Māori and, despite its aspirations to decolonise, creating cultural safety is an ongoing challenge within Ngā Ao e Rua as well.

ORGANISATION AND ACTION – SUSAN GREEN AND KEITH TUDOR

As any group or organisation, Ngā Ao e Rua has been through a number of changes in its purpose (and specific focus), structure, and organisation, as well as its relationship with other people and organisations, especially those with(in) the New Zealand Association of Psychotherapists.

The first meeting of what was initially referred to as the “[Northern Branch’s] Bicultural Interest Group” was held on Thursday 10 June 2004. There were nine people present; and three sent apologies. The minutes of that meeting noted the following:

This group arose from the conference committee’s experience of working on the bicultural aspects of the conference and [its] process of forming relationships with tangata whenua in the planning process. It was felt that the [B]ranch needs to develop relationships with tangata whenua as an ongoing commitment to partnership, and that this group would look at ways of doing this for the [B]ranch.

The group – now the Branch’s “Bicultural Working Group” – met again later that month (on 26 June) to consider the purpose of the group; to discuss a document prepared by Haare Williams (guiding the NZAP towards partnership with tangata whenua); to attend to “our group process”; and to offer a karakia (prayer). Looking back, this agenda set the template for the group’s purpose and its meetings which still mostly begin and close with karakia and waiata (songs), considers documents and articles and other agenda items, and attends to group process. The following month marked the first meeting of a smaller group with Haare to prepare for the first and larger meeting of the two groups – Te Ao Māori and Te Ao Pākehā – which was held later that month also with Haare. Ngā Ao e Rua was born!

Just a month later, in August 2004, Ngā Ao e Rua was referred to as such and as “the bicultural committee of the Auckland Branch” (Manning, 2004a, p. 14); in the May 2008 issue of the NZAP *Newsletter* the second Camp Pākehā was advertised as being hosted by Ngā Ao e Rua, which was described as “a bicultural working group of the Northern Region Branch of NZAP”. Notwithstanding that the group has members in other parts of the country and, indeed, some based in other countries, between 2004 and 2011 Ngā Ao e Rua certainly held the focus of thinking about biculturalism “for the Branch” and, reading back over the minutes of the meetings, there was consistent consideration given to the relationship between the group and the Branch, and the group and NZAP’s Te Tiriti Committee. Organisationally, Ngā Ao e Rua has been supported by NZAP’s Council, and its Te Tiriti and Bicultural Committee, both of which, along with NZAP’s Northern Branch, provided seed money for the group’s first hui in August 2005. However, following a particularly acrimonious meeting of the Northern Region Branch in February 2010, the group decided to become independent of the Branch, a move which continues to be the source of some debate both in and beyond the group, but which means that the group no longer holds the bicultural mandate “for the Branch”.

After the second Camp Pākehā, it was decided that a Steering Group for Ngā Ao e Rua be formed. The rationale for this was that there would be a small team holding ideas and thoughts about ways for the group to move forward. It also fell on the Steering Group to organise the more practical aspects of the meetings, such as organising the venue, agenda, refreshments, subscriptions, and the opening and closing of meetings. Although the group did hold a sense of continuity of and between meetings – and indeed, it became referred to as the “Holding Group” – it also floundered a bit as, at times, it was unclear about its role. Also, some people in the wider group were resistant to what was seen as undue “steering” and what sometimes felt like a level of leadership/control. This was in part due to the fact that it was still mostly the founding members who were a part of that group and, somehow, it seemed difficult for others to join it. Some newer members did join the Holding Group but did not stay long. The larger group did discuss this from time to time and, at the end of 2012 decided to streamline the

organisation of the group with the nomination of two Convenors who, since then, have held the administrative and practical aspects of the group (see Table 1).

In terms of action, Ngā Ao e Rua:

- Has established a consistent membership – currently, it has over 60 members, which, to give this some context, represents some 15% of the total membership of the NZAP.
- Has organised two Marae-based hui (2005 and 2006); and four Camps (2007, 2008, 2009, 2012), the papers from three of which have been written up (Dillon, 2007; Mercado, 2008; Solomon, 2009).
- Has promoted biculturalism and influenced bicultural thinking and practice in the profession by contributing to discussion at conferences and hui; organising waiata workshops; through the involvement of its members in psychotherapy training programmes; and the establishment of a bicultural partnership to the NZAP's journal, *Ata: Journal of Psychotherapy Aotearoa New Zealand*.
- Has supported Waka Oranga in its mahi (work), by being ringawera (hosts) in the whare kai (kitchen) for its hui (meetings); by becoming an Associate Organisation member of Waka Oranga; by encouraging the publication of an article on Waka Oranga (Hall, Morice, & Wilson, 2012) and a book (currently under discussion); by nominating Waka Oranga for the Te Tohu o te Pihi Award (2013); and supporting the development of a He Ara Māori pathway for membership of the NZAP (2013).
- Has made representation to the Psychotherapists Board of Aotearoa New Zealand regarding a Māori scope of practice (2009), and ethnic record-keeping (2010).
- Has made a submission to the Ministry of Health's review of the *Health Practitioners' Competence Assurance Act 2003* (Tudor & Duncan, 2012).

CAMP PĀKEHĀ – GRANT DILLON

Early in its life, Ngā Ao e Rua experienced familiar, regrettable and probably inevitable instances of cultural tension. These mostly involved members of Te Ao Pākehā, the non-indigenous half of Ngā Ao e Rua, invoking distress in Te Ao Māori, the indigenous half, through unconscious displays of monoculturally dominant thinking. We in Te Ao Pākehā wanted to build relationships with Te Ao Māori, but we simply did not know how, because we did not understand tikanga Māori, and because we did not understand ourselves as a group, culturally and politically. One of our responses to this was to meet as a separate group. We did this to grapple with some deceptively simple and troubling questions: What does it mean to be Pākehā? Do we experience ourselves as Pākehā at all? In what ways? Why is it so difficult to experience ourselves as Pākehā? Is there a Pākehā culture? If there is, what distinguishes it from other cultures, especially those of Britain and of other former British colonies? How does being Pākehā in Aotearoa influence our understanding and practice of psychotherapy?

The impetus for the first Camp Pākehā was a wero (challenge) laid down by Te Ao Māori to Te Ao Pākehā. Te Ao Māori had hosted two hui on marae, and challenged Te Ao Pākehā to offer something in return. This was problematic. Māori have a defined place of meeting: the marae ātea, with its heart, the whare rūnanga, and its rituals of meeting. What culturally significant places of meeting do Pākehā have? We decided on a camp. Most Pākehā have some familiarity with the summer rituals of camping, and it is resonant with our recent pioneering past of goldrush towns, gum digging, and bush logging camps.

Table 1. The changing organisation and focus of Ngā Ao e Rua 2004–2014

Date	Groups	Steering Group/Convenors	Focus
2004–2008	Ngā Ao e Rua Te Ao Māori Te Ao Pākehā	No formal steering group or convenors, though, from time to time, some small(er) group meetings were held	Establishing the different groups Kaitiakitangā (safety, security, continuity), awhina (support), korero (consultation), ngakau mahaki (respect, love, belonging, consciousness), and mahi (work) (Williams, 2005)
2009	Te Ao Māori and Te Ao Pākehā (meeting alternate months) Ngā Ao e Rua (meeting alternate months)	A steering group evolved with the view to hold group and group tasks, the initial members of which were: Liadan Cotter, Grant Dillon Susan Green, Gabriela Mercado, Sally Natan, and Helen Packard	Te Ao Pākehā meetings focused on dealing with Pākehā history, and our diversity as experienced both within and outside the Te Ao Pākehā group. During 2009 and 2010 in meetings of Ngā Ao e Rua, there were ongoing discussions about the impact of the state registration of psychotherapists on Māori therapists and health care providers
2010–2011	Ngā Ao e Rua (meeting monthly, with occasional meetings of Te Ao Pākehā)	The composition of the Steering group changed to include Margot Solomon, Suzanne Timpson, and Wiremu Woodard.	Open agenda, with (in alternate months), a focus on the philosophical basis of the group
2012–2014	Ngā Ao e Rua (meeting monthly)	Convenors: Ingrid-Rose Nagl and Paul Solomon	Open agenda: a focus on discussion of specific articles, interpersonal and group process

The first Camp Pākehā was held over a weekend in February 2007, in a field in Waitakere, west of Auckland. The theme, “Reflecting on Psychotherapy and Pākehā Values”, drew on personal experience and theoretical reflections from discussions in Te Ao Pākehā. It centred on the three poles of: European culture, Pākehā culture, and becoming Pākehā/being Tau Iwi. The second camp, held a year later, in November 2008, at the same venue, shifted focus from European and Pākehā identity to exploring the theme of “Towards a Bicultural Psychotherapy: Theory and Practice”, in response to which Māori and European conceptions of human experience and the effects of colonisation on tāngata whenua were explored. One participant wrote up his experience of the weekend, describing it as “an event like no other, combining this most important of kiwi activities with opportunities to catch up with friends in the psychotherapy community, and with contemplation of cultural identity and heritage – an event born from an idea of genius” (McManaway, 2009, p. 69). The third camp, held in November 2009, again in Waitakere, had as its theme “Cultural Identity and Cultural Competence”. This was in response to debate then raging about the consequences of state registration of psychotherapists (see Tudor, 2011c), and the rangatiratanga (sovereignty) of the NZAP with regard to assessing the fitness to practise of its own members, especially those who were or are not registered. While this theme was explored, the death of a member of Ngā Ao e Rua immediately prior to the camp became a central focus of the event. The subsequent NZAP *Newsletter* (December 2009) published accounts of the weekend from six participants. A dissipation of energy in the group resulted in no camps being held in 2010 and 2011. The theme of the fourth camp, held in November 2012, again in the same location, was “Waiata/Song”, at which the ways in which music embodies cultural values and personal experience were explored.

One of the benefits of the Te Ao Pākehā meetings and of Camp Pākehā is that they have led more people to discover their identity as Pākehā – and as Tau Iwi. Following the next contribution on te Ao Māori, two sections offer personal examples of this.

TE AO MĀORI – WIREMU WOODARD

E tipu e rea mō nga rā o tōu ao
 ki tō ringa ngā rākau a te Pākehā
 hei ora mō tō tinana,
 ko tō ngākau ki ngā taonga a ō tīpuna
 hei tikitiki mō tō māhunga, a ko tō wairua
 ki te Atua nana nei ngā mea katoa.
 (Apirana Ngata, cited in Mead & Grove, 2001, p. 48)

Grow and branch forth for the days of your world;
 Your hand to the tools of the Pākehā
 as means to support and sustain you
 Your heart to the treasure of your ancestors
 as adornments for your head, your spirit
 with God – who made all things.

This perspective about my experience of Ngā Ao e Rua is my personal perspective; I do not claim to represent a Māori voice, only my particular experience and reflections from within an indigenous paradigm and worldview.

Te reo Maori is intensely metaphorical and poetic in its form (Ngata, 1974; Barlow, 1991; Mead & Grove, 2001; King, 2003; Biggs, 2006). Ngata (1974) observed that “a wealth of meaning was clothed within a word or two as delectable as a proverb in its poetical form and musical sound” (p. xv). Our name, Ngā Ao e Rua, the two worlds, was gifted to us by

our kaumatua, Haare Williams. As a native speaker of te reo and a master orator, in choosing our name, Haare intuitively and ingeniously tapped into deep, historic social movements, capturing the complex and intricate figurative function of the group: to express and ultimately transform the wider socio-political and historical relationships between Māori and non-Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand – Ngā Ao e Rua.

Buttimer (1993) observed that a “treasure of insight can indeed be unlocked via metaphorical rather than literal or rational thinking” (p. 78); and Lackoff (1978) stated that metaphors are the mechanism through which abstract concepts are understood and abstract reasoning is performed. Metaphor functions as a way of mapping relationships across conceptual systems, enabling us to move beyond concrete physical experiences or cognitively schematised views of the world and leap into highly complex emotional worlds to include feelings of love hate, and hope.

The metaphor of the two worlds traces its roots from New Zealand’s early colonial era and is typified by the famous whakatauki (proverb) “E tipu e rea ...” (above), from renowned Ngāti Porou leader, Sir Apirana Ngata (1874–1950). Trying to forge a place in the “New” Zealand for his people, Ngata envisioned an identity (for Māori) consisting of dual elements originating in the Pākehā world, the hands, and the Māori world, the heart. The metaphor of two worlds, however, goes beyond a simple dualistic description of the existing political, social and cultural context in Aotearoa New Zealand. Inherent in this dual coupling is a third generative possibility: a deep desire for social change. Nga Ao e Rua is suggestive of the struggle against cultural hegemony and political oppression, and the search for emancipation.

From my perspective, this is the true power of the metaphor Nga Ao e Rua: the potential to dissolve rigid Māori–Pākehā dualism, which operates to maintain a particular and inequitable social power relationship founded on racism. Beyond this dualistic construction, Nga Ao e Rua alludes to dialectical tensions between these two spheres, and potential spaces that allows for the possibility of a third generative experience.

Phenomenologists use the metaphor of the circle to describe processes of categorisation and identity formation (Heidegger, 1962). Stewart-Harawira (2005) has extended this concept by referring to a figurative function of takarangi, which spirals from creative generative energy back to destructive force, an endlessly recycling process of life and death. Hoskins (2001) has explored the idea of “te pae” – the horizon. Many people (at least in Aotearoa New Zealand) are familiar with paepae on marae, where speakers representing different perspectives sit to address each other. Hoskins has described “pae” as a metaphorical horizon point, where energy and light (ideas) converge and are smashed into a billion pieces, only to be reformed into something new and different (and ultimately the same).

Nga Ao e Rua is metaphorically evocative of wairua, which also explores and captures the phenomenological concept of a third space. In the dominant discourse, wairua is often translated as “spirit”; however, its literal translation is “two waters”, which alludes to both metaphysical and physical dimensions. Wairua is both subject and object, a combination of the raw matter of the universe (mauri) and our raw conscious awareness of the universe. The combination of these two elements creates a third and generative element: our phenomenological experience of the universe, or wairua. Given Māori philosophical and epistemological realities, I believe that Sir Apirana Ngata intuitively recognised that from any dual pairing a third option will arise, thus: tinana (body) ngākau (heart) generating wairua.

In order to recognise the third space of generative healing potential in our contemporary context Nga Ao e Rua must ultimately defeat itself. Nga Ao e Rua needs to maintain and define its constituent elements (being mindful of inequitable power relationships) while simultaneously dissolving and collapsing those very definitions of itself. An impossible task? Yes, but one, I think, that is worth pursuing.

Nga Ao e Rua (the group) has struggled with these competing processes. To survive as distinct and discrete entities, we struggle to retain our cherished and unique signifiers that delineate “us” from “them”. On the surface this obstinate (and potentially backward) position may sound archaic. However, to create a third and truly generative option, both sides must be equally balanced. If this not the case, as in Aotearoa New Zealand, then the less powerful group is in real danger of being subsumed, effectively creating a monolithic entity rather than creating a third space.

So this is the tricky dance in which Nga Ao e Rua engages. In the face of a homogenising dominant force, Nga Ao e Rua must create and defend its unique identities in order to promote and maintain the possibility of a pluralistic world. While defending this precious and precarious position, it must also collapse into and embrace the “other” in order not to become rigidified, transforming into the very thing against which it is defending. Contrary to what it often feels like, I do not believe this dilemma to be hopeless or contradictory. In fact, I celebrate these precarious and seemingly impossible relationships because, I believe, Nga Ao E Rua embodies a spirit of pluralism and models which are reflective of Indigenous understandings of the world.

Orthodox psychoanalytic developmental models traditionally privilege linear progression (Bibace & Kharlamov, 2013). In comparison, Nga Ao E Rua embodies a process of dynamic coexistence similar to Werner and Kaplan’s (1963) genetic principle of spirality and syncretism. These concepts are aligned to Indigenous models of development, stressing parallelism and simultaneity of functions, exploring the dynamic coexistence of various processes across different levels of organisation. Werner’s concepts are mirrored in Lackoff (1978) description of the function of metaphor mapping relationships across different conceptual systems and domains.

Nga Ao e Rua is a powerful metaphor which conceptualises simultaneous and parallel processes of growth and destruction, capturing the possibility of creating a potentially dynamic and generative society. Gerber (1997) also reminded us that the process of dissolving and breaking down rigidified, entrenched positions and challenging dualistic power constructions cannot be done by language change alone; they must be accompanied by “investigation” which includes living, breathing, feeling, and experiencing processes where physical, mental, and social realms interact.

Over the last ten years, members of Nga Ao E Rua have endeavoured to exemplify this process: meeting monthly, organising hui, presentations, and seminars, and offering supervision. We have fought with each other, laughed together, stood together, and fallen apart together. Gerber (1997) stated that: “It is through interaction that individuals are socially constructed, and thus a fundamental requirement of ‘self’-consciousness is the presence an ‘other’” (p. 8). As an Indigenous member of Nga Ao E Rua, I am deeply thankful that te Ao Pākehā choose to engage in these difficult and confusing relationships (though, arguably, choice is a privilege reserved for the dominant group). Nevertheless, without the willing and generous spirit of Pākehā and Tau Iwi to engage these monolithic systems at structural,

political and personal levels, then the promise of metaphorical “redemption”, as my kaumatua Haare Williams often reminds me, would be an impossible dream, which, remaining unfulfilled would relegate all of us to a drab, monochrome and monocultural world.

BECOMING PĀKEHĀ – ANDREW DUNCAN

I was born in England in 1945 and came to New Zealand with my family in 1949. In 1972 I went to the USA and only visited New Zealand three times (in 1979, 1987, and 1991) before returning to live here in 1992. Although I was firm about being a New Zealander, my understanding of this identity was very limited.

I used to tell Americans that while they have weekends off because you can't work all the time and you need a rest, we Kiwis really only work so that we can have the weekends free! I would tell them that we always expected they would do something really ridiculous like elect a film star to be president – then they elected Ronald Reagan.

I often took the train from Boston to Washington and back and when we approached New York city, which that train goes through, I would have a minor panic attack – because I had grown up with so much news about New York and muggings and other violence. What pride I felt when everyone in Boston was reading *The Bone People* (Hume, 1984) and how powerfully moved I was by that book.

During my first few years in the United States, I had panic attacks and anxiety related to my own personal history and dynamics. Now I realise just how ungrounded and unanchored I was, and that included being culturally ungrounded, as if I ought to be able to be fine anywhere in the world. This, I believe, was a fundamental British cultural belief, perhaps unconscious, but perfect for a people who wanted to have an empire, or perhaps it is a belief born as a result of the empire? My mother was dislocated by coming to New Zealand from her birthplace (England) at age 38 with a family of five children – but would she expect anything different, since her mother came from France to England to marry her father? My father was born in New Zealand but was of the generation who called England “home”. At age 14 he was sent to England to school and stayed there until he was a young adult and then as a young adult came back to New Zealand for a very few years. Then he returned to England and didn't come back to New Zealand permanently until he was 40 and brought an English–French wife and five children with him. How do you “locate” your culture with that history? It seems to me my father was also thoroughly colonised by English culture – actually his paternal grandfather was Scottish and grew up in Scotland, and his maternal grandparents were both of Irish origins, yet he was very English. My mother was also very English – the French seemingly colonised out of her.

I proudly gathered up citizenships: UK because I was born there, US because I lived there for 20 years. Then I found that I had never been naturalised as a New Zealander, so my only right to NZ citizenship came through my father having been born here! That was a shock. I imagine that my parents never felt it consequential to naturalise me as a New Zealander, such was their merging of the “mother country”, England, and the colony, New Zealand. As a result of this, my son had to live here three years before he could become a citizen.

I believe my energy for this process of exploring what it means to be Pākehā comes from this dislocation. Now that I feel and understand my Pākehā identity better, I am committed to it. I can't imagine going back to live in the USA even though I have very good friends there.

How offended I am when people tell me I have an American accent – though this is less frequent now. How carefully I try to use the Kiwi words and phrases rather than US ones: I amuse people by always saying “Giddyay” because I want to resist the American “Hi” that has colonised New Zealand.

In the USA, the area I lived in for twenty years, Massachusetts, was where the ethnic cleansing of the indigenous people was almost total; ironically the name Massachusetts comes from the native American people.

Arriving back in New Zealand in the early 1990s, I discovered that I was not – and am not – tangata whenua. I thought this was my country and I discovered it wasn't. Gradually over the years since then I have come to value my right to be in Aotearoa under Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Snedden, 2005). It has taken me some time to let Te Tiriti sink into my being as part of my grounding here. This is a strongly positive validation for being a kiwi and serves as some balance for the coloniser's guilt I also carry – my first ancestor, in fact, arrived in Aotearoa in 1840 and my father's family benefitted enormously from colonisation. Now I realise I do have a right to be here – through the Treaty which, in a different way, means again that this is my country.

BEING TAU IWI – CREA LAND

I grew up in the USA, in the state of Virginia. Where I lived and breathed was a very racist environment, in sometimes subtle and often not so subtle forms. Whites' dislike and hatred towards blacks was most blatant their distrust and fear of the indigenous “Indian”, as they were then called, was much more hidden – from both sides. As I was told by some First Nation peoples, as they now refer to themselves, when I visited more recently, it was safer to “pass” as white – and many did just this to survive.

In my late teens I left that conservative state and began travelling across the country, and then around the world, finally coming to Aotearoa. My heart was instantly captured, and so too, over time, were my mind and spirit, for I sense that here in this Land of the Long White Cloud, there exists the possibility of a real relationship between the indigenous and non-indigenous.

While recognising this, I also was aware that I did not really know where to position myself. Was I Pākehā? Was I Tau Iwi? Through my involvement with Ngā Ao e Rua, I felt compelled by my increasing understanding of the concept of biculturalism, to discover and connect with my own ethnicity, my own indigeneity, that is my Jewish, Lithuanian, Latvian, Polish, and American ancestries – and thus I came to see myself as Tau Iwi, “one from another land”.

From my perspective, I have been given the right to be and to live in and on this land, on the basis of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. By accepting this right, given to me by Tangata Whenua (people of the land), I accept my responsibility as Tau Iwi, which, for me, is to stand alongside Pākehā, that is, those non-Māori New Zealanders, and, together, we stand in partnership with Māori.

In practical ways my tautoko (support) for this relationship has been through making a concerted effort over now more than five years “ki te ako i te reo Māori” | to learn the Māori language. In this small way I am part of a larger initiative here to keep the language alive. A very long time ago I recall hearing someone say, or maybe I read it: “If you destroy the language, you destroy the people. Language is the backbone of a people.” I am also committed to learning waiata (Māori song) and have been privileged

to offer my support to others in learning waiata; there is an amazing richness within each waiata that is deeply stirring.

I am continually surprised when I notice that the majority of Pākehā and Tau Iwi do not appreciate or value a Māori world view. My experiences in Ngā Ao e Rua have helped me to understand that I do have a place here in Aotearoa. I have become more able to see the transgressions and underground racism that occur quietly yet very strongly here, both in Aotearoa in general and in our psychotherapeutic community in particular. It is an ongoing challenge for me to be able to speak what I see, both in small moments and interactions, and in larger ones – but I am also committed to this and my identity in this land as Tau Iwi gives me strength to do this.

DIFFICULTIES, AND DIFFERENCES – SUSAN GREEN

As the Conference Organising Committee prepared for the NZAP Conference in 2004, which was hosted by the Northern Region Branch, the Committee (of which I was a member) realised that we were falling very short in terms of our relationship with Māori. We were looking around, trying really hard to find a Treaty partner with whom to work alongside. As far as biculturalism was concerned, things went quite badly at that conference. When I say “badly”, I am not saying that the Committee did not work hard and diligently to incorporate aspects of biculturalism into the Conference – it did. However, as in any relationship with no meat on the bones, as it were, there was not a lot to fall back on when things did fall apart. This is what inspired some of us from that Committee to go forward to create a group and begin to build a more substantial working relationship with Māori, one that we could hold from conference to conference, and one on which we could build – and, crucially, one which honoured Te Titiriti o Waitangi.

Haare Williams was involved in that NZAP Conference, as he had been in many previously, and became central to the planning of our course. After that Conference he met with a group that had formed around biculturalism, supported us, and gave us the format for the group. As more of our Māori colleagues joined us, we, with Haare’s guidance, divided into three groups: Te Ao Pākehā (the Pākehā world), Te Ao Māori (the Māori world) and, when these two groups met together, Ngā Ao e Rua (the meeting of the two worlds).

In our early years (2004–2006) we abounded with energy: we met, sometimes quite frequently; we processed; we planned; and we thought together about the issues at hand. We have always been open – and, indeed, an open group, a decision that was taken at the very first meeting of the group in June 2004 – and we welcomed whoever wanted to join us. Although the group has been criticised by some (detractors) as being “exclusive”, this was and is not my experience of the group. In fact, one of the reasons I was drawn to the group was that there is so much I just did not know and wanted to learn and understand with others. We do not have or own exclusive knowledge of anything.

Of course, the group has not been all plain sailing. There have been issues about leadership: the reference in Table 1 to “Steering Group/Convenors” is symbolic! Originally, there were leaders, though this was not explicitly acknowledged; later there was a “steering group”, though some people questioned the direction in which they were steering (or even if they were steering at all); more recently, we decided to streamline this by having two convenors who convene but do not steer.

At this stage of the group(s) (2004–2009), Ngā Ao e Rua and Te Ao Pākehā held monthly meetings with no specific agenda: the groups were, in effect, mostly process groups. Only if we were organising or hosting a particular event did it then become a planning group. However, when meeting together, some of the processing became painful for Māori in the group, specifically when Pākehā compared their own issues to those experienced by Māori, for instance, when they said that they felt as bad about these things as Māori did. This kind of equalising of experience missed the point for others, including the Māori members of the group, who were in the minority, and whose experience of being marginalised in their own country was not like or “equivalent” to that of settlers or of more recent immigrants. It is, of course, hard, if not impossible, to understand the experience of colonisation and the subtleties of oppression.

These painful conversations led those of us in Te Ao Pākehā to have some powerful process groups. We decided that our own stories of pain and struggle should be kept to this group, and this led to us organising meetings which alternated between Te Ao Pākehā and Te Ao Māori, meeting separately, and Ngā Ao e Rua meeting as a whole. For about a year or more, we engaged in a lot of process about being Pākehā; we felt this was the best thing we could do for ourselves. We shared stories out and realised the diversity among us: many were immigrants born overseas; some were fourth- or fifth-generation New Zealanders whose forebears had come here to carve out a life; and others were raising a first generation here. Between and within these groups of Pākehā, there were differences in how the relationship with Māori was viewed. Those Te Ao Pākehā meetings were vital and went really well until we started to talk about our own racism, at which point things slowed down a bit.

Over the years there have also been tensions between people and the different groups – tensions which are symbolic of wider cultural dynamics and politics in the country. At times the relationship between Māori and Pākehā has been robust, at other times fragile and tentative. Some people recover, others move away, still others join and engage.

Another disruption came in February 2010 at an NZAP Northern Region Branch meeting (referred to above). Some members of Ngā Ao E Rua who were also Branch members were part of a panel formed to discuss the ideas around the registration of psychotherapists. Issues of biculturalism within NZAP were raised in this discussion and it became very clear that there was a division in the thinking of members. While difference in thinking is not an issue if there can be discussion, this discussion ended in an argument that was painful for everyone. As this has never been processed in the Branch since, some of us were – and are – left holding something extremely uncomfortable. Following that meeting and further discussions within Ngā Ao e Rua, we decided to separate from the Branch as we did not want to hold all the responsibility for bicultural issues on behalf of the Branch, hoping rather that the Branch would take these up. While this has been an important decision, it has, nevertheless, created a certain awkwardness as many of us were – and still are – members of both groups.

From its inception Ngā Ao e Rua has been many things to many people: a consciousness-raising group; a meeting of colleagues and friends; a group for professional development; a political organisation or network – and to others, perhaps, a bunch of malcontents! In its commitment to raising the profile and practice of biculturalism, especially within the NZAP, we have worked hard – offering workshops, holding hui and Camp Pākehā – and many of us have been active in other spheres – as Members of the NZAP’s Council and on conference organising committees.

COLLEAGUES AND/OR COMRADES – KEITH TUDOR

I immigrated to Aotearoa New Zealand in July 2009. I had visited this country before (in 2006) and had become aware of the significance of Māori as tangata whenua and of Te Tiriti o Waitangi as the founding document of the nation, and of something of the application of the politics of biculturalism. In 2008 I came over again, principally to attend the Annual Conference of the NZAP, which that year was held at Waitangi, both at the Copthorne Hotel and Te Tii Marae, on which I stayed, and which I learned had a particular significance, not least in the annual celebration of Waitangi Day on 6 February, which is a national holiday in this country. Walking over the bridge between the two venues – and the two worlds – became a daily and symbolic reminder both of the bicultural engagement of the Conference and the NZAP as well as the tensions concerning biculturalism.

Soon after arriving here in 2009, my partner and I were invited to a meeting of Ngā Ao e Rua. Despite our newness and some significant differences in culture, to which we were only just beginning to acclimatise, we both quite quickly felt at home in the group. We both viewed the group as a political group, and the fact that each of us had been political activists in the UK, I think, gave us a certain sense of being at home or, more accurately, having a political home.

At the time (2009–2010), colleagues in the NZAP were engaged with the transition to the state registration of psychotherapists. Some years previously, the NZAP had voted for this move but, by late 2009, was seeing and feeling the implications of the state, in the form of the Psychotherapists' Board of Aotearoa New Zealand (“the Board”), not only taking over the registration of psychotherapists but also seeking to extend its remit to include the regulation of the whole field of psychotherapy, including supervision (approving supervisors), and education/training (approving Visiting Educators and training programmes). As someone who in debates in the UK had always been sceptical of and argued against the statutory regulation of psychotherapy and the state registration of psychotherapists, I naturally allied myself with colleagues here who had also been critical of this move and who were involved in asserting and supporting the independence and right of practitioners who had not registered as psychotherapists to continue to practice psychotherapy, a perspective which, two years later, we elaborated in a publication on the subject, *The Turning Tide* (Tudor, 2011c). One of the arguments against the state registration of psychotherapists under the *Health Practitioners' Competence Assurance Act 2003* was concerned with the lack of any reference in the *Act* of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and, more generally, the lack of acknowledgement of the specific situation of Māori psychotherapy practitioners (for a summary of which see Tudor, 2011a, 2011b). While supporting the right of any of its members to register, as a rōpu, Waka Orangā was – and is – opposed to state registration, and some of us thought – and still think – it important to support its position as fully as possible, especially given that it is the NZAP's Treaty Partner. It seemed to me and others that the implications of state registration for bicultural relationships within the NZAP and in the profession of psychotherapy at large had not been sufficiently explored, but, as most members of Ngā Ao e Rua were – and are – registered psychotherapists, it was at times difficult to do so. It appeared to me that there was a certain tension between being *professional colleagues* with people who wanted the status of being registered professionals and being what I would term political comrades who were arguing a *political position* and taking a political stance against the state control of the profession and the state

oppression of Māori therapists and, more broadly, the exclusion of indigenous wisdom traditions (see Woodard, 2014).

At this time (2009–2011), there were tensions in the group, partly around the issue of state registration, but also, and informed by this, about the nature of the group itself: whether it was a political, campaigning group or a consciousness-raising group – or both? For a while we tried to manage this by having different alternate meetings: one month where the focus was more on personal, interpersonal and group dynamics and process, and the next where we discussed points of activity and action. However, people tended to attend the meeting in which they were more interested, which led to further polarisation, until we decided to divide each meeting into these two agendas – which worked well. During 2012 and 2013, this structure continued to work well: we did talk personally and philosophically, and we did engage in some campaigning, including producing a *Submission Regarding the Health Practitioners Competence Assurance Act 2003 on behalf of Ngā Ao e Rua* (Tudor & Duncan, 2012) (see section on “Organisation and Action” above).

The other tension in the group I have experienced and observed has been in wanting and trying to open up the group to new members. The group had been founded mostly by people who had known each other for a long time, including having trained together at the same educational institution. As some of us inhabited different professional groups or networks, based on different modalities or theoretical orientations, we were keen to bring these two worlds together. However, when I suggested that we might have a leaflet about the group and seek to recruit new members, there was a certain reaction against this. Initially I thought this was about friendship networks: many people in the organisation were friends and socialised with each other. Gradually, I realised that the issue of the leaflet or no leaflet was partly derived from a theoretical perspective about the group (“Join and find out what we’re about”) as distinct from a political view of organising (“Recruit and survive”); and that the issue of other people joining was based on a reluctance to open up what was at times quite personal sharing. Also, people in the group had very different levels of experience and knowledge with regard to bicultural issues, their own cultural identity and identification, and to personal and group process. As a result, we discussed the pros and cons of inviting new people into a kind of starter group, though this never happened. Last year (2013), we did (finally) agree that we would go out into other groups and tell people who we are and what we are doing, though, for various practical reasons, this has not been consistent.

Following what became known as “*that meeting*” (the Branch meeting referred to in several contributions above), and Ngā Ao e Rua’s separation from the Northern Branch of the NZAP, we have had various discussions as to whether we are a national group or a regional group. The fact that we meet in Auckland on a monthly basis makes us *de facto* a local or regional group; on the other hand, we have a mailing list that includes people in other parts of the country and, indeed, other parts of the world, and the meetings are open to all members. While I personally view Ngā Ao e Rua as an open, national group, I appreciate that there are sensitivities in other centres and regions about the dominance of Auckland and Auckland-based groups, so this debate and, more importantly, the engagement of the different branches of the NZAP with biculturalism and, specifically, their Treaty obligations (see New Zealand Association of Psychotherapists, 2008), remain open and to be continued ...

Despite my differences and, at times, my frustration, with, as I see it, the privileging of reflection over action, I still regard Ngā Ao e Rua as a political home. We are a political group

in that we do organise and campaign; we are a consciousness-raising or conscientisation group in that we do raise our consciousness(es) especially about culture, biculturalism, and identity; and we are a group of psychotherapists – and, of course, psychotherapy practitioners – who reflect and address personal, interpersonal and group process.

Kia kaha! (Be Strong). Ka whawhai tonu matou – Struggle without end.

LOOKING FORWARD – SUSAN GREEN AND KEITH TUDOR

This year marks the tenth anniversary of this small but significant and influential bicultural group. As with any anniversary, it offers an opportunity to reflect on the past and to imagine the future. One of the current convenors contributed the following:

A focus of the group in the past two years (2012–2013) has been as supporting Waka Oranga. We do this actively, through helping with preparation of food as ringawera at their hui. It is a privilege to be welcomed into experiencing tikaNgā and kaupapa as we support Waka Orangā which is pioneering a unique journey towards a Māori practice of psychotherapy.

During Waka Orangā hui, our monthly meetings, or the annual Camp Pākehā, we are facing the challenge to be actively in relationship with each other, acknowledge differences and similarities, and feel into what it is that keeps us separate, fearful, judgemental, threatened, numb, paralysed, defensive, or disconnected. We sit with the tension, implicit in the confrontation: what's needed to prevent repeating the cultural violation of the past?

For many of us this is new and risky territory; others have been part of the group since its beginning in 2004. I have a vision for this journey to continue, to deepen and to expand. While more established members may feel a pressure or readiness to increasingly step into political action through initiative, new members may arrive with an anxious curiosity to explore their own feelings in relation to “Who am I – as Pākehā? as *Tau Iwi*? as *Māori*?” or as someone who does not identify as belonging to any of these groups. We have and explore other questions, too: “What are my rights, my obligations, and what is my moral standing in relation to the Treaty?” “How does the history of colonisation in New Zealand affect me personally, professionally, socially, and spiritually?” “What are the parallels to the history of my own culture?” “What am I (perhaps unconsciously) continuing, repeating or trying to reconcile?” Unravelling these questions and answers through sharing in the group, and actively working on projects, may raise our awareness about the tensions we hold as individuals and as a group, for the NZAP and for the people of Aotearoa New Zealand. (Ingrid-Rose Nagl)

Another member (and an ex President of the NZAP) wrote:

I would love to see Ngā Ao e Rua continue and maybe find some way to encourage other Branches (of the NZAP) either to be part of, or to set up something along the same lines for themselves.

It has been a formative influence in our partnership relations – and has been challenging for both “sides”, and a learning growth especially for Pākehā.

Could there be more encouragement for people to learn the reo (the Māori language)? Could that be a role for the network? (Eileen Birch)

Another member looks forward:

I joined the Northern Branch and NAeR in 2009 with a background of anti-racism activity, a 20 year bicultural marriage and active membership of Ohomairaki, the bi-cultural working group of the Australia Aotearoa New Zealand Psychodrama Association. What impressed me was how active NZAP was at a Branch level, as well as nationally. However, when NAeR moved out of the Branch, the interface between the two groups was lost; our bi-cultural focus, opinion and questions occurred primarily at NAeR or in some conference committees but rarely in Branch meetings. Although many of us are members of both NAeR and the Branch, I think we compartmentalised our attention – certainly I did.

With the passing of time, I now hold hope for this to change. I would like the struggle and the learning so aptly described by others here to be taken back into the Branch, in the first instance by members of Te Ao Pakeha/Tau Iwi. I see it as our task to work for sufficient healing and adequate conscientisation so that Branch meetings might become a place in which NAeR could be occurring, as described by Wiremu in his contribution. As much a verb as a noun, Nga Ao e Rua is an awesome phrase befitting national, if not international usage. For future discussion is the question of where this name and activity best fits within the context of Te Tiriti Committee, various Branch bicultural working groups and our Tiriti partner, Waka Oranga with its Maori and non-Maori memberships. I look forward to such conversation being included in the Celebration of our 10 years. (Fay Lilian)

Finally, Jonathan Fay, who wrote the earlier contribution on philosophy and praxis, puts Ngā Ao e Rua in a wider context:

There is only one planet. Now, more than ever, we need to learn how to share it fairly and care for it with affection and gratitude. The health and wellbeing of Mother Earth, upon whom all life depends, is now under acute threat from careless, extractive economics and policies. Cultural diversity and biodiversity alike are shrinking, disappearing before our eyes. The primary task of human beings in the 21st century is the increasingly urgent requirement to work intelligently *with* instead of against nature, and to halt and reverse the destruction of the garden planet and the degradation of the quality of life for generations to come. Scientific and technological expertise alone will not avail us. We need forms of wisdom that our dominant cultural traditions have forgotten or never learned. We need diversity and the synthesis of diversity: an array of creative responses nourished by many cultures worldwide. The loss of cultural diversity is as alarming as the loss of biodiversity, and for the same reason. A narrow cultural base that over-specialises and over-adapts to our current unstable status quo will leave us at grave risk when that status quo shifts unpredictably, as it must. Many keys to the survival of the human species and the quality of life reside in indigenous perspectives: in the deep wisdom of ancient traditions, and in the profound knowledge and understanding handed down through countless generations. Indigenous worldviews have always understood the human social world to be a microcosm of the natural world, itself a microcosm of the cosmic world. This understanding provides the original blueprint for sustainability and living cooperatively with nature. Yet indigenous peoples and indigenous traditions have been and continue to be devalued and marginalised, their very survival put at risk in the modern world. In the 21st century we will flourish or perish together, learn to live together in peace and creative cooperation, or pay a heavy price.

Ngā Ao e Rua is a tiny experiment, one of countless experiments in tolerance and understanding worldwide. Māori and Pākehā/Tau Iwi are by no means unique in needing each other, or in needing to find their partnership possibilities. For our own and each other's cultural health, wealth and wellbeing, we all need to pool our respective strengths and offset our weaknesses, preserving our independence while enhancing our interdependence. Ngā Ao e Rua has endured for 10 years. A vigorous dialogue at the cultural interface continues. My hope is that the next 10 years will extend and deepen this dialogue in the clear light of its larger purpose and meaning. Bicultural partnership, in all its many forms and manifestations, is part of the process by which we might raise our consciousness, rise above our own destructive and self-destructive self-involvements, improve our capacity to care for ourselves and each other, and develop the tools with which to survive and thrive into the future.

Looking back – Susan to 2004 and Keith to 2009 – re-reading minutes and documents, and reading the various contributions to this article, it is clear that Ngā Ao e Rua has achieved much more than its numbers suggest. While this is not untypical of an organisation of activists, it is perhaps less typical of an organisation of psychotherapists (and others).

Inevitably, after 10 years, some of the original members are tired and/or want a break or to do other things, and, equally inevitably, when people leave, this raises the question of why other people stay, and what the continued purpose of the group is; and, in his contribution,

Wiremu Woodard (as usual) raises a significant point in a beautiful and poetic way. Does Ngā Ao e Rua continue or does it dissolve, only to raise again, perhaps Phoenix-like, in another form or other forms? Does Ngā Ao e Rua develop a more sophisticated understanding of its social, cultural and ecological politics? Certainly, the contribution that Ngā Ao e Rua has made to the politics of psychotherapy in Aotearoa New Zealand is still needed; we have not defeated dualistic thinking or binary divisions, and we have not created a generative third force in a post-colonial society. As Roberta Sykes (1992) put it in her poem “Post Colonial Fictions”:

Post colonial – fiction?
 “Post –colonial IS fiction.
 Have I missed something?
 ... Have they gone?

Clearly there is more to do: to continue the work of action and reflection; to continue to support Waka Oranga; and to continue to be open to new members and, in many ways, to generate the next generation of psychotherapists and psychotherapy practitioners who are aware of, knowledgeable about, and active in bicultural issues and dynamics within and outside the NZAP. We have achieved more than we might have expected, and less than we would have liked. As James Henare put it (in a speech made in 1989): “We have come too far not to go further; we have done too much not to do more.”

REFERENCES

- Barlow, C. (1991). *Tikanga whakaaro: Key concepts in Māori culture*. Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- Bibace, R., & Kharlamov, N. A. (2013). The spiral: The concept of development after Werner and Kaplan. *Culture and Psychology, 19*(4), 453–462. doi: 10.1177/1354067X13500324
- Biggs, B. (2006). *Kimihia te mea ngaro. Seek that which is lost*. Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand: Polynesian Society/Macmillan Brown Centre for Pacific Studies.
- Buttimer, A. (1993). *Geography and the human spirit*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dillon, G. (Ed.). (2007). *The Camp Pākehā papers* [Monograph]. Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. Ramos, Trans.). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin. (Original work published 1968)
- Gerber, J. (1997). Beyond dualism: The social construction of nature and the natural and social construction of human beings. *Progress in Human Geography, 21*(1), 1–17. doi: 10.1191/030913297671906269
- Hall, A., Morice, M. P., & Wilson, C. (2012). Waka Oranga: The development of an indigenous professional organisation within a psychotherapeutic discourse in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Psychotherapy and Politics International, 10*(1), 7–16. doi: 10.1002/ppi.1255
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Hoskins, C. T. (2001). *Kia whai kiko te korero: Constituting discourses, exchanges at the edge* (Master’s thesis). University of Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand.
- Hume, K. (1984). *The bone people*. Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand: Spiral Press.
- King, J. (2003). Whaia te reo: Pursuing the language. How metaphors describe our relationships with indigenous languages. In J. A. Reyhner, O. V. Trujillo, R. L. Carrasco, & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Nurturing native languages* (pp. 105–124). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- Lackoff, G. (1978). What is a conceptual system? In W. F. Overton, & D. S. Palermo (Eds.), *The nature and ontogenesis of meaning* (pp. 41–90). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Manning, S. (2004a, December). Advisory Committee on Te Tiriti and bicultural matters. *NZAP Newsletter*, p. 14.
- Manning, S. (2004b, August). Report on Treaty issues. *NZAP Newsletter*, p. 9.
- McManaway, P. (2009, August). Being (at Camp) Pakeha. *NZAP Newsletter*, pp. 69–72.
- Mead, H. M., & Grove, N. (2001). *Nga pepeha a nga tipuna. The sayings of the ancestors*. Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Mercado, G. (Ed.). (2008). *The Camp Pākehā papers II* [Monograph]. Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand.
- New Zealand Association of Psychotherapists. (2008). *Code of ethics*. Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand: NZAP.
- Ngata, A. T. (1974). *Nga moteatea. Part One*. Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand: A. H. & A. W. Reed.
- Snedden, P. (2005). *Pakeha and the Treaty: Why it's our Treaty too*. Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand: Random.
- Solomon, M. (Ed.). (2009). *The Camp Pākehā papers III* [Monograph]. Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand.
- Stewart-Harawira, M. (2005). *The new imperial order: Indigenous response to colonisation*. Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand: Huia.
- Sykes, R. (1992). Post colonial fictions. In *Eclipse*. Retrieved May 21, 2014, from <http://www.poetrylibrary.edu.au/poems-book/eclipse-0301000>
- Tudor, K. (2011a). Introduction. In K. Tudor (Ed.), *The turning tide: Pluralism and partnership for psychotherapy in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 15–27). Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand: LC Publications.
- Tudor, K. (2011b). The law is an Act: The Health Practitioners Competence Assurance Act 2003. In K. Tudor (Ed.), *The turning tide: Pluralism and partnership in psychotherapy in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 39–68). Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand: LC Publications.
- Tudor, K. (Ed.). (2011c). *The turning tide: Pluralism and partnership in psychotherapy in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand: LC Publications.
- Tudor, K., & Duncan, A. (2012). Submission regarding the Health Practitioners Competence Assurance Act 2003 on behalf of Ngā Ao e Rua. Submission 50, available from [http://www.moh.govt.nz/NoteBook/nbbooks.nsf/0/C27798AE9A5B1007CC257C9E007C7A97/\\$file/submissions-39-60.pdf](http://www.moh.govt.nz/NoteBook/nbbooks.nsf/0/C27798AE9A5B1007CC257C9E007C7A97/$file/submissions-39-60.pdf)
- Waitangi Tribunal. (2011). The Treaty of Waitangi. Retrieved November 18, 2011, from <http://www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/treaty/>
- Werner, H., & Kaplan, B. (1963). *Symbolic formation: An organismic-developmental approach to language and the expression of thought*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Williams, H. (2005, May). Ngā Ao e Rua: Moving in two worlds. *NZAP Newsletter*, pp. 36–37.
- Woodard, W. (2014). Politics, psychotherapy, and the 1907 *Tohunga Suppression Act*. *Psychotherapy and Politics International*, 12(1), 39–48.



Susan Green is a psychotherapist and supervisor who works in a private practice in Auckland, New Zealand. She is also a creative writer, a poet and a gardener.



Keith Tudor is an Associate Professor at Auckland University of Technology, where he is currently Head of Department of Psychotherapy and Counselling | Tari Whakaora Hinengaro ā Whakangārahu. He is an active member of Ngā Ao e Rua, an Associate Member of Waka Oranga, and a Provisional Member of the New Zealand Association of Psychotherapists.



Grant Dillon is a psychotherapist and supervisor working in private practice in Auckland.



Andrew Duncan – I was born in England; my family moved to Aotearoa when I was three. My father was born in Aotearoa, as were his grandparents and great grandmother. My father identified strongly as of English origins, having been sent to school in England, but his father was Scottish and mother was Irish/English; and, just to stir the cultural pot further, for 20 years I lived in the USA.



Jonathan Fay is a clinical psychologist with 35 years' experience practising, teaching, and supervising psychotherapy in the USA and Aotearoa New Zealand. Jonathan has always been active in the psychotherapy community in this country, serving on the Executive Council of the NZAP for 12 years and teaching on the psychotherapy training programme at Auckland University of Technology for 13 years (1991–2003), to which he has recently returned as a senior lecturer, and coordinator of the postgraduate, post-qualifying psychotherapy training programmes in the Department of Psychotherapy and Counselling. He also practises in Auckland as a therapist, supervisor, and consultant.

He is married to Margaret Poutu Morice and they enjoy the company of their three adult children: Rush (aged 30), Anna (28), and Zoe (22).



Crea Land is a relational therapist and supervisor from Tamaki Makaurau (Auckland), Aotearoa (New Zealand), where she has lived for nearly twenty years. She was born and grew up in Virginia, USA, as the grandchild of Jewish Eastern European immigrants. Crea has a Master of Health Science and a Graduate Diploma in Psychotherapy. She is a member of the New Zealand Association of Psychotherapists, a member of Ngā Ao e Rua, as well as an associate member of Waka Oranga. Crea's passion for waiata (Māori song) inspired her to study te Reo (the Maori

language), which she has been doing for several years.



Margaret Poutu Morice MHS_c (First Class Hons), MNZAC, MNZAP is a Founding Member of Nga Ao E Rua, a Founding Member and Runanga Member of Waka Oranga, and a Member of Nga Pou Mana (Māori Allied Health Professionals). She trained as a psychotherapist and works as a kaiwhakaruruhau wahine Māori social and mental health practitioner, with many years' experience working in designated Māori positions within "mainstream" public and private organisations. Her practice includes cultural supervision with professional groups who are committed to understanding and addressing the chasm of inequity

which exists for Māori in accessing social and health services. She has a lifetime experience of living biculturally within a monocultural Western society.



Wiremu Woodard is an Indigenous therapist, father of four, activist, environmentalist, and sometimes contemporary dancer and artist. Wiremu is committed to reducing health disparities for Māori and promoting social justice. He currently works in community practice at Kereru and teaches on the psychotherapy programme at Auckland University of Technology. Wiremu is a founding member of Waka Oranga, a group of dynamic Indigenous Māori practitioners committed to emancipatory freedom.