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# Chapter One Whakapapa

Kei tua i te awe kāpara, he tangata kē māna e noho te ao nei, he mā.

*Behind the tattooed face stands a stranger who will inherit the earth, and he is white[[1]](#footnote-2).*

## Summary

This chapter examines the whakapapa of Māori involvement in State Care. It is clear that colonisation and structural, systemic racism have been enduring features permeating the State Care system and child welfare policies across 1950-1999. Colonisation is more than a historic event and research findings emphasise that colonisation is part of a ‘wider, enduring and cascading, traumatising environment’ as a persistent mechanism of settler state policies and institutions (Reid et al, 2017, p.16) (p. 33).

The undermining of whānau, hapū and iwi structures and networks was not merely a result of colonisation, but an essential part of the process. The loss of whenua and access to traditional life- sustaining resources has had a dramatic effect on whānau wellbeing and economic prosperity. While witnessing the extreme poverty of many Māori communities, state observers often attributed their poor living conditions to laziness and a lack of self- responsibility without officially acknowledging the consequences of land confiscation, discriminating government practices, war, and introduced diseases on whānau (p. 36).

Settler state policies maintained the intentional dismantling of whānau gendered relationships through white European patriarchy. In pre-colonial society, wāhine Māori had autonomy equal to males, gendered relationships were more fluid and less pronounced than those of the white European settlers. Wāhine Māori status and authority was redefined by the settler state, and their behaviour was often interpreted as immoral and lacking male discipline (p. 38).

State sanctioned policies and practices were underpinned by epistemological racism that privileged Pākehā nuclear family practices and ways of being whilst treating whānau Māori practices as inferior and damaging (p. 48).

Racism (both structural and societal) positioned whānau ways of living and child-rearing as inherently inferior to Pākehā, perceiving traditional whānau models of childrearing as unhealthy (p. 37).

Land alienation and urbanisation of Māori communities was central to settler state policies of assimilation and integration. Māori families moved into towns and cities where Pākehā-defined living conventions were individualistic and unfamiliar, and tikanga Māori was disparaged and maligned (p. 39).

Urban migration signified a critical detachment of whānau and hapū ties and support networks which previously had ensured the wellbeing of tamariki Māori. Furthermore, papakāinga suffered the permanent loss of the most productive age demographic in the community, which destabilised tribal culture (p. 44).

Without the supportive factors of tribal, communal life, the conditions were set for increased economic disadvantage, social dislocation and cultural disconnection. Discrimination, loss of opportunity, poor housing, unemployment, low educational attainment and low incomes created conditions ripe for social problems, including domestic violence to occur (p. 46).

The 1950s was imbued with moral panic and racism. Rising rates of ex-nuptial births post-World War II were associated with the social and moral taint of illegitimacy. Negative stereotypes of wāhine Māori as lazy mothers with lax moral attitudes were perpetuated in society. The State Care system focussed on the perceived deficits of wāhine Māori and non-Māori who had pēpi born outside of marriage. Pākehā Christian shaming, particularly of Pākehā women having Māori babies meant many pēpi were put up for adoption (p. 48).

Racism fuelled increased scrutiny and surveillance of whānau Māori and this was the starting point for the over-representation of Māori within State Care institutions. Māori juvenile offences were often linked to the perceived ‘defects’ in their home life, including the culture and traditions of Māori communities (p. 52).

From the 1960s onwards there were increasing numbers of children identified as state wards and this led to a corresponding increase in state funded residential institutions (p. 55).

The state’s role as ‘colonial parent’ has not ensured the care and protection of Māori tamariki and rangatahi, indeed research analysis has demonstrated intentional neglect and abuse. The state’s refusal to accept its culpability, despite considerable evidence to the contrary has contributed to intergenerational harms still experienced by whānau today (p. 65).

## Introduction

The over-representation of Māori in negative statistics, including tamariki Māori and vulnerable adults in the State Care system, can only be understood within the context of historical and intergenerational trauma inflicted on whānau, and particularly wāhine Māori through colonisation, land confiscations, language and culture loss (Pihama, Cameron & Te Nana, 2019; Cram, 2011; Dalley, 1998; Jackson, 1990; Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1988). In this chapter we employ Judge’s (2017) definition of ‘the state’; as ‘a broad, holistic approach’ used as a colonising and enduring process (p. 19). This is needed as the settler state was developed through a white patriarchal system. It is characterised ‘by its exercise of public power and force, via its access to resources, and thus its ability to alter society’ (Judge, 2017, p. 19). Therefore, the state includes past and present governments and government departments (Judge, 2017).

In framing our findings, we have also utilised Reid, Rout, Tau and Smith’s (2017) aetiological framework; the study of causation that views colonising environments ‘as being generated by two key types of mechanisms - structural and psycho-social’ (p. 18). For example, structural mechanisms are institutional inequalities as experienced by resident indigenous communities in the settler states. These include deliberate settler state legislation and policies (such as the Native Lands Act - 1873, the Native Schools Act - 1867, the Tohunga Suppression Act - 1907) designed to eliminate cultural practices and perpetuate racist beliefs in the inferiority of the backward natives, who needed civilising for their own good. Psychosocial mechanisms include the acceptance and internalisation by indigenous communities of this ‘cultural superiority’ myth culminating in ‘a sense of shame, shame of their culture and shame of their ethnicity’ (Reid et al., 2017, p. 28). ‘In blunt terms, the settler state is a creation that is both intentionally and incidentally geared against indigenous people’ (Reid et al., 2017, p. 23).

Therefore, colonisation is more than a set of historic traumatic events and its devasting impacts are far-reaching. It needs to be seen as a cascading process that creates and sustains enduring racist environments whereby indigenous communities suffer (Reid et al., 2017). Pihama et al. (2019) concur, emphasising the need to understand the history and impacts of ‘colonial trauma’ as both ‘event and as structure’ (p. 13).

This means coming to know the history of the many whānau, hapū and iwi and the violence perpetrated through colonial invasion and occupation. For example, the historical invasions of Rangiaowhia in Waikato, Parihaka in Taranaki, Gate Pā in Tauranga and many more, and in contemporary times events such as the eviction of Ngāti Whātua from Bastion Point in 1978, the Foreshore and Seabed Act confiscation of the foreshore in 2005, and the freeholding of Waitara lands in 2019. Alongside these events is the ongoing failure of the government to honour Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the embedded systemic racism in ministries and agencies, the continuing expression of deficit views and racist assumptions about Māori, and the denial of Māori status as tangata whenua, the people of the land (Pihama et al., 2019, p. 13).

Colonisation is inherently violent and traumatic and, as a result, whānau suffered daily (Pihama et al., 2019; Reid et al., 2017; Te Puni Kōkiri, 2008;). As early as 1863, legislation was used by the settler state to commit atrocities and human rights violations against whānau, hapū and iwi. For example, the Suppression of Rebellion Act 1863 suspended the right to a fair trial, ensuring imprisonment for whānau who opposed land confiscation. Moreover, pursuant to the West Coast Settlement Act 1880, any Māori could be arrested without warrant in Taranaki on suspicion of interfering with settler state prospecting (Bull, 2004, p. 508). In addition, an indemnity Bill was passed which meant crimes against a person or property were no longer deemed a criminal offence if committed by Crown volunteers or constabulary, provided the victim was Māori (Bull, 2004, p. 509).

Our research findings demonstrate the contribution of colonisation, land confiscation, alienation and urbanisation to the overarching racist and sexist state sanctioned mechanisms that replaced tribal conventions with settler institutions. Thus, colonisation was a deliberate, enduring and destructive force perpetuated by various settler governments resulting in: whānau deprivation; psychosocial harms; and the over-representation of tamariki Māori and vulnerable adults; in settler State Care from 1950-1999 and beyond.

## Background

Prior to the arrival of the European settlers, tamariki, through whakapapa, were regarded as the physical embodiment of tūpuna, thus giving them a preferential position. This ensured they were safe and nurtured. The care of tamariki and pēpi was shared within extended family structures of whānau and hapū (Durie, 2003; Hiroa, 1970). Children were not considered the property of their parents, but belonged to the whānau, which was an integral part of the tribal system bound by reciprocal obligations. Whānau coalitions created distinct political and economic units (Durie, 2003; Reid et al., 2017).

The practice of whāngai (adoption or fostering) of pēpi and tamariki was very open (Pitama, 1997). Whāngai status enabled tamariki to maintain communication and interactions with their birth family and their whāngai family. Having whāngai status protected both the child’s and hapū rights and privileges (Pitama, 1997). Raising healthy, educated tamariki was a collective responsibility (Pihama et al., 2019) as whānau were centred on common kaupapa as much as common heritage (Durie, 2003). ‘Traditionally whānau, hapū and iwi lived collectively on their ancestral lands in contexts where people knew each other and their connections to each other, enabling tikanga to be enacted as a mechanism for collective wellbeing’ (Pihama et al., 2019, p. 6).

Whānau were regarded as the primary social unit and cornerstone of traditional Māori society contributing to the expansion of hapū and iwi. A typical whānau comprised immediate and extended whānau members of three to four generations residing within the same dwelling. Roles and responsibilities of whānau members were clearly defined and reflected an individual’s position, status and place within their social unit from birth evolving as members grew into adulthood (Metge, 1995).

Although mātua had a role in raising children and contributing to their welfare, ultimately it was the grandparents who were afforded the most influential responsibility. As elders, they held the esteemed positions as mātua tūpuna, kaumātua, koroheke, rūruhi tāua, pōua, tūnohunohu, pēperekōu, koro and kuia. Grandparents and elders alike were seen as repositories of knowledge, experience and were expected to transfer this wisdom on to their descendants and mokopuna (grandchildren). This learning continued throughout childhood and into adulthood. It was supported by: the life experiences; patience and wisdom of elders as educators; mentors; and as significant role models, influencing healthy development of their mokopuna and other members of the whānau. The term ‘mokopuna’ is explained as ‘moko’ referring to an image, often facial tattoos (moko mataora or moko kauwae/kauae), that were regarded as a person’s status or signature. The word ‘puna’ can mean a spring or pool of water and when these words are combined, you have an image reflected in a pool. This is true of a grandparent’s relationship to a grandchild; it is the grandchild who is the image of their grandparent. When the grandparent looks at the grandchild, they see their reflection, they see their mokopuna (Makereti, 1938; Buck, 1958 cited in Edwards, McCreanor & Moewaka-Barnes, 2007).

Traditionally, whānau members relied on each other and their interdependence impacted on the whānau dynamic. This level of intergenerational support ensured the younger members of the whānau were exposed to vital life-sustaining knowledge and education to test universal concepts through practical application in their lives. Core traditional values instructed through daily practices were fundamental in guiding the behaviours and activities of everyday whānau life. Amongst siblings, expectations and tikanga (customary practice) in relation to reciprocal relationships were intended to support the welfare of the whānau as a collective. For example, elder siblings referred to as tuakana, had responsibilities for leadership, protection and advice, while the younger siblings regarded as teina, were required to serve and provide (Bray & Hill 1973; Buck 1958 cited in Edwards et al., 2007; Pere, 1982). Before the arrival of white European settlers, there was a richness and depth to child- rearing practices and to the composition of whānau and hapū relationships (Durie, 2003).

## Defining ‘whānau’

The meaning of ‘whānau’ is to be born or give birth. Thus, the purpose of the wider whānau is to care for and raise the child/ren. Metge (1995) explains that within a well-functioning whānau unit, adult and elder members describe their relationship to each other’s children by using the following phrase: ‘ā mātou tamariki’ (the children of many of us), as opposed to ‘ā māua tamariki’ (the children of us two), which tends to lean more toward the Pākehā- centred approach of the nuclear family. Metge describes four key underlying principles of child rearing: tamariki are uri; children are members of the whānau; the principle of communal parenting; and the rights and responsibilities of the child. The principle ‘tamariki are uri’ reinforces the Māori worldview that children are direct descendants of tūpuna and must be cherished. They will eventually become the successors to their lineage ensuring whānau, hapū, and iwi whakapapa relationships are maintained (Metge, 1995).

Traditionally, tamariki were referred to as taonga. Sadler (2000) argues this is relevant to Article Two of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, meaning whānau have specific rights and responsibilities in the protection of their tamariki. Whakapapa ensured social connection, as well as obligations to the health and wellbeing of the whole (Metge, 1995; Boulton, Potaka-Osborne, Cvitanovic, & Williams, 2018). Whānau life was interconnected and intergenerational, providing a protective element for tamariki as responsibility for their wellbeing was shared (Boulton et al., 2018; Durie, 2003; Metge, 1995; Mikaere, 1994).

Mikaere (1994) asserts that prior to the colonial invasion, whānau wellbeing was associated with Papatūānuku (a female Māori deity), and the physical links to whenua. Indeed, the word ‘whenua’ means both land and afterbirth. The traditional and valued position of wāhine Māori and their contribution to intergenerational wellbeing, contrasted greatly to the subordinate place of women in the colonial patriarchal state (Mikaere, 1994). Conversely, the colonial settlers and power-brokers viewed land/whenua as an individually owned commodity within the context of a settler state capitalist economic system (Boulton et al., 2018; Reid et al., 2017). That Māori collective strength, underpinned by whānau, hapū and iwi relationships was threatening to ‘Pākehā power- brokers’ (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1988, p. 58) is evidenced by a statement made by the distinguished nineteenth century politician, Sir Francis Dillon-Bell: ‘The first plank of public policy must be to stamp out the beastly communism of the Māori!’ (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1988, p. 58). Document analysis demonstrates that the undermining of whānau, hapū and iwi structures and networks was not merely a result of colonisation, but an essential part of the process (Mikaere, 1994).

## Colonisation, land loss and the destruction of the Māori economy

The health and wellbeing of whānau, hapū and iwi was interconnected to whenua, awa and moana, through whakapapa, including environmental and spiritual dimensions (Boulton et al., 2018; Reid et al., 2017). For example, the Tainui waka and Ngāti Tuwharetoa have viewed Waikato Te Awa as a tūpuna, a taonga that sustains mauri. This connection to whenua, awa and moana was critical to tribal identity and survival (Durie, 2003; Reid et al., 2017).

At the time of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi/ Te Tiriti o Waitangi, whenua was the basis of the Māori economy (Cram, 2011; Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1988). Māori were growers and producers, shipping their produce around Aotearoa and beyond. There were clear examples of the flourishing Māori economy that had been ‘reshaped’ with new settler technology; that was both highly successful and threatening to ‘Pākehā power-brokers’ (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1988, p. 58).

Approximately 8,000 Māori lived in [the Eastern Bay of Plenty in 1857]. They had 3,000 acres of land in wheat; 3,000 acres in potatoes; nearly 2,000 acres in maize; and upwards of 1,000 acres planted in kumara. They owned nearly 1,000 horses, 200 head of cattle and 5,000 pigs. They had built and owned four water-powered mills and 96 ploughs. They also owned a staggering 43 coastal traders averaging 20 tonnes each, and upwards of 900 canoes (Gardiner, 1994 as cited in Cram, 2011 p. 16).

Post-1840 and the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi/ Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the large-scale acquisition of land by Crown agents and settlers contributed to Māori dispossession. These changes placed Māori at a significant disadvantage in the emerging land-based capitalist economy. Ngāi Tahu for instance, ‘became an impoverished and virtually landless tribe’ (Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, n.d, n.p). The escalating growth in Pākehā population following the proclamation of British sovereignty in 1840, accelerated the drive and demand for land, culminating in the Land Wars fought around the country, and the subsequent land confiscation and loss of life as well as continuously exposing Māori to new diseases. It is estimated that between 1840 and 1901, the Māori population may have halved (Department of Statistics, 1963, p. 73; Lange, 2018), which is tantamount to a ‘significant and sustained de-population’ (Kingi, 2007, p. 5).

Beliefs in the inevitability of the decline and eventual extinction of Māori underpinned Crown policies designed to ‘smooth down their dying pillow’ (Featherston, 1856, cited in Buck, 1924, p. 362). Nevertheless, a period of paternalistic and protectionist social policy (1860-1920) followed, taking measures to ensure Māori survival (Armitage, 1995, p. 190), albeit by way of the prominent school of thought that Māori would survive by being racially amalgamated via miscegenation (Kukutai, 2011, p. 37), and/or adapting to European ways and becoming individualised, de-tribalised and ‘educated’ (Lange, 1999, p. 64).

Cram (2011) underscores land confiscations and land alienation following the signing of the Te Tiriti, as the failure of the Crown ‘to protect Māori resources and economic wellbeing, as guaranteed’ (2011, p. 17). In 1910 ‘just over 10 per cent of Māori land remained in Māori hands’ (Cram, 2011, p. 17). Māori land loss and alienation has had devastating, multifaceted, and far-reaching effects (Cram, 2011; Pihama et al., 2019; Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1988).

The loss of whenua and access to traditional life- sustaining resources had a dramatic effect on whānau wellbeing and economic prosperity. Colonial observers, whilst witnessing the extreme poverty of many Māori communities, often attributed their poor living conditions to laziness and a lack of self-responsibility without officially acknowledging the consequences of land confiscation, war, and introduced diseases on whānau.

Grinding poverty in many Māori communities particularly impacted upon children, and the reports of native school teachers from this time often included observations about hungry and neglected children living in dire conditions. Narratives from this period indicate that children perceived as being neglected or at risk were cared for within wider kinship systems; as the historian Judith Binney notes, the strengths of Māori society in times of crisis were kinship and community networks, the very things which successive government policies had tried to dismantle (Kaiwai, Allport, Herd, Mane, Ford, Leahy, Varona, & Kipa, 2020, p. 24).

## Colonisation and the intentional dismantling of whānau gendered relationships through white European patriarchy

In precolonial society, wāhine Māori had autonomy equal to that of males and gendered relationships were more fluid and less pronounced than those of the white European settlers (Mikaere, 1994; Salmond, 1991). This can be seen in te reo Māori with gender-neutral terms such as ‘ia’ for personal pronouns. Wāhine played essential roles, vital to ensuring the health and prosperity of whānau, hapū and iwi because they ensured the continuation of whakapapa (Wilson, Mikahere-Hall, Sherwood, Cootes & Jackson, 2019). The New Zealand Law Commission in its analysis of the experiences of Māori women in the Justice system cite Metge, (1995, p. 97) who asserted that for many hapū their mana is directly linked to female ancestors and recognised through names, ‘for instance Te Whānau a Hinerupe,

Te Whānau a Ruataupare; Rongomaiwahine; Ngāti Hine’ (1999, p. 15). Wāhine has specific leadership roles within whānau, hapū and iwi and as individuals they had ‘use-rights’ over whenua and resources (New Zealand Law Commission, 1999, p. 15, p. 15). Wāhine shared roles and responsibilities with tāne, which was very different from the patriarchal gendered relationships of the white European settlers (Mikaere, 1994; Wilson et al., 2019). To the European settler wāhine Māori behaviour was often interpreted as immoral and lacking male discipline (Mikaere, 1994).

The status of wāhine Māori quickly changed as a result of colonial law, whereby they were viewed as subordinate to men (Mikaere, 1994; New Zealand Law Commission, 1999). This is explained in historical analysis by Dame Ann Salmond (1991):

At the time of European settlement (from 1814 onwards) European gender relations were controlled by an ideology of male dominance far more severe than the agnatic biases that existed in Māori reckoning of descent group status. European women were legal minors who came under the guardianship of men and they had no independent rights to control property or to formal participation in political decision-making. Moreover, the Protestant religious sects which missionised New Zealand practised male ritual dominance, and under such influences Māori women had much to lose (Salmond, 1991, pp. 353–354).

Colonisation resulted in wāhine Māori losing their valued status within whānau and hapū as well as in the new white settler society (New Zealand Law Commission, 1999; Mikaere, 1994; Salmond, 1991). There was much resistance by prominent wāhine Māori who saw the introduction of white European patriarchal views and practices permeating through whānau. For example, Heni Sunderland, born in 1916 and a prominent woman of the Rongowhakaata tribe, resisted the allocation of male seating arrangements on the paepae of marae (Binney, 1989, cited in New Zealand Law Commission, 1999, p. 20). This resistance of prominent wāhine Māori to white patriarchal views being accepted by tane Māori was noticed.

Beliefs about female subordination were internalised by wāhine and tāne and reinforced by white European settler State Care policies and practices. Negative stereotypes of wāhine Māori as lazy mothers with lax moral attitudes were perpetuated in society and very much evident from the 1940s. Young kōtiro in urban areas were viewed as ‘naturally’ inclined towards ‘sexual delinquency’. In the 1950s, unwed mothers whose children were deemed illegitimate, were treated as fallen women. They were perceived by the state as social problems, being unable to provide ‘a normal home life’ for their children (Dalley, 1998, p. 216). Being treated as a social outcast was particularly true for young pregnant, unmarried wāhine Māori who found themselves without the generational support provided by whānau. This deliberate dismantling of whānau gender relationships is an enduring traumatising mechanism caused through enduring colonising environments, resulting in intergenerational harms. This theme is explored in more depth in Chapter 3 ‘The impact of the system on Māori’.

## Colonisation and its traumatising mechanisms: 1800-1920

Before 1860, European contact was largely ‘acquisitive, exploitative and proselytising’ (Armitage, 1995, p. 186). The introduction of diseases and muskets prior to 1840 saw the beginnings of Māori population dislocation and decline, estimated at 10-30% (Lange, 2018). In parallel, the introduction of religion and the ‘colonising spirit’ constituted an ideological assault that served to undermine Māori social and cultural structures (Kingi, 2007, p. 5; Walker, 2016, pp. 19-20). Individualisation was facilitated by the workings of the Native Land Court, established in 1865, through the conversion of traditional communal landholdings into individual titles, to expedite and enable further land acquisition (Mikaere, 1994, p. 133). Furthermore, European systems of formal education were introduced via the Native Schools Act 1867, which stipulated instruction to be given solely in English, preparing Māori children to assimilate into Pākehā society (Richmond, O’Neill & Carleton, 1867, p. 862-3).

Miscegenation did not result in the anticipated outcome of biological absorption; from the earliest census (1906), Māori choices to identify ‘culturally’ rather than racially served to inflate rather than diminish Māori population figures (Kukutai, 2011, p. 39). De-tribalisation was also delayed, in part due to another emerging school of thought, promulgated by a new generation of Māori political leaders educated in European institutions. Apirana Ngata and his peers in the Young Māori Party supported limited Māori self-government and the reassertion of mana in traditional tribal territories under rangatira (King, 2003, p. 469).

However, the increasing influence and involvement of Ngata and his peers in government did not mean that Māori cultural practices were left unscathed. Ngata attributed the decline in the Māori population to the persistence of harmful Māori customs as much as the effects of Western contact (Lange, 1999, p. 99), and Te Rangihiroa/Peter Buck wrote that ‘the greatest factor which retards the progress of the Māori in health matters, is the influence of the past’ (cited in Williams, 2001, p. 179). In the early twentieth century, legislation was passed that sought to curtail certain customary practices, most notably (but not confined to) the Tohunga Suppression Act 1907.

“In the early 1980s I was friendly with Dame Mira Szászy. Mira was really an impressive woman and on the marae she would get stuck into Pākehā and bureaucrats, but she certainly gave Māori men a good serve as well. Mira was particularly angry at the lack of equality for Māori women and challenged Māori men about that. During one hui, she challenged the men about speaking rights for wāhine on the paepae.”

– Dame Margaret Bazley, Non-Māori senior public servant

The practice of whāngai became subject to legislative measures in 1901 (Native Land Claims and Adjustment Act 1901) as policymakers sought to dismantle Māori communalism (Sorrenson, 1975, p. 107). Thus, to be able to inherit the lands of their whāngai parents, Māori adoptees had to be registered with the Native Land Court (McRae & Nikora 2006, p. 1). Thereafter, the Native Land Act 1909 required Māori to legally adopt children through the Native Land Court to legitimise the relationship between adoptive parents and children (Mikaere, 1994, p. 137). Furthermore, the Act prohibited Māori adoption of European children in order to prevent two undesirable possibilities: European children succeeding to Māori land, and the upbringing of European children in an ‘improper’ way or in sub-optimal conditions, within Māori society (Keane, 2017, n.p; Findlay, 1909, p. 1275). These changes did not appear to impact negatively on the practice of whāngai, or the care of Māori children, however, they signalled a gradual encroachment of Pākehātanga (European concepts, practices and values), and a turn of the colonising gaze towards tamariki Māori.

## Child welfare policy in Aotearoa New Zealand

The origins of settler-colonial state child welfare policy lie in nineteenth century England, where the separation of children from their pauper parents had been used to manage families and increase the economic productivity of parents and children (Armitage, 1995, p. 5). The grounds for state intervention in the care of children was eventually extended to include the care of orphans, truants, children of unmarried mothers, and children of parents considered to be abusive or negligent.

Children were recognised for their ‘perceived amenability to change, education and ‘salvation’, thus, in settled territories, these extant child welfare policies and mechanisms took on a new dimension; that of ensuring indigenous acceptance of British rule and enabling ‘civilisation’ (Armitage, 1995, pp. 5-6).

Where the primary purpose of structural colonialism is to control power and decision-making through political and governmental means in order to extract (primarily economic) benefits, this is often accompanied or followed by a form of ‘cultural colonialism’, where normative control of a minority group or culture is sought in order to explain and legitimise actual control (McKenzie & Hudson, 1985, p. 130). Efforts to ‘civilise the savage’ are central to colonising mechanisms, undertaken by missionaries and later the educational, health and child welfare systems. Interview participants spoken to, emphasised the legacy of colonisation in understanding the over-representation of tamariki Māori in settler State Care.

As colonisation gained momentum, Māori patterns of communal living, ownership, gender roles and child-rearing practices were increasingly perceived as obstructive to the assertion of colonial systems, structures and understandings leading to increased regulation of Māori traditional and cultural practices (Love, 2002, p. 6; Williams, 2001, pp. 178, 239). This form of cultural colonialism, inextricably linked with structural colonialism (Sinclair, 2004, p. 50), was part of a broader initiative following the Native Land Court legislation, to dismantle the communal functioning and organisation of Māori communities.

By 1920, Māori communities had suffered significant health, cultural, economic and social impacts as a result of structural and cultural colonialism. Reid et al. (2017, pp. 16-17) note the cascading nature of these impacts, arising from ‘diverse, multiple and persisting mechanisms [that] are cumulative and compounding in their cause and effect’. Although there was evidence of Māori population recovery by the end of the nineteenth century, certain impacts remained. Impoverishment and a level of ‘cultural erosion’ were to be soon overlaid by other demographic and societal changes, including World War I and the subsequent economic depression. Living in more isolated rural areas, Māori had relatively little contact with the largely urban child welfare system that had developed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Dalley, 1998, p. 83). However, this was set to change as Child Welfare Officers expanded into rural districts from the late 1920s, and Māori began to move into cities (Dalley, 1998, p. 153).

## Colonising environments: 1920 – 1950

The period 1920-1950 brought significant social and economic changes in Aotearoa New Zealand, including the sequelae of World Wars I (1914-1918) and II (1939-1945). Families and communities were affected significantly by the return of traumatised men from World War I, and the economic boom and bust that followed (McGibbon, 2012). However, as part of the government’s post-war recovery measures to promote stable communities and national population growth, child and maternal health became a significant focus of social policy in the 1920s (Baker & Du Plessis, 2018). The confinement of children to institutions for lengthy periods became less acceptable given the newly increased social value accorded to child life. Thus, children tended to be boarded out with foster parents, supervised in their own homes in the community, or in community-based preventative schemes (Dalley, 1998, p. 191; Garlick, 2012, p. 32-3).

The Child Welfare Act 1925 established the Child Welfare Branch of the Education Department, which was responsible for ‘orphaned, destitute, neglected and ‘out of control’ children’ (Baker & Du Plessis, 2018, p. 3). The state responsibilities to protect and train such children bifurcated into a network of state supervised homes or institutions, and a separate system of juvenile justice through children’s courts (Dalley, 1998, p. 95).

In the late 1920s, working through Māori honorary officers and local social service groups, Child Welfare Officers moved into rural districts (Labrum, 2002, p. 163). Māori children and their living conditions came under increased scrutiny with material deprivation being interpreted as neglectful or attributed to character or racial defect (Labrum, 2002, p. 167). Moral judgement was passed on Māori pastimes and expenditure, and Māori children were ‘discovered’ to be delinquent (Dalley, 1998, pp. 119, 155). This resulted in increasing numbers of Māori children and adolescents being brought before the courts. Correspondence between officials indicates the Child Welfare branch was aware of the impact of forced separation from whānau and wanted to keep Māori children out of its institutions well into the 1940s. This was, in part, prompted by Māori groups (for example, Te Akarana Association) communicating the importance of Māori children remaining with kin groups, within their localities and te reo Māori speaking contexts. ‘Less salutary motives’, including concern for detrimental Māori influence on Pākehā, also prevailed (Garlick, 2012, p. 58). In some cases, Māori children were removed from their families and sent to church or private institutions (Dalley, 1998, pp. 131, 134).

## Colonising Mechanisms: Urbanisation and intentional policies of integration

From the late 1930s, growing numbers of Māori were moving away from their rural homelands. Small family farmlets and land-based Māori development schemes were no longer able to sustain the rising Māori population. Furthermore, the conscription of Māori labour into industries to support the World War II effort (via the Manpower Act 1944) accelerated the pace of Māori urbanisation (Walker, 1992, p. 500). Before 1945, most Māori lived in rural communities, concentrated in the eastern and northern parts of the North Island, leading quite separate lives from the majority of Pākehā (Hill, 2009). Within two decades, Māori underwent a massive rural exodus (Kukutai, 2011). By 1945 large numbers of landless Māori moved from what had been their traditional tribal areas, into urban centres (Brittain & Tuffin, 2017; Garlick, 2012; Reid et al., 2017; Walker, 2016). However, many whānau in the South Island sought employment across various Pākehā settlements and public infrastructure projects that were not in urban settings (Reid et al., 2017). Having been stripped of their ancestral lands and its concomitant resources, whānau and hapū had little choice but to provide the labour demanded by the industrial sector in the late 1950s. This urbanisation of Māori communities was central to settler state policies of integration (Hunn, 1961), yet ‘entailed the disintegration of Māori social and cultural underpinnings that had a disruptive psychological ripple effect’ (Jackson, 1998, cited in Brittain & Tuffin, 2017, p. 99).

“If a person was to ask me, 'Well, how come all these Māori kids are in State Care ... and the rate is so high?' I'd say, 'Well, it's just the continuation of colonisation.' We actually haven't got to a point where we're serious about decolonisation. So, if people are saying, 'Well, it must be post-colonisation.' I'd like to know, as Moana Jackson says, 'What date did it stop?'”

– Harry Walker, Māori public servant

Without educational qualifications (as a direct result of educational policy), Māori became concentrated in manufacturing and service industries, forming an urban underclass (Walker, 1992, p. 500; Labrum, 2002, p. 164). Māori families had to do more with less, based on lower median earnings and reduced entitlements to state assistance. Māori were paid pensions and benefits at lower rates than Pākehā until 1945, and in 1951, for example, the median income of a Māori male was 72.4% of that of a Pākehā male, and it had to be spread over larger families (Labrum, 2002, pp. 171, 173).

Whānau were now in a more ‘precarious economic situation’ as they became more dependent on the ‘settler economy’ (Reid et al., 2017, p. 42). Walker (1992) argued urbanisation presented fundamental difficulties for migrant Māori in overcoming racial discrimination and cultural assimilation. Whānau had to adapt not only to the nuances of the Pākehā industrial economy in seeking and securing employment, but also to budgeting, and meeting financial commitments within the urban environment.

Māori families moved into towns and cities where the Pākehā-defined living conventions were individualistic and unfamiliar, and Māori customs and ways of living were disparaged. In some cases, traditional tribal ties were severed, and the whānau was increasingly remoulded into a nuclear family arrangement (Mikaere, 1994, pp. 133-4). Echoing official policy of the time, the tenor of public thought was of paternalistic assimilation; the general public expected Māori conformity and adherence to ‘British ways’ (Hill, 2009, p. 34). For example, welfare officers who had the broad mandate of ‘bringing urban Māori up to scratch’, were frequently called in to address Pākehā neighbours’ complaints of ‘unseemly’ Māori behaviour (Hill, 2009, p. 35). Interview analysis highlighted that tikanga Māori was often foreign and unsettling to many Pākehā families living in towns at this time.

Without the supportive factors of tribal and communal life, and in an unsympathetic, even hostile environment, the conditions were set for increased economic disadvantage, social dislocation and cultural disconnection. Māori were treated as foreigners in their own country, as they settled in urban centres dominated by Pākehā families.

Durie (2003) contends the urban environment compelled Māori to shift from the traditional whānau model to that of the settler nuclear family. By extension, urban migration signified a critical detachment of whānau and hapū ties and support networks which previously had ensured the wellbeing of tamariki Māori. Furthermore, papakāinga suffered the permanent loss of the most productive age demographic in the community, which destabilised tribal culture.

## Colonising environments in the 1950s: Racism and moral panic

Racism (both structural and societal) positioned whānau ways of living and child-rearing as inherently inferior to Pākehā, perceiving traditional whānau models of childrearing as unhealthy. Through state encouraged urbanisation, Māori families became more visible in rapidly expanding suburbs as they became eligible for state housing (Brittain & Tuffin, 2017; Garlick, 2012; Labrum, 2013). Government housing policy from 1948 was one of ‘pepper- potting’ whereby whānau were sprinkled amongst Pākehā ‘in order to avoid residential concentrations’ (Labrum, 2013, p. 71) as there had been concerns and complaints about social disorder and a ‘growing Māori underclass’ (2013, p. 67). Walker (1992) theorises inner-city locations were favoured in the early stages of the urban drift, because they were close to industrial centres which employed whānau. Nonetheless, as migration continued, a critical build-up of Māori within cities and suburbs occurred despite declining social conditions including high rates of unemployment, which were conducive to domestic violence, offending, and police monitoring in subsequent decades (Dalley, 1998; Garlick, 2012; Labrum, 2013).

“I remember a Māori family moving into our town, they lived a distance from us. The husband was a Māori dental technician and was married to a Māori wife, and they had about seven kids. And his wife died in childbirth. And when she died, the whole town was kept awake for about a week, with people coming from all over the country and arriving during the night. This was very unusual at the time. And the town went absolutely berserk because there was this wailing. Everyone was being kept awake and we'd never ever experienced anything like that. But it was that Māori people were moving into the towns with their customs … it was something that was absolutely foreign to Pākehā.”

– Dame Margaret Bazley, Non-Māori senior public servant

Racism also underpinned increased scrutiny and surveillance (Labrum, 2013; Stanley, 2016). Reviewing complaints made in the 1960s to the Department of Māori Affairs (DMA) Labrum (2013) notes Pākehā objected ‘to the presence of Māori’ in their communities and to Māori living ‘as Māori’ (2013, p. 67).

The 1950s were also characterised by ‘moral panic’ and increased public concern over incidents of perceived juvenile delinquency. The problems of ‘adjustment’ were particularly notable for rangatahi, evident in ‘anti-social’ and ‘extra-legal’ behaviour (Hill, 2009, p. 35). In some areas Māori youths outnumbered Pākehā coming before the courts by 2.5-3 times (Dalley, 1998, p. 102). Comments made in the Mazengarb Report (1954) suggested that Māori made up 27% of all ‘juvenile delinquents’ (offenders aged 10 – 17) - three and a half times the rate for non-Māori (1954, p. 13). These Māori offences were linked to the ‘culture’ and ‘traditions’ of Māori communities and the negative impact on tamariki caused through ‘defects’ in their home life:

A considerable portion of offences may come from factors inherent in the culture and traditions of the Maori and their difficulty in conforming to another mode of living. In an examination of the factors which promote juvenile delinquency special attention must be given to the type of community in which children grow up. The more normal and well balanced a community is, the greater are the child's chances of developing a well-balanced personality. The teaching at school may be good, the home training satisfactory, but these good influences may be upset by defects in the neighbourhood. When the atmosphere of home or school is unsatisfactory, the chances of normal healthy development are made progressively worse for any child whose community environment is also poor (Mazengarb Report, 1954, pp. 13- 14).

However, claims of increasing Māori juvenile delinquency within particular areas was questionable and not supported by other evidence (Clerk of the House of Representatives, 1949; Dalley, 1998; Stanley, 2016). Earlier government documents had noticed a drop in Children’s Court appearances of Māori tamariki and rangatahi (Clerk of the House of Representatives, 1949). In a 1949 report written by the Acting Director of Education, Superintendent C.E. Peek, reference was made to ‘recent public statements’ concerning the incidence of crime amongst the Māori people and extent of Māori juvenile delinquency (aged 7-17). It was noted that ‘separate statistics’ on Court appearances were not kept for Māori and European children, but that annual reports by District Child Welfare Officers had noted a substantial drop in Māori children appearing in the Children’s Court.

…the total numbers of Maori children appearing before the Courts have dropped substantially. For instance, in North Auckland (where there is one of the greatest concentrations of Maori people) the peak year of the period 1938-1949 was 1943-44, when there was a total of 206 court appearances. Of this number, 146 or (70.8 per cent.) concerned Maori children, and the senior officer in that district made special comment on the high proportion of Maori to pakeha offenders that year. The latest figure shows a total of 83 appearances, both of Maori and of pakeha, in North Auckland, and there is no comment about the proportion of Maori offenders (Clerk of the House of Representatives, 1949, p. 9).

Despite the lack of evidence of a youth crime problem, the Mazengarb Report (1954) captured public and state attention. In response, a number of government initiatives were developed. For example, Child Welfare organised a media campaign to raise awareness of the increased number of children and young people involved in delinquent and criminal behaviour (Stanley, 2016). In 1957 the police initiated the Juvenile Crime Prevention Branch to focus on young people, and in 1958, the government established a Committee on Juvenile Offending (Stanley, 2016, p. 31). Increasing numbers of tamariki and their whānau came under scrutiny, not only by government agencies and their officers, but also from the public. As Stanley notes, Child Welfare staff encouraged the public, teachers and religious leaders to engage in ‘delinquency spotting’ and ‘concerned citizens’ noticed and referred Māori children and their whānau (2016, p. 31).

“In the 1940s, somewhere between the late 1930s and 1945, the urbanisation that occurred of Māori then led to quite a shift in the chance of ending up in both child protection and the court system. And I think one of the things we ignore, particularly during the 1960s is that as a result of both increased birth numbers and the shift to the cities of Māori at that time, there were four times as many Māori children in urban New Zealand in 1966 than 1951. It might have seemed to public services as quite a flood. And I think because the cities were overwhelmingly white, you had people who, although it was their country, were migrants in their own cities, but not being treated as European children were.”

– Len Cook, public servant researcher

Concerns were fuelled by entrenched racist beliefs that Pākehā nuclear family models were far superior and more suitable for child-rearing than whānau models (Labrum, 2013). As Stanley argues, ‘Māori children steadily came to notice for their ‘potential’ bad behaviour and their targeting was the starting point for the over-representation of Māori within institutions’ (2016, p. 31). The predominant perspective among Pākehā officials, such as magistrates and child welfare officers, was that Māori youth were better off being institutionalised ‘for their best interests’ rather than remaining within their own whānau. (Stanley, 2016, p. 8). Indeed, some welfare officers maintained that children should be taken from their parents until they could ‘prove they were fit to look after them’ (Labrum, 2002, p. 170) following minor misdemeanours, such as truanting or shoplifting.

Rising rates of ex-nuptial births post-World War II were the object of another wave of moral panic, associated with the social and moral taint of illegitimacy. The Child Welfare branch was responsible for dealing with adoptions, with the exception of those involving a Māori parent adopting a Māori child, (with Māori determined by half- blood quantum or more). These ‘Māori adoptions’ were processed through the Māori Land Court in open proceedings, with judges and Māori welfare officers who took heed of whakapapa relationships and were more likely to recommend placement of babies with extended whānau (Else, 1991, p. 187; Mikaere, 1994, p. 139). This process was more likely for Māori birth mothers supported by their whānau, but the standard adoption process (through the Child Welfare Division, and Magistrate’s Court) was more likely to be followed if Māori women were living ‘more or less’ as Pākehā, or the birth mother was Pākehā, or the child was deemed to be less than ‘half Māori’ (Dalley, 1998, p. 220; Haenga-Collins, 2017, pp. 59, 72-3). Although the precise numbers of Māori adoptees and Māori birth parents are not known due to inadequate and inconsistent ancestry/ descent reporting by Child Welfare/Social Welfare (Else, 1991, p. 185), there is anecdotal evidence that a large proportion of adopted Māori children were born to Pākehā birth mothers and Māori birth fathers (for example, see participant sample from Ahuriri-Driscoll, 2020, p. 83).

As the settler state policy of ‘integration’ took hold in the late 1950s and early 1960s, the imperative to retain Māori children in Māori families and communities had diminished. The Adoption Amendment Act 1962 brought all adoptions under the jurisdiction of the Magistrate’s Court, removing any considerations of whānau or whakapapa. Because the numbers of Māori adopting parents were relatively few (Labrum, 2002, p. 177; Else, 1991, p. 187), this meant many Māori children were adopted into Pākehā families. In this legally and socially sanctioned act, tamariki were lost to their cultural communities in large numbers.

## The connection between colonisation and State Care

It is clear from research analysis that the settler state and its care systems have been deliberate in intention and design in dismantling whānau Māori networks that were crucial for health and wellbeing. The recently released Waitangi Tribunal Report (2021) ‘He Pāharakeke, He Rito Whakakīkinga Whāruarua, Oranga Tamariki Urgent Inquiry’ emphasises the contribution of colonisation and its devastating effects on diverse Māori communities (p. 51). The report cites evidence provided by Judge Becroft (the Children’s Commissioner) as an expert witness and his testimony.

Judge Becroft observes that epistemological racism has driven the Crown’s assimilation policies by privileging Pākehā language and culture and defining Māori equivalents as ‘other’. Furthermore, he comments, this ‘was no accidental racism: it was by determined intent and design’ (Waitangi Tribunal Report, 2021, p. 52).

Deliberate intentions by the settler state are visible in the various racist, patriarchal assimilationist policies and practices sustained over time through formal and informal ‘traumatising mechanisms’ (Reid et al., 2017, p. 21). These mechanisms not only contributed to settler colonisation, but also compounded the effect of historical trauma inflicted on whānau through land loss and cultural alienation (Reid et al., 2017).

Traumatising mechanisms were integral to settler state institutions concerned with education, employment, housing, health, justice, policing as well as child/social welfare. The over-representation of tamariki Māori and vulnerable adults in the settler State Care system cannot be separated from the socio-political and historical contexts of Aotearoa, and the deliberate dismantling of whānau Māori. The violent and enduring impacts of colonisation has significantly reduced whānau capacity and capability to care for their own. Citing research by Timu-Parata (2009), Reid and colleagues (2017) argue:

The years between 1964 and 1984 saw a continual decline in Māori health, largely due to poor housing, unemployment and low incomes. A contributing factor was the move to urban areas. The move gave rise to feelings of alienation, powerlessness and subsequent loss of cultural identity. Another consequence of this drastic lifestyle change was the types of diseases afflicting Māori, such as high rates of heart disease (including rheumatic fever and hypertension). Today, Māori also have high rates of incidence of cancers, mental illness and tobacco use (Reid et al., 2017, p. 148).

Psycho-social harms caused through land alienation and structural racism have left whānau physically and spiritually drained. The failure of successive governments to meet their obligations to Te Tiriti o Waitangi has severely impacted whānau health and wellbeing (Waitangi Tribunal Report, 2019; Waitangi Tribunal Report, 2021). Contemporary research programmes undertaken in Aotearoa, such as ‘He Kokonga Whare: Māori Intergenerational Trauma and Healing’ and ‘He Waka Eke Noa: Māori Cultural Frameworks for Violence Prevention and Intervention’ have highlighted the importance of understanding whānau violence as ‘both the violence perpetrated by colonisation and the state upon whānau, and the violence that occurs within and between whānau members’ (Pihama et al., 2019, p. 5). Intergenerational abuse within whānau has been caused through decades of deprivation inflicted by the settler state (Pihama et al., 2019; Reid et al., 2017).

Research analysis has highlighted that the policies designed and enacted by the white patriarchal settler state from the 1950s, were underpinned by epistemological racism that privileged Pākehā nuclear family practices and ways of being whilst treating whānau Māori practices as inferior and damaging. Furthermore, settler state policies supported assimilation, through land alienation and urbanisation. Several themes emerged from analysis including:

* Public, institutional and structural racism: A continued belief in the superiority of Pākehā nuclear families and child rearing practices, coupled with differential State Care treatment that negatively impacted tamariki and whānau Māori (refer to Chapter 3).
* Deliberate inaction by the white settler state to address economic, social and educational disparities facing whānau. The state publicly apportioned blame for negative social outcomes (health, justice, education and economic) to whānau Māori rather than recognise these as consequences of colonisation, land loss and cultural alienation. This is evidence of structural racism (Waitangi Tribunal Report, 2019).
* Deliberate inaction by the state to address whānau capability deprivation and ‘systemic entrapment’ of wāhine Māori and tamariki Māori living with whānau violence (refer to Chapter 4).
* Deliberate inaction by the State Care system to monitor ‘practice’ within State Care residential institutions, as well as insufficient, patchy and poor-quality ethnicity data collection are significant examples of institutional racism. This lack of appropriate monitoring, transparency and accountability demonstrates a breach of Te Tiriti o Waitangi Crown responsibilities (Waitangi Tribunal Report, 2021).
* Deliberate inaction on the part of successive governments to fully implement the 1975 Treaty of Waitangi Act and the 1988 Puao- te-Ata-Tū report recommendations and to hold State Care Departments/Ministries accountable (refer to Chapter 6).

## Structural Racism within the settler State Care system

Structural and institutional racism equates to ‘inaction in the face of need’. Such ‘inaction can be conscious or unconscious; it can manifest through the deliberate intentional actions of individuals or result simply from the routine administration of public institutions that produce inequitable social outcomes’ (Waitangi Tribunal Report, 2019, p. 21).

“From my experience of working in various fields of nursing, heading up the Department of Social Welfare and as member of the Waitangi Tribunal, I have concluded that the cause of Māori over-representation in State Care were a likely combination of assimilation policies and urbanisation leading to loss of culture, identity and collapse of tribal life. This combined with access to alcohol which families were not able to cope with. Many people successfully made a new life in towns and cities, but some did not and were very vulnerable. I think urbanisation led to situations where people ended up separated from families, breaking down and subsequently going into State Care. There wasn't the iwi network watching out for them then. That had disintegrated. The introduction of the Domestic Purposes Benefit around the early 70s allowed this group to keep their babies. But away from tribal life they were without support and lacked skills of living needed to look after children in these urban environments. Young Māori mothers and their children and their young men were the main group at risk of being institutionalised in varying settings (Welfare homes and the Justice System). This group probably were the foundation members of the 25,000 at risk families that we identified in the Department of Social Welfare in the early 1990s. Rogernomics in the 1980s led to many Māori people who were proudly working (such as intergenerational forestry worker/s becoming unexpectedly unemployed. They were demoralised and in grief at their predicament. This came on top of the grief they carried from colonisation. The benefit cuts of the early 1990s only added further to their despair”

– Dame Margaret Bazley, non-Māori, senior public servant

Following the diaspora of Māori from rural to urban areas during the post-World War II era, increasing numbers of Māori children were intentionally removed from their families (Stanley, 2016). From the early 1960s the settler state became aware of significant disparities between Māori and Pākehā groups (Hunn, 1961) through various reports that revealed the over-representation of Māori in offending statistics, lower educational achievement and poorer socio-economic status (Fifield & Donnell, 1980). Despite warnings of the future impact for Māori, the state was neglectful in its ‘duty of care’ as it failed to take adequate reparation action. Integration into Pākehā society meant whānau were now ‘in a more precarious economic situation as they became almost completely enmeshed within, and thus reliant on, the settler economy’ (Reid et al., 2017, p. 42).

From the 1960’s, through to the 1990’s, many Māori whānau were forced to give up their children often by ‘well intentioned’ Child Welfare staff and advocates, who were both Māori and non-Māori, unaware of the ensuing long-lasting devastating impacts to whānau (Labrum, 2002; Love, 2002; Mirfin-Veitch & Conder, 2017; Stanley, 2016). The removal of Māori children from whānau was justified as being in the best interests of the child (Mirfin-Veitch & Conder, 2017; Stanley, 2016) and through encouragement by the patriarchal settler state, white families were encouraged to foster or adopt tamariki Māori (Love, 2002).

‘Good homes’ reflecting Pākehā family norms were viewed as essential in terms of social progress and necessary to ‘educate’ Māori children and young people on simple rules of hygiene (Labrum, 2002, p. 167). The collective model of whānau with its extended, intergenerational focus was considered unhealthy and unsuitable for child-rearing. It needed to be replaced by the settler state family model with its patriarchal, nuclear and individualistic focus (Labrum, 2002; Reid et al., 2017). Educating Māori children into Pākehā ways, was seen as a way to advance the native Māori society as part of an enduring civilising mission (Reid et al., 2017; Walker, 2016). State sanctioned policies of assimilation and integration (Hunn, 1961) influenced education and child welfare practices from 1940s onwards (Walker, 1992; Walker, 2016). The superiority of the Pākehā family unit over whānau models was emphasised in academic publications at the time (Ausubel, 1961). Mikaere (2011, p. 246) cited in Reid et al. (2017) notes that, ‘colonisation has always been about much more than simply the theft of land, the dissemination of an indigenous population by introduced disease and the seizure of political power, [it has always been about the intentional recreation of] the colonised in the image of the coloniser’ (p. 27).

## Traumatising mechanisms: The drive to ‘develop’ Māori people

Indigenous communities in settler states are ‘subalternate’ in that they are ‘politically, economically and socially excluded from the power structure’ (Reid et al., 2017, p. 25). The impetus to ‘develop’ indigenous communities and to solve their problems, is an enduring narrative of superiority and racism embedded within settler state institutions and processes. For example, the migration of Māori families into urban settings was supported and encouraged by government economic and social policies ‘to develop Māori people as a whole’ (Labrum, 2013, p. 71). Previous government policies of assimilation progressed to those of integration as seen in the Hunn Report (1961). Jack Hunn and his research team were commissioned to take ‘a new look at Māori affairs from every angle and invite study of the pace as well as the nature of what is being done for Māori’ (Shuker, 1987, p. 13). According to Hunn (1961), integration implied ‘some continuation of Māori culture’ noting ‘much of it, though has already departed and only the fittest elements (worthiest of preservation) have survived the onset of civilisation’ (1961, p. 15). Although his assertions were criticised at the time (Biggs, 1961) integration became the state’s focus. Both urbanisation and state education were viewed as key processes for ensuring Māori were assimilated into New Zealand society (Hunn, 1961). Hunn (1961) asserted there were ‘broadly’ three groups of Māori:

* A completely detribalised minority whose Maoritanga is only vestigial.
* The main body of Maoris, pretty much at home in either society, who like to partake of both (an ambivalence, however, that causes psychological stress to some of them).
* Another minority complacently living a backward life in primitive conditions (Hunn Report, 1961, p. 16).

Hunn (1961) believed the majority of Māori benefitted from the policy of integration, despite acknowledging some ‘psychological stress’. He asserted that integration was best achieved through Māori migration into urban settings, as it enabled ‘evolution’ and a chance for more ‘modern’ groups to free themselves from their ‘backward’ lives (Hunn, 1961, p. 16). This confirms deliberate intention on the part of the settler state. The Hunn Report, whilst providing more comprehensive statistics in terms of the ‘Māori problem’, demonstrated racist and paternalist attitudes towards Māori, their culture and tikanga. In reviewing the Hunn Report, Biggs (1961) questioned Hunn’s assertions regarding benefits to Māori

Is integration as simple and polarised as the report suggests? Are the Maori who are most advanced in terms of living standards the ones who have completely abandoned their Maori institutions and vice versa? Do the backward Maori who live in isolated rural communities really provoke more of the frictions of co-existence than their city cousins who have absorbed more of the pakeha way of life? And is urbanisation the quick frictionless road to integration? If it is, why have such communities as Orakei achieved something less than complete integration after a century and more of urbanisation, and why is there so much dissatisfaction with the state of affairs among the large urban Maori population of Auckland, for example? Why in the list of Maori cultural relics are only the most obvious, even hackneyed items mentioned, while no mention is made of, for example: aroha; extended kinship obligations; attitudes to land, children, sex, rank; and other customs, values and attitudes of which long-time observers of the Maori are aware, and which are confirmed by such intensive research as has been done, research incidentally not mentioned in the report, where ‘facts’ are almost all figures? (Biggs, 1961, p. 362).

Despite such criticisms, the Hunn Report cemented deliberate state policies of integration particularly through urbanisation and state education. Labrum (2013) highlighted the dramatic shifts in Māori migration: ‘In 1926, only 9% of Māori lived in cities and boroughs; in 1951 this figure was still only 19%; but by the mid-1970s three-quarters of the Māori population lived in urban areas’ (2013, p. 70). In contrast to Pākehā families, whānau were forced to choose between their cultural beliefs and economic survival (Reid et al., 2017).

Stanley (2016) notes that for many Māori families, migration into urban areas did not result in higher wages or better lifestyles, instead children were often removed from families ‘because of social disadvantage and marginalisation’ (2016, p. 19). Poverty was often the precursor to the removal of tamariki Māori as many whānau found themselves unemployed or on low wages. ‘Families could be pushed to breaking point by unemployment, limited benefits, escalating living costs and sparse social services’ (Stanley, 2016, pp 19-20). Inadequate housing, public health issues and infant mortality rates also contributed to more and more whānau coming to the attention of child welfare authorities (Labrum, 2013; Stanley, 2016). Racism fuelled the prevailing deficit views of Māori as lazy, dependents of the state, incapable of providing the right family environment for their children (Stanley, 2016).

“How is a family that has been alienated from their culture, their heritage, their whakapapa and their whanaungatanga, how are they supposed to behave? What are they supposed to do? Who’s taught them how to do this (parenting and care) well?”

– Rahera Ohia, Māori senior public servant

State policies of integration resulted in whānau, hapū and iwi being further marginalised and placed in more ‘precarious’ economic situations (Reid et al, 2017, p. 42). Whilst acknowledging these policies improved opportunities for whānau to find better employment, housing and education, integration often resulted in low-skilled and low-paid work.

The vocational focus of the education system was on providing Māori ‘man-power not mind-power’ (Reid et al., 2017, p. 43). From the 1960s onwards there were increasing numbers of children identified as state wards and this led to a corresponding increase of state funded residential institutions (Dalley, 1998; Garlick, 2012). The State Care system focussed on the perceived deficits of wāhine Māori and non-Māori who had pēpi born outside of marriage. Pākehā Christian shaming, particularly of Pākehā women having Māori babies meant many pēpi were put up for adoption. Within a decade, residential enrolments increased ‘from 360 to 718 and existing institutions were extended to meet the demand’ (Garlick, 2012, p. 63). Increasingly these facilities became ‘a care option in their own right’ rather than as a temporary facility prior to family placement (Garlick, 2012, p. 63). More and more whānau came under scrutiny as they struggled with constant racial discrimination and the loss of their traditional support networks (Curcic, 2019). According to Curcic (2019), daily urban life for whānau in the 1970s included at least one of the following characteristics:

Lack of recognition, institution or everyday racism, denial of speaking te reo Māori or being able to practice cultural beliefs, economic marginalisation, domestic violence, institutionalisation in native schools and youth homes, and incarceration in borstals or prisons. Racial profiling and police arrests [also] became an everyday reality (Curcic, 2019, p 84).

“The abuse that I was focused on (when compiling the CYPF Act) in the late 1980s was the cultural racism that essentially determined that kids had to become Pākehā in order to be seen as a success and whānau had to become Pākehā families and behave like good Christian Pākehā families even though that was the complete antithesis of who and what they are.”

– Rahera Ohia, Māori senior public servant

Stanley (2016) highlights the dramatic growth of foster care, Child Welfare institutions and family homes were fuelled by paradigms of ‘child blame’ (2016, p. 5). Welfare dependents were perceived to be responsible for their own situations, given the capitalist ideologies that promoted views of the ‘level playing field’, individualism and individual responsibility. This again speaks to the intention and deliberate action on the part of the settler state system.

## Inadequate action and inaction in the care and protection of tamariki Māori

Many have highlighted the significant practice failures by settler state funded institutions to ensure adequate care and protection of Māori tamariki and rangatahi (Becroft, 2009; Kaiwai et al, 2020) whilst emphasising the presence of severely ‘abusive’ State Care institutional cultures (Ernst, 1999; Mirfin- Veitch & Conder, 2017; Stanley, 2016). During the 1970s and 1980s there were increased concerns raised, particularly by Māori, about the plight of Māori children in State Care and the adverse impact of Pākehā social welfare policies (Doolan, 2005; Kaiwai et al., 2020). Stanley (2016) states that the monitoring of individual residential institutions ‘was remarkably weak’ (2016, p. 56). Kaiwai et al., (2020) stress that earlier ‘official reports’ from the 1940s – 1950s did ‘consistently express the view that State Care for neglected or delinquent Māori children was inappropriate and any problems were best dealt with by working with local communities’ (p. 26).

Māori resistance and rejection of state policies concerning racial integration, coupled with the call for Māori self-determination, generated increased debate about the failure of settler state social welfare policies for Māori (Kaiwai et al., 2020). Official inquiries during the 1970s-1980s revealed there were:

High numbers of Māori children who were in State Care; there was a high rate of placement breakdown and instability; Māori children frequently were placed with non-Māori families; and Department of Social Welfare institutions were abusive and were not meeting the cultural needs of children in care (Ernst, 1999, p. 117).

## Containment as opposed to therapeutic treatment

Beginning in the 1950s, Aotearoa New Zealand’s Social Welfare institutions began adopting ‘secure’ units as a way to address the behavioural needs of children considered to be difficult or disturbed. These units are described as possessing an alarming degree of influence from the justice model in focussing on the containment rather than therapeutic practice, or care of the child (Stanley, 2016). Department manuals set out the regulations for the use of secure units from 1950 to the 1980s. However, research indicates these were vague and allowed varying practices to be adopted.

Residential worker manuals outlined secure units as places for children with particularly difficult or disturbing behaviour. However, in the absence of proper training, and a military background in lieu of social work experience, residential staff readily resorted to physical dominance and punishment as a control measure (Stanley, 2016, p. 79). Adherence to official policies on the use of secure were often disregarded and the use of secure units became common for various and unwarranted reasons. Time in ‘secure’ could be given as punishment for trivial acts, part of the initiation process, or simply to ease overcrowding (Stanley, 2016, p. 123).

Contributors to Stanley’s research published in Road to Hell (2016) recounted their experiences of ‘secure’ and other forms of corporal punishment as a humiliating and debasing introduction to institutional life. For many children, ‘secure’ epitomised the culture of violence within institutions through experiences of isolation and psychological abuse. For others, it sowed the seeds of institutionalisation. According to Stanley (2016), borstal secure cells were intentionally altered to add to the discomfort and degrading nature of the conditions. Kohitere Boy’s Training Centre’s secure units for example, were situated around a concrete yard with a wire netting roof, toilet, hand basin and bed (Stanley, 2016). In winter, all bedding was removed during the day, and in some institutions, children were not permitted to speak whatsoever (Stanley, 2016). Participants described their experiences within ‘secure’ as isolating and dehumanising.

The department’s use of ‘secure’ came under international scrutiny with the release of the Human Rights Commissions 1982 report which addressed complaints made by the Auckland Committee on Racism and Discrimination (ACORD) based on their findings of cruel and inhumane treatment in Social Welfare homes. The commission was highly critical of a number of practices considered to be in breach of the international covenant on civil and political rights (Parker, 2006). Among the findings, the report highlighted that the manuals issued lacked the force of law and their contents were not widely known amongst staff (Parker, 2006).

Dr Oliver Sutherland, spokesperson for ACORD, made the following witness statements to the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Historical Abuse in State Care and in the care of faith-based institutions in 2019 in relation to the Human Rights Commission Report/Findings of 1982:

* + [58] ACORD made a complaint to the Human Rights Commission in 1979 that the state was in breach of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in relation to treatment of children by the Department of Social Welfare in residential homes. The Human Rights Commission held hearings throughout 1980 and finally issued their report in 1982 ...
  + [62] The Minister of Social Welfare, Venn Young, accepted that the report included some ‘pretty hair-raising stuff’ but criticised the process of the inquiry. Robin Wilson of the Department of Social Welfare rejected the report entirely as ‘based on false complaints. Arthur Ricketts, principal of Owairaka stated that the report was ‘unfair, untrue and biased’…
  + [65] Years later in 1996, in a published history of the Department, ex-Director of Social Work, Auckland, Robin Wilson, who had for years criticised ACORD and rejected all our complaints, was quoted by Bronwyn Dalley as saying ‘Some of it was pretty indefensible … I guess the Department shouldn’t have allowed it to happen … with hindsight a lot of what [ACORD] said was right’ (Sutherland, 2019, pp. 18-21).

The state’s refusal to accept its culpability, despite considerable evidence to the contrary has contributed to intergenerational harms still experienced by whānau today (refer to Chapter 4).

“I think you can argue that we have tended to consistently under- resource the programmes that need to be in place to replace institutionalisation, whether it’s in mental health or in childcare we’ve ended up with problems because - rather than sticking people in appalling institutions like the old-fashioned mental hospitals we still haven’t had sufficient follow up care and sufficient monitoring.”

– Sir Michael Cullen, Minister of Social Welfare, 1987

## Physical punishments and psychological abuse

State Care residential institutions tended to have organisational cultures of control, domination, punishment and psychological abuse. This was designed to break, divide and rule the resident populations of children and young people, of which there was an over-representation of Māori (Stanley, 2016). Although there was variability in the practice of residential staff workers, many administered and encouraged dehumanising physical punishments to affirm their control over the residents (Stanley, 2016). These were perpetrated by staff directly, or through other residents under adult supervision as a form of mob rule and affirmation of the physical dominance of the institution over its residents (Stanley, 2016). Ex-residents who contributed to Elizabeth Stanley’s book, Road to Hell, recounted their experiences of being ‘slapped, punched, kicked, strapped, whipped, caned, belted, hit with objects, hosed down or made to eat horrible items’ (Stanley, 2016, p. 113).

The following are Dr Sutherland’s witness statements to the Royal Commission relating to Owairaka Boys (14-17 years) Social Welfare Home:

[46] Punishments were administered for misdemeanours such as being cheeky, stealing smokes, and especially for absconding. Children could be put in secure for days or weeks for persistent absconding.

[47] Children were forced to do physical training or work (including mowing sports fields to the point of exhaustion) as punishment. This included running on blistered feet and being hit with a cane if they stopped (Sutherland, 2019, p. 14).

Tamariki Māori and rangatahi with disabilities, as well as vulnerable adults who were housed in State Care institutions also experienced physical, sexual and emotional abuse from staff members and/or peers (Mirfin-Veitch & Conder, 2017). Despite complaints of abuse, there was a lack of official investigation and staff members often punished children for speaking out (Mirfin-Veitch & Conder, 2017; Stanley, 2016). In addition to the general lack of care and protection from State Care institutions, the staff often lacked specific training to ensure care and protection of tamariki Māori. As well as the physical violence used as a form of control, sexual violence towards vulnerable children was also common. Stanley (2016) relays how the induction for young girls entering State Care institutions included testing for venereal disease: ‘Sometimes, workers carried out inspections so roughly that they caused bodily damage’ (2016, p. 63). The use of constraints and punitive control measures such as isolation/timeout boxes were common, particularly employed for children identified as troublesome or non-compliant (Mirfin-Veitch & Conder, 2017; Stanley, 2016). This lack of adequate supervision and monitoring by the state to ensure care and protection of children and young people, was against official policy (Stanley, 2016).

Stanley (2016) highlights the dramatic rise in Māori children being admitted to State Care institutions between the late 1950s through to 1980s. Citing residential statistics, Stanley noted:

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, Māori constituted about 25% of boys in Owairaka; by the 1970s, this figure had shifted to more than 80%. In 1985, the department recorded a 78% Māori population across six Auckland institutions. Epuni, Hokio Beach and Kohitere followed a similar track (Stanley, 2016, p. 38).

Stanley (2016) reveals how the notes of residential workers were tinged with racist remarks. By inference, we can assume the racism evident across government agencies permeated into residential institutions contributing to abuse cultures.

State ‘care’ in such institutions served to increase incarceration rates as many tāne moved onto borstals and prisons, and wāhine graduated to mental health institutions (Stanley, 2016). Stanley (2016) uses ‘Fareham House’ which opened in 1944 as an example:

Workers directed their charges to homecraft, gardening and farming, hoping they would become competent housekeepers. In 1963, Fareham House changed its intake to accommodate just pre-adolescent girls (mainly those aged eleven to fourteen). The over- representation of Māori continued through the 1960s and 1970s, with 72% of residents being Māori in 1977. Most girls had been through other Child Welfare placements before arriving at Fareham. Officials saw them as ‘of average or above-average intelligence’ but that they were too ‘educationally retarded’ or ‘emotionally disturbed’ for placement in private foster homes. Most stayed for about a year and, in 1969, officials reported that over a fifth of residents progressed to a ‘mental hospital’ (Stanley, 2016, p. 205).

## State schooling as a traumatising mechanism: Structural racism and disparities in educational attainment

The settler state schooling system from 1867 onwards has operated under racially assimilative policies that facilitated acts of structural violence and perpetuated cycles of institutional racism (Walker, 1992). Māori were prosecuted and criminalised for resisting the native school system and suppression of mātauranga Māori. According to Bull (2001), from 1897 to 1920 and beyond, government harassment of Māori through school legislation is readily discernible from justice statistics. The first charges brought against Māori for ‘failing to send a child to school’ appeared in 1897. From the inception of the native schooling system, tamariki Māori were restricted to manual training rather than academic endeavours. Manual training was needed to prepare them for racially defined societal roles such as agricultural labourers, domestic workers, and housewives (Walker, 1992). The state schooling system functioned to suppress Māori academic achievement and language and promote Pākehā culture (Walker, 1992). These trends have persisted across decades and are directly linked with schooling practices in State Care residential institutions.

State schooling was central to promoting policies of assimilation and integration of Māori into Aotearoa New Zealand society (Hunn, 1961). It proved a powerful tool for control and indoctrination (L.T. Smith, 1989). It is an area where institutional racism has been allowed to flourish, resulting in lower educational achievement, higher school dropouts’ rates and higher truancy and suspensions rates for Māori (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Hynds et al., 2017). Evidence highlights that tamariki Māori truanted from mainstream schools, because they found them foreign, monocultural and unappealing (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). By truanting they often found themselves picked up and incarcerated by the State Care system (Stanley, 2016). Research has highlighted the strong association between youth disengagement in education and youth offending (Becroft, 2009; McLaren, 2000). Systemic racism across the education sector was recently acknowledged by Kelvin Davis, the Associate Education Minister (Māori Education), as he launched the anti-racism school programme ‘Te Hurihanganui’ (Maxwell, 2020). Minister Davis pointed to the existence of low expectations of Māori students within education, highlighting that this lack of belief in Māori students and what they could achieve was systemic racism. He also highlighted the impact of streaming or banding practices within schools, positing it needed to be removed because it harmed Māori (Maxwell, 2020). Low teacher expectations restricted Māori students’ opportunities to learn, resulting in their underachievement (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Hynds et al, 2017; Walker, 2016).

“One Māori parent [whose son is] at Lake Alice, … his father says to the social welfare officer, ‘You treated my son like a bag of potatoes. You took him from one place to another, and we never knew where he was’. That boy had been taken from one boy’s home to another boy’s home, to another, around the North Island, and ended up at Lake Alice. The parents didn’t know that he was there. Didn’t know where he was … gets to Lake Alice … the parents never do catch up with his movements and then at Lake Alice, of course … he’s only 12 – and he’s getting shock treatment – and there’s no such thing as consent. There’s no such thing as parents being involved. So that, to me, [is as] good a case as any, to illustrate how the child is separated and torn from the only relationships that really matter in its life, which of course is with the parents and with the whānau, and the hapū, and with the iwi.”

– Oliver Sutherland, advocate for Māori

McKinley and Hoskins (2011), in a review of educational policy in Aotearoa, point to a range of state endorsed educational discourses to explain Māori underachievement. They note the ‘first set of dominant discourses’ emerging from research from the 1930s through to the 1960s were overwhelmingly focussed on deficit explanations for underachievement that located the ‘problem’ with tamariki Māori and their whānau (McKinley & Hoskins, 2011, p. 3). The Hunn report (1961) presented the extent of ‘the problem’ through statistical analysis, highlighting considerable gaps in Māori health and life expectancy when compared with Pākehā, disparities in educational achievement (particularly higher education), and that Māori unemployment was three times that of Pākehā. Hunn (1961) noted several interrelated problems, giving an example of a ‘serious flaw’ in Māori education. One was ‘the lack of tuition in mathematics’ particularly for Māori boys, which meant exclusion from professions such as engineering, architecture, surveying and science (Hunn, 1961, p. 26). Hunn noted that ‘Maori representation at university is only about one-eighth of what it should be’ (1961, p. 25). The statistical analysis that showed educational underachievement particularly in higher education clearly baffled Hunn (1961). For example, he reflected that the IQ testing which was carried out at school (resulting in children being prevented from continuing their education) was probably inadequate, and disadvantaged Māori children:

Maori children are quite capable of absorbing education at all levels. According to teachers interviewed at Maori schools visited for the purpose of this review, the distribution of intelligence is the same among Maoris as among Europeans. Perhaps this is not borne out by intelligence tests administered to all pupils enrolling in Form III at post-primary schools, but that is probably due to the fact that the literary element of the tests related to English, not Maori language and thought. A special set of tests would have to be devised to give a true IQ rating for Maori children (Hunn, 1961, p. 23).

Hunn asserted that ‘education will, in the long run, do most for the cause of Maori advancement. It is the one thing, more than any other, that will pave the way to further progress in housing, health, employment and acculturation’ (1961, p. 22). This confirms how the development of Māori people in the image of the coloniser was seen as progress. However, Hunn believed the ‘state of Maori education – not its quality but the demand for it’ was the problem. He lamented Māori parental apathy towards education, whilst praising ‘those other parents who want their children to have the advantage of a good education’ (1961, p. 22).

In response, Walker (2016) demonstrates that Hunn ‘did not question the moral integrity of an education system that tracked Māori away from the professions and into manual work. Nor did he see structural racism and inequality in the distribution of power as the root cause’ (p. 30). Walker highlights how the underlying agenda of state education was concerned with ‘subordinating Māori as an underclass of manual workers’ (2016, p. 30). This again speaks to the intention of the settler state. Māori intelligence levels were tested as lower than Pākehā according to 1960s studies (Zimmerman, 1971). However, there is inherent cultural bias in intelligence tests that privilege the culture of the test designers, and the designers were not Māori. Lovegrove (1964) cited in Zimmerman (1971) noted that many studies indicated Māori children as ‘less able to cope with basic intellectual and school tasks than European children of the same age’ (p. 8). Lower levels of intelligence were also viewed as the reason for higher rates of delinquency among Māori. Because Māori had larger families than the typical nuclear Pākehā families, this was alleged to correlate with lower average intelligence caused by environmental factors which inhibited cognitive ability (Zimmerman, 1971). Zimmerman’s reflections demonstrate the various beliefs perpetuated at the time relating to why Māori children were perceived as less intelligent than their European peers:

At the present time there is no clear evidence to show whether it is poverty and large families, or rural location and depressed social status, or Maori inheritance patterns of child rearing or some combination of all three of these conditions, that are responsible for the type of intellectual functioning displayed by Maori children which teachers apparently consider restrictive, unhelpful, or countervailing (Zimmerman, 1971, p. 8).

Low expectations and negative stereotypes depicting Māori tamariki as possessing lower intelligence were plentiful in educational discourse around the 1960s. For example, Lovegrove (1966) stated ‘typical Maori homes are less visually and verbally complex and less consciously organised to provide a variety of experiences which will broaden and enrich the intellectual understandings of their children’ (1966, p. 34). This deficit theorising was another form of victim blaming, that taught generations of tamariki Māori that their culture was inferior to that of the white middle class (Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

Fifield and Donnell (1980) investigated trends in the socio-economic status of Māori and non- Māori over a decade, from 1966 to 1976, and how this correlated with school qualifications and employment. Their analysis showed that in 1966, 10% more non-Māori than Māori school leavers reached the fourth or a higher form, 24% more reached at least the fifth form and 25% more reached the sixth or seventh form (Fifield & Donnell, 1980). Furthermore, their analysis revealed that over 10 years this ‘gap’ had closed to some extent at the lower levels of education attainment but had become much wider at the higher levels. ‘In 1976 only 4% more non-Māori had reached the fourth or a higher form before leaving school, 20% more non- Māori stayed on to at least the fifth form and 33% more non-Māori reached the sixth or seventh forms’ (1980, p. 30). Analysis of educational attainment for University Entrance (UE) or higher in 1966, showed, the rates for Māori were 2.2% compared with 19.9% for non-Māori, in 1971 the rate for Māori was 4.3% compared with 27.8% for non-Māori, and in 1976 the rate for Māori was 5.4% compared with 29.8% for non-Māori (1980, p. 32).

Whilst for both Māori and non-Māori, the educational attainment levels increased, the gap between the two groups expanded. Fifield and Donnell (1980) demonstrated that ‘in 1966, 52% of non-Māori school leavers possessed some sort of qualification, compared with 15% of Māori school leavers, by 1976, 69% of non-Māori school leavers possessed a secondary school qualification, compared with 31% of Māori school leavers’ (1980, p. 32). Their analysis confirms a deterioration of educational attainment for Māori school leavers over time.

## Disparities in educational qualifications of the labour force

Fifield and Donnell (1980) also examined the formal educational qualifications of the labour force for 1966 and 1971, (formal educational qualifications were not collected in the 1976 census) with a concentration on workers aged 15-24 years. They found ‘the majority of both Maori and non-Maori workers aged 15-24 years had no formal qualification’ (1980, p. 35). For example, in 1966, 94.6% of Māori and 74.1% of non-Māori had no formal qualification. There were slight improvements by 1971 for both groups, for example 89% of Māori workers had no formal qualifications, compared with 59% of non- Māori workers. However, the disparities were still evident between the two groups. In relation to university qualifications the widening gap was stark with non-Māori attainment almost doubling, whilst Māori attainment stayed the same at one in a 1,000 during this time period.

From their analysis, Fifield and Donnell (1980) warned, ‘the relative deterioration in the position of Maori … [as compared with non-Maori] can be expected to have serious consequences’ (p. 36). Thus, they recommended urgent action by the state, noting that ‘a policy commitment to promoting the social and economic advancement of the Maori people was by no means a new idea’ (1980, p. 51). Despite such warnings, Māori disparities in social, economic, health and education outcomes continued, as the development and control of ‘initiatives’ to remedy the ‘Maori problem’ were insufficient lacking input and direction from whānau, hapū and iwi (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1988). Inadequate remedies (policies and practices) and deliberate inaction by the state to address the widening gaps, have been shaped by racism, both personal and structural (Cram, 2011; McKinley & Hoskins, 2011; Waitangi Tribunal Report, 2020; Waitangi Tribunal Report, 2019; Walker, 2016). State failure has had devastating, intergenerational impacts resulting in whānau capability deprivation (refer to Chapter 3).

## Discussion and summary: The legacy and abuse of the ‘Colonial Parent’

Research analysis demonstrates the over- representation of tamariki Māori and vulnerable adults is a direct result of the colonising settler State Care system (1950-1999) that has negatively affected generations of Māori individuals, whānau, hapū, iwi and communities. The impact was caused by the state’s deliberate dislocation and disempowerment of many whānau from their ancestral lands and life-sustaining networks. Additionally, by the loss of traditional gender relationships, particularly the value and importance of wāhine Māori for collective leadership and wellbeing (Mikaere, 1994).

The state’s role as ‘colonial parent’ has not ensured the care and protection of Māori tamariki and rangatahi, indeed document analysis has demonstrated its intentional neglect. As Judge (2017) notes, ‘the New Zealand State’s willingness to place children in State Care and subsequently neglect them undoubtedly constitutes systematic harm equated to state crime’ (p. 37). The state’s ‘care’ system has been a traumatising mechanism, underpinned by the structural racism that pervaded ‘foster homes, family homes, religious homes, psychiatric hospitals, special needs residences, hostels, borstals and prisons among other places’ (Stanley, 2016, p. 3). State Care has not produced the promised pathway to success.

Care has many meanings. According to the Office of the Children’s Commissioner (2015) ‘Children in the formal custody of the state are ‘in care’. Care also has a more general meaning: to protect someone and provide for their needs’ (p. i). The state needs to understand the quality of care and services children receive (Office of the Children’s Commissioner, 2015). However, our research analysis has highlighted that patriarchy and structural racism have always underpinned the Colonial Parent’s role and responsibility as ‘carer’.

Māori lost their political sovereignty and have always been viewed as subordinate. They were not treated as active partners in policy making and practice monitoring to determine what constitutes ‘quality care’ for tamariki Māori and/or vulnerable adults in the State Care system. Dalley (1998) notes that when ‘the state acted in loco parentis and took over the guardianship’ of tamariki Māori there was ‘scant account of Māori beliefs and practices’ (p. 207). The intentional elimination and reduction of tribal institutions and their independence, coupled with the loss of ancestral lands has resulted in Māori being over-represented in negative economic and social statistics, a cascading effect that has resulted in intergenerational harms.

The destruction of the Māori economy through land confiscations and alienation has had an enduring and devastating impact on whānau capability and capacity.

Socio-economic determinants are a key driver of whānau vulnerability and inability to participate fully in society, with poverty being a major contributing risk factor for children. Compared to European/others, Māori are more disadvantaged on a range of economic indicators and experience poorer access to, and outcomes from, universal services (e.g., health, education). The poverty experienced by many whānau is often intrinsic to the communities in which they live. Twenty-four percent of Māori, compared to seven percent of non-Māori, live in the most deprived areas of this country (Cram, 2012, p. 7).

Research analysis exemplifies how the root causes of Māori over-representation in the State Care system are a result of enduring colonisation; the belief in the superiority of the ‘mother’ country (England); and the development of the settler state, its laws, institutions, policies and practices. The deliberate destruction of the cultural, spiritual and economic base supporting whānau wellbeing has produced devastating intergenerational harms (Mikaere, 1994). Institutional and structural racism within and across State Care systems is underpinned and perpetuated by the belief that Pākehā child rearing, education and justice practices are superior to Māori, and that Māori are to blame for their over-representation in negative statistics. The paternalism and structural racism evident within the settler State Care system was emphasised in interviews.

Research analysis demonstrates how successive government policies and practices have privileged Pākehā society and marginalised Māori through inadequate action and deliberate inaction, most markedly seen through State Care systematic failure. Specifically, a failure in ensuring Te Tiriti o Waitangi guides government policy and the monitoring of policies in action, particularly across the ministries with a stake in caring for Māori tamariki (such as the Ministries of Education, Social Welfare, Justice, Health, Police, Child, Youth and Family). As the ground-breaking 1988 report Puao-te-Ata-Tū noted:

The history of New Zealand since colonisation has been the history of institutional decisions being made for, rather than by, Maori people. Key decisions on education, justice and social welfare, for example, have been made with little consultation with Maori people (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1988, p. 18).

The state’s distrust and ‘lack of belief in Māori capacity’ has been perpetuated by colonial, paternalistic and assimilationist policies (Stephens, 2013, p. 2). After analysing evidence related to the disproportionate effect on Māori, Judge (2017) concludes that institutional abuse and neglect was systematic in nature. ‘In other words, the harms have causal roots located in organisational systems or policies of the state, despite sometimes being perpetrated by an individual’ (Judge, 2017, p. 6).

Structural racism is ‘inadequate action’ and deliberate ‘inaction’ in the face of need (Waitangi Tribunal Report, 2019), and there is clear evidence that the settler state failed to address the aspirations and needs of whānau. Structural racism is embedded within the State Care system through traumatising mechanisms (Reid et al., 2017). Many state agencies are incriminated, including, but not limited to, the Ministries of Social Welfare/Social Development, Education, Health, Justice, Te Puni Kōkiri, and Police as well as organisations funded by the state to provide care (foster homes, faith-based and state- run residential faculties). The interconnectedness of failing State Care systems for whānau Māori has been demonstrated through our analysis. This failure has led to generations of pēpi and tamariki Māori being uplifted needlessly.

“So we had a very awful attitude, as a country. And you can see paternalism in many comments in written reports. Māori kids were often picked up because they might be going to offend, not because they had offended. The longitudinal study by social welfare points out that the age when most Māori kids were taken into care was at age 13 and 14, while for non-Māori kids it was 16. One of the problems I think the state always has is that it thinks it's got a sort of a God-given right, and is always going to deliver a perfect service for a child, compared to anyone else. And that sort of arrogance, in a way, has dominated state welfare policies for a hundred years.”

– Len Cook, public servant researcher

“They (the State) were bullish in their absolute resistance to any suggestion that they were discriminating (against Māori) or that they were unfair in the administration of the judicial system. Actually, further than that, they would attack us whenever they could.… And it didn't really matter whether it was the labour government or the national government … back in the '70s to say these things was an absolute anathema to the system.… And people would say to me that I was a disgrace to my race for saying such critical things about the Pākehā culture, about the civilization, and about colonization.”

– Oliver Sutherland, advocate for Māori
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