

PETER CLEAVE

‘Twixt cup and lip: Language revitalisation strategies: a comparative approach with special reference to New Zealand Maori language policy

Abstract

This paper considers *Te Māngai Pāho – Television RFP June 2018*, a paper reflecting strategy and policy regarding Te Reo Maori in New Zealand. There is an attempt to aim for a wide view where as many positions as the author has found to apply to and, possibly, inform the policy from around the world have been examined. As the paper develops several themes emerge. One is the difficulty in moving from the local to the supra-local. Another is a review of the media that might best be used in language revitalisation and there is a critique of television using comparisons and contrasts with Ireland and other situations. Through the course of the paper many and various perspectives are considered including, *inter alia*, scopophilia, being a good neighbour, examples from personal experience with a considerable emphasis on possibilities on the internet. The intention is to approach *Te Māngai Pāho – Television RFP June 2018* from a variety of angles particularly in terms of language and mind and then to evaluate those perspectives in the conclusion.

Ko te kai a te rangatira ko te korero: Speech is the food of chiefs

According to a story about the proverb, the verse was a comment by a seer who told Ancaeus, who was setting out on the perilous enterprise of the Argonauts, that he would never taste wine from his newly planted vineyard. On his safe return, Ancaeus filled a cup with the first wine from his vineyard and reproached the seer for what appeared to be a false prophecy. The seer responded with the verse and just then an alarm was raised that a wild boar was destroying the vineyard. Without tasting the wine, Ancaeus rushed out and was killed by the boar. Hence, the prophecy came to be true.

There’s many a slip ‘twixt the cup and the lip
There is many a slip between subjective cup and objective lip
W. V. O. Quine (*cf* Stroll, 2001)

He tao kii e kore e taea te karo,
He tao rakau ka taeaano te karo
A shaft of the tongue may not be parried
A wooden shaft may be parried

Language Policy and Practice

This paper works through a national language policy information document, *Te Māngai Pāho – Television RFP of June 2018*, and makes an international set of comparisons. The document concerned is a 2018 application, an official Te Mangai Paho document (see Appendix One). Given the integration that Te Maatawai, an overarching government Department set up from 2016-7 that incorporates Te Mangai Paho, the Maori broadcasting section, aims to achieve, the Te Mangai Paho application document may be taken as generally indicative of New Zealand government policy regarding Te Reo Maori. It is hoped that the analysis of the document shows where the nation state wants to go with te reo Maori, where the ‘cup’ of it all is for the government and where it might be in years to come.

The consolidation of policy shown in the document which is referred to here as ‘the policy paper’ or Appendix One has produced a template, a set of boxes to be ticked in policy work, and an evaluation of this model, this template, follows along with an estimation of what will actually get there to the ‘lip’ of things achieved, of policy realised.

A paper given by Hemi Dale in 2017 entitled *The need for an on-line one stop Maori language dictionary shop* offers an introductory historical perspective:

For one hundred and twenty years after the 1867 legislation of the 1867 Education Act the use of the Maori language was confined to a small number of domains such as the marae, the church and a small number of Maori speaking communities and households. With the onset of preschool Maori language nests kohanga reo and immersion schooling in the early 1900s the doors of education were prised open to the Maori language. A plethora of educational words and terms emerged to support the Maori medium schooling sector. Some of these words were awoken ‘sleeping beauty-like’ from their long slumbers to find that they had new meanings attached. New words

such as *ata paki* (snap chat and *tihau* (#twitter) were created to satisfy the insatiable language needs of the modern world. A Stalinist type linguistic purge that began in the 1990s sought to cleanse the Maori language of transliterations. The word *kereeme* (claim) made way for *kokoraho* and the days of the week and the months of the year succumbed to more authentic modern (yet quasi-traditional) ones.

In the 1990s this process was regulated by the National Maori Language Commission. From the early 2000s the process of word creation was deregulated and devolved. Curriculum Designers, resource developers, schools, communities and language excellence groups are some who have filled the word generation space. In this presentation the response of the immersion teacher training programme, *Te Huarahi Maori* (University of Auckland) to the needs of a corpus of educational terms will be discussed. The need for a 'one stop Maori language dictionary shop' will be actively lobbied for.

Dale's approach to the history of Maori language studies in Aotearoa-New Zealand is important showing as it does the shaping and re-shaping, the regulation and deregulation of language authorities and the nature of what might be called a Maori language industry. This includes *Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Maori* the Maori Language Commission and key points in the worlds of publishing, media, education and politics as well as production for television as called for in the policy paper discussed.

To an extent this industry has a mindset shared around the world with respect to indigenous languages. There is a locale involved, there is the identity of an ethnic group involved, there is a fear of the major languages like English and Spanish, and something of an apparently necessary defensive approach. There is an equation of indigeneity and language, an equation of the industry of indigenous studies and the industry of the language of origin.

A critical part of the industry is the Maori Language Commission, *Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Maori*. This is a case where the local language industry has actually created a new variant, like other variants to the Eastern Polynesian language family. This has been largely overlooked and only commented upon in one or two places (*cf King et alia*). It is though the industriousness of the industry blinds people to what is being changed. As an example:

Monday
day of the Moon
Rāhina
rā + Māhina (day + Moon)
Tuesday
day of Mars
Rātū
rā + Tūmatauenga (day + Mars)
Wednesday
day of Mercury
Rāapa
rā + Apārangi (day + Mercury)
Thursday
day of Jupiter
Rāpare
rā + Pareārau (day + Jupiter)
Friday
day of Venus
Rāmere
rā + Mere (day + Venus)

This set of everyday terms shows a world with a different cultural spin, a kind of ancient Southern European world with a Polynesian touch. There is no justification for having a set day of the week for the Moon in Aotearoa. That is a European idea. *Hina* though is a Maori word for moon. So here is a cultural proposition from a long way away given a Maori name as it has the same referent, the moon. Similarly there is little if any justification in the Maori world for naming other days after planets. Is this end of the industry which Dale calls a Stalinisation a kind of language and/or cultural displacement akin to if not the same as colonialism?

There is something of a split nation here. The educated, so called, having passed tests at school on this language, can hold a conversation in *Te Taura Whiri Maori* saying *Rahina* for Monday while others cannot or prefer not to do so, preferring to use transliterations like *Mane* for Monday.

Be that as it may this language industry has something of a single mind. Is this primarily a language industry or is it, at base, an ideological frame with language as a tool, a focus point. What is it like? Is it like the language nationalism of the late nineteenth century in parts of Europe?

The local language is caught in two, at least two meshes. The first is that of language nationalism or indigeneity. The second is local settler state sentiment. Tension between the two might be greater in

New Zealand than, say, Wales where sentiment toward the locale and sentiment toward the language go together. Neither of these meshes need have much to do with how a language survives or develops. They may, in fact, in their own ways as suggested below, be ideological drags which inhibit development.

The critical industry for language is speech, what is going on at the lip. Beyond that there are considerations of language support such as publication of works in text, pictures and video, in print and on the net that help people to speak. There are the ideological supports mentioned above, well placed or misplaced as they may be. But there is a constant need to review such supports in terms of the question, why are people speaking the language, how many are speaking and how often and how does language policy such as that seen in Appendix One help or hinder the answers to such questions?

As seen in Appendix One, a key part of the template is ZePA theory. Ze stands for zero, P for passive and A for active speaker, We can also see how zero might be a starting point for many people and so be a starting point for discussion here in the excerpt from the document below:

The ZePA model highlights how right-shifting the position of an individual from Zero – Passive – Active can strengthen the position of the language within society. The key difference is that the emphasis is not simply on moving directly from Zero to Active. Right-shifting an individual from Zero to Passive can generate increased awareness and support for language revitalisation more broadly, and the subsequent right-shift from Passive to Active is then easier to achieve.

The evidence reported in the Te Puni Kōkiri surveys on the Health of the Māori Language suggests that there has been continued left-shifting in Aotearoa/New Zealand over time that has contributed to the decline of the language, leaving the language in the precarious state described by Te Paepae Motuhake.

What are the constraints in meeting the goals implied in the ZePA model? What do Zero people bring to te reo and are the things brought constraints or advantages? The Zero Maori language speakers like, say, several at least of the intake at Auckland Grammar in 2019 might bring with them expertise in several languages like Mandarin or Hindi as well as English. What does this language experience mean in terms of their learning needs and expertise and where is the policy to address these questions? The use of the internet to learn languages from a Zero position might be one feature amongst others.

The Te Mangai Paho document says:

MĀORI LANGUAGE REVITALISATION There is a strong foundation of research on language revitalisation. Te Māngai Pāho has built this focus on revitalisation into its funding activities in a manner that is likely to be consistent with current and future Māori language strategies. The current challenge is to develop more objective measures of quality and outcomes that can be used to guide performance against these goals.

Then there is a reference back to legislation and themes involved:

The Māori Language (Te Reo Māori) Act 2016 was passed on on 14 April 2016. The Act establishes Te Mātāwai to lead revitalisation of Māori Language on behalf of iwi and Māori.

And then a comment on the two major aspects;

Two Māori language strategies will be developed:

- The Maihi Karauna strategy, will focus on national matters and be the responsibility of the Crown.
- The Maihi Māori strategy, will focus on matters at an iwi and community level and be the responsibility of iwi and Māori, through Te Mātāwai.

The word maihi refers to the barge boards on the façade of the wharenui or meeting house. Maihi is a reference to a metaphor of the meeting house, a traditional proverb being:

*He maihi tu ki roto i te wao
He kai maa te ahi
He maihi tuu ki roto i te pa tuuwatawata
He tohu no te rangatira*

Maihi standing in the clear are food for the fire
Maihi standing in a fortified space are a sign of a chief

The effect of the proverb might be to take it that there is more involved than just the maihi, the barge boards. These stand for distinct villages or settlements, kainga, in this case villages of thought as

it were, and in each case, that of the Crown and that of Maori the trappings of each may need to be considered.

To return to the notion of constraint, high constraint might be when state and iwi resist change. Low restraint would be where state and iwi agree upon language strategies and goals. To take the example of maihi or barge boards on a meeting house as this image is used in the application document, where the Maihi Karauna, the bargeboards of the Crown and the Maihi Maori suggest similar or different things, where these converge or depart from one another has an effect on constraint.

The reference to the house is significant and elsewhere there is the image of all parties being in the same house. The reference takes us to a traditional locale and the imagery of two sides to the house, taha nui for guests and taha iti for the locals. The Crown, Te Karauna sometimes is portrayed as the guest to the language and a fairly comprehensive booklet has been issued in mid-2018 to inform people about it all (Maihi Karauna, 2018).

Rajendra Kumar Dash has discussed a comparable distinction as he looks at the prospects and challenges in public-private relationships:

This paper argues that the active involvement of the endangered speech community is a must to preserve and promote the language, hence it requires both 'top down' and 'bottom-up' approaches which is largely absent in India. This paper presents a Public-Private Partnership model (www.pppinindia.gov.in/) and explains how central/state/govt. agencies and institutions and representative linguists and private stakeholders can carry out protection, preservation, and promotion of endangered languages in India. (Dash, 2018)

This takes us to the way people think on a state basis as compared to how they think on a tribal basis and how they talk in both places. In other respects it takes us to a consideration of the nature of iwi or tribes. New Zealand is going through and in some cases nearing the end of a Treaty of Waitangi settlement phase that sometimes affords the iwi cash or resources. Are iwi, in the post settlement phase like companies, like private entities as in the argument of Rajendra Kumar Dash? Are the iwi the repository of the language and is Te Taura Whiri as an arm of the state a major repository as well or are both of these giving way to the internet, especially the digital dictionaries found thereon as an increasingly used repository?

When we think of Dash's 'top down' or 'bottom up' arguments several questions come to mind. Is language authority to be 'top down', as in from the state down to the people or is the iwi the traditional source and the top of the language tree, so to speak? And where is the internet on an up-down authority basis with its dictionaries and reference points as a source, as an authority in all this?

In many respects Maori has been the language of the iwi, the tribe from before and after contact to the 1970s and since then has as well become a state language both officially and in terms of Maori Television and radio. There is even something of a division now where the radio stations are iwi stations and Maori Television but not, perhaps, the Te Reo station, offers something of a pan-tribal reo. Having said that it is interesting to look at the legislation around Maori Television which seems to give it an independent edge (cf Cleave, 2010), independent, that is, of the nation-state.

At this point in history, the word iwi has a positive connotation in terms of te reo. It evokes tradition and a romantic locale. We might look to Guernsey for a comparison or at least a sense of perspective that may be helpful. Julia Sallabank (2018) has presented a paper called *What's in a word? Authenticity in a highly endangered language*, and looks at how people say hello. Sallabank talks of epistemic positioning where things French, words French in this case, are favoured over words and, one supposes, matters English:

This talk will focus on a recent controversy concerning the use of a particular word, 'warro', meaning 'hi' or 'hello'. As a useful term which is easy to pronounce and distinctively local, 'warro' had become almost a brand name for language revitalisation in Guernsey; but the word's authenticity has been challenged by some speakers. Sallabank says I will examine coverage of this controversy in the local press in order to highlight overt and covert ideologies embodied in discourses on the topic. An underlying factor that emerges is epistemic positioning: who owns knowledge (Sharrock 1974; Avineri 2012). This has potentially serious consequences for revitalisation of highly endangered languages such as Guernesiais, as it influences whether they should be valued only as largely symbolic post-vernacular 'languages of the past', or whether they can be regenerated by and for a new speaker community.

Guernsey contrasts with Aotearoa in that there is little government interest, no equivalent to Maihi Karauna and Sallabank suggests:

there is little effective coordination of language policy at government level, so community language ideologies assume a salient role.

Sallabank also talks about 'family-ects' in Guernsey. We might relate these 'family-ects' and 'community language ideologies' to the use of -tanga with iwi names in New Zealand. For example

Tuhoetanga might imply the use of the specific dialect of the iwi, Tuhoē, as well as other aspects to do with culture and politics.

The question of language for symbolic use and effect as distinct from language as communication is, as Sallabank notes, important and runs through the discussion in this paper. In some ways Maori is an endangered language but when one thinks of English and Arabic in Bahrain discussed in the conclusion the scope of the matter starts to sink in.

We might then ask about language wants and needs. What do the iwi, the tribes want as a matter of language revitalisation and more broadly, perhaps, what do speakers want? Put in Sallabank's terms what is the kind of epistemic positioning wanted in Aotearoa New Zealand? Should this remain iwi centred or should there be an awareness of what is required when this becomes state-centric.

Is epistemic positioning a constraint or an aid in language revitalisation?

Coming back to the idea of a language house, the whare reo, who is in the house beside Crown and Iwi? Non Maori speakers of te reo, people who do not belong to an iwi but might be exposed to the language would often seem to be situated on the Crown side of the house although they will live in and might relate to local dialect as well as to the reo taught in the schools and on Maori Television of a state wide or state-centric kind. Or they might simply be people who live with a respect for but not a high involvement with the state. Non Maori in the Te Maataawai official literature are an invisible set in the contrivance of the house if you like. Maori and non Maori also might be sitting together in the house but engaged on the internet through their devices and relating to matters outside of the house.

In the literature generally and in the document discussed here there is a sense of iwi as natural or proper speakers of te reo. This is augmented in some ways by the meaning of the word Maori which means natural as in natural to the land to take the example of wai Maori, fresh water. In terms of the Ze part of ZePA a lot of Zero people coming now to learn the language are without iwi bearings so to speak.

Normalisation across the nation in Zepa theory is discussed below and may be a critical factor in language revitalisation. Is this normalisation to a dialect, say to the most competitive dialect or is it normalisation to a synthetic language that uses a diversity of dialects and influences from the academy, Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Maori, the Maori Language Commission?

We might look at the work of Caroline Bacciu (2016) in her paper *Area-bound linguistic identities in Sardinia - An educational grammar proposal* where she suggests:

The UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger states the Sardinian varieties logudorese, campidanese and Italian based gallurese as of definitely endangered vitality. Italian as the dominant language with respect to Sardinian increasingly invades informal communication spaces where usually Sardinian is spoken. The standardization attempt (2006), the normative written grammar LSC is applied, at most, in official publications. Until today no overall educational textbook based on LSC grammar for all dialects has been proposed: a supraregional grammar is of vital importance. Based on the structural linguistic divergence between the dialects and the historically constructed area-specific linguistic identities, I will present an educational proposal that takes into account the areas and their respective linguistic and cultural particularities. In order to embrace the (re)learning of Sardinian it is necessary to bring the educational tool into line with the cultural practices of the Logudoro, the Campidano and the Gallura area.

The search for a major dialect to take as a paradigm began, perhaps, with the missionaries who spoke of Ngapuhi as the 'Attic of the North'. Regarding Maori as spoken across Eastern Polynesia in New Zealand the area situation has become national to a considerable extent and matters of dialect have synthesised to a degree while Maori remains localised, island by island in the Cook Islands and elsewhere.

In New Zealand the development of Te Maataawai over the last few years would seem to relate to bringing the educational tool into line with cultural practice. Te Maataawai is just a step away from bringing education into the fold of media. Once that happens then there is a breaking of 'area bound' situation and a strictly defined national language situation.

Te Maataawai notwithstanding, many speakers, especially young speakers and perhaps especially non-Maori speakers get a lot of their reo off the net. In some cases this replaces going to a koroua or kuia, an elder from a specific tribe with a specific dialect. Can we now speak of a 'dianet' that replaces a locale based dialect? Could it be the case that net-based language will supersede 'area-bound' situations?

We can find contrasting examples of state involvement in the language. As noted above Cook Island Maori possibly with comparable differences to those between North Island and Waipounamu Maori is outside of the Crown-Maori relationship, outside of the whare so to speak, as are other Eastern Polynesian languages.

Also outside of the houses, outside Maihi Karauna and Maihi Maori is the net. Is there an argument about those grammatical forms of a language which survive and thrive on the internet and are there any

lessons of kinds of English that do better than others on the net? Later the success of English in Bahrain at the expense of Arabic is discussed with a view to how Maori might survive and grow in the context of New Zealand.

Note that in the policy document there is silence generally about the net especially its openness. There is something of a contrivance that we are all in the same boat or house in New Zealand. Note also that there is no mention of age grade or gender both of which are discussed later.

What happens when there is no family and little government support or where both are somehow misplaced? We might look to Elyse Ritchey. The title of her 2016 talk is *The promise and limits of civil society organisations in language revitalisation: The case of Occitan* and she argues:

The major instruments used to describe language endangerment and vitality are based in large part on domains of language usage in society (Fishman 1981, Euromosaic 1996, UNESCO 2003). I take a new approach to the metric of domains by applying it to a corpus composed of contemporary public discourse in southern France. In this corpus, which I developed, I identify the domains to which Occitan language and culture are linked. A major finding of the study is that the majority of references to Occitan involve the domain of associations and clubs active in local cultural life. This tendency reflects the paucity of family transmission of Occitan as well as the marginal role of governmental support. It also indicates that Occitan is esteemed as a symbol of local identity, but that its persistence is highly dependent on a fragmentary network of volunteers. My study thus demonstrates the unique place of *la vie associative* in French life and sheds light on the promise and fragility of that domain's role in language revitalization.

The equivalence to clubs in New Zealand might be Kapa Haka groups at least to begin with. In the last fifty years there has been something of a professionalisation of the administration at least of Kapa Haka competitions. Then there are the organisations like Ratana and the Kingitanga which carry the *reo*. The *whanau*, extended family, or *hapu*, sub-tribe, might be seen in this context to be or to be like language clubs. Generally there is a need to figure out exactly how such groups might help in endangered language situations. One way forward is, of course, to recognise such groups as bearers, standard bearers of *te reo* and to appraise and encourage strategic language planning that includes clubs and societies.

There is something of a glitch here where the emphasis in New Zealand seems to have gone straight to the state and missed the community. The last decade in particular has seen the emergence of the monolith of Te Maataawai and a state wide policy formulation evinced in Appendix One rather than a variegated policy situation with different strokes for different folks in different clubs and societies.

Later it is suggested that individuals, especially those who might be called key speakers, are broadcasters. But groups of speakers are critical and the idea of internet groups or sites as clubs or societies might well come into play here. In this way we might talk of broadcast sites in *te reo* and evaluate them in terms of hits and interaction and seek appropriate funding. Obviously the difficulty with dependence on individuals, as shown in the episode of Black Mirror referred to later, is that the individual may become exhausted or somehow run out of puff.

Coming back to *maihi* and the *whakatauaiki* cited above note also that when *tuwatawata* are brought in then we have fences or walls. These are possibly constraints. In an interesting paper about Sorbia (Dolowy-Rybinska and Ratajczak, 2018) the idea of walls, at least of a conceptual kind, is discussed. The paper considers people gathering to dance and sing in Sorbian and argues that because non-Sorbians are encouraged to learn but not to speak the language there is an issue with the recruitment of new speakers.

How does the speaker-singer distinction work in New Zealand?

The *Te Reo* channel with its Kapa Haka emphasis is language performance rather than, or at least as much as language communication and it might be called the singing station even. *Te Teepu*, the round table talk show, is a matter of affirmation more than radical debate. We might note the blandness of television in the New Zealand context generally where people have been stopped from entering country to talk on national television.

When it comes to singing anthems one might ask who is at Zero, at Ze to use the symbols of Zepa, in New Zealand when all- all children at least- sing the national anthem in Maori as they learn it at school and all who listen repeatedly to that anthem at rugby or national occasions are beyond zero one might think?

Understanding anthems in the context of language revitalisation may be important. Kapa Haka itself is something of a set of anthems. There is, at least, the hanging of a performance on points- intros, outros introductory or concluding *waiata* or other points that are anthemic. Karen Mazer and Ken Foote's work on memorialisation is important here (*cf* Cleave 2014). The anthems are key memorial points in an epistemic positioning process.

It might be suggested in the Sorbian context that the non Sorbs who are confined to singing are between Zero and Passive and are in a ZeP situation, stuck in a kind of language limbo between Ze and P while those Sorbs who sing and speak might well be in a full ZePA situation. Coming back to New

Zealand the singing point might be the point of entrapment in a ZeP situation as it is for non Sorbs in Sorbia but it might also be a key to unlock a ZePA situation.

Do we sing to avoid speaking at times? And are these two different forms of lip? Where might such considerations put us on the ZePA continuum? If singing is a kind of language comfort zone then we could see it in ZePA terms and also, perhaps as an early point in an epistemic positioning which runs into affirmation as people move from singing to speaking. With the language affirmation shows on Maori Television where people converse in a bubble so to speak there is the entry to a more fully blown epistemic positioning. Similar comments might be made of shows in English such as those on Fox News. We might have to have a hard look at television itself as a medium and ask, following Postman (1985) whether it is a useful media at all.

It may be that we could go further than Postman and suggest that television has the capacity to lock in an epistemic position as people talk in panels or singularly to themselves. With the application process as in the Appendix One and the two house-ZePA frame of discourse there is a more sharply defined epistemic position. It may be that television offers the chance to pitch to a catcher with known moves so that the two-house-ZePA framework is easily or, at least, readily reflected back on a facile kind of a media path or street.

Can we see an emphasis on singing, especially the singing of religious songs or songs within an epistemic grid as an ideological matter that often happens in language revitalisation contexts where culture is at threat and affirmation might be seen as critical? Singing usually involves listeners or spectators at a concert and often in group singing situations these positions are almost interchangeable. This is language participation at a group level in a Passive mode if the ZePA model is followed.

What really goes on with language revitalisation and singing? There are traditional singing programmes on Irish TV *Abair Amhran* tg4 and *Moteatea* Maori Television (Lysacht 21). These might be related to the Sorbian situation.

One impression, again following Postman, is that this is easy money for the TV crews. As an example, for some years and ongoing I do continuity work in *te reo* at Kapa Haka events as part of my job for a Maori radio station and these are often attended by Maori Television producers, cameramen and the team on the bus that come to get a Kapa Haka event on tape. There are no interviews of people done its just a matter of getting the cameras in place and passively taking the feed for three hours or more of an event and then loosely editing that for the *Te Reo* television channel. In terms of language extension this is content for jam. How much work are the crew doing themselves in and about *te reo*? Blindly taking the feed without consideration, analysis or critical review seems to be the order of the day.

This takes us to the epistemic positioning involved which is appreciative and supportive. The question is whether passive appreciation fires the brain to engage in spirited debate. Is the singing business a matter of being comfortable, Passive with a capital P after ZePA? Perhaps television takes us into a comfort zone, essentially passive that is not, or at least not necessarily good for language revitalisation. The question is whether there are too many passive supports in the EL situation. Admittedly in many cases there will not be enough but comfort zones will surely not yield as much as language challenges like debates fiery and otherwise and everyday interchanges.

How are speakers trapped in the Passive area? It may happen in religious or spiritual contexts when they are concerned about making mistakes. If you only hear *te reo* at *tangi* and in formal oratory or at church or in a context of recitation this, the religiosity factor if you like, may be a reason for language entrapment or containment. It may be that outside of a given locale people feel shy or *whakamaa*. It may be the way people are taught, it may be that people are taught to recite, sing or to listen rather than to just yahoo on about things.

In a Passive situation all is scripted, everyone knows what happens next. There are no surprises and performance work in Kapa Haka conforms to this. By contrast, in the continuity work the trick is to keep it tight but to take the mickey where it is found, again keeping it light. You do not need to get into attack mode or any kind of direct opposition but it is vital to keep it bright as well as light and that might mean a little sting with the bling at least as an option so the epistemic positioning is a kind of play in a language radar where you follow the *reo* where it obviously takes you at the same time staying in the ideological zone so to speak. Can we see all this in the ZePA model? To move right along the spectrum one might have to be able to play in, to play with as well as to follow a script.

A general caution about language endangerment might be to note also the influence of the overall economic situation in language revitalisation. In an interesting and important paper Ben Ó Ceallaigh (2018) talks about Irish language policy ten years after the financial crash:

The dramatic consequences of the economic crisis which began in Ireland in 2008 have been frequently discussed over the last decade. In spite of this, the implications of the state's far-reaching austerity measures for Irish language policy, have, to date, remained absent from such discussions – despite the linguistic crisis currently facing Irish-speaking communities. This paper will attempt to rectify this deficit by examining how the recession provided the state with an opportunity to radically reform its language policies. I will discuss the cuts to Irish language organisations, which were hit much harder by austerity than comparable English language institutions and contend that this is due to the neoliberal opposition to “culturalist” endeavours such as language revitalisation. I will argue that key policies like the 20-year Strategy for Irish and

the Gaeltacht Act 2012 can too be seen as products of the neoliberal paradigm, deeply unsuitable for their declared purposes. Referring to literature on both RLS and public policy studies, I will demonstrate what Ireland can teach us about the challenges neoliberal policy regimes present for RLS efforts, a topic of relevance to minoritised language communities throughout the developed west and beyond.

What happens to Maori language in times of an economic downturn? Do we have research on that? Or do we have a situation in New Zealand in contrast to other areas of language endangerment where the economic situation of the government agencies is to be trusted as compared say to the 'clubs' the voluntary associations where the economic circumstances may sometimes be precarious. And do we have here the reason for the emphasis on *Maihi Karauna*? For many years the assumption has been that *iwi* were economically dispossessed by the Crown and that the language as a *taonga* taken away by colonisation is the responsibility of the state, a kind of debt owed by the state to the language. To listen to and proceed from what *O Ceallagh* is saying, how does neo liberalism work with language in the New Zealand context and elsewhere out of Ireland?

Should language revitalisation be as certain as death and taxes?

This paper looks at setting language revitalisation goals, knowing how they might be constrained and what to do when things change. It is suggested that we need to look deeply and critically at the cup, the body of policy and thought about language as we speak. In the last half century things certainly have changed. We could go back and broadly look at policy directions in education. In 1970 there was almost no Maori taught in New Zealand schools while in 2020 chances are, if the Greens get their way, Maori will be compulsory in schools. Fifty years ago there were different constraints and different goals in Maori language education. What have been the constraints and what has happened when things changed?

In terms of the lip we could look at speakers and ask whether proportionately more people spoke Maori in the 1970s than now. With that in mind we might consider how an attitude of 'catch up' might now pervade policy decisions in language revitalisation in certain respects and whether this has been the case over the fifty year period. This is pointed out in the document in Appendix One which refers to *Te Paepae Motuhake*, a study conducted earlier by *Te Puni Kokiri*.

But all this is extremely complex in some ways. For example-and without getting into detail because such would be outside the scope of this paper but asking readers to follow up if interested- if we took the estimations at contact of Maori population in the South Island and compared that number to the numbers there speaking Maori now my 'guesstimate' is that the latter would exceed the former. If so how could *Te Reo Maori* be called an endangered language in that area?

In the media there are huge differences between 1970 and the present day with Maori radio, Maori television and so forth. Between 1970 and 2020 there is a shift, to take a word, from one or two state based media outlets for the Maori Language to over twenty five Maori language radio stations and two television stations as well as what is happening on the internet which was not there at all fifty years ago. The lip has shifted into the media over the half century.

With any kind of policy it is important to define the elements involved. In many if not most policy statements Maori language policy works in terms of the Maori population. This has, to date been a fairly reliable element but after several decades of development in nationally available media like Maori Television and the prospect of compulsory education for people of all ethnic groups it may be that policy suggestions, statements and plans extend to a wider possible set of ethnic identities.

Part of this situation is the definition of the Maori language as an official national language, a national treasure so to speak. The word normalisation is used in Appendix One. There may be two, at least, definitions of 'normalisation' as used in the document. One is that for Maori people they will not feel abnormal in speaking Maori. Another is that Maori becomes a national, normally accepted language in New Zealand.

In an interesting and important discussion of Maori and Irish television *Lysaght* (2010) talks about normalisation:

Whether 'normalised' on screen as a fact of life (carrying the danger of minimising real inequalities and discrepancies between lipservice and community usage) or reified as valuable in itself (which may lead to lacklustre translations of tired cultural material to the screen, as it is assumed that the audience will watch for the language and not for the content) a (minority) national indigenous language in the context of a mediascape dominated by a majority language is problematic for both producers and for viewers. A television station broadcasting in this language engages, willingly or not, with ideological issues such as nationality, identity and belonging...The word 'normalise' might imply that the language has become sub-, ab-, or super-normal. The idea of normalising the already normal (as indeed is the literal meaning of the word Maori) is bizarre.

When considering normalisation and locale, we may be thinking of the national language and the local language. This takes us to issues of transmission. Martin Kohlberger (2018) talks about this in a paper entitled *Revitalising endangered knowledge: Insights from the Shiwiar Nation*. Kohlberger argues:

Since the early 1990s, language endangerment and revitalisation has increasingly been a concern in the field of linguistics. Although most of the attention has been given highly endangered languages, this presentation showcases the urgency of revitalisation even in cases where the language itself continues to be used vigorously by a community, but where cultural and ethnolinguistic knowledge is being rapidly lost by younger generations. The Shiwiar language is spoken by around 1,200 people in the lowlands of eastern Ecuador and northern Peru. Although Shiwiar communities are multilingual, the Shiwiar language is the primary language in all Shiwiar villages, and it continues to be transmitted to younger generations. Nevertheless, despite the vitality of the language, missionisation and integration with the broader Ecuadorean society have brought on a rapid change of lifestyle which has almost completely halted the transmission of traditional knowledge to younger generations. The realisation that this knowledge is becoming critically endangered has alarmed the community, and many Shiwiar people are now exploring ways in which this knowledge can be documented and preserved. This case study will address the revitalisation of traditional prayers and incantations (anent), knowledge of flora and fauna (including an avoidance register used for hunting), and toponymy.

Is the effort to preserve in step with the effort to normalise? This might apply to the Te Reo channel as distinct from Maori Television with the former seeking to preserve and the latter to normalise. Transmission of the esoteric or transmission of normal speech? The two station approach does have a value in that the Te Reo station normalises traditional knowledge forms as well as the language used in those contexts while Maori Television normalises communication more generally speaking. These questions are addressed in the discussions of mind and language below.

Nowhere is the gap between traditional knowledge and language transmission more clearly seen than on the net away from the marae. On the net the communication proceeds between individuals in the main rather than between groups although the latter does happen. Interaction on the maare is usually on a group to group basis on the marae as well as in the wharenuui, the meeting house where tangata whenua, the locals interact with manuhiri, visitors. Group support is also important in both places as people sing songs in support at the end of speeches.

The sense of locale is heightened by language, by dialect, by local history and mythology. Local proverbs and metaphor become something of a canon. We might say that there is a corpus of words that functions to illuminate a body of identity. In the endangered language context, especially where there is some geographical differences involved there is a familiar problem when this corpus of words, this body of identity is subsumed or apparently subsumed by a nationwide or supralocal language authority like Te Taura Whiri o te Reo or even by textbooks that suggest priorities in choice of terms. Citation of work by Dale who talks about the Stalinisation of the language in the 1990s at the beginning of this essay and by Trinick in the Conclusion show the feeling of educationalists about this.

This distinction between the specific language of the locale and the generalised language across locales may be a critical bind in the study of endangered languages. This may be also the cutting edge of language bureaucracy, or to take Moon's (2017) term, 'Sovietisation' as the control of the language as it moves beyond a specific locale takes on a sense of power and direction that might not have a lot to do with the way the language is actually spoken.

If we turn again to the ZePA classification, is an Active speaker necessarily conversant with tauraspeak? Would that speaker know that Paraire and Raamere mean the same thing, Friday, along with a couple of dozen or more key words for, say, the months of the year, the days of the week the word for tweeting *etcetera*? If not, in the case if a tribal person from, say, the Bay of Plenty, someone who might otherwise be called a 'native speaker' should we say that person is an Active speaker or should we begin to divide up the Active category into those that tend to local speech and say Paraire for Friday and to those who follow the supranational, follow Te Taura Whiri i te Reo and say Raamere? And then there is the third set of speakers, those that alternate between the two and play with the terms.

To return to the subject of singing does singing offer a way to normalise the endangered language? If so, and if singing offers a kind of comfort trap where people are stuck in a passive language and culturally affirmative position, is this kind of normalisation helpful for language revitalisation? To what extent are people singing archaic language forms not used usually when having a yarn in the pub or when otherwise playing with words?

When it comes to normalisation, authenticity, so called, may be an issue. Who are the 'authentic' community of speakers, people who really speak the language and what do they say? It is possible to say that all speakers are authentic and Moon (2017) may be getting at this when he complains about the emphasis on pronunciation. The attention to pronunciation may be keeping people in the Passive zone in terms of Zepa, trapping them as listeners in a hyper-conscious way to their own reo as well as that of others. Many now speak a polyglot of dialects and might be accused of not speaking an authentic tribal dialect.

One problem is that new plays are required in the polyglot situation. In the locale there is a corpus or word-list, a canon if you like. Every speaker in the locale knows what is or might be coming most or

a great deal of the time. Speech is reliable, trustworthy. The corpus is a body more than a list, is an ethos. Playing with the canon's style, wit and taste in jokes in comforts of one kind or another makes the language like an old and comfortable slipper, the language is home. But in the supranational or polyglot situation language is as away, at a remove and speakers are, in this sense, visitors. How do new plays, new language comforts occur at the supralocal level?

How do we help one another to speak in playful, humorous and comfortable ways? When it comes to some of the differences in the New Zealand context the 'powerful neighbour' thesis of Hawkey discussed below is interesting. We might think of people in the Ze area as less powerful neighbours of the Passive people and they being less powerful in language terms than the Active people. Going back the other way how do the more powerful help the less? We might think about this thesis in terms of the locales of North and South Islands in New Zealand where the North is clearly the more powerful in terms of Te Reo? We might also think of the gap between genders with women being the powerful neighbours.

In 2016 James Hawkey (Bristol) spoke about *Collaborative cross-border curricula: The design and implementation of bilingual and immersion Catalan education programs in France*:

The traditionally Catalan-speaking area of Northern Catalonia has been part of France since 1659, and as such, has been subject to a great number of assimilatory language policies in favour of French over the last two centuries. However, may the tide be turning? The last decade has seen a massive growth in Catalan language bilingual and immersion education programs in the region. Figures from 2014 reveal that 3,116 students follow some form of Catalan language education (with more than 100 refused access due to lack of resources), which accounts for approximately 4% of school-age children in Northern Catalonia (Gorrand 2014). Although maybe not impressive at first glance, this represents a fourfold increase over the past fifteen years (Becat i Rajaut, 2000: 27; Le Bihan and Rull, 2005: 68), and recent language attitudes data (Hawkey, forthcoming) attests to a heightened level of awareness of Catalan-medium language education in Northern Catalonia. Catalan language programs in the region are designed and implemented with a great deal of collaboration from just over the border in Catalonia. Links between the two traditionally Catalan-speaking territories take many forms – teacher training, provision of materials, promotion of cultural events etc. This presentation will examine the collaborative nature of curriculum design in Northern Catalonia. When a language variety (in this case, Catalan) is endangered in one territory (Northern Catalonia), but not in a neighbouring one (Catalonia), how can the latter help the former? To what extent is having a 'powerful neighbour' a useful weapon in the fight for the preservation of an endangered language variety?

With the advent of the Maori Language Commission in 1987 policy direction began to be coordinated at least at a reporting level and on an informing basis whereby Te Taura Whiri i te Reo came to inform other state agencies how the language might best be spoken. In a sense Te Taura Whiri became the 'powerful neighbour' to other state agencies. We might ask about the road to hell being paved with good intentions and make other wisecracks about so called good neighbours, we could refer to Dale's Stalinisation of the language in the 1990s (*op cit.*) essentially at the hands of Te Taura Whiri but the other side of the good or powerful neighbour thesis is whether the other neighbour does or does not want help.

During the last half century many words have been found again or coined as a matter of national Maori language policy. At the same time some words, sometimes words that might be often used are not taken up. One thinks again of names coined for days of the week and for the months. The former seem to have been taken up more than the latter. As discussed below the speaker will often use several words including the taura whiri words in a kind of language smorgasbord. This, it is argued later, can be an attractive and for those involved in public speaking to disparate groups a necessary language feature. State agency in the form of Te Taura Whiri, Te Mangai Paho and Te Maataawai and their policies have become cultural matter, have given words for speakers to play with as they see fit.

Obviously, speakers from one area will take their language with them and this will influence the way te reo is spoken elsewhere, possibly on a nation-wide basis- reading the news on the radio or on Maori Television perhaps. The language of one locale is being taken to another or possibly to the supralocal. If the language of the locale is sacrosanct how effective and how appropriate is this relocation of the lip?

What is the role of Te Taura Whiri in terms of cup and/or lip? Is the focus on forming policy or chasing the way the language is actually being spoken. Or both? Which is more appropriate in language revitalisation? What kind of mind is sought, a base mind that will accept transliterations or a sophisticated mind, to take a phrase, that inclines to commission words? What kind of epistemic position, one that stays close to the street usage or one that harks back to the traditional, the traditional so called let's say. This is seen in the case of synthetic words like the one for Monday, Rahina which, as mentioned earlier, is a made up word with ra being the day and hina being the moon following, one might argue, the English for a shortened Moonday. With nothing like this connection in traditional Maori society the word Rahina is a Taura Whiri conceit, a synthetic sophistication, if you like.

How fluid has the speech community been regarding changed goals as set by state agencies in the last fifty years? How fluid might be the potential speech community be in the half century to come? More importantly, how fluid does the speech community need to be in language revitalisation in an endangered language situation? To contextualise the last question, how fluid does the society need to

be to allow right shifting using Te Taura Whiri words along the ZePA continuum? By contrast we might ask how fixed the community might need to be regarding a so-called traditional word substituted for a transliteration. In short we might ask how fixed or fluid must a language be to survive?

In 2017, with the establishment of Te Maataawai as an overall umbrella for language policy and a monitor of practice matters of policy and practice were set to change. The reasons for setting up Te Maataawai were because of the gap between cup and lip, between theory and reality and messes at both ends, policy and practice. Too many organisations going in too many different directions. Under the umbrella of Te Maataawai we have Te Mangai Paho now operating and a consolidation and an intensification of the policy seen in the document listed in Appendix One.

We might ask how clear does Maori language policy have to be in order to ensure language survival? This question is important in New Zealand where the last fifty years has seen firstly something of a policy drift where separate institutions of state like Te Mangai Paho, Maori Broadcasting and Te Taura Whiri i te Reo were going their respective ways and this gave way to the last five to ten years as Te Maataawai has developed to include both and other bodies in a highly centralised system with, at least on the face of it, a streamlined, single minded policy machine.

The cup, the well of thought on where to go has become, one might think, more clearly defined and organised in a fairly strictly defined template that is fairly clear to see in Appendix One. Where there was formerly a mad set of crockery there is now a single bowl. It is suggested below that this is something of a grid. How helpful is the tooling of policy into a rigid structure? Does such clarity of policy offer pitfalls as well as progress? Is, simply put, language a messy business best served with assorted containers from a loosely organised assemblage of things to sup from?

While this paper is entitled cup and lip there is also a matter of lip service to consider. Is the phrase 'normalisation across the nation' in the document in Appendix One as a matter of tax payers dollars being involved or is it for real? Is the use of language commission words a kind of lip service to the politically correct, 'traditional' or 'synthetically traditional', to posit something of a contradiction, world?

To take a word from Ireland, does normalisation, however it might happen, put the 'crack' into the language or take it out? In a supranational, translocal situation how is humour found and what are the cultural underpinnings of humour. In the Maori case is a kanohi to kanohi, face to face situation with a whanaunga, a relative, the home of humour? On television the sitcom with standard gags, canned laughter and applause and the like offers a very different cultural template, the internet being another form of communication perhaps, a depersonalised way of communication away from a face to face situation. Even if, at a remove though, the net offers a chance of reply, of interaction.

What has happened in other countries with normalisation? Two other examples are offered, one where the 'wrong' ethnic group have taken up or are being asked to take up the language and the other where normalisation or standardisation has caused a rift or at least a distinction with variants in this locale or that. The first is from Sorbia. Nicole Dołowy-Rybińska and Cordula Ratajczak (2018) in their paper *Upper Sorbian language (re)vitalization through education: When revitalization strategies disregard the community's internal language maintenance policy*:

Upper Sorbs are a Slavic minority living in Germany with approx. 12,000 speakers of the language. They are divided within their community, i.e. on the basis of religion. The Catholic Upper Sorbs have maintained the intergenerational transmission of the language, and their identity is based on the interrelation between language use, participation in religious life, and tradition. Most of the Upper Sorbian Protestants shifted to German. Therefore, the Catholic Upper Sorbs perceive themselves as 'real' Sorbs and – despite the decreasing number of speakers in their community – their strategy of language maintenance is through isolating themselves linguistically and culturally from Germans in order to keep the Sorbian community stable. In the interim, with forward thinking, the top-down policy of an increase in new Sorbian speakers through education has been launched with bilingual education for non-native speakers. This paper discusses the conflicting situation when the institutional minority language revitalization strategy (in this case through education) does not fit the internal and intuitive community's language maintenance policy.

The second is from Ireland. Eileen Coughlan (2018) in her paper, *'It'll keep the Irish going, like': Attitudes to language revitalisation policies among Irish-speaking teenagers* where she argues:

A distinctive characteristic of the Irish state's language policy is its distinction between 'Gaeltacht' areas, where Irish remains the main language of daily life for many, and the rest of the country, where English is the main community language. This paper explores attitudes towards language revitalisation policies among students in two Irish-medium secondary schools, one located in the Gaeltacht and one outside it, based on ethnographic fieldwork. The education system is the primary focus of language revitalisation activities in Ireland, as in many other contexts. It is, therefore, particularly important to understand teenagers' attitudes to language revitalisation efforts, since they are more affected by language revitalisation policy than adults and are more concerned than younger students with language as a means of identity construction and rebellion. The Gaeltacht school encourages the use of Irish rather than enforcing it, while the non-Gaeltacht school strictly forbids the use of English. There is significant disagreement among students in both schools over whether school policies promote the use of Irish and the type of Irish they promote. In the Gaeltacht school, students argue for the importance of their local dialect, while many of the non-Gaeltacht students are proud to speak a 'modern', non-local variety of Irish.

Something of this may also be seen in Torsten Dörflinger's (2018) *Language planning and the Gaeltacht - The case of County Donegal*. He argues:

Since the establishment of the Irish State, official government policy with regard to the Irish language has aimed at both language maintenance and revival. While official census figures have shown an increase in language competence ever since, a closer look on the figures reveals that not even 80.000 people use Irish on a daily basis. Additionally, there is a dramatic decline in the language use in Gaeltacht areas, accompanied by the fear that Irish will soon cease to exist as the ordinary means of communication. At the same time, the passing of the Gaeltacht Act 2012 presents an additional challenge to these communities. Local planning committees were founded and given the responsibility of developing their own strategies to save Irish. This presentation offers an evaluation of the language situation in the Donegal Gaeltacht. Data was derived from multiple sources – interviews with language activists and language planning authorities as well as findings from a recent survey with schoolchildren – for the purpose of providing a thick description of the research subject. It might lead to a better understanding of the dynamics of language maintenance and shift as well as to a depiction of the consequences for the larger political and societal setting.

The suggestion above is that with more state involvement, possibly with the fall off of local dialect and the ascent of a synthetic, nation-wide language, a language outside of the locale, at a remove from the locale, the language declines despite and, in some respects, because of state involvement along with the move to the supra national. Perhaps in New Zealand there may be lip service to iwi but not much attention to following te reo, how the language is being spoken by iwi members. How much happens within Maori Television or even Maori radio which is meant to be grounded at the iwi level, how much happens that is strictly within dialect? How much control do dialect speakers have on the direction of the language? How much might be learned by iwi as well as by language analysts from the case of County Donegal?

Coming back to Dolowys Rybinka's phrase, 'the community's internal language policy' this is especially important in traditionally Maori speaking districts such as in the Kingitanga where the Poukai round of meetings and the Ringatu with the Twelfths. These gatherings involve 'internal language maintenance'. Are people, in the ZePA frame of reference, being right shifted into these internal systems or into supralocal language and so being shifted away from source, so to speak?

There are issues of covert and overt aspects. Te Reo was and still is in some respects from the POV of the state an outlaw language and this particularly applies to the language of the so called rebel groups, Te Kingitanga and the Ringatu as well as that of the Taranaki prophets. Te Reo as found in Te Maataawai is a government language, an overtly stated language. To return to the expression, 'te reo me ona ahuatanga' it is the things that go with the talk that matter to some speakers and one thinks with a proposed transition to the supralocal, national language of Te Maataawai especially as found in Maihi Karauna of the idea of a decommissioned language as is mentioned in the Irish context.

The idea of decommissioning or deweaponising the language evokes a number of thoughts some from traditional lore as with:

*He tao rakau e taea,
He tao kii e kore e taea*

A shaft of wood may be parried but nor a shaft of words, of the tongue. How was and is the language commissioned in traditional terms? Accentuating all this and possibly complicating matters is the emphasis on following te kawa o te marae which varies from area to area and illustrates what is meant with te reo me ona ahuatanga. There is the kawa o te whare as well inside the meeting house including specific karakia and the Rauna Tapu, the way the round of korero or speech making works inside the house. Given the emphasis on this type of thing in Maori Studies and Anthropology as well as in the school systems there may well be something of a local drag to the shift to the supra local. Having said that, perhaps the direction of language revitalisation ought to be in the direction of local ritual rather than into the pan-tribal, multi-ethnic ether.

One can see the attempt to ground the language in the world view of the iwi in a workshop taken by Neihana Jacobs at the endangered language conference at Cambridge in 2016.

This workshop looks at how the Māori (Indigenous Peoples of New Zealand) language, concepts and World view can be included and implemented into a Business Management degree programme. Between 1996 and 2014, the proportion of the Māori population able to converse in Māori decreased from 25.0 percent to 20.3 percent. Between 2006 and 2014, the proportion of Māori able to converse in Te Reo Māori increased only among those aged 65 and over. In all other age groups, the proportion of Māori able to converse in Te Reo Māori declined (Smith, 2015). To avoid undermining both the degree qualification and Māori world view, this presentation looks at a few examples of how this may be achieved. This area of focus is in response to the continual request by external monitors and internal curriculum advisors of how Māori learners are catered for and how we are insuring that the Māori world view is recognised. Language is intrinsic to expressing and sustaining culture as a means of communicating values, beliefs, and customs. As the

indigenous culture of New Zealand, Māori culture is unique to New Zealand and forms a fundamental part of the national identity. Māori language is central to Māori culture and an important aspect of cultural participation and identity (Walker, 1995). The response was to investigate ideas and examples of how the integration of the Māori world view into the prescribed learning outcomes while recognising the limitations of lecturers in Māori concepts.

Regarding state involvement in projecting world view we might turn to Moon's idea of 'Sovietisation' (Moon, 2017) along with Dale's idea of 'Stalinisation' (ibid) and look at the fact that most broadcasting, to take an example, runs on the advertising dollar and English is the medium required in most if not all cases. The problem then is how do minority languages like Maori get funding? The answer is through state funding with the strings that apply to taxpayer dollars first off. Then there is the matter of qualifying for state money in the Treaty of Waitangi context in the case of New Zealand but not Cook Islands Maori. So immediately criteria are set up that are not directly to do with the actual reo but to do with who speaks it, who should speak it and, according to the state, what they say and after Dale's Stalinisation of the language in the 1990s by way of Te Taura Whiri I te Reo Maori, the words they use. This might not lead, as Moon suggests, to Sovietisation but it might map the path.

Sovietisation is the recognition of identity and the politically correct way to express it before the recognition of competence. When one thinks of, say the rules and regulations around broadcasting in Maori, Te Mangai Paho Te Maataawai Te Taura Whiri etc and the relative freedom that a talk show host might have in a popular radio show the Sovietisation idea takes some form. Taking up a patter, running a light critique or even a heavy one, playing with words all take a back seat to toeing a line.

We might view 'Sovietisation' as a matter of agreed and shared memory with a nod at earlier work on memorialisation (cf Cleave, Mazer, Foote etc. in Cleave, 2015). This is history running acceptable lines with normalisation of an ideology more than or at least as much as normalising a grammar or a set of vocabulary points. We might be speaking of the normalisation of a corpus of ideas as well as a canon of a corpus of words and grammatical points; a set of acceptable memorialisations spoken and thought.

Are such memorialisations in the EL context a kind of voyeurism and do things blur into a distanced, romanticised past? In this situation do the language citizens live in a partial feel-good relation to their language estate? And might this be worsened in cases of severe and creeping institutionalisation as with Te Maataawai in the New Zealand context? Is this a kind of scopophilia as discussed below?

An emphasis on Article Two in the Treaty of Waitangi, of acceptance of such distinctions of Maihi Karauna and Maihi Maori, even acceptance of ZePA as a convention all contribute to a way of thought about language as they do to a way of memory and a way of language experience in shared metaphorical terms. Staying with scopophilia for a moment it has been defined in the Encyclopedia of Identity (Jackson and Hogg 2010):

Scopophilia is mostly related to Jacques Lacan's notion of the gaze. However, Sigmund Freud first introduced the concept in 1905 in his Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality. Scopophilia refers to the pleasure of looking as well as the pleasure of being looked at. It therefore has both voyeuristic and exhibitionistic, as well as narcissistic, overtones. Freud believed the child's looking is motivated by an inquisitive and curious desire to look at forbidden body parts and functions that foreshadow fantasies concerning phallic (masculine) desire.

The idea of a gaze where there is an exhibition and a looking upon resonates with the argument on memorialisation and other matters. The word scopophilia has been associated with sexuality via Freud and I argue that that connection is important but not necessary. Others might like to take that up but here it seems useful to consider the idea of scopophilia as a way that people are caught up in an alternative world as actors and observers, actors and spectators in shared, particular experience. This might be especially true when the audience and participants in the endless Kapa Haka on the Te Reo station are considered, as they engage in the shared, 'secret' and to some extent sacrosanct world of an endangered language and the culture associated with it.

How else do we explain the expressions of 'buzz' and 'crack' when people in New Zealand speak of 'getting a buzz' from Kapa Haka or people in Ireland speak of the crack of the old language properly spoken?

But then again why don't people just yahoo along and say what pops into their heads instead of learning and presenting formally? In the Kapa Haka situation there is a combination of sonic and vocal, visual and mimetic cues approved by committee of judges. This is language driven from on high in that what the judges say matters more, perhaps, than basic communication. Meantime the predator language, the 'low' road language, works point to point in a no prisoners, no frills manner. In English if it works use it, leave the quaintness of the locale in the Essex village in a fantasy memory of Maypole Dancing and the like in an occasionally revisited memory. Authenticity is in use, not in the reflection of approval through a gaze disguised to some extent as high culture or as 'appropriate'.

The general idea with regard to these questions, officially speaking at least, in answering the question 'Who sets the goals?' is that Te Taura Whiri, the Maori Language Commission and Te Maataawai the overarching structure regarding the Maori language set the goals. Another way of looking at it though is that speakers set the goals as they speak. For example from a broadcaster's point of view I set the

language goals for my show *Te Ao Whanui*. I like short clear words that people understand and my medium is radio where there are no cue cards or subtitles and you don't get a second chance. Someone else working on television with subtitles in English might have the chance to use more complex language. And have different goals along with different constraints. We can see this in, say, the simplicity or otherwise of the radio broadcaster's intros and outros,

Concentrating on the force and effect of the three minute segment on air is a focus for language revitalisation for me (Cleave 2017). But all speakers with their various ways of speaking and communicating often *via* social media are broadcasters conscious of speaking an important indigenous language distinct from the main, the predator language of English. There are new spins on old words. All Maori speakers are setting goals as they choose to use Mane or Rahina for Monday or tuiti or tihau for tweet or whether both words are to be used. Language revival is a natural communicative and aesthetic process in personal speech at least as much as it is a state sponsored matter.

To expand on the example of the word tweet, tihau is the Taura Whiri word and on the radio I have found that you also need to use the word tuiti, the transliteration as well. These represent epistemic positioning. When you use the word tihau you are locking into the politically correct world whereas when you use tuiti you are, perhaps in the land of the language lout as mentioned above. In Guernsey there is said (Sallabank *ibid*) to be epistemic positioning that works so that the occasional French word is OK and the occasional English word is not.

Speakers position themselves as they speak, revealing their identity as they do so.

As pointed out in a recent article (Cleave 2018) talking Maori dolls show the use of AI in te reo. The dolls are also broadcasters and their designers are setting language goals in ways comparable, perhaps, to those mentioned above. As discussed below when we have doll to doll or machine to machine communication in the internet of things a new scenario opens up perhaps.

It might also be important to note that revitalisation is a matter of style, speed, emphasis, timing, and entertaining. This is not just a matter of new words. Language revitalisation is not just 'what' but 'how'. Nor is it just a matter of state actors and iwi actors. Curiously perhaps, I find that on the radio the use of simple words like mahi for work and the supplementing of those with a good number of manner particles as in he mahi nui, a lot of work, he mahi nui rawa, a great deal of work a very useful strategy.

The example of official goals in submission of programmes to Maori Television in the strategy document in Appendix One shows the level of integrated policy thinking involved now. Zepa theory is almost as a kind of Bible. These examples show, it is argued, the form of the policy cup. Having talked about the cup perhaps we could turn to the lip. This would involve the linguist understanding the attitudes of the speech community. How fluid or fixed might that speech community be regarding changed goals or tightened goals in the case of Te Maataawai?

Indigenous communities are sometimes conservative having suffered language colonialism and sometimes near language death or linguisticide (cf Zuckermann 2018) so innovation is something of a challenge and this, in itself, may be a constraint. The naming of the days of the week might afford an example of this kind of thing. This makes for the same tedious but potentially productive business as mentioned above about the word tweet where the Te Taura Whiri word and the transliteration both have to be included.

It is critical to have an idea of how the language is actually used and sometimes this means a play on policy words. So when speaking about a day of the week a speaker might use two definitions the commonly used Mane or the Taura Whiri word Rahina saying 'e ai ki Te Taura whiri' 'according to Te Taura Whiri' as he or she proceeds. There is an eye on the official and the accepted word to bring in yet another metaphor.

Regarding the idea of language play, the importance of language play in the endangered language situation, we could look at corpus theory and some of the things described by Meili Fang and David Nathan (2016) in their paper *Tapping the well: evaluating and adapting teaching LWC methodologies for endangered languages*:

When struggling to support endangered languages (EL) through teaching, it can be easy to assume that we can adopt tried-and-true methods used to teach languages of wider communication (LWC). However, there is no single or overarching scenario for teaching 'big' languages, and a wide range of teaching approaches are used for LWCs. Major language teaching scenarios range from first language and second language to first foreign language and second foreign language, and more. We can attempt to map appropriate and effective methods from these onto EL scenarios. While it would not only be more efficient for us not to 'reinvent the wheel', these scenarios can enliven us to the feasibility of using a range of methods, e.g. in communities with different language ecologies or where there are varieties of learner types and motivations. In this paper we will develop a schema mapping between LWC teaching approaches and various indicators in EL language situations, and describe some concrete examples where specific LWC scenarios are mapped to EL situations. Of course this approach finally raises the question: which features of EL situations

require unique methods not presently available for LWCs (and might even be of benefit for LWC pedagogy)?

You do have to work harder in the endangered language if you choose this route but Fang and Nathan's idea of mapping is useful here as speakers of endangered languages are often working in a two language context. Traversing the map of the language more widely spoken and setting that map alongside the map of the EL might be a very useful strategy. In the New Zealand Maori situation this might involve, *inter alia* consideration of the map of the iwi speaker, the map of biblical Maori and, of course, the things in the landscape right in front of the speaker.

The linguist could look at how additional members of a speech community may also be agents of linguistic change wherein new goals as well as new maps may emerge. Who are the Zero people, what do they like and how are their language needs to be best met? Who are the passive people and who are the active speakers? How might cup and lip be described in each case? Do active speakers carry more language baggage than the zero lot? How does each group like to learn and what are the constraints involved? We might turn again to epistemic design. What do new speakers want to use the language for? For restricted or extended code? To express an identity? To get a grade in school? To get a job?

Above all perhaps, we might ask the question, where are the most important pressure points across the ZePA system, at Zero, Passive or Active or in the various sub-sets of these set forth at various points in this paper? Or is the ZePA system a kind of rabbit hole, a cup of supposed shapes? We might turn to Quine as the argument about language and mind looms in the next section of the paper:

There is many a slip between subjective cup and objective lip

(W.V.O. Quine)

There is also the constraint of speaker resistance which you have with days of the week or other things sometimes on a generational basis. In many respects the resistance of speakers is the major constraint. If people don't want to use a word then they won't. The general questions are, 'Is this good for us?' or 'Is this another government trick?' Sometimes there is suspicion and strong doubt about language 'improvements' perhaps not unlike the way some might think a vaccination for illness is the cause thereof.

Are there different knowledge systems in each house, as symbolised in Maihi Karauna and Maihi Maori and does this imply different kinds of language? The language desired or even required by the Crown and the language desired by Maori might or might not be the same. This question is examined in later sections below.

The houses reflect the Treaty of Waitangi as in 1840, the Crown being seen in Article One and the iwi in Article Two. Coming back to critical differences since 1840 especially those of the last fifty years the media comes to mind. The tremendous steps in Maori radio and television and on the internet since 1970 might seem to imply a necessary presence in both houses and, perhaps, a movement away from 'in house' situations.

Informing both Maihi Maori and Maihi Karauna policies is ZePA theory, Zero- Active-Passive. This is described in the Te Mangai Paho Application document as follows:

The ZePA3 model highlights how right-shifting the position of an individual from Zero – Passive – Active can strengthen the position of the language within society. The key difference is that the emphasis is not simply on moving directly from Zero to Active. Right-shifting an individual from Zero to Passive can generate increased awareness and support for language revitalisation more broadly, and the subsequent right-shift from Passive to Active is then easier to achieve.

The notion of shift, especially what is known as right shift along the Zepa continuum is a significant part of this. In 1970 the majority of iwi members or at least a significant number spoke Maori. Fifty years later in 2020 a minority of people identifying as Maori, as, perhaps, iwi members might speak Maori. So while this is a shift forward, the shift back to a majority speaking situation makes for a *ki mua ki muri* process, a back and forth. As we sort out how language was lost there might be a need to see how it might be found, found again or found in a new shape now. Again we could come back to epistemic design especially with reference to locale on the one hand and the world outside the locale, in the diaspora or on the net on the other.

One of the problems of 'shift' and also for 'endangerment' as concepts is the numbers. Are there more or less Maori speakers today than at other times in history? The door opens to the language demographers and might be too complex an issue to deal with here but if we take the population of speakers at the end of the nineteenth century and compare them with those of today or if we take the number of Kai Tahu and other South Island based tribal speakers given the estimation of their population by Cook and others and ask of then and today about total number of speakers then the notion of 'endangerment' seems moot and relative. The shift seems to be going in various directions.

There is a criss-crossing in the Te Mangai Paho document from Maori communities to the wider nation:

More recent research has highlighted the important impact of societal ideologies, and the value and attitudes attributed to the language by society, on language revitalisation. Language values are an inherent factor of language choice amongst bilingual Māori communities. Against this background, current revitalisation strategies emphasise shifting this ideology to advance the Māori language and encourage normalisation across the nation.

Coming back to earlier quotations from the document, if the Crown is responsible for Maihi Karauna and the iwi for Maihi Maori, who is responsible for 'normalisation across the nation'? And how do we distinguish between normative and native, between normalisation and the native speaker? We might turn to the work of Dörte Borchers (2016) in the paper *Why mother tongue education in Nepal doesn't work (yet)*:

Speakers of any language of Nepal have the constitutional right to use their language in education but mother tongue education is offered only in very few schools. The language in most schools is either English or Nepali. The right to mother tongue education has been included in the country's first democratic Constitution (1990) due to political pressure by various of the countries more than 70 linguistic groups and has been an important part of the following Interim Constitution (2007) and the new Constitution of 2015. This paper provides a brief overview over the situation of mother tongue education in Nepal followed by an exploration of reasons for the non-implementation of mother tongue education in most schools. Finally, a look at schools where mother tongue education does work might help to understand, how this concept can be implemented successfully in other places too. The presentation is based on examples from the literature as well as from field work.

Is the matter of being a native, a native speaker, a matter of identifying primarily with an episteme and then speaking a language that serves the episteme as a 'mother tongue'?

And coming back to the broadcaster the vocabulary and style used ought to, supposedly at least reflect the following points of reference. A broadcaster might find a word like *tweet* and render it as a transliteration, *tuiti*, let's say and so nod in the direction of the iwi or look at using the traditional word *tihau* in a nod to Te Taura Whiri and with a hope of normalisation of the correct word rather than the transliteration or with a view to simply let the chips fall where they may. But a consciousness of positions and points of reference is important and perhaps necessary. Epistemic positioning by the broadcaster might or might not be a good idea. A sense of epistemic design and a grasp of the consequences involved might be very positive.

One way to look at this is to say that all languages involve some kind of epistemic design perhaps more emphasised in endangered languages precisely because they are endangered. Speakers in any language surely recognise and play with the epistemic design involved. But who is writing the language revitalisation script? And what is the appropriate role of the linguist as policy designer/writer?

If there is divergence or dissent within the speech community concerning goal setting in language revitalisation the linguist as policy designer/writer might make suggestions but may be trying to solve too many problems at once in an already stressed situation. The role of a speaker in the Maihi Karauna-Maihi Maori situation is complex and might in itself be a constraint. Do people going about their daily business really need to use their language with one eye on what the government might want to hear and another on what the tribe might want to hear? Is there an enrichment here, a sense of local culture, of, as the official literature like the application document discussed says, 'language values'. Are so-called language values a constraint or an advantage?

Are we in the world of the prescriptive linguist with power?

The linguist might need to scope the language situation with a goals and constraints analysis or another model of evaluation. However, given the power of the government machine now at play with Te Maataawai each situation needs to be defined in terms of the official template in order to make sense to the linguist as policy/designer/writer and this means speaking of the maihi involved and the Zepa situation. In the South Island as opposed to the Bay of Plenty there are different scopes, different codes to follow due to the language exposure involved. To take a concept considered at various points in this paper, what kind of language partner or neighbour is the linguist as policy designer/writer to be in this context of power across an uneven terrain?

One important area of study now is education. Even though this is not a large part of the policy document discussed it is the critical part of the lip perhaps. Education offers important contexts for the linguist. At the earliest point, the preschool, the Kohanga Reo figures seem to show a decline. Is that to do with the policy directives on the National Trust? This may be to do with a haere aa whanau, go as a family, pedagogy. One of the early drivers of Te Kohanga Reo was John Rangihau. In Rangihauism the army marches at the pace of its slowest member, and there is attention especially to the mana of the

child. And this may be fine in terms of social learning. Is it working in terms of the language though? Does a form of pedagogy of the oppressed work with language? Or is the pedagogy found in the Kohanga Reo a constraint?

Other points to consider might be that Kohanga Reo people are generally assumed to be Active or Passive in the Zepa system while Auckland Grammar students in the newly established compulsory Maori language programmes there will probably be assessed as Zero. What are the pedagogical differences here? Does the same cup work for both? Again we might go back to look at restricted or extended codes and then look at epistemic positioning and design in both cases.

More pertinent perhaps in terms of the Application document discussed and Maori language broadcasting policy, what are the media needs of these groups and do they need to be considered as discrete or as homogeneous?

We could look at the kind of language wanted on Te Reo the second Maori channel devoted to the language and ask how that station might appeal to new speakers living in an urban environment without experience of Kapa Haka or, for that matter, kauta, traditional cook houses where people joke and talk casually but with substantial experience of the internet.

Is there divergence or dissent within the speech community concerning goal setting in language revitalisation? If we come back to the changes described above over the last fifty years it would be surprising if this was not the case. Te Maataawai runs counter to this in that goal setting will be shared across the board, across the nation and between the two houses, the two sets of maihi. But if we look at, say, Te Panekiri o te Reo, a teaching and learning practice sponsored by Te Taura Whiri i te Reo we might see an elitist situation with a high point for select groups in camps, language camps with spurts and crams of complex vocabulary. How will the language find its own level in this context?

While there might not be much discussion of economic downturn there is certainly talk of money and its shortage in key areas. To return to the example where Maori Television might not bring a Maori speaker as a commentator to the Kapa Haka this is, of course, explained with budget reasons. How does Maori Television help in Maori language revitalisation in this case? This is an especially important question where the possibility of speech interaction as opposed to one way traffic is considered. We might also consider the position of Postman (1985) and his thesis as to the vapidness of television as a medium.

Policy might best be to follow the reo consistently in its simplicity as well as its complexity, in the mundane as well as the serious esoteric matters. How to find ways to do this in modern society away from traditional locales? Kapa Haka is a matter of remembered tribal homelands, remembered traditional locales especially for those in the cities. These imaginary spaces are the bedrock of *nga wa o mua*, the days of yore and in continuity radio work arcing the spark from deep mythology to who came on what bus and how you'd better run to catch it now or you'll have to walk to Dannevirke from Palmerston North is what the action in te reo, the uneven terrain of talk, is all about if you are the broadcaster.

But all speakers are continuity people in this sense. This introduces the 'key speaker' argument discussed later and to the idea of key places. Studies of locale and language from elsewhere might inform the New Zealand situation. James Costa and Sara Brennan (2018) ask *Does a stronger association between language and place facilitate language revitalisation efforts? Some insights from Occitania:*

This presentation will investigate and question the ideological and representational consequences of the recent institutionalisation of the name Occitania as a French regional entity in 2016 for Occitan language revitalisation efforts. Given the discrepancy between the way that language advocates have traditionally perceived Occitania as encompassing the entire Occitan-speaking domain, and the restricted territory comprised by the new Occitania region, we ask how different categories of social actors are currently turning this new configuration into either an object of contestation or a resource to promote the language, for example through language classes, branding, tourism, business. In order to better understand how this (re)new(ed) connection between territory and language impacts Occitan language revitalisation projects, we will seek to understand how the creation of Occitania is understood and acted upon by language advocates and Occitan speakers alike, focusing on how, if it all, the naming of this region influences linguistic practices and representations of Occitan. This presentation is based on ongoing ethnographic fieldwork in the Tolosa/Toulouse area and is part of a wider project that seeks to understand how emplacement and language revitalization interact in everyday practices.

With the above in mind we might consider how emplacement of te reo on the internet and in state agencies like Te Taura Whiri and Te Maataawai and language revitalisation interact. How does contestation work in New Zealand and the Cook Islands and across Eastern Polynesia regarding the Maori language and how might the topic be best considered? We could go back to a consideration of normalisation here as we consider the word supralocal as does James Hawkey (2018) in his paper called *Revitalising Catalan in France: Language rights and tailor-made policy proposals:*

Catalan is an autochthonous variety in the region of Northern Catalonia, found in Southern France. Centuries of monocentric language policy in favour of French have resulted in the precarious ethnolinguistic vitality of Catalan in the region. This paper addresses the language rights concerns

of Catalan speakers in France. The successful identification of these rights issues serves to act as a foundation for the proposal of situation-specific revitalisation policies in Northern Catalonia. In order to pinpoint the needs of Catalan speakers in Northern Catalonia, this paper compares the situation in the region against a number of language rights benchmarks, as advanced in the Girona Manifesto. Unsurprisingly, support for Catalan in France is shown to fall short of ambitious language rights suggestions. Comparatively modest revitalisation efforts are suggested, involving the increased presence of Catalan in the media and education sectors. I conclude that the most suitable vehicular language for such efforts is supralocal (and not local) Catalan. This decision is supported by the abundance of extant resources in supralocal Catalan, as well as the existing presence of supralocal varieties in the region, and the typological similarity between supralocal and local varieties.

Have language rights – and what are these by the way – been clearly defined in New Zealand and what might they mean in terms of Te Maataawai? One approach is to say Te Reo is a taonga guaranteed under the Treaty of Waitangi. Taking Hawkey's 'situation-specific' notion could we ask whether the right to learn and the right to speak Maori are being clearly understood across New Zealand. If there are 'situation-specific' places and times in New Zealand these need to be clearly identified in policy documents.

Regarding resources the situation might be changing with Treaty Settlements and we might look to Ngai Tahu or Kai Tahu in the South Island and look at what happens when people of the locale have resources. Here we could also look at the work of Kawharu (2010) who clearly outlines an epistemic position as the significance of traditional locale is considered. Add a potential multiplier effect in the form of a substantial Treaty Settlement and what kind of language development might occur? This gets us into policy and locale where, again, a 'horses for courses' approach might be best.

It all, after Te Maataawai, seems very supralocal. In a recent article the present author asked *Kei hea te reo, where is the reo* (2017), and talked about the diaspora involved, about AI and the language on the internet and other media. Coming back to ZePA theory most of the Active areas are ones where locale has not been altered such as the Bay of Plenty where people have remained for generations and where large scale urbanisation has not occurred. What are the locales, the speech locales if you like, of the new speakers? What is the use of the internet and AI by new speakers? If it is the case that the locale you learn in is the locale most comfortable for you as a speaker then those beginning now to learn in the context of the classroom and the internet may well be more comfortable there than anywhere else and this would seem to imply a new epistemic design the dimensions of which we are unsure of at this stage.

Is the internet a true and real speech locale? Guillem Belmar Viernes presented a paper in 2018 called *Social media platforms and minority languages: Opportunities and challenges from the perspective of the #europeminoritylanguages project*:

According to a 2013 survey (LTInnovate 2013), in 2012 digital content had doubled in only one year. The number of users of social networks is ever increasing, and in 2013 there were an estimate 174.2 million people using social networks in Western Europe alone. These numbers are probably much higher nowadays, and hint at how much of our everyday interaction takes places online. Social Networks like Twitter or Facebook are common tools of communication, especially among the youth, whose communicative exchanges consist largely of Computer Mediated Communication (CMC). Digital Presence is, therefore, an essential component of language revitalization (and maintenance). There is consensus among activists and scholars alike that a language's digital presence is of the utmost importance to be perceived as fitting the needs of the modern world (Soria 2016). Among other things, the Europe Minority Languages Project collects information on different minority languages spoken in Europe, building a profile for each of them. We also publish a Word of the Day, we have taken part in both the Social Media Day for Small Languages (organized by Afük) and the Meme Challenge (organized by Rising Voices) and we are currently developing more materials in a few languages (such as vocabulary lists, kahoots and quizlets).

In the New Zealand Maori case the internet certainly is a speech locale in the sense that the dictionaries on the net are extensively used. This is very important in terms of the displacement of locale as a speech source as instead of asking a kaumatua what a given word might be or mean to people in a given area simply go to the internet and consider the possibilities offered there. The iwi radio stations are all on the internet through punganet and this is very important for listeners in Australia and around the world, a long way from traditional tribal locales.

Regarding the context of the net, the locale of cyberspace, Christian Pischlöger asks in his 2018 title *Which language do we want to save? Udmurt language ideologies on social media*:

Udmurt, an endangered Uralic language spoken in the Russian Federation by 324,000 speakers (i.e. 59% of ethnic Udmurts), is one of the most visible minority languages of Russia on the Internet, in numbers of groups on VKontakte (the equivalent of Facebook in Russia) outscoring even Tatar and Bashkir, languages which considerably more speakers. But the Udmurt on-line success is not undisputed since the language use on social media, including vernacular varieties and code-mixing, is criticized by influential linguists, poets, journalists, activists and laymen like-

wise. The standard language ideology which is representative for the Russian speech culture tends to be adopted by members of minority language communities like the Udmurt and hence the vernacular language varieties, which are used by the majority of Udmurts, are often disparaged by native speakers themselves. The aim of the presentation is to show how these language ideologies are represented (discourse analysis of online postings and scientific publications) and which impacts this could have on the potentially positive role of the Udmurt internet success in reversing the impending language shift. The role of sociolinguists, due to their descriptive and not prescriptive approach often perceived as useless 'suffixologists', shall also be discussed.

Pischlöger's work might be very important for the situation of Maori in New Zealand and around the world as we may need to pay special attention to critiques involving code-mixing such as those he is referring to and come through that to a new understanding of 'normalisation'.

Also a study of strategies, locale by locale, strategies for Zero, Passive and Active might be interesting for the linguist. Are the wrong strategies being used in the wrong places? This includes geographical areas such as the South Island where people might begin at Zero as well as institutional areas such as Kohanga Reo where statistics might show virtually no child goes in with Zero, but rather with some Active or Passive understanding. How many come out with Active classification in both of these areas? Such an analysis of goals and performance, between cup and lip, might help in prioritisation, breaking things down to workable units and setting out perspectives.

Probably a lot more needs to be done on the specific needs of locales. Pauweks (2016) talks of a domain seen as a construct built around three elements interlocutors, topics and locales with the latter comprising both time and space. I could go back many years to a study of the Tuhoe schools that I did with Tamati Cairns (Cairns & Cleave, 1997). The establishment of the Tuhoe Education Authority, the forerunner of others shows the problems that exist in the locale along with attempts to correct the decline from within the locale. The stability of a locale from historical times is no guarantee of language survival but it behoves the locals to have, as a language right, the resources to maintain and develop their own language.

There is a sorting and sifting process that the linguist might turn to. To begin with there is some data that the ZePA people refer to regarding gender. Why should more women than men speak Maori? How might the men be reached and do men and women living side by side work in different language locales. The same thing might be asked of age differences and language differences. The next section asks where are the minds of these groups with regard to language? And to come back to policy language where are the majority and where are key groups of speakers or key individuals in terms of ZePA? Are they stuck between Zero and Passive or between Passive and Active? What policy steps are required regarding this?

When one is broadcasting Kapa Haka the feeling is that we are probably up to Passive with very few Zero people and a few Active people listening. So that is how you pitch the show as you come in for continuity, with short, clear words for the most part with the occasional metaphor for those proficient in Te Reo.

What resources exist for training in this area and where might such be found and undergone? How for example, does training change from the move from Zero to Passive to the move from Passive to Active? In terms of the policy document in Appendix One how are broadcasters on television trained to navigate, explore and develop the frameworks involved in ZePA and Maihi Karauna and Maihi Maori?

Language must inform and entertain, entertain and inform as Lord Reith's BBC was meant to do. Revitalisation is surely to do with interest, with excitement, with humour and sense. Information must be swiftly and effectively passed and received as all the language must flow without impediment or walls wherever and however it can.

But what does all this policy and practice do to the mind?

Policy, Language and Mind

In both cup and lip there are questions of language and mind. We might speak of conscious or unconscious ways that we revitalise our language as we revitalise our minds. This might take us into pedagogy and matters of discourse including epistemic positioning and to what is known as epistemic design. We might ask whether endangered languages mean endangered minds.

How do speakers use the language concerned? What are they expressing? Is the language used in emotional contexts and in philosophical contexts as well? Is it used for commerce? What parts of the mind are used when speaking? Is the endangered language a language for all seasons? What is the policy for the questions above? What is the shape of the cup? What is the direction of the lip?

In general terms how does Language Revitalisation Theory work regarding the needs of the mind? Osiris Sinuhé González Romero (2018) talks about *Inclusive research methodologies and multidisciplinary in Nahuatl revitalization*:

At this time, my goal is the analysis of inclusive research methodologies applied to two different projects related to Nahuatl revitalization. Firstly, I will explain briefly the framework used by Nahua teachers in San Miguel Xaltipan and Santa Ana Tlacotenco and secondly I will focus on two case studies in indigenous communities. The participation of Nahua speakers, teachers and researchers is very important to develop different methodologies grounded on the needs of indigenous communities. Moreover, inclusive research methodologies are useful to face the question: to what extent are the attitudes and approval of the speaking community key to the successful implementation of RLS strategies? Additionally, the role of multidisciplinary is very useful to face another question: should revitalization strategies involve both 'top down' and 'bottom-up' initiatives? As a result of this fieldwork experience I want to highlight that multidisciplinary involves the use of science and art to develop didactic materials and also to improve public policies related to language revitalization.

This might be considered, perhaps, as the 'mind above' situation. As with other research cited above the top down, bottom up perspective is employed. In actually speaking a language though this distinction is not a significant one unless one is addressing the topic itself. We say what comes into our heads without reference to it coming down to us or us offering it up to meet overhead criteria.

Does language come to us from across a locale? Te reo Maori has been a locale based language and the argument in recent papers (Cleave 2017) and here is that the locale has changed and this must be considered when we talk about language shift. And what about a locale of ideas? Soung-U Kim (2018) talks about *Managing ideology: Language-ideological surveying for language revitalisation*:

This talk reflects on qualitative 'ideology surveys' as part of what Kroskrity (2009) calls "ideological clarification". Such explorative studies elucidating ideological connections between language and culture have the potential of not only uncovering a speech community's "shared basis of commonsense notions about the nature of language" (Rumsey 1990: 346), but more importantly, they help understanding crucial aspects of the underlying "cultural system of ideas" motivated by "moral and political interests" (Irvine 1989: 255). As language revitalisation operates in multilingual contexts with impactful ideologies of language choice, such surveys can identify potential obstacles that may impede revitalisation efforts. To exemplify, I present the results of a qualitative study on ideologies associated with Standard Korean and Jejuan (Koreanic, South Korea; Moseley 2010) language use. Jejuan language use was characterised as symbolising historicity, connection, closeness and the absence of social and linguistic boundaries, whereas Standard Korean was associated with images of remoteness and social distance. Drawing on that web of ideological connections, I conclude that existing language ideologies on Jeju Island may stand at odds with the aim of revitalising Jejuan unless some kind of 'ideology management' is incorporated into a language revitalisation framework.

To what extent is the policy statement involving Maihi Karauna and Maihi Maori along with ZePA 'ideological management'? We could turn to the idea of epistemic positioning and then to epistemic design for a theoretical perspective perhaps.

We are also looking at Artificial Intelligence ranging from basic net dictionary work to talking dolls. This is language and mind in a new place. The locale is de-centred. The locale is a machine. The locale is found in code. This is language without, on the face of it, values. The 'mind' in this case is a language machine. How can a language policy be determined here? Do distinctions like Maihi Maori and Maihi Maori or theories like ZePA apply here?

In the basic work of net dictionaries the mind of the language, the authority of mind if you like is taken from traditional sources like elders, kaumatua to the machine in the sky, the bowl or the cup in the sky, te ipurangi, the internet. There is a sorting based on connections, digital, analogical and associative, processes that do not relate or necessarily conform to practices, metaphorical and other in the locale. These associations do not need to refer to a mentality; they are outside the brief of *The Savage Mind* (Levi Strauss, 1966) except, of course, if we go back to the organisation of the mind and Levi Strauss' thoughts on binaries.

Celebrating the multiplicity, working across the mind, the language mind if you like may be an answer here as indeed it might be in Ireland with the Gael. On the radio you might use the Taura Whiri word along with dialectal differences or transliterations as with tweet or Monday as you would do for different dialect words such as koka or whaea for mother. Listing the options might be time consuming and tedious perhaps but this ranging, this covering of the bases might be best treated as the language culture, the differences to be celebrated. Dialectal differences and the differences between supralocal and local are a tapestry for the speaker, the radio announcer or whatever kind of communicator to play with as part of it all with a mind for all seasons.

Then there is the shift to female gender with more women speaking the language than men. What does that do for mind? Given some research cited in Zepa work has Maori been feminised in New Zealand? Then there are age sets, elders versus the young. In broadcasts of such events as the Ratana Pa centenary I have been arguing for combinations of younger with older speakers so that there is a sharing of language styles. In any language context there may well be different mind sets for young and old but this may well be critical in an endangered language situation.

Then there is the effect of the academy, the state authorised mind which gives authority to te reo, Te Taura Whiri alone before and Te Maataawai incorporating Te Taura Whiri now. One effect of Te Maataawai might be to strengthen state authority and the idea of Maihi Karauna and the responsibilities involved for the Crown, the state seem to do this. Dale's critique of Stalinisation in the 1990s through Te Taura Whiri and Moon's critique of Sovietisation in the last few decades would both seem to apply here.

The situation of New Zealand Maori might now be going beyond matters of basic identity and locale. Hélène Yèche (2018) from the Université de Poitiers writes of *Language warriors? Contemporary conceptions and practices of Lakota in the US*:

A Native language in the US still spoken by the Lakota people of the Sioux tribes on several reservations in North and South Dakota (Standing Rock, Pine Ridge, Rosebud Reservation), Lakota is one of the few Native American languages with a significant chance of survival. However, with only 2,000 first-language speakers left, Lakota is currently an endangered language. The Lakota revitalisation movement is one of the most active among many Native American languages facing endangerment. It has become more structured as of 2004 with the advent of the Lakota Language Consortium (LLC), an educational non-profit that provides essential learning and teaching resources and programs. Exploring the reactions and attitudes of the Lakota speech community towards RLS strategies led by the Lakota Language Consortium, this presentation focuses on better understanding whether language revival may be an important step toward reclaiming identity and building community among the Lakota people. Using data from a recent case study (LSI 2017) and from a new field study to be conducted on the Pine Ridge reservation in South Dakota in early June 2018 I will be discussing contemporary conceptions and practices of Lakota in the US.

To put this in historical context Yèche seems to be talking about a situation that Maori language was in prior to the advent of Maori radio, Maori TV and then the internet, a period, say, around 1975-80. From another perspective it may be that Kapa Haka, an industry that intersects with Maori television and radio to a considerable extent freezes at the point Yèche is at with 'reclaiming identity and building community'. Could we speak of shift in terms of shifts of mind?

Do we have a typology for language and mind, a typology that might work for endangered languages? In this paper several situations have been discussed. Language and locale and supranational language, *kanohi ki te kanohi*, face to face or communication via the net. Language and identity alongside language and fun, language and play. The Lakota language context as described by Yèche is one familiar to the student of endangered languages and would seem to be at a particular stage in the endangered language situation, one where the revitalization of identity is happening along with the revitalization of language. But are we deceiving ourselves to think that language is more than the reclaiming, restatement or revitalisation of identity? Are we forever in the circuit of language and identity reclamation and revitalisation?

There are also considerations of media and mind. For example, there may actually be a question about television itself. Is television a directed enterprise which is, in some senses, closed rather than open? The thesis of Postman (*ibid*) has been cited with the suggestion that television is not a serious form of communication. Language properly revitalised, to use a phrase, might be discursive, random, mad and wild. Television is a steer through the world. But language is a firecracker jumping hither and thither. Do television and language help one another or do they contain one another? Does learning best occur in a controlled, directed fashion or in a discursive way? Does talk run along predictable lines or uneven terrain?

By contrast the net may not be as closed. Apparently life and, for that matter, mind on the net is nomadic. You can always move away or one can make comment in text audio or video. One thinks of a general evolutionary model where people moved from nomadic life to agricultural settlement and their minds became set and focussed on that locale. This might especially apply to oral as distinct from literate society. This has implications for theories of identity and conflict. Now we have a shift back to the nomadic perhaps. A shift to the literate nomad, the cultural traveller. What does that mean for language?

The intersection of Kapa Haka and Maori Television, especially the Te Reo station shows a kind of epistemic positioning. Can we talk about epistemic positioning as a kind of literalism? Is it a matter of tying the language to values or tying values to language? In a recent paper on historiography and language (Cleave 2017) the present author mentioned chaining in the way Moslems think of language. Is this a matter of set values that cohere, of whakapapa or is it a spreading mind that is involved flowing from point to random point on the net and elsewhere in a diasporic as compared to a settled situation?

It may be that Maori in New Zealand is in a very different mind space to that found in other countries including that found by Yèche amongst the Lakota speakers. For example if we look at Colombia through the lens of Colleen O'Brian (2016) in her paper *Creating relevant curricula for endangered languages in Colombia*:

Most of Colombia's around seventy indigenous languages are endangered. Although the government supposedly supports bilingual education in schools, few (if any) programs have been successful, due to the sheer number of languages, massive displacement of indigenous populations, and lack of resources. In this paper, I examine several language revitalization

programs, including Quechua, Cofan, Muisca, and San Andres Creole, discussing their strengths and weaknesses. Then I discuss what we can learn from the school-based component of these programs and finally offer suggestions for the creation of more successful language programs in Colombia, taking into account the sociopolitical situation. I argue that each curriculum has to be tailored to the individual community based on four criteria: (1) their desires, such as prioritizing rituals, traditional stories, or ecological knowledge (2) location, such as urban environments or isolated villages; (3) resources, namely whether the government is dedicating money to the program; and (4) learner demographics, including speaker number, age, and type of employment. Finally, I suggest that we can borrow some tools from anthropology, such as in-depth ethnography and participant observation to create more effective pedagogical materials that address the needs and wants of communities.

In certain respects at least Maori in New Zealand but not, say, in the Cook Islands, may have transcended or at least taken each of the four points Brian lists into another dimension. Maori media takes the language beyond ritual in many respects even though Kapa Haka is accentuated. News of the world as well as traditional stories are to be found. While there is an emphasis on locale sometimes that locale is the supra national situation of Parliament buildings. Sometimes the locale is shaped in the locale of AI or in the code of the net. By contrast with Colombia and the USA in the case described by Yeche significant money is coming from the government and has been for some decades in support for te Reo. The learner demographics have skipped the trappings of the traditional locales and demographics as mainstream, compulsory education in and of te reo proceeds.

Regarding typology, a prospective typology of endangered languages it might be suggested that the Lakota are in a situation without information age supports. There are no radio stations, television stations or internet supports such as on line dictionaries as might be found in the New Zealand Maori situation. Cook Islands Maori might be somewhere in between. Such a typology need not be related to efficacy, at least not directly. A language just now entering the information age might be without the baggage, as suggested in this paper, of an over reliance on television this being, perhaps, an expensive one way street for language revitalisation.

How do we best characterise the mind of Maori language learners in terms of media? Regarding epistemology Lysacht (2010) suggests:

The strength of an alternative media service is in part to convey a different epistemology through similar technology perhaps through different visual styles and attendant critiques and evaluations. The ultimate goal is to "transform" or identify other ways of seeing and being.

The character of mind is shaped by things like the media, the state and the senses of endangerment or excitement. What is the shape and character of the balanced language mind? How is normalcy spoken? Defining the normal sounds pretty basic but it can be complex, dangerous even. Lysacht (ibid) notes that Zuberogoitia claims that for 'normalisation to occur, a media communications model must be centred within the linguistic community' (2003, as cited in Arana et al, 2007).

What is the linguistic community? Across locales that community at its widest is the prototypical one. We do not have much of an impetus for standardisation across Polynesian languages but it may be an important and worthwhile objective as each locale has developed survival strategies for the language form or dialect concerned and one could help the other. In the New Zealand case, an extremity in the endangered language community perhaps, there is immense, relatively speaking, standardisation by the state. So it might be asked, how is the language community being shaped and directed by the standardisations described here, how is the language community being normalised and how is it normalising itself?

How do we define a locale based language as distinct from a supralocal language? We could start by taking a line from Bob Dylan:

its either one thing or the other
but neither is what they claim

(Bob Dylan, Just like Tom Thumb's Blues)

A locale based language seems straightforward. There is the mountain the river the proverbs, the idiosyncratic language points the lexical shades, the local colour of the language. But sometimes, especially in the Pacific Islands but also in New Zealand the language of the locale is spoken with deference to the church. Even when there are nativist churches like Ratana the idea is of a church language for all locales tribal or otherwise.

The supralocal business is difficult in some respects. There is the shape of the language, the nouns and verbs and where they come in sentences, gender, tense and so on. And if these things line up across several locales such as the islands of Polynesia we might proceed to talk about Proto-Polynesian. The idea is that language is evolving in the locales and this potentially could affect the proto language hovering, in the minds of academics at least, somewhere above the locales. Language revitalisation

seems to be a mix where sometimes the locale based language and sometimes the proto language with a coinage from history or from a given locale gets to be normalised.

Then these days with language archives, with IT and talking dolls and, indeed since the age of Jonson and dictionaries we have standardisation that is done from above or from without the locale. A standard setting arrangement gives the world the Queen's English just as the French Academy gives us French and Te Taura Whiri gives us Maori. We might talk of state standardisation, historical standardisation, geographical standardisation and machine standardisation in the case of IT. Out of all this we might proceed to consider normalisation.

Does standardisation imply the formation of, the clarification of the prototypical? Possibly, probably even, but not always.

In the case of the endangered language this all gets a bit tricky. In the Irish and many other endangered language situations there is an emotional attachment to the language of the locale and a distrust of outside tinkering. In the case of New Zealand we have the synthetic words from the Taura Whiri, we have standardisation on Maori Television. And we have the digital archive. So we may have widened a gulf between that and the language spoken in Pukapuka or Hawaii or in the Marquesas. In that case the prospect of a shared supralocal language across Eastern Polynesia would appear to recede.

And what about the endangered language community on the internet? To the extent that, as with Maori, speakers use dictionaries on the internet, this is pretty well everyone. Even in remote locales teachers in schools will be using such resources which don't necessarily refer to iwi based reo.

The game is loaded to the supralocal, the state sponsored language in certain respects. Lysacht (ibid) talks about percentage quotas that Maori Television and Irish Television are given by state and how the stations exceed that. We have language performance here without which, in bald terms, speakers don't get paid. If the state rings the changes and sets the criteria then this colours language development for the endangered language in certain respects. How healthy is this? Why have the state define criteria, why call for credit for exceeding state based criteria? How do endangered language speakers find true and valid credit for their language use?

Can a state save and revitalise a language? When we add the epistemic design of ZePA and the Maihi not forgetting the power of the prescriptive linguist could we be looking at linguicide by state sophistry?

This follows historical standardisation as with the creation of the Maori Bible and it is possible to look at differences between the Maori spoken in Pukapuka where there is strong influence from the church in the transmission of te reo but little from the state of the Cook Islands government and New Zealand Maori as spoken on Maori Television where, these days at least, there is little apparent influence from the church and significant influence from the state at least in terms of who gets paid for what.

Would it be helpful to take these three terms, supralocalisation, standardisation and normalisation and work out the objectives that the endangered language community might have with regarding them? In working this out the net would seem to beat physical place as a testing ground as it is accessible to all, used by most people and has the 'crack', the 'buzz' to fire the mind.

An endangered language usually, almost inevitably ties things to specific locality and time-phrases used in certain eras but speakers in the New Zealand case are in diaspora. Tuhoe, as Temara and Maataamua (2010) point out are an extreme case coming from a mountainous remote locale to the cities of New Zealand and Australia. In a sense anyone who communicates on the internet is in diapora from their home locale as they roam in a zone without a mountain or a river but with code as the underpinning for their communication. Again we come to distinctions between locale and supralocal language as *per* Taura Whiri and the language used in the pub or between te reo o te kainga and te reo o te motu.

But Cook Islands Maori, Hawaiian and Tahitian are languages of motu and we could trace the language back to a proto form, back to basic Sikaian (cf Cleave 2017) if we wanted to. Why should we want to? The idea seems to be that if the endangered language has common goals it will better endure and survive. Would it be better simply to look at speaker to speaker interaction and see how that finds its own level, its own norm, its own standard?

It may be the case that the supralocal is a problem. One thinks of the Irish situation. Lysacht (ibid) in an important statement says that the theory behind Irish TV 'positions the idea of language revitalisation as a by-product, as something which may flow from culturally specific approaches to broadcasting but not as something which needs to be made explicit or codified in itself'. This is like the situation with Maori Television and the Te Reo channel. But then Lysacht quotes Larry Parr 'we regard our core business as being the language revitalisation business and television just happens to be the medium through which we do it' (2007).

Gary Wilson's idea of the reo as a voice and not simply as a language is mentioned by Lysacht (ibid):

That voice these days comes in two languages but predominantly in English. Its that whole voice not just the Maori language which warrants protection and a secure place in the New Zealand media.

This needs to be examined critically as it sounds like just another excuse to speak English. The idea of voice as distinct from language gets us back to epistemic positioning and design and the question as to whether these are useful or not in language revitalisation. There is a general problem which might

be framed as follows; what happens when people are trained to be listeners not broadcasters? What kinds of mentality are involved?

Mentality and strategy are interwoven. Lysacht (*ibid*) refers to the Maori Broadcasting Advisory Committee suggesting in 2000:

- 1 that the protection and promotion of te reo was consonant with a Treaty right and judicial recommendation
- 2 that providing a television service in te reo had strategic value in gaining votes for the government
- 3 was in line with existing policies in relation to language
- 4 that a Maori channel would contribute to national goals for broadcasting local content
- 5 that support for the language of the indigenous people would be a move toward democratic and social justice

Television itself with its monolithic organisational requirements as well as the monolithic money involved has been a huge distraction in some ways. Could we go further than Postman (*ibid*) who questions the seriousness of television and suggest that television involves a placement of mind, a rabbit hole ring-fenced from minds that cannot directly interact with it and the time when we needed to find again our true languages and the truth in them unfortunately happened to be the television age.

Lysacht (*ibid*) talks of the establishment of Te Mangai Paho as a parallel funding strategy and notes that in Ireland and New Zealand the establishment of television took three decades. Given video on the internet and the development of social media over the same period was this a diversion and did it help te reo? Lysacht sees Irish TV as a matter of cultural expression while Maori TV is about te reo. This begs the question about cup and lip. Is the cup about epistemic position, about voice but, going back to Gary Wilson (*ibid*), more to do with a supposed 'voice of the people' than actual speech? More directly is the Maihi Karauna- Maihi Maori distinction helpful in terms of te reo or is it just an epistemic position comprised conceptually and to some extent in reality of two speaking and listening platforms that exist, in fact, in a multitude of platforms and possibilities?

Pakeha speakers of te reo are rarely seen on Maori TV.

As asked in various places in this paper does the assumption that locale is authentic needs to be looked at? Lysacht (*ibid*) argues that 'nation-friendliness and the 'toothlessness' of the Irish national channel loses the prospect of being a more radical regional broadcaster and notes the side-lining of native speakers. But is a correct counter-assumption that the home locale will be radical and that it is a good home to the language?

The Irish comparison is useful and important. Lysacht (*ibid*) argues that 'te reo is linked to a Maori cultural identity which exceeds the 'nation'. But is language necessarily linked to either cultural identity or to the nation state?

Mediascape and useful talk is worth considering. Lysacht (*ibid*) compares New Zealand and Ireland. In Ireland Irish culture was in the mediascape but in New Zealand it had to be introduced by Television New Zealand. This idea, that the culture must be introduced to a given mediascape, in this case the mediascape of television in New Zealand is itself worthy of praise. The accompanying idea which seems to be that the reo goes with this even if the culture and not the reo is the main thing, may be questioned though when it comes to language endangerment.

The material cost of television is huge if not immense and the need is surely to evaluate the possible mediascapes and to extend that to talkscapes in any context anywhere including korero on the marae as well as this site or that on the internet. The need to consider all conversation sites as 'mediascapes' may be important. The good neighbour thesis discussed elsewhere in this paper is important here and the question might be put how is Maori Television mentored or helped by other media and how does Maori Television help or mentor other media? Are some media trapped in their own bubbles? Does the policy document in Appendix One help media other than television or is it inherently self-referential?

Has this push to centrality in the media, the assumption that radio and television are the central platforms for development of an endangered language helped or is it better to improve existing speakers and to concentrate on those speakers with significant audiences in the endangered language involved?

So much is to do with the excitement that may or may not come with speech. Lysacht (*ibid*) cites Rangihau (1997) talking about 'Sunday morning slots with old people boringly sitting behind a desk or talking at length on a marae'. We might ask in 2019 in regard to the Te Reo station, 'Have we not come a long way?'

There are various spins on this. Lysacht (*ibid* 91) cites Ngata in Whiteside 2010 'The aim of Te Karere was nor so much to preserve the language but 'to put out news that would be important to Maori and to do it in the Maori language'. This puts the conversation into a POV (Point of View) situation. It is not about the language itself but rather, it's about Maori people and their point of view and if the language is involved that may be a bonus. The point about costs made earlier is not just about economic downturns but about the sheer cost of media like TV in relation to language retention. How much does a Point Of View cost?

The onus falls onto the state to pay and what are the social and political costs of that? Regarding the document discussed here the costs are ones of substitution. If the money spent on television was

spent in other language development areas like the net or in the clubs and societies area- read Kingitanga, Ratana, Ringatu- what would be the relative returns for language revitalisation?

This brings us to the making over of the endangered language situation into the endangered social group situation or the potential for this to happen. Lysacht (ibid) says 'the purpose of indigenous broadcasting is not limited to considerations of language'. Is the ideology of indigenous broadcasting actually helping the development of endangered languages?

The conflation of endangered and indigenous might be as perilous as it might be profitable for the development of a language. We have the salutary experience of language decline over the same period as the development of a specific mediascape in the form of Maori Television. Later the question is posed, as to whether Maori TV is a media Edsel in terms of language revitalisation. Just as author and Edsel scholar Jan Deutsch suggested the Edsel was "the wrong car at the wrong time" is Maori Television the wrong language development space at the wrong time?

With this danger of turning from one endangered situation to another comes the risk of losing control. Lysacht (ibid) cites Riggins (1992) to the effect that in some cases state funding constitutes an attempt to control the broadcasting energies of the minority. Again the point is state funding for what? For a POV or for the sake of developing a language? Language promotion or language control?

Part of the problem here is that when you set out to save an endangered language ethnic identity is important but is there a point where POV obscures language development, where there is an over ethnicisation of a language, where people speak to prove their identity? People speaking Maori in Pukapuka in the Cook Islands might not have this kind of conflation of identity and language retention. And how do languages develop without dispute between one POV and another?

Again this might come back to the local vs supralocal matter. Lysacht (ibid) talks about when the local is normalised. This makes the language Iwicentric in a state vs iwi situation. But the reo might best develop taking on all situations anywhere, anyhow. This might be called the te ao whanui approach.

Maori Television has offered hope. Lysacht (ibid 74) refers to Smith (2006) who regards programmes on Maori Television as 'potential circuit breakers....that challenge the imaginary totalities produced by the state broadcaster'. The latter phrase refers to TVNZ as, as it were, the Pakeha state broadcaster.

How much can the state afford to claim with respect to language revitalisation? Lysacht (ibid) talks about lip service for official language 'inclusive exclusion' Smith and Able (2007). Turner suggests (2007) 'the creeping maorification of the public domain' results in the majority (settler) culture spicing up their own culture whilst denying real recognition of the indigenous culture they exploit'. This is like the idea of the use of Maori words in English which just extends English rather than Maori language. This might allow the co-existence of apparently mutually exclusive versions of reality (cf Duddy 2002) momentarily but the predator language will predate. When does state control mean state enslavement or state dependency?

And then there are the responsibilities after so much money and energy has been expended on a technology such as television to provide more than a language. A new view of the nation perhaps. Lysacht (ibid) suggests that Maori TV presents a new kind of nation, Aotearoa-New Zealand', which engages more deeply with the specificity of the place and people. It should be said that many television stations have world views or national views but are such just another load on language development? Why should a language carry a nation, a nationality or idea of such?

Is it better to accept that all speakers of an EL are broadcasters, all have a consciousness of speaking a certain kind of language outside the norm. Then there is the question of locale, from where are they broadcasting and to consider them in terms of locale, palimpsest, provincialism, dialect and dianet? These days when most speakers have a phone and most have followers a new kind of performance communication exists best seen perhaps in the episode of Black Mirror (Episode 1 *Black Mirror*, 2017) where popularity as seen in hits on posts matters all. The endangered language might be found here and in a world where everyone is a broadcaster and the fracturing of the communications sphere into a host of individual points of light might be as useful for development as not.

The communication aspect is really important. Lysacht (ibid) suggests that in Ireland and, possibly in New Zealand with Maori, the Irish language 'is seen only in terms of cultural obligation and not in terms of communication'. Where this is important is in the provincialisation of a language. This is, again, the emphasising of a locale. Jo Smith (2006) refers to a palimpsest. This is the acceptance of a layering of interpretations. Kinsella (1995) talks of 'palimpsestisation and peasantisation' of the Irish language whereby provincialism became the refuge of a previously outward-looking people. Where this might be applicable in New Zealand is in the Te Reo station where urbanity in a worldly way is not emphasised but the 'true talk' of the local is. This gives the phrase 'around the traps' another twist as each locale has its own pitfalls as well, of course, as its strengths.

The phrase, 'the politics of identity' may have a different resonance here. Lysacht quotes Stephen Turner (2007) saying 'Maori identities both precede and exceed the nation-based identity of Kiwi' Lysacht also talks of sharing and shadowing. It might be asked when does overlapping, the pursuit of language overlapping into the pursuit of a romantic heartland that may or may not exist or the pursuit of a political goal that may not be achieved without the use of the endangered language, become a habit?

At least part of this situation is the way bi-culturalism has or has not worked in New Zealand. Lysacht (ibid) assumes a tension between Maori and Pakeha spheres of communication and notes that as Appurdaï writes 'one man's imagined community is another man's political prison'. Bi-culturalism

in New Zealand affords a context, ideological or real that other endangered contexts might not have and obviously in Ireland there is not the same thing.

In both countries though there are bubbles of communication. Lysacht is talking about an in-state context (ibid) where linkages between sphericules are critical 'Without linkages between them a mass of independent and parallel sphericules will not sustain a multi ethnic public sphere' (Husband, 1998)

This is a matter of minority and majority conversing. Lysacht refers to Hartley and Green (2000) who talk of the 'unresolved national status of indigenous people'. This is certainly not true of Maori in the Cook Islands but may be true for Maori in New Zealand and this may be an important comparison.

Lysacht (ibid) notes Lotman's (1990) image of the semiosphere, a space where stories and other narrative forms are organised. There are issues of citizenship here as well as jokes to share and a wider problem of metaphor that has to work for levels of both state and locale such as *maihi*.

There is a significance here for the Calendar of Events espoused by a given media outlet. Lysacht (ibid) notes the difficulty of Irish and Maori Television being dependent on state money and then being obliged to represent the state in certain ways. Maori Television has picked up various national issues like Anzac Day which only help the *reo* in a general way.

In an important footnote Lysacht (ibid) quotes Fishman (1995), 'Institutions, although important, should be on tap rather than on top of a language. The language does not belong to them. The language makes use of them.' We might now need to understand what might be meant by Fishman and others by the word 'institution'. This might apply to ethnic groups and the language and institutions like *Te Maataawai* equally.

Then we get to questions of power, voice and language. Lysacht (ibid 57) in an important footnote refers to May arguing for geo-linguistic language in language shift. 'A person of high standing and influence has more effect than one of low public profile' (2001:146). This might be very important in social media and radio and television presenters. This point is also important in the argument about each speaker being a broadcaster suggested earlier and again the example of hits on posts from the *Black Mirror* episode (ibid) might be instructive.

How do we scope all this? Lysacht (ibid) Appuradai talks about the mediascape (1990). Hartley (1999) talks about the 'mediasphere' and the interdependence of the state and television as publicly funded Stuart Cunningham (2004) talks of the specificity of 'minoritarian public spheres'. One wonders in the day of the net and constant even compulsive sharing whether these are as tightly bound as these terms might suggest?

One wonders also about the language of Ireland, its actual roots and extent. Lysacht (ibid) talks about cultural citizenship. But while Irish is rooted to state at least from a nationalist POV but *protogael* is like proto polynesian and is not necessarily bound to a state. This takes the argument back to a consideration of the supralocal but perhaps outside of state and nation and this seems to be missed again and again by commentators including Lysacht.

Are we talking now more of person and device, person and net rather than person and nation, person and state? Lysacht (ibid) refers to Gitlin (2002) talking about 'sphericules' and suggests that in New Zealand and Ireland, small countries as they are, these are shared and intersect. Again we may need to review the scale and scope of the language locale with the idea perhaps of personal sphericules and the close identification of these by participants and their use in language endangerment. The sphericule might include or even be contained within the email, the social media points and the phone that the person uses as well as the nature of shared conversation in the endangered language. We might refer again to *Black Mirror* and the rating of hits etc.

The sphere of communication need not be predicated by the state. There needs to be a speaker and a listener who swap roles and these need to be human unless this is done by machine in one or both roles as with automatic responses on the net or the likes of the talking doll. State, ethnicity, nation or tribe are none of them necessary predicates for communication and over reliance on these in any combination might well be itself an endangerment.

We might turn again to the idea of *te reo* as a critical identity or power point. Lysacht (ibid) refers to Indigenous National Minority television 'to welcome people (back) to the language'. With this there is the idea of purification:

Hokia ki nga maunga kia purea ai koe e nga hau o Tawhiri Matea

Return to the mountains so that you may be purified by the winds of Tawhiri Matea

It may be important to note that for some if not many the language is a new home rather than a traditional homeland and that this might better be celebrated and explored rather than resented or resisted. The policy paper considered here is about television where there is a one way language with no immediate come back. When television is posited as the home it is a home of watching and listening rather than interacting. It is a place where language happens from outside the room of the watcher, from some external source or another.

The person speaking on an uneven terrain, using words that come to mind and hand, finding his or her voice in the *reo* as they go might be preferable to the machine like precision of someone checking

with Te Taura Whiri dictionaries on the net before speaking. Lysacht (*ibid* 55) says 're-naturalisation' involves the use of English or anglicisation rather than academic neologisms 'imperfect fluency is preferred to hesitant accuracy'. A skilled broadcaster plays with these. In the endangered language context play with words is important (Cleave, 2017). Here is where you play with possibilities. In 2019 'renaturalisation' must surely include, code, AI, the net and the phone and how a speaker might play with words in such a context

With this is the matter of communicating lexicographical and corpus research to a lay audience with a variety of language experience on a ZePA or other basis. Julia Miller and Yukio Tono spoke in 2017 about *Popularising corpus studies: Mr Corpus and Ms Parrot meet the audience* and they introduce Ms Parrot who is a grammar detective who teaches English grammatical concepts and academic skills through Agatha Christie-style mysteries and shows based on popular culture and Mr Corpus who is the star of a television program that popularises corpus-based language teaching in Japan. The program is designed based on the spoken component of the British National Corpus and each lesson features one of the most frequently used 100 words whose usage is exemplified by typical collocational rankings. Miller and Tono suggest that through these means we are popularising corpus studies and bridging the gap between traditional lexicography and new media.

The value in all this is that Mr Corpus and Ms Parrot are well recognised resources. Somehow these comical characters have succeeded in the popular imagination and this is where revitalisation could and should be. The fact that this has happened through television is remarkable and a bright light. Humour has been found, has been ignited in a language programme that puts together 'traditional lexicography and new media'. But this humour and the language scope involved in the use of corpus concepts has an advantage in that English, the wily old predator language is the 'second' language here and this, like the example from Bahrain involving Arabic and English in the conclusion may be as salutary as it is instructive.

Having said this, it is suggested later that people in Camp EL could learn from those in Camp LWC, Languages of Wider Communication, as in the Japanese/English or Arabic/English contexts in Japan and Bahrain.

Then there is the question of taking out the fire from a language, the fire of reaction to colonialism say and, perhaps, finding other fires, other adrenalin spurs. Lysacht (*ibid* 56) refers to John Walsh's idea (2005) of 'decommissioning' of language for television. It may be that there is a need here to find the adrenalin even if from another source than the fearful or the romantic. Walsh's is a good point though especially regarding epistemic positioning. To what extent may languages be weaponised and what do we do when it is not the time to wage war? One thinks of the haka in New Zealand as an example of a language weaponised and there are various questions in this zone in the area of Kapa Haka (cf Mathews & Karetu as discussed in Cruz Banks, 2017). And one also thinks of traditional proverbs like:

*He tao rakau e taea,
He tao kii e kore e taea*

A wooden shaft may be parried, a shaft of the tongue may not

How might aspiration regarding language revitalisation best be sorted and prioritised? Lysacht (*ibid*) talks of Te Rautaki Reo Maori (2003) which corresponds to Grin's (2002) categories: 1) reo in the community 2) maintain and improve quality 3) foster the number of situations to use te reo and 4) to increase the number of those situations. Lysacht says the emphasis on iwi is good as 'language can only live in a social situation' regarding this plan, and Te Rautaki Reo Maori is less 'strategic', her inverted commas, than aspirational.

Lysacht compares Te Rautaki with Plean (2018) in Ireland saying that this too is aspirational but argues that national bilingualism is more likely in Ireland than New Zealand. In New Zealand it might be asked whether the linking of an endangered language to the state which has endangered it is useful. The first step might be to ensure that the endangered language is in a safe place whether that is in a file on an interactive machine or in the apparent warmth and comfort of a social situation or in a bureaucratic, state based situation. It might also be questioned what Lysacht means with 'national bilingualism'. Is she talking about symbolic or actual communication?

So many analyses are from policy moments so to speak. For example Lysacht's approach at her time of writing in the first decades of this century is interesting and the germ of Te Maataawai might be detected in much of her research with a focus on iwi. Note that this focus came with the increased emphasis on the Treaty of Waitangi from 1975 with reference to Article Two. How long will this focus last and will it work and to what end? How useful has it been and how useful has the state-iwi binary been? And now with greater state influence over te reo with Te Maataawai and its incorporation of language development entities like Te Taura Whiri what do we have here?

Some claims for policy to go with a certain technology seem wild and misplaced. Lysacht (*ibid*) suggests that television straddles business and arts and culture then says 'Television as a domestic medium provides a nexus for language status and 'nation-creation'.' She notes 'local specificity'. There is a faith and credence I as well as a blame and shame regarding media that borders on the fanatic and Lysacht (*ibid*) notes, 'Derek Fox (Ngati Kahungunu, Ngati Porou) remarked in 1993 that te reo Maori

had been brought to the very brink of extinction more than anything else by the influence of monolingual broadcasting' (Fox, 1993).

Lysacht (ibid) does note that television might be problematic but does see 'The television broadcaster is a safe haven for the language and culture encouraging relationships and reconnection.' She does not go as far as Postman (ibid) or the present writer to suggest that television may be a false comfort zone.

The drive to standardisation is strong. Lysacht (ibid) notes Jo Mane (2009) talking about a lack of connectivity between Maori language initiatives' because their energies and attentions are directed primarily towards working in the field of language revival, leaving little time or resources for collaboration across initiatives.' Again this is pre Te Maataawai.

Where do commentators step outside of ethnicity to consider language revitalisation? Lysacht (ibid) quotes Tipene Chrisp of Te Puni Kokiri (2005) saying of Pakeha that their 'major contribution...will come instead from the support that Pakeha can give for the creation of a positive linguistic environment'. This could change with a compulsory language learning situation. The idea that Maori might be spoken by Pakeha or other ethnic groups in Aotearoa-New Zealand seems outside the frame of reference here and this is astonishing given Chrisp's role as a government employee and Lysacht's as an academic commentator. As an aside I often note the number of Pakeha contributing to my radio shows in te reo Maori. These are invisible or inaudible speakers in the languagescape and promoting or even unthinkingly encouraging that invisibility, that inaudibility may itself be a language endangerment by omission of speakers.

What happens when it is not someone recognised as being from this tribe or that, when the voice is from a machine? In an interesting spin on the idea of locale and the machine, Global Positioning Services in vehicles and elsewhere provides examples of standard speech about the locale of the listener that is usually meant to be but is not necessarily supralocal. GPS instructions could come in dialect. The speech might, at least in the early stages, be as mechanical in Maori as it is now in English and given the tendency to apps, the speaking doll and the like it probably won't be too long before Maori GPS exists if it does not already. How might this sort of thing, the car as broadcaster- and it might be a screen with drone fed visuals like television-in-a-car as well as voice- be best encouraged or managed by the language authorities under Te Maataawai in terms of language revitalisation? And how might policy documents such as Appendix One apply to such developments?

The conundrum of diaspora and the supralocal occurs in several ways. Lysacht (ibid) notes that Mc Giolla Christ holds that in places where native or fluent speech communities are dispersed there is greater 'necessity for intervention that is community-based in terms of moral ownership, agenda setting and action' (2005). The problem is that the people in diaspora are outside of their home locale and the question is which language best serves them as they interact with other Maori speakers also outside of their home locales in different tribal areas. Here we can turn to Temara and Maataaamua (2012) and ways to retain identity and culture of diaspora. We could look at John Rangihau and the Tuho Festival, indeed we could look again at his ideas of Tuhoetanga as opposed to Maoritanga in terms of the locale and the supralocal, as interventions when we come to the diaspora and the net and we might ask what interventions might work. Also we may need to see the net as dispersed but connected, specific in its connections but pricking bubbles of specificity.

Person and place matter in language. Lysacht (ibid) goes over Grin's condition 2 of space talking about personality vs territoriality regimes saying that Ireland is more territorial and New Zealand is more of a personality regime. She points out that those outside the language speaking areas of Gaeltacht feel 'off the hook'. Many questions in the New Zealand context ensue from this. One thinks of radio zones, the internet as a zone or a territory, state binding with Te Maataawai and Moon's Sovietisation. How is the language best used in the spaces in which it is found? On the other hand one thinks of May's idea of key speakers and the idea put forward here of the speaker as broadcaster.

Teachers of endangered languages are, in this sense, broadcasters. Jennifer Leunga in a lecture of 2017 entitled *Teaching Language and Loving Language- Perspectives of a Kaiako (Teacher)*, talks of the teacher and new media without, interestingly, talking about television:

Oral narratives in Maori and Pacific whanau are central to understanding about, where we come from and who we are. Reciting a pepha at the marae-whaikoorero and waiata are all integral to the functioning of a hui Marae-Maori meeting. The tradition of making guests welcome and presenting our native tongue with notions of manaakitanga and whangai manuhiri. Oppositely students are now designing pronunciation videos. Ad a kaiako (Teacher) I use a device to film speeches and use online platforms such as youtube, schoolology, seesaw and google classroom to distribute material.

Benefits of new media allow akinga to view at any time, our languages, including innovative and incomparable platforms and apps like www.maoridictionary.co.nz and www.kupu.maori.nz. In a digital era we are faced with the challenge to retain historical events and stories and value the knowledge our tipuna (ancestors) have, regarding our languages and our whakapapa (genealogy). A recent visit to my 86 year old Kuia (Grandmother) who taught in a total immersion Maori environment and has a wealth of knowledge, was so informative regarding traditions at the marae. She speaks of the dislike for macrons and double vowel use, however within the assessments that our rangatahi (youth) are required to complete, macron use is part of the

assessment criteria. With transliterations and kupu hou (new words) being created to cater for new devices and social networks eg hei tauira: ipad (iPapa) and facebook (pukamata) our languages are evolving.

Similarly our once spoken stories are digitised and made available to anyone, stories once held within whaanau are now easily accessible to continue our history and language. There are clear benefits of new media: onlinedictionaries. Social platforms and apps for continuing our traditions, language and history. Finding balance between tradition, oral narratives, transference of knowledge and new media and then teaching with older rauemi (resources) dictionaries, books etc is an art that I am currently perfecting.

Leunga is talking about more than lip service, more than simply giving status to the language as she gives her examples many of which are about interaction. Elevating status need not reduce endangerment. Lysacht (ibid) notes that Nettle and Romaine follow Fishman in remarking that affording status to a language rather than empowering its speakers is ineffective (Fishman 1997; Nettle & Romaine, 2000). Does state involvement afford status or power? Does state involvement enrich the cup as much or more than the lip?

'Bookend' situations where the beginnings and ends of meetings are spoken or sung in the endangered language which so becomes civic may be problematic. Lysacht (ibid) talks about civic life in the nation state and the indigenous language, 'in order to live a full and active civic life in such countries fluency in the majority language and culture is essential. The effects of the shift from one language to another continue to cause distress for minority group individuals, communities and the larger polity in which they live.' The shift required though is from the bookend to the book, to the meeting itself being in te reo as well as the beginnings and ends.

What about the polity of the internet? Do Maori speakers live in several polities including social media? Is the basic polity not the conversation? And could the conversation go into or comprise any polity, anywhere at any time? These questions apply to language development. The confining of a language into a given polity like a civic situation where a meeting in English is bound by karakia and waiata might itself be a recipe for endangerment when the correctness of symbolism does not give way to the uneven terrain of communication. Should the bookend situation be encouraged in policy such as Appendix One where the Karauna might be saluted along with Maori at the beginning and end of a feature with the middle bit in English, then we might talk about language conventions as bad habits.

The same applies to poetic language which must not be mangled into everyday speech. Lysacht (ibid) notes Hiberno-English in Ireland being seen as poetic. 'The Ascendancy (landed gentry of Anglo origin) love of dialect had the result of preserving oral traditions but also of fossilising them.' Does the Te Reo station do this and does the state apparatus, Te Taura Whiri, Te Maataawai and the like fossilise as they celebrate te reo as well? Might submissions to the Te Reo station made through Appendix One fall into such a condition and might Maihi Karauna and Maihi Maori become the new points of fixation in a process of fossilisation?

With Te Maataawai and the context of Maori Television we have an authorised and mandated language space which may be essentially passive. Lysacht (ibid) references Jo Mane (2009) to the effect that a multiplicity of agencies gets a 'too many cooks' scenario and that Te Puni Kokiri will have to deal with this. As mentioned earlier, this presages Te Maataawai. Lysacht refers to Grin's condition of 'creating a space in which the language can be used' which influences Grin's third condition which is the will to speak the language. If the will is coming from above rather from within and if the language learner is a language watcher as with television then a cage may have been created which is potentially inimical to the rough and ready but necessary foray of language use.

The power of this situation is noted. Lysacht (2010) notes that media broadcasters are powerful conduits for language image. Lysacht also speaks of the 'atmospheric'. And 'not frightening sensitive learners'.

If everyone with a voice is a broadcaster then a state monopoly on voice like Te Maataawai is ridiculous. When a monolith like television is involved the monopolisation of the voice takes another twist. But if the impacts and influences of media, state and mind are put aside for a moment, what then for the character of the language? How do voices outside the frame or frames of human comprehension, settled or diasporic, become a dialect? The talking doll is the contemporary case in point but the Maori speaking Pakeha coming from outside the culture to speak the language as say in the case of talking priests who carried a mindset of the Bible with them might have been earlier examples as might have been the beachcombers.

This is something of a conundrum in that for a language to be revitalised it must usually be extended to new speakers who, in the day of urbanisation, the internet and other influences may bring a different voice and a different, even if only just emerging, dialect.

These outsiders, these apparent isolates outside the epistemic frame may have come before the machines of the net and the talking doll but the thought of them raises questions of dialect and locale as has the media developments in the last fifty years such as Maori television and radio. New Zealand is poised to have Maori as a compulsory subject in schools. This will mean numerical superiority of people speaking a classroom based, usually supralocal language form especially in the cities rather than a marae based form.

In a possibly important take on locale Lysacht refers to Seamus Deane of the Field Day movement who remarks that people mistakenly think that:

in order to resist the colonial process, they must...stabilise for themselves the idea of being Irish...
(In Fact) the moment you stabilise your identity you have done part of the job of the imperial system. Imperial systems are about mapping, geography, stability, characterising people within certain fixed limits

Regarding mind and mentality post-colonial trauma might help explain several things. There may be a general preference for the dialect of the locale rather than a state imposed language because of post-colonial stress and we can see this in the work of Lysacht on Irish. People might sing to escape trauma. People might not want to move from local words to nationwide coinages because of trauma especially deep seated distrust of the government. The gap between cup and lip where people do not move from singing to speaking or from locale to supralocal might be explained by a conservatism born of trauma. Sometimes there are issues of tapu here as with the idea that the waiata at the end of a speech is a whakanoa process whereby the tapu of speech is lifted. Singing, especially group singing is a comfort zone and doing things in a group reduces individual shame at mistakes. This gets us into whakamaa and there has not been enough research on whakamaa and New Zealand Maori or, generally, shame and the endangered language and this might go with the suggestion made below that there is not enough attention to the mental health of the endangered language speaker (cf Sachdev, 1990; Waretini-Karena, 2012). Certainly one might speak of whakamaa as a matter of freezing people at the Passive point in the ZePA model.

One effect of post-colonial trauma might be the anti-English attitude, more generally perhaps the negative reaction to using the language of the coloniser. Words preferred may not be traditional, they might be synthetic like the days of the week with Rahina instead of Mane for Monday but that they are not directly derived from English is the main thing. In a paper on the language of Guernsey (Sallabank, 2018) the preference for French over English inclusion is discussed possibly because of the same reason. So much work done by Te Taura Whiri has been in the area of re-framing out of English influence with a move in some cases to the made up word, to the synthetic. One of the biggest factors in language endangerment might be the shift from the absolutely trustworthy local language situation to the potentially fraught nationwide situation. Language seems to be lost between locale and nation state again and again in various ways.

Are we thinking about endangered languages, New Zealand Maori in particular, in the right way? Should we be talking about mind, eye and ear? A lot of spoken or recited Maori is actually seen and this goes with kanohi ki kanohi face to face interaction at hui and elsewhere where spoken language may not be taken out of the mix with body language and atmosphere including music and song as well as haka. Body language is very important in Kapa Haka and the 'cultural cage' (cf Smith, 1995) of song suggested earlier may be strengthened by this. Should we be thinking about visual and other cues? Jeffrey Davis talks of *Curriculum approaches to reawaken indigenous sign language*:

Hundreds of sign languages (SL) have been documented globally and it is estimated that the actual number may exceed 400 (Ethnologue). Generally, two major types of SL communities are described. First, "urban deaf sign language communities" where members of the Deaf cultural group use SL as their primary communication mode across a range of sociolinguistic domains (education, religion, law, etc.). A second type "village or indigenous sign language communities" involves both deaf and non-deaf community members sharing a common SL. Among both types of SL communities we find many degrees of greater or lesser vitality; i.e., SL surviving under the shadow of a more dominant spoken language or on the verge of extinction due to the loss of all native users who maintained the language for identify and heritage. The revitalization or reawakening of Indigenous SL is linked to how it is transmitted and taught. For 25 years, the author has been engaged in documentary linguistics fieldwork, research, and revitalization of American Indigenous SL varieties considered highly endangered or dormant. This paper features efforts involving Native American community members to encourage more uses of indigenous SL and innovative teaching approaches designed to boost the number of L2 users. Visual language pedagogy entails multimodality approaches to accentuate signed, spoken, written, and digital representations of language, also applicable to teaching both spoken and signed languages.

Do we have a here a mix of visual language pedagogy and mother tongue identity? Is Kapa Haka a kind of sign language with sound? The sound involved is musical and audio cues of an intimately known world, a sound locale if you like. Is the word family-ect in the study of Guernsey discussed above useful as it connotes sight as well as sound and the sense of familiar kin speaking and interacting in the same space? The saying below comes to mind:

He kitenga kanohi,

He hokinga whakaaro

A face seen,

A thought returns

If Kapa Haka is a 'sign language with sound' how does it work to endanger or support 'regular' communication without sign? Has Apirana Ngata's attempt to save Te Reo with action songs become a true and fair crutch, a genuine support for verbal communication or a crutch that has served its time and now might profitably be thrown away? Given the growth of Te Matatini and now Mokotini at the Kohanga Reo level the latter approach seems extremely unlikely and this growth begs the questions, can we refer to this 'sign with sound' as an endangered language and then what kind of language is this?

We also need to reconsider the word 'language' Kapa Haka is more than verbal and less, perhaps, than clear aural communication between two turn takers? In considering this in terms of ZePA is it a pause on P for Passive that obstructs verbal communication or is it an Active language form in itself? Is dialect grounded necessarily in and of a specific territory? Or can there be language outside of locale, on the internet perhaps. Could we call this a dianet? Are people more comfortable in 'no-space' (cf Auge discussed below) outside of locale and nation-state?

Several questions occur. Can there be a set of language practices unique to a means of communication? Television with its one way traffic and canned responses comes to mind. Is a dialect a kind of memorialisation, a language system of memorialisation after scholars like Foote, Mazer and Cleave (cf Foote, Mazer, Cleave, as cited in Cleave, 2015)? Note that other scholars, so far as the author is aware are not suggesting such but it is raised seriously here.

Looking up a word on the net is a conversation, a 'to and fro' with choices to be made usually. But it is a conversation with a machine. What is a conversation? How is the conversational and wider language context modelled? We have a model for language loss and retrieval which goes something like the following in Rarotonga and Aotearoa:

1. Loss in cities of Aotearoa and the main island of Rarotonga
2. Retrieval occurs via outer islands in Rarotonga and hinterland dialects eg Tuhoe in Aotearoa
3. Reforming of the language as a national form
4. There is an in and out of locale and identity situation here an ethnic and cultural reconfiguration so language revitalisation means in these cases resetting the base, the locale
5. Complicating the matter is the state agency Te Taura Whiri wrapped up now in Te Maaataawai injecting new vocabulary and language forms based on an idea of the linguists following the traditional aspects of language and the state ideology of biculturalism in Aotearoa as well as the ZePA/Maihi template. Other things might be involved in Rarotonga.
6. This, in Aotearoa, is instead of a natural attrition and survival process where one dialect surpasses another or where dialects blur and coalesce. One thinks, say, of how the early missionaries saw Ngapuhi dialect as the Attic of the North or the wide use of Mataatua speakers as teachers from the 1970s or the language renaissance in Otaki which involved the Raukawa dialect.
7. Going forward and looking at the kind of language policy that might be involved, what kind of media is required along with what kind of criteria might best be set for such media and, of course, what kind of language might be required by that media? These questions are referred to above in terms of radio, television and print as well as machine in the form of AI with the talking Maori doll and machine to machine communication in a projected case of the internet of things, say, of the Maori speaking toaster activated by the Maori speaking clock.

Is a mind aside from language bureaucracy required? Do we come back to Dale's Stalinisation and Moon's Sovietisation again? We have layers of ideology starting with Biculturalism. Maihi Karauna and Maihi Maori that might be seen as ideological accretions through which we view ZePA theory and practice and 'normalisation'. Do we have the institutionalisation of an attitude and ideology which has nothing to do with the way language is actually spoken except as a matter of allowing people to speak at certain times and places? Are we talking about endangered language or endangered recitation?

Can we speak of the madness of unity? We might refer to Moon's Sovietisation again as we look at recent administrative developments regarding te reo. First came Te Maataawai which unified the administrative units of te reo like Te Taura Whiri and Te Mangai Paho. In 2018-19 there is talk of the rationalisation of news agencies and, with all that, perhaps the homogenisation of the news and,

possibly, the reo. Then in 2018 we have the Requests for Proposals modelled on Te Maataawai ideology as seen in Appendix One and which will generate, no doubt a kind of echo chamber.

A significant amount of research referred to above refers in one way or another to epistemic positioning. We could go back to Foucault's idea of an episteme here or we could lighten things by calling this a Point of View. New speakers from outside the culture might veer between cultural voyeurism and scopophilia. They could be trapped in a gaze, walking through the episteme of an Other or talking their way through it and creating a new episteme as they speak.

If we look more closely at the idea of the endangered language as a trap or series of traps we might need to question the idea of epistemic design. It seems too contrived. Language operates at a visceral level and regarding scopophilia and such things as the sexualization of Kapa Haka or the mix of aural, visual and gut level signals in the Mathews- Katetu debate it might be better to speak of an epistemic or emotional contour that speakers have fallen into, a series of comfortable vales and gullies each with a charge of adrenalin that speakers do not usually philosophise about but enjoy. Having said this people starting at Zero in the schools do so, without, in some cases, te reo me ona ahuatanga. Regarding the latter the chills running down the spine at the sound of the karanga, te ihi, te wana, te koonga and so on are highly interactional if not sexual.

There is the problem, if so it be called, of history and myth attached to or embedded in the endangered language even with native speakers of a voyeurism into an imagined and idealised past, one where things can only be named in certain ways- no English words, only French in the case of Guernsey. There is perhaps a thin perspective, a thin lens in the case of new speakers and a thick or thicker understanding on the part of natives regarding the culture associated with the endangered language.

This all changes with changes in language transmission where more language is transmitted through the net than through respected elders. But its distortions all round. The gendering of the language has been discussed above in New Zealand although there is little in this vein from elsewhere in the world referred to above and this is a departure. With this we have spins in the standard Sapir-Whorf hypothesis where languages are a part of a world view with different tenses and so senses of time and vocabulary or so many words for snow etc.

How does this relate to the decommissioning of a language or the weaponising of a language discussed above? In the latter case there is an adrenalin feed, of combat, of conflict, say against an oppressor, perceived or otherwise, of intense play. This may in fact be one definition of an endangered language-when it depends on a set adrenalin feed, a set epistemic position and it cannot find others. On the radio I recall once getting into heated arguments in Maori with another person. I felt this was good as it took te reo into a place of one on one debate. Others felt that it demeaned the reo to be so stropopy. And yet that sensitivity to perspectives outside of 'the kaupapa', the set of recognised and approved language regimes may. I suggest, be a weakness because if a language is circumscribed by its speakers then it is being killed from within.

In a discussion of play Marc Auge talks about 'no space' (2002) the area outside of a set locale like an airport and this is perhaps like the argument to do with the net above. At least two views might be taken, one is that an escape into the world of the endangered language is a release and a relief for EL speakers who live in a world dominated by predator languages. The second is that it may be a retreat or a movement into a new zone of, if you like, free space. In the case of movement to the internet or into AI this is, paradoxically, a zone without an identity anchor except, perhaps for a programme code. With the net and AI 'no-space' is a machine space, a space away from rather than further into social locale. Is there a sense of safety, false or otherwise in the 'no space' zone?

Do endangered languages themselves become highly cultured and to that extent become highly or even overly controlled so that the supposed 'no cultured' zone (or at least the machine cultured space like the net) like Auge's 'no space', like the spaces enjoyed by gamers becomes a comfortable place to play with language. 'No space' is actually free space where the culture of comfort, the language of comfort as well may be set up. In the Kapa Haka playing on the Te Reo channel and in the application for progalles requested in Appendix One everyone has a place, knows what to do and things follow a pattern impossible to find in the choppy waters and uneven terrain of everyday language life.

The reference to Auge comes from the field of interpersonal excitement and we might pause to think about the dopamine involved in the endangered language situation, the thrill of speaking a forbidden or once forbidden language.

Endangered languages, almost by definition, have suffered trauma. How good or bad is all this for the mind of the speaker? There is little on mental health and language endangerment in the literature although there is a fair bit of very good work on whakamaa and this may be related (cf Waretini-Karena, 2013). Obviously in an endangered language situation in the context like most endangered languages are of a majority or predator language speakers are in and out of language and epistemic bubbles and there must be an effect of some kind. But, on the other hand, is this the possible doorway, the way forward into a new mind, one that might be desired in the future as the predator languages tire and wear out? Or are we drifting and shifting to a place where we all speak one language and suffer a uniformity that becomes suffocating and mindless?

Conclusion

A first point in conclusion might be to try to understand the effort including the stress of those in an endangered language situation. In NZ there is a kind of fatigue regarding words like 'standardisation' or 'codification' a tiring in regard to the shift from the local to the supralocal. One thinks of Leonard Cohen's words regarding Joan of Arc:

*She said I'm tired of the war,
I want the kind of work that I had before*
Leonard Cohen,
Joan of Arc

The work of educationalists such as Dale (*op cit*) and Trinick also comes to mind, where there is the sense of a load, cultural and linguistic, long carried. In a paper delivered in 2017 entitled *Ideologies and tensions underpinning the codification of curriculum language to support Maori medium schooling* Tony Trinick offers an historical perspective:

For over 100 years, the status of te reo Maori was variously affected by various linguistic ideologies such as assimilation, which in turn led to such policies as English only in schooling. As a consequence, at the schooling level, the development of the language went into a hiatus for over 100 years, and at the macro level considerable language shift occurred to English causing te reo Maori to become endangered. In response to the parlous state of the language, a range of initiatives were launched in the 1980s by Maori to revitalise the language-including Maori medium schooling.

To support the funding of the school subjects in Maori-medium there had to be rapid expansion of the lexicon. While at times very ad hoc this paper will examine the various ideologies and tensions that have consistently underpinned this corpus development. For example, early lexical developments were largely driven by local schools and their communities, centred on the maintenance of their tribal dialects. In contrast, there was a strong belief among curriculum specialists for the need to standardise terms, particularly for teaching in secondary schools the goal was to facilitate consistency and common interpretation of terms for use across the country and to raise the status of te reo Maori as the medium of instruction. Through the development of resources such as dictionaries, local word varieties were eliminated with the implicit intention of making the standardised form the preferred form in the belief this was the best strategy for supporting learning the school subjects nationally. Thus, the prescriptive nature of standardisation and codification is a double edged sword. At the community level many iwi continue to hold strong views that the language of schooling should reflect their own dialects including the desire for dialect-specific curriculum terms used in schools in their tribal area.

Some time has been spent on defining cup and lip. The example offered of cup from official sources is the strategy statement in Appendix One. How much of this cup is to do with language and the mechanics of such and how much is to do with socio-political context? Both Trinick and Dale, *inter alia* are iwi focused. Are their minds on the where te reo is right now?

The characteristics of the policy document in Appendix One which are consistent under the umbrella of Te Maataawai form a template with the following features:

1. Maihi Karauna and Maihi Maori
2. Regarding ZePA you need to show how you will reach Zero, Passive and Active people
3. You need to show how you will normalise the language

This template is new and has a freshness about it. It is also culturally sensitive in the use of parts of the whareniui. At the same time it makes for something of a language machine or at least a language ideology, a maximally or at least very highly integrated approach that gives concern in certain respects. The wholesale acceptance of the ZePA model as a central maxim is worrying without a full description of the categories, Zero, Passive and Active and the tasks associated with these categories in language revitalisation. Attention has been given above to POV, epistemic positioning and epistemic design and what might be called excitement points of systems. In earlier work, (Cleave, 1981) I have described charismatic systems in a Maori boarding school involving key slang terms. I note that people proficient in that system have gone on to be leaders, ambassadors in Te Reo. In recent interviews with the likes of Joe Harawira or Shane Jones the idea of language and cultural broadcasters occurred again to me.

I interviewed Joe – more of a catch up in the radio tent than a proper interview – at the Ratana Pa centenary in November, 2018. One of the striking features of the gathering to me and others was the number of te reo speakers who wanted to be interviewed in te reo on the radio. Again it strikes me that these speakers, typically leaders of this or that group are performing as broadcasters and that this is an accepted and to some extent a necessary role: to put the POV of the group in te reo. Coming again to the work on St Stephens I was talking about the set of terms around 'gun' and 'dick' and I suggested we were looking at charismatic kinds or systems of communication. I would argue that there is a strong performance aspect to the contributions of these speakers in te reo on the radio and that their followers listen with a tingle of excitement to make sure the boxes are ticked with the right aplomb. The speakers are mangai, mouthpieces for their groups and there are matters of mana involved.

Considering matters of mana and rangatiratanga the policy document and the template within it looks back to a Crown-Maori relationship that certainly existed at the time of the Treaty and up to the urban migration after WW2. But since then especially in the last fifty years with the advent of the internet and social media the locales inherent in the Iwi- Crown relationship, the tension, creative or otherwise of the mountain and river of the hinterland and the beehive in Wellington have shifted considerably. The iwi are in diaspora and both iwi and crown are on the net. People, speakers that is, are not neatly placed in houses or whare with distinctively carved barge boards or maihi.

Some of the 'new' media may not have delivered. In New Zealand television is about sixty years old. Maori Television is about thirty years old from its first manifestation. Lurking at the back of the mind is a question about all this, has Maori Television been a waste of time sucking up a critical resource of speakers as the technology i.e. the net has surpassed it? Had the charismatic speakers been on more often and better encouraged on the net what then?

A similar thing may be happening with Maori radio. To give an example I run competitions in te reo on the air and on the station internet page that goes with my show, Te Ao Whanui, in both places but I find that people are, firstly coming via the net and second using the net, the dictionaries thereon, as a resource more than they are using kaumatua in their area. In this example the net rules, the net jumps the radio feed and it may be that the net also jumps the television feed, the classroom feed and the feed from the whanau, critically the input and advice from tribal elders.

It may be that the to and fro on the net, spoken or written be taken as starting points in considerations of where te reo is going. This might include the use or not of terms from Te Taura Whiri in such internet exchanges. Have those speakers on Maori Television like the people at the Maori Language Commission been creating a national dialect that disappears into the ether and does the same thing apply in Ireland or elsewhere? Where is the ground here? Do we come back to the idea suggested earlier of a dianet if the internet is the locale, the ground upon which language study might best commence?

One problem is that figures are against Maori TV in that as Maori TV has risen the figures for Maori speakers have fallen. If Maori Television is such a great idea why are the figures falling? Is Maori Television supported because Pakeha can see it? Is the language being lost behind Maori Television? Is television a place where language is shown but not or at least not necessarily learnt? If the answer to such questions is negative it might be disingenuous of Maori Television to run behind the language revitalisation truck as the document in Appendix One clearly does.

It is suggested above that there is a set of filters, ideological filters if you like sometimes loosely referred to as language values and sometimes these go with other distinctions made in the sociopolitical locale of Aotearoa New Zealand. The Maori -Pakeha distinction for example might be like the French-English distinction in Guernsey. In the Maori language context in the country the expression, 'That's a pakeha idea' means that is a bad idea usually. Whether such a distinction applies on the internet or in AI is a matter of conjecture perhaps. In the Guernsey case theorists like Sallabank have called this epistemic positioning and this may be a handy concept in this case. Similarly perhaps James Costa (Lacito and Médéric Gasquet-Cyrus ask in a 2018 paper *Language ideological clarification in revitalization: Is there any point?*)

This presentation seeks to question the widespread assumption that revitalisation efforts are often impeded by language ideological debates and tensions, and that "language ideological clarification" might help overcome this (Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer 1998, Fishman 1991, Kroskrity 2000). We argue that this perspective derives from a dualistic and perhaps simplistic approach to language revitalisation, one which problematises it in terms of diagnosis and treatment, one that polarises debates in terms of being "in favour" or "against" revitalisation, and one that ultimately buys into the nativistic narratives at the source of revitalisation movements. Taking the position that revitalisation is primarily a groupness project (or a series of competing projects) (Brubaker 2002), some argue that it is probably not our role as linguists or anthropologists to help achieve such clarification, a task we deem inherently impossible. On the other hand, some are convinced that a certain role (to be determined) can be played by linguists or anthropologists, but within a certain limit, beyond which it is in all the cases naive to think that any "ideological clarification" can help a potential language revitalisation. Based on case studies in Scotland and Provence, we argue that it might be more productive to help map the various networks of social actors or actants involved in such endeavours and to acknowledge that while language might not be the ultimate aim of revitalisation movements, or that such movements might be misguided from our perspectives, their study reveals something of the role language has come to take in late modernity as a totem.

Several of the questions posed by Costa and Gasquet-Cyrus have been considered in the discussion of Lysacht and others above. In the discussions of Irish and Maori Television in particular the question as to whether they are essentially about identity or language has been raised.

To answer the question where is the language, it is, as seen in Appendix One, in something of an ideological grid called the template elsewhere in this paper. Is this best considered as a totem or a plan for a totem, say with associated carvings as with the imagined Maihi Karauna and Maihi Maori, a floor map for an identity statement? As such we are being asked to engage in a kind of pageant with set indigenous frames, set dialogues.

Where should policy be going? To a point of origin or a point of departure, to the original group of speakers or to new speakers? Which of these is the major consideration in 'normalisation'? How does normalisation work with epistemic positioning? New speakers bring their own values, their own filters, their own noise. There may be ideological dissonance.

Throughout this paper the notion of language play has been raised. Play has been regarded as critical and as lacking in the case of the one way traffic with television while the net and systems that allow interaction have been seen as positive.

It may be profitable to consider the direction of play without being directorial. As mentioned earlier, in a 2017 paper entitled *Popularising corpus studies: Mr Corpus and Ms Parrot meet the audience* Miller and Tono offer a humorous way to learn English on television with the embedded idea of a corpus and the need to learn it even if that implies parroting. Part, perhaps a large part of the endangered language situation is scoping the learning needs involved, especially the vocabulary required for elementary fluency. Miller and Tono seem to be talking about a pleasant way to do this even if, actually it's all hard work.

A lot of history is told through the lens of an ethnic or nationalist group members of which speak the same language. The historiography of language is followed sometimes loosely and sometimes without a set relation between language and culture but usually by the history of a nation or an ethnic (cf Cleave 2017). In the present situation Te Maataawai, the state machine for language does have a relationship with the way the language functions but the language gets out from under, comes around corners and pops up here and there in an apparently willy nilly fashion outside of the ideological grid of Te Maataawai.

Will the talking Maori doll follow Maihi Karauna and Maihi iwi? Where is the talking Maori doll in terms of Zepa? It may seem a silly example but a fair part of normalisation going forward may involve a mix of the robotic and the net, of AI and machine to machine technology. Can the toaster be programmed in Maori? Or the stove to tell when the roast is done according to pre-set instructions or the alarm system by the bed to inform you of the day's weather as instructed when the alarm sounds? In most if not all of these cases the answer is in the affirmative.

We seem a long way from Moon's 'Sovietisation'? Or are we? We seem a long way from epistemic positioning with code, the net and AI but are we really? To what extent can ideology be programmed on a machine to machine, in an internet of things, *he kupenga ipurangi o nga mea* basis? To what extent can it be controlled from a supposed point of origin. As argued in *Kei hea te reo* (Cleave 2017) that point of origin might best be where the major characteristics of te reo emerged in places like Sikaiana *en route*, probably, to Polynesia (cf Capell cited in Cleave 2017). Is it too much of a stretch to imagine that point of origin as far as some speakers are concerned is on the net?

There has been a discussion of Maori language revitalisation as a speaker centred activity rather than a state policy driven matter driven by state language policy. There may be a need now to have research that is focussed on personal, interactive speech policy and conduct rather than that of the state or the school. And there may be a need for policy documents like that in Appendix One to be centred more around clubs, societies and key individual speakers with clearly established broadcast patterns than on media such as television.

Regarding lip the cross references to *Kei hea te reo* (Cleave 2017) might show that, by contrast, as state policy has become more consistent the use of Maori has become more varied This has been discussed with reference to locale, the use of Maori in AI and in other ways. Some features of the lip, the way the language is actually spoken with and without regard to policy are worth considering.

In 2017 at the Cambridge conference I looked at the way people tell the history of their language (Cleave, 2017). How will the story of the last fifty years be told? Will there be the history of Te Taura Whiri starting some fifty years ago replaced by the history of Te Maataawai over the last five years? Will Te Maataawai really offer a new start? What will be the telling of language endangerment the histories of cup and lip, the myth of beginning, middle, end. We might look at epistemic positioning and design and historiography. All of this might be considered as a matter of language identity and this might be taken as the core of language values. Will the story of language rescue go back to te hau kainga, back to the template of ZePA or to Te Taura Whiri or Te Maataawai. Can language afford a history? Will the story be told as a matter of top down meddling? Where policy fifty years ago addressed a localised tribal language now it is something of a moveable feast along the ZePA line and through social media, through urban environments in several countries and on the internet.

There is also concern perhaps at the use of the word 'shift'. It seems sometimes to be used as a polite way of saying decline, from Active to Passive to Zero. But the language, te reo, has shifted geographically so that New Zealand and Australia are centres for Eastern Polynesian languages given the number of speakers from that zone in Aotearoa-New Zealand and Australia so there has been a western shift if you like (Cleave 2018). Then there is the shift to the net. Then there is the shift in gender speech. Then there is the shift out of ethnic as this year at say Auckland Grammar students from many ethnic backgrounds are learning Maori as it becomes compulsory in a school where Maori are in a distinct minority and where Pakeha are not always the majority. There is the shift to AI and the talking doll. To simply talk about shift from left to right might be a little simplistic and miss important avenues for development.

Put another way, shift is used to express more or less without regard to the specific texture of language say as used in the net, or in AI or in different geographical areas or gender spaces. What if we

are shifting generally to a world where certain kinds of metaphor are decreasingly used but language use continues and even increases despite that? Should we talk of shapeshifting in language revitalisation and create policy to go with it?

What does the template used by Te Maataawai stand for? A national culture? A sovereignty? When we talk of Maihi Karauna are we also talking about a state wide dialect with a state bureaucracy dancing to its own drumbeat? The template might better be speaker-listener, listener- speaker. Where is the research and concentration on this? What is the linguist's role? To be a kind of policy analyst re Maihi Karauna-Maihi Iwi? Or a cultural expert regarding maihi, tuuwatawata etc? Or to be closely watching speaker-listener interaction and suggesting policy initiatives to go with that? Within all this the linguist might be looking to avoid walls, especially walls that constrain existing speakers of the endangered language.

Some researchers look to community needs as with Vijay A. D'Souza who presented a paper in 2018 called *Context-based language revitalisation: A case study of emerging language revitalisation efforts among the Hrusso Aka*:

In this presentation I explore a context-specific approach to language revitalisation based on my ongoing work with the Hrusso Aka tribe of Arunachal Pradesh, Northeast India. Hrusso Aka is an endangered language with approximately 4000 speakers. Having been a part of the community's efforts to preserve their language for the last twenty years, I propose a model of revitalisation with the following key elements: (1) Context-based: Through the Hrusso Aka myth 'The alphabet that got eaten up', I shall discuss why revitalisation efforts without a deep understanding of the context and culture are likely to fail; (2) Empowering native speakers: Members of the native-speaker community, empowered with relevant skills and motivation, are the best driving force of revitalisation; (3) An evolving model: A model that begins small and evolves constantly based on the community's needs, aspirations, philosophy, attitudes, creativity and resources.

In all cases with a speaker- listener focus the sovereignty of the speaker would be established and the authorities of state and tribe in the template discussed above might not have force. In the speaker listener situation the language walls are human. How loud, how soft, when to speak, the words to use and the general sensibility of language would occur in an unimpeded way.

One of the critical points in the discussion above may be that of context, of locale. In the first instance This may be something of a misconception, a misconception of locale to begin with. Anne Salmond (1975) referred to a Maori map. The best statement of the traditional locale for Maori and the concepts involved might be that of Kawharu (2010). The first problem with such work is that few Maori and relatively few Maori speakers live in the deep hinterland now as fine a sense of metaphor as speakers living in those areas might have.

And then there is the response to the Euro mind and to the consideration of where New Zealand is as a nation and the attendant focus on the wide world and not on the Maori history of New Zealand. Is this overbearing context echoed or transmuted or subverted by the speakers of the endangered language? As we have seen above in the case of French in Guernsey or in the case of Maori in New Zealand with no transliterations, in the 'thou shalt not borrow' examples, naming the environment, describing the locale happens in an 'authentic' manner. Will we move past this or keep doing it and which of these is best for language revitalisation?

In the case of the maps, geographical in Salmond's case and conceptual in Kawharu's, there are many and heavy over-layering accretions following centuries of colonisation. The stripping away of these, the throwing out of the 'borrowed' is something we can reflect upon in New Zealand over half a century. To what effect? How much of this is tolerated or eschewed in the document in Appendix One?

So much of the paper has been about the grounding of reo at community or state level. If the endangered language is not grounded effectively in these places then can a language be grounded on the net or in a machine language and programme? What are the signposts, the maihi, if you like on the net or in code?

To conclude with a thought about culture, in the endangered language situation there seems a need for singularity of purpose. There is an attention to the Sapir Whorf hypothesis that takes it to a strict set of meanings and behaviours that may in fact get in the way of language development. As seen in Appendix One, above all else hover monolithic or single minded cultural positions that are expected to be followed. But we live in something of a situation where many or most people have their own page on the net. Each person is a broadcaster, each with their own epistemic position, their own template. One pays attention to growing the base and improving the platform.

There is a new media context now independent of states or big media conglomerates like Maori Television so teaching people how to use their media platforms and how to grow the base of interactors is critical in the endangered language context. There is little in the literature or even in the conferences about this (but cf Keegan & Cunliffe, 2014).

There is also the will to speak. This can be motivated in different ways. One might be to do with the sense of history, the historiography of the language and the hopes and dreams involved. The dream is usually a switch from endangerment to standard communication, from dead to alive in a magic moment as with as with Hebrew in Israel in 1948. The power to make that shift might be presumed to come from

the state and this is where Te Maataawai and the policy paper discussed here resides in terms of dreams. The language is directed to get up from the tent at the side of the cemetery and walk away into a world of light. There are almost millennial expectations. All things are possible.

Another concluding point might be to ponder yet again the scale and force of English, the Other Language in New Zealand. Most of this paper has involved the comparison and contrast of endangered languages and usually what is meant by that phrase is a small language confined to a minority position of some kind. There may be a case for simply looking at competitions between languages big or small and to see how an EL might learn from LWC, a Language of Wider Communication. There are many and various slants here. Khalaf in a 2018 paper talks about *Attrition in an L1 environment: The strange case of English-Arabic language contact in Bahrain*. Khalaf argues:

The impact of both education and language contact on language shift has been amply documented. Such shift, however, disproportionately occurs among either minority ethnic groups, migrants in an L2 environment, or speakers of a national minority language. Not yet observed is first-language attrition in a first-language environment, as is currently unfolding among Bahraini children of Arabic-speaking parents in Bahrain, where Modern Standard Arabic enjoys official status and Gulf Arabic is spoken by 51% of the resident population (36% of which is Bahraini). For at least one demographic, however, which is young, middle-class and privately schooled, Arabic has become not only a second language, but in many cases one of which children scarcely even have passive knowledge, corresponding to the third stage of Joshua Fishman's model of language shift. Combining a sociohistorical study of the Bahraini linguistic landscape with interviews of non-Arabic-speaking children under 18 and their parents, this study finds that English-medium education can outweigh the contributions of a largely L1 environment. Here bilingual parents are, as ever, mediators of the process - although, as the findings show, they do not always realise it. Those who do emphasise the importance of English-language fluency in preparation for higher education abroad, whatever the cultural cost.

Bahrain, like Japan perhaps as with the earlier example of English instruction programmes on Japanese television is a case where the state does not act to prevent language endangerment. It is assumed in these countries that Japanese and Arabic is not at risk and one might well query such an assumption given the argument of Khalaf's paper. This might prompt a question as to whether the notion of an endangered language is fully understood. If language endangerment can happen to Arabic then, surely it can happen anywhere and the scope of the matter is considerable.

There are some comparisons that might be made with the Bahraini example and Maori in the Pacific. Just as Bahrain may be seen as a centre with considerable population movement, Auckland in New Zealand saw the Ngati Whatua, the local iwi challenged in terms of language retention for similar reasons and the same or at least a similar thing happened in Rarotonga. In the latter case the Maori language seems to be under threat in Rarotonga to a greater extent than in the outer islands such as Pukapuka while in the case of urban populations in New Zealand especially in Auckland those populations distant from the city such as the Tuhoe in the Urewera seem to have better retained the language. Regarding English in Bahrain that language may be taking a greater hold there than in the Arab hinterland.

This might also take the discussion into L1 and L2 considerations and in the New Zealand context there are many warps and wefts. English is the L1 language usually or at least often but not always for Maori speakers. For the demographic considered in Bahrain where Arabic was/is the L1 language and is the official language is there a misplacement of policy and a lack of appreciation for just how strong or how predatory English is? Are we aware of these things in the New Zealand Maori context where Maori is an official language and for some people it is the official *second* language? Are we aware of what is required by the state in terms of encouraging L2 languages or for that matter what awareness of all this is required by the iwi and then by other speakers?

Khalaf's argument is about English language teaching. What about the language on the net and what kind of emphasis in an endangered language context should be placed upon the net as well as upon education? To what extent is the Bahraini example one where state policy in education is an endangerment to a language, one where the educational tools and cultural practices, the traditional ones at least, are at odds. To really turn things on their heads and to finish with a provocative if perhaps wishful thought, if English can take on Arabic in Bahrain why can't Maori take on English in Aotearoa-New Zealand?

Khalaf's paper conjures a question from left field. In a situation where the endangered language is the L2 how can the education system be used along with other systems, other influences, so that there is at least competition between L1 and L2? If Arabic in Arabia can be subverted, if you like, by English in a combination of education and the internet why might not the same be seen with Maori and English in New Zealand? This is asked in the context of Maori being seriously considered as a compulsory subject in New Zealand schools and the use of Maori in AI and the internet in various ways discussed below and the suggestion that we may be in a new area of sphericules and mediascapes as set out in the second part of this paper. Obviously English is a major language and it is difficult to compare its progress anywhere with other less widely spoken languages but might it still be asked whether there is there a

multiplier effect of some kind to be found in the case of an endangered language so that rapid advances might be made? Of all the EL languages considered above Maori might seem to have the best shot.

In a paper replete with questions we might be left with the tantalising if challenging and difficult question, what happens when we assume that Maori in New Zealand is not an EL but a competitor with English in an LWC context? What kind of a cup might we have then? Perhaps this is the kind of play required at the theoretical level to go with the kind of play suggested in this paper at the level of the lip.

The situation with Arabic and English in Bahrain shows the torrent that Gitlin (2002) describes as one so called predator language engages in the predation of another. This is a torrent of images and words on social media and elsewhere, the rub here being that it is all or at least mostly in English. How do you fight, arrest or at least stand out against the torrent without memorialisations, fetishisations, sexualisations, Stalinisations, Sovietisations and the like? The Mathews-Karetu debate (cf Cruz Banks, 2017) is a conversation about physicality in communication which illustrates the difficulty involved in separating viscera from intellect when the endangered language is involved. Any attempt to normalise the threatened language through policy, especially through policy alone, seems fraught.

Another comment or query that might be made in conclusion could be to ask who is identifying with Maihi Karauna, the Crown being seen as the language oppressor at least in historical terms. At the same time it might be asked who is identifying with Maihi Maori given the differences that might exist amongst iwi and people who identify as Maori although this might not be as problematic. There might well be a sense of unease that one of these contrasting points is a straw person.

Coming to the point about population shift and thinking about immigrant workers in Bahrain who might come from English speaking areas such as the Indian subcontinent it may be that we now need to seriously consider reasons for population and language shift. In a 2017 paper called *And to what purpose?* about language and change in the Gilbert Islands Tobias Leonhardt talks about how the Gilbertese approach questions of identity and culture in times where climate change impacts are rendering their home islands uninhabitable and where preparations for 'migration with dignity' (cf Duong 2015) are ongoing.

In a recent paper (Cleave, 2017) the situation of Sikaian and the effective relocation westwards of that language to Honiara was discussed with the suggestion that this was interesting as that language is perhaps one of the first manifestation of Polynesian but occurring originally and subsequently outside of Polynesia. Climate change itself could well displace people from low islands in Polynesia along with their languages and there may be a case now for considering a dislocation of original locale and language. In some respects there has been a shift westward in the last fifty years of speakers of Eastern Polynesian languages to New Zealand and Australia to do with employment and urbanisation. The locale, the so called locale of origin, is important but not necessary for language survival or revitalisation.

One intention in this paper has been to make comparisons and contrasts with New Zealand Maori and other language situations. In the same language group there are contrasts with Cook Island Maori where there seems little state policy. New Zealand Maori could also be contrasted with the situation described by Yeche where there is very little if any direct support from the US government for a native American language.

The singing of the endangered language in the Sorbian case has a resonance with Kapa Haka and the Te Reo station as well as the iwi radio stations. A fair bit of attention has been given to a comparison of Maori and Gaelic in the Irish case because of the attention given in New Zealand and in the policy document discussed to Maori Television. The idea of neighbourhood support has been discussed and there may well be media to media support opportunities from state to state regarding endangered language.

The comparison of North and South Island Maori and the cross border Catalan situation has been made and again the 'good neighbour' thesis put forward by Hawkey has been mentioned. Similarly the New Zealand Maori- Hawaiian relationship offers good neighbour possibilities within the Eastern Polynesian language group.

To what extent do endangered languages become scripted? This question has been addressed across the paper. Are speakers staying and to some extent being trapped in role as true tribal folk? And to what extent do singing and dancing roles support this?

To take a proposition from a different field in conclusion, Jan Deutsch, the auto historian suggested the Edsel was "the wrong car at the wrong time". Could this apply to Te Maatawai as an inefficient and misguided monolith or to Maori Television as a unidirectional vehicle? Do these inform and structure the wrong language development space at the wrong time? Do we have a fleet of Edsels here? Taking this example to the title of this paper, is the drawing board of the auto plant like the language policy of a government, a cup of desired possibilities? Needs there be a flame in the plan to ignite the market, a magic 'twixt cup and lip so that they meet properly? Or should development start with what is actually happening, with what people are saying and how they speak rather than how they might or should speak? Should we follow a plan at all with language or is the idea referred to in this paper, that the speaker is the policy maker, the language *bricoleur*, to patch over from Levi Strauss again, and that the possibilities of language in whatever locale or space are found and flow from the lip?

Bibliography

- Agirre, Idola, & Astigarraga. (2016). Active audience? Interaction of young people with television and on-line video content, *Communication and Society*, 29, 3.
- Appurda, A. (1990). Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy, in M. Featherstone (Ed.) *Global Culture: nationalism, globalization and modernity: a theory, culture and society special issue* (pp 295-310). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Arana, E., Azpillaga, P., & Narbaiza, B., (2007). Linguistic Normalisation and Local Television in the Basque Country. In Mike Cormack & N. Hourigan (Eds.), *Minority Language Media: Concepts, Critiques, and Case Studies, Multilingual Matters* (pp. 151-167). Clevedon; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Auge, M. (2002). *In the Metro*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Everyone Dies Young: Time Without Age*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2016.
- Bhabha, H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*, London; New York: Routledge.
- Bacciu, C. (2016). *Area-bound linguistic identities in Sardinia - An educational grammar proposal*, Sixth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). An attainable version of high literacy approaches to teaching higher order skills in reading, *Curriculum Inquiry*.
- Borchers, D. (2016). *Why mother tongue education in Nepal doesn't work (yet)*. Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Cleave, P. (1981). *Gun and Dick in The Family and the New Zealand School* in P. Ramsay (Ed) Longman Paul.
- Cleave, P. (2008). *Iwi Station*, Campus Press, Palmerston North.
- Cleave, P. (2010). *Iwi Station*, Campus Press, Palmerston North.
- Cleave, P. (2014). Memory, Body and Dance: a review of literature. *Te Kaharoa*, 7(1) <https://doi.org/10.24135/tekaharoa.v7i1.46>
- Cleave, P. (2016). *He Tono moo Te Maataawai*, Campus Press, Palmerston North
- Cleave, P. (2018). Kei hea te reo. *Te Kaharoa*, 11.
- Costa, J., & Brennan, S. (2018). *Does a stronger association between language and place facilitate language revitalisation efforts? Some insights from Occitania*. Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Costa, J., & Gasquet-Cyrus, M. (2018). *Language ideological clarification in revitalization: Is there any point?* Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Coughlan, E. (2018). *'It'll keep the Irish going, like': Attitudes to language revitalisation policies among Irish-speaking teenagers*. Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Cruz Banks, O. (2017). HAKA ON THE HORIZON Māori contemporary dance and whare tapere, *MAI Journal*, 6(1).
- Cunningham, S. (2004). Popular Media as Public "Sphericules" for Diasporic Communities. In R. C. Allen and A. Hill (Eds.), *The Television Studies Reader* (1st ed., pp. 151-162). London: Routledge.
- Dash, R. (2018). *Prospects and challenges in public-private relationships*. Eighth Endangered Language Conference, Cambridge.
- Davis, J. (2016). *Curriculum approaches to reawaken indigenous sign language*. Sixth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- D'Souza, V. (2018). *Context-based language revitalisation: A case study of emerging language revitalisation efforts among the Hrusso A*. Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Dale, H. (2017). *Intersections between oral narratives, traditions, lexicography and new media*, Australix, Rarotonga.
- Deane, S. (1985). *Celtic revivals: essays in modern Irish literature, 1880-1980*, London: Boston.
- Deutsch, J. (1976). *The Edsel and Corporate Responsibility*, Yale University Press.
- Dörflinger, T. (2018). *Language planning and the Gaeltacht - The case of County Donegal*, Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Dołowy-Rybińska, N. & Ratajczak, C. (2018). *Upper Sorbian language (re) revitalization through education: When revitalization strategies disregard the community's internal language maintenance policy*, Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Duddy, T. (2002). *A History of Irish Thought*, London; New York: Routledge.
- Fang, M. & Nathan, D. (2016). *Tapping the well: evaluating and adapting teaching LWC methodologies for endangered languages*. Sixth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Fishman, J. A. (1989). Language and ethnicity in minority sociolinguistic perspective. Clevedon; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift: theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon; Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

- Fishman, J. (2001). Can threatened languages be saved? : reversing language shift, revisited: a 21st century perspective. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J. (2007). What Do You Lose When You Lose Your Language? In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilising Indigenous Languages*, A Center for Excellence in Education Monograph.
- Foote, K.E. (2003). *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy*, revised ed. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Foucault, M. (1969). *The Archaeology of Knowledge* London and New York: Routledge.
- Gitlin, T. (2002). *Media Unlimited: How the Torrent of Images and Sounds Overwhelms Our Lives*. Henry Holt and Company.
- González, R., & Sinuhé, O. (2018). *Inclusive research methodologies and multidisciplinary in Nahuatl revitalization*, Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Grin, F., Moring, T., Haggman, J., O'Riagain, D., & Strubell, M. (2002). *Support for Minority Languages in Europe*. Report to the European Commission.
- Hawkey, J. (2016). *Collaborative cross-border curricula: The design and implementation of bilingual and immersion Catalan education programs in France*. Sixth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Hinton, L. (2015). What counts as a "success" in language revitalization? University of British Columbia Webcast sponsored by the Irving K. Barber Learning Centre and hosted by the *Future Speakers: Indigenous Languages in the 21st Century* series.
- Irvine, J. T. (1989). When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy, *American Ethnologist*, 16(2) ,248-267
- Jacobs, N. (2016). *Application of Maori concepts into a Business Management Degree programme*, Sixth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Kawharu, M. (2010). Environment as marae locale. In R. Selby, Moore and Mulholland (Eds.), *Māori and the environment: Kaitiaki*. (pp. 221-239). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Books.
- Karetu, T. (1993). *Haka! The dance of a noble people* Auckland, New Zealand: Reed.
- Keegan, T. & Cunliffe, D. (2014). 'Young People, Technology and the Future of te Reo Maori' in *The Value of the Maori Language, Te Hua o te Reo Maori*. Vol. 2 Huia Press.
- Khalaf (2018). *Attrition in an L1 environment: The strange case of English-Arabic language contact in Bahrain*, Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Kim, Soung-U, (2018). *Managing ideology: Language-ideological surveying for language revitalisation*, Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- King, J., Maclagan, M., Harlow, R., Keegan, P., 7 Watson, C. (2017). *Thou shalt not borrow! Attitudes of Māori speakers towards Te Reo Māori and New Zealand English*. Unpublished paper from the Seventh Cambridge Conference on Language Endangerment.
- Kohlberger, M. (2018). *Revitalising endangered knowledge: Insights from the Shiwiar Nation*, Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Kroskrity, P. (2009). Narrative Reproductions: Ideologies of Storytelling, Authoritative Words, and Generic Regimentation in the Village of Tewa, *Linguistic Anthropology*
- Leaunga, J. (2017). *Teaching Language and Loving Language- Perspectives of a Kaiako (Teacher)*, Australex, Rarotonga.
- Levi Strauss, C. (1966). *The Savage Mind*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson Ltd.
- Lotman Y. (1990). *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture* London & New York: I. B. Tauris & Co Ltd.
- Lysacht, R. (2010). *Teanga and Tikanga: A Comparative Study of National Broadcasting in a Minority Language on Maori Television and Teiliflis na Gaelige*, D. Phil Thesis University of Auckland
- Mac Giolla Chríost, D. (2005). *The Irish language in Ireland*, London; New York: Routledge.
- Mac Giolla Chríost, D. (2008). Micro-level Language Planning in Ireland. In A. Liddicoat & R. B. Baldauf (Eds.), *Language planning and policy: language planning in local contexts* (pp. 75-94). Clevedon: Multilingual Matter
- Matthews, N. (2004). The physicality of Māori message transmission — Ko te tinana, he waka tuku kōrero. *Junctures: The Journal for Thematic Dialogue*, 3, 9–18.
- May, S. (2000). Uncommon Languages: The Challenges and Possibilities of Minority Language Rights, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 21(5), 366-385.
- May, S. (2001). *Language and Minority Rights: ethnicity, nationalism, and the politics of language*. Longman.
- May, S. (2008) *Language and minority rights: ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language* London: Routledge.
- May, S. (2008). Language Education, Pluralism and Citizenship. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (Vol. 1, pp. 15-29). Boston, MA: Springer US. Retrieved from <http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3>
- Moon, P. (2017). *Killing Te Reo*, Campus Press, Palmerston North.
- Moon, P. (2018) <http://www.maoritelevision.com/.../kohanga-reo-chronically-un...>
- Nettle, D., & Romaine, S. (2000). *Vanishing Voices: the extinction of the world's languages*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mazer, S. (2016). From Waka to Haka: Performative Voyaging in the 21st Century' *Performance Research*

- Miller, J. & Tono, Y. (2017). *Popularising corpus studies: Mr Corpus and Ms Parrot meet the audience* Australex Conference, *Intersections between oral narratives, traditions, lexicography and new media*, Rarotonga
- O'Brian, C. (2016). *Creating relevant curricula for endangered languages in Colombia*, Sixth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University
- Ó Ceallaigh, B. (2018) *Irish language policy: ten years after the financial crash* Eighth Endangered Language Conference Cambridge University
- Pischlöger, C. (2018). *Which language do we want to save? Udmurt language ideologies on social media*, Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University
- Postman, N. (1985). *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*, Penguin
- Rangihau, T. (1997). Solutions for Maori Broadcasting in Norris, P and Farnsworth, J, *Keeping it ours: issues of television broadcasting in New Zealand: papers from the New Zealand Broadcasting School Seminar* (pp. 106-9), Christchurch: Christchurch Polytechnic.
- Resnick D. P. & L.B. Resnick (1977). The nature of literacy: an historical explanation. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47, 370-385.
- Ritchey, E. (2016). *The promise and limits of civil society organisations in language revitalisation: The case of Occitan*. Endangered Language Conference, Cambridge University.
- Riggins, S. (1992). *Ethnic Minority Media: an international perspective*, Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Rumsey, A. (1990). Wording, Meaning, and Linguistic Ideology. *American Anthropologist*, 92.
- Sachdev, P.S. (1990). Whakama: culturally determined behaviour in the New Zealand Maori. *Psychological medicine*, 20(02), 433-444.
- Sallabank, J. (2018) *What's in a word? Authenticity in a highly endangered language*, Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Selby, R., Moore, P., & Mulholland, M. (2012). *Māori and the Environment: Kaitiaki*
- Smith, J. (2006). Parallel Quotidian Flows: MTS On Air, *New Zealand Journal of Media Studies*, 9(2), 27–35.
- Stroll, A. (2001). *Twentieth-Century Analytic Philosophy*, Columbia University Press.
- Turner, S. (2007). "Inclusive Exclusion": Managing Identity for the Nation's Sake in Aotearoa/New Zealand, *Arena*, 28, 87-106.
- Viernes, G. (2018) *Social media platforms and minority languages: Opportunities and challenges from the perspective of the #europeminoritylanguages project*, Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.
- Walsh, J. (2013) *Transforming Māori Experiences of Historical Intergenerational Trauma*, PhD thesis, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiāraangi.
- Yèche, H. (2018). *Language warriors? Contemporary conceptions and practices of Lakota in the US*, Eighth Endangered Languages Conference, Cambridge University.

Reference Texts, Songs and Media References

Encyclopedia of Identity 2010 (Eds.) Jackson, R.L and Hogg, M.A., Sage
Black Mirror, 2017 Netflix Episode One
Just like Tom Thumb's Blues, Bob Dylan
Joan of Arc Leonard Cohen

Government Documents

Maori Media Strategies (2018)
Te Mangai Paho
Te Maihi Karauna Ta te Karauna Rautahi moo te whakaoratanga o te te Reo Maori, I nga tau 2018-23
Maihi Karaina
The Crown's Strategy for Maori Language Revitalisation 2018-2023
Consultation August-September 2018
Te Kawanaranga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Government

Māori Language Strategies

The Maihi Karauna strategy is still in development but a clear message that emanates from both the development process and the new government is the need for a more collaborative and cohesive approach to language revitalisation.

Te Paepae Motuhake (2011), "Review of the Māori Language Strategy and the Māori Language Sector".
Te Māngai Pāho – Television RFP June 2018

Te Māngai Pāho Position

Te Māngai Pāho has undertaken a careful re-examination of the literature around language revitalisation and, with the assistance of access to a significant research project, developed a view on how the theory of language revitalisation might be better tailored to the specific needs of the Māori language revitalisation environment and efforts.

The academic literature on language revitalisation is well-developed² and various theories have been applied in the development of strategies to address Māori language loss. These theories have also influenced how these strategies have been measured.

More recent research has highlighted the important impact of societal ideologies, and the value and attitudes attributed to the language by society, on language revitalisation. Language values are an inherent factor of language choice amongst bilingual Māori communities. Against this background, current revitalisation strategies emphasise shifting this ideology to advance the Māori language and encourage normalisation across the nation.

The ZePA³ model highlights how right-shifting the position of an individual from Zero – Passive – Active can strengthen the position of the language within society. The key difference is that the emphasis is not simply on moving directly from Zero to Active. Right-shifting an individual from Zero to Passive can generate increased awareness and support for language revitalisation more broadly, and the subsequent right-shift from Passive to Active is then easier to achieve.

The evidence reported in the Te Puni Kōkiri surveys on the Health of the Māori Language⁴ suggests that there has been continued left-shifting in Aotearoa/New Zealand over time that has contributed to the decline of the language, leaving the language in the precarious state described by Te Paepae Motuhake.

To successfully revitalise the language, Māori language initiatives need to both stem the factors that support this left-shift and proactively encourage a right-shift – to increase the value, status and use of the language over time. Māori broadcasting is one such initiative. A review of international research also suggests that broadcasting can be a cost-effective intervention to revitalise the language.

Innovation And Improving Performances

A key feature of the Government's expectations for the State sector is an emphasis on innovation to deliver better outcomes at lower cost over time. Applying the right-shifting approach also suggests a need to innovate and to update Te Māngai Pāho's strategy and activity in the following areas:

- Focussing on the quality of te reo and programming.
- Building capacity and capability in the broadcasting sector.
- Seizing the opportunities presented by technology.
- Securing greater leverage from the Crown funding.

The critical role of the quality of te reo and of programming is a common theme across the Māori language revitalisation literature and of the discussions Te Māngai Pāho has had. Consistently lifting quality is both an enduring challenge in its own right and a key factor that influences the effectiveness of broadcasting in generating a rightshift.

The sector is aware of the increased focus that Te Māngai Pāho has placed on language plans and language outcomes from programming over the last three or four years. The expectation is that there will be a continual improvement in the quality of the language plans within programme proposals and that applicants will also be able to demonstrate a commitment to improving the language quality within the programmes they produce.

Applicants for funding must expect Te Māngai Pāho to persist with this increased focus on language planning. They should also expect Te Māngai Pāho to more assertively manage the implementation of those language plans to ensure the outcomes promised are in fact delivered.

Capacity and Capability Te Māngai Pāho recognises that the broadcasting sector needs to be assisted to raise its capacity and capability in te reo Māori and tikanga Māori. The fulfillment of Te Māngai Pāho's

objectives and goals for te reo and tikanga Māori are dependent on the sector to deliver. A critical influence on the overall right-shift is the ability to continually improve the quality, depth and breadth of te reo Māori used by broadcasters, and of the tikanga they express. There is an opportunity for Te Māngai Pāho to use the Māori language plans developed by broadcasters and producers as an important component of the approach for achieving this focus on capability and capacity.

Leverage Greater leverage from Crown funding can be gained from both improved co-operation at the Crown agency level by ensuring that initiatives are well planned, complementary and coordinated. For Te Māngai Pāho, it is also about being clear about the objectives being sought from our funding and being able to better demonstrate to taxpayers the impact and effectiveness of these initiatives so that they continue to attract Crown support. For example, programmes with multiple plays on different platforms, that engage audiences and provide a measurable impact, all contribute to this objective.

What Does This Mean For Producers?

The adoption of the “Right Shift” approach is a response to the government’s drive for better outcomes and better results. Our aim is to for the Māori broadcast sector to be able to demonstrate a tangible impact on Māori language and Māori cultural outcomes. Te Māngai Pāho therefore now has a greater emphasis on acquiring programmes that have a clear programming objective in terms of the “Right Shift”, ideally a means to measure that objective and a commitment to report on its impact.

A programme proposal should:

- Outline an idea that demonstrates to the assessors how it will draw in its target audience.
- Include a Māori language and/or Māori cultural objective for the programme.
- Ideally, have a way of measuring or demonstrating its impact.
- Include a commitment to report on the objective.
- Outline the quality management processes planned to ensure high quality Māori language and cultural content.
- Respond to this RFP.

Te Māngai Pāho Objectives For Television

Te Māngai Pāho’s role is one part of the government’s wider Māori Language Strategy. Our work is complementary to and in support of initiatives in other areas and our objectives can be summarised as follows:

- to promote te reo Māori as a living language by funding a wide variety of original, informative and entertaining content for fluent speakers of te reo Māori for public broadcast as well as distribution on other platforms;
- to ‘Right Shift’ those learning the Māori language and learning about Māori culture, by ensuring original, informative and entertaining content appropriate to their interests and Māori language abilities is made available for broadcast and distribution on other platforms;
- to ‘Right Shift’ the wider community by funding a range of content for broadcast and distribution on other platforms, that (a) informs them about the Māori language and culture; and (b) promotes the normalisation of the Māori language.

Audiences

Te Māngai Pāho provides funding for producers to produce programmes and other content that promote the Māori language and Māori culture, in each of the areas identified above. Te Māngai Pāho’s Purchase and Funding Framework identifies these areas as: Fluent Speakers, Second Language Learners and Receptive Audiences