

Beating shame: Parihaka and the very long sorry¹

Between 1991 and now, the New Zealand government has apologized five times for the 1881 invasion and ransacking of Parihaka, a non-violent community on the south west coast, and there will probably be more apologies to come as other iwi in Taranaki negotiate with the Crown to settle historical claims of grievance. As well as these official apologies, Parihaka has attracted a surfeit of unofficial apologies too. In 1981, the 100th anniversary of the invasion, the head of the New Zealand Police apologized for the Armed Constabulary's role in the plunder and more recently, black and red 'Arohamai remember Parihaka' apology T-shirts expressed a wearer's individual remorse.² Even by the standards of a well-documented 'age of apology', Parihaka has attracted an over-abundance of remorse and regret. The problem is that these Parihaka apologies appear to have magnified rather than mitigated grievance at Parihaka itself and done little to aid either local or national understandings of what Parihaka is all about. Why might that be? The answer, I have come to see, is not to do with the sincerity of the Crown's apologetic utterances or the dedication and skill of the many Maori and Pakeha people involved in the Tribunal and settlement processes. Rather, it lies in common misunderstandings of wrongdoing and its aftermath, especially the sort of profound and sustained wrongdoing that was committed in Taranaki in the nineteenth century. Serious wrongdoing, of the kind I outline in the following two paragraphs, generates an enormous amount of shame, anger and sorrow the flows down through generations. But how is this shame distributed? Who feels it most? How can it best be banished or, at least, mitigated? This essay is my attempt to answer these important questions and so offer some new approaches to thinking about settling claims of historical injustice in Taranaki and elsewhere in New Zealand.

Parihaka was established by Te Whiti o Rongomai and Tohu Kakahi as a refuge for Maori who had been dispossessed by the wars of colonisation. The settlement soon became a large, radical, well-known alternative centre of Maori power grounded not in violent armed resistance but in non-violent protest. The ploughing and fencing protests of its residents challenged the authority of the New Zealand Government and of the white settlers who were farming confiscated Maori land. These protests were reported in newspapers in New Zealand and around the English-speaking world. When mass arrests and the destruction of crops failed to stop the ploughing and fencing, the Crown decided to go further. Under the guise of building a new road, the government prepared to crush Parihaka. On 5 November 1881, 644 Armed Constabulary and 945 volunteers invaded the pa. An Armstrong canon, set up on Purepo (Mt Rolleston) was trained down on the 2500 residents who were seated, quietly, on

the marae. Dancing and singing children greeted the invading force. Behind them, women carried bread that had been baked, in a gesture of hospitality, for the troops. Two government inquiries, the 1926-27 *Commission of Inquiry into Confiscated Land* (the Sim Commission) and the 1996 Waitangi Tribunal's *Taranaki Report* found that soldiers had ransacked the pa.³ Soldiers stole taonga (treasures) and food and they indiscriminately raped women. They pulled down people's houses. Hundreds of residents were evicted and told to return to their proper homes, even though their homes no longer existed because their land had been confiscated. The Native Minister, John Bryce, arrested Te Whiti and Tohu and the men were exiled and imprisoned in the South Island.⁴ They were never even given a trial and nor were the arrested ploughmen or fencers.

The invasion of Parihaka is often described as the final act in the New Zealand wars and Taranaki itself suffered from the longest 'regional conflict' of these wars. The fighting went from 1860 to 1881 with smaller skirmishes and unrest on either side of these dates.⁵ In Taranaki war encompassed violent exchange, non-violent resistance and what Richard Hill has described in his work on the armed constabulary as periods of 'coercive occupation', that were necessary in a 'post-conquest situation'.⁶ Given this, it would be difficult to imagine a Taranaki Maori agreeing with the sentence that opens Roberto Rabel's recent essay on 'New Zealand's Wars'. Rabel writes: 'War has generally touched lightly on New Zealand'.⁷ There was little that was light about this time for people in Taranaki and the wounds of war, occupation and invasion were intensified by raupatu (confiscation) and the terrible perpetual leasing regime that followed and continues to this day.⁸ Further, in the first half of the twentieth century, many Taranaki people died in the flu epidemic and in 'two world wars not of our making or in our interest'.⁹ The depth of injustice inflicted on Taranaki people is, perhaps, one reason why the Waitangi Tribunal made reference, controversially, to 'the holocaust of Taranaki history'.¹⁰

These are some of the terrible facts of Taranaki history but what do we do about them? It is commonplace to assume that shame is felt, most keenly, by those who have done wrong, by the perpetrators rather than the victims. The Crown's five apologies indicate that this assumption is also correct for Parihaka. A historic Taranaki waiata, 'Te Whakama' (the shame or embarrassment), a song that is reproduced, in te reo Maori and in English, in the historical account portion of the Deed of Settlement reached, in 2004, between one Taranaki iwi, Ngati Mutunga and the Crown, also indicates that shame belongs to the perpetrators. In 1927, Ngati Mutunga performed this waiata in Wellington before the Commission of Inquiry into Confiscated Lands. The 2004 Deed of Settlement explains that

‘this song is about the embarrassment and shame “tauiwi” (non-Maori) should feel for the terrible things they did to Maori people in the old days’. This is how the waiata begins:

Kahore hoki e te whakama e tau to ngaro
 ake nei
 E mahi tatou ake e te iwi
 E whaiwhaia nei e te ao koha ra e
 kupu tautoro mua
 Whakaaria mai mo tenei rangi ka tu
 Na Te Atua tonu i whakahau
 I kite ai hoki au i nga tatau rino
 Ka hora te akau ki Ngamotu ra e ki
 Whanganui ra hoki ki Poneke ra ia
 Ki te haupuranga o nga ture Kawana kia...

Such is the shame its conclusion will not be
 achieved.

We the people will continue
 This world inflicts a realm of pain extending far
 into the past.

Display it all for the occasion before us
 It was God who urged this
 I also saw the steel doors
 The seafront stretched out to Ngamotu to
 Whanganui and then to Wellington
 To where the laws of the Governor are heaped...

‘Te Whakama’ leapt out at me from my computer-screen, downloaded from a pdf stored on the Office of Treaty Settlements website. Even in English translation, it seemed to buzz with ambiguity and power. I was drawn to it. The bleak poetry of the translation resonated with me and with the questions I had begun to ask about the Parihaka apologies. My whanau ‘owns’ land in Taranaki that is subject to perpetual leases and my tipuna were involved with Parihaka, albeit in rather contradictory ways. Some of them lived at Parihaka and were imprisoned for ploughing protests while others spoke at Parihaka

meetings in support, seemingly, of the government's plans for the forcible installation of utilities, such as a lighthouse and a telegraph line, near the settlement.¹¹

Waiata are precious, sophisticated and flexible historical sources. As Judith Binney has observed, waiata are challenging primary sources to work with because even when they are written down 'they will still convey an "original" fluidity of metaphor and meaning'.¹² I found 'Te Whakama' at a time when I was ready to respond to the hints my ancestors, Maori and Pakeha, were giving me about the inescapable complexity of the past and of representing stories about the past. I was also fortunate to be guided along by many teachers, including the late Te Miringa Hohaia at Parihaka, Pou Temara and others who helped me think about the other meanings embedded in 'Te Whakama' and how they might apply to the problem of the sincere but rather ineffectual Parihaka apologies.

As a result, I now believe that it is Maori, not Pakeha, who have been overwhelmingly burdened by shame as a result of invasion, plunder and confiscation. So, rather than dwelling, excessively, on the actions or inactions of the Crown, the article considers how Taranaki Maori have tried to beat the shame generated by these events. The article's structure is intended to mirror the development in my own thinking on the apologies. It begins with a discussion of the place of the apology in Treaty settlements and an analysis of the five Crown apologies for the invasion of Parihaka. I then change perspective and discuss the ways in which Taranaki people have worked to turn around the pain of historical events by acts of determined, creative and provocative remembrance. I discuss how this local, intimate, whanau-centred work provides some exciting possibilities for new kinds of historical scholarship but it also illuminates a significant problem with Crown apologies. Namely, there is a disconnect between what the Crown says about the past, supposedly on behalf of the nation, and what ordinary Pakeha people say about it inside their homes, a fissure between national history and domestic history. The final section of the article returns to 'Te Whakama' and the many approaches it suggests for the critical work of continuing to keep the past in mind, to live alongside the past, as we strive for partnership, understanding and justice into the future.

Parihaka and the very long sorry

Apologies are central to the negotiated settlements between the Crown and iwi and academic commentators tends to be rather celebratory about them.¹³ Along with cultural redress and commercial and financial redress, 'The Apology' is one of the three building blocks of a settlement package. It has become almost mandatory. A 2008 Crown Forestry Rental Trust guide for claimants negotiating

Treaty settlements explains that while claimants may have mixed views on an apology – some demand one while others debate its merits – the ‘reality is that the Crown insists on making an apology, even if negotiators do not want one’.¹⁴ The Office of Treaty Settlements explains that ‘The Apology’ makes ‘very significant steps towards recognizing the mana of the claimant group; restoring the honor of the Crown; and rebuilding the relationship between the Crown and the claimant group’.¹⁵ This may certainly be true for some iwi – especially for Tainui who elicited an apology from Queen Elizabeth herself – but it is not true at Parihaka where there has been a mismatch between the responses of the givers and the receivers.

While I expect that the Crown and its agents heard, in The Apologies, sincere remorse, respect and a desire to rebuild relationships, Maori heard something less positive. Some Parihaka kaumatua (elders) view The Apologies with indifference, anger or even disdain. I tried out these ideas with Kaumatua, Te Miringa Hohaia. and he encouraged me to provide an ‘informed perspective’. He did not think these apologies had fixed anything at Parihaka either (except for grievances, perhaps!). Among other things, Te Miringa asked me to consider: ‘Why was the Crown apologizing about Parihaka anyway? Did it imply that Parihaka was being addressed? Where were Parihaka people in all of this? What does it bode for Parihaka when we negotiate? Was it wise of the Government to make Parihaka apologies in the absence of dialogue with us? Indeed, who negotiated with them on the appropriateness, the content, the dignity required?’¹⁶ These questions are urgent. Along with Te Ati Awa, Taranaki iwi are the tribe most closely associated with Parihaka and at the time of our conversation in late 2009, Te Miringa was one of the mandated Taranaki iwi representatives working so hard to ready Taranaki for entering into negotiations with the Crown.

Te Miringa’s comments signal the flaws in a model where an official apology is supposed to be a pathway to healing grievances and making peace, to putting the past behind us. As philosopher Janna Thompson has argued in relation to Australia and elsewhere, one reason for dissatisfaction with apologies is ‘that they seem a poor response to the enormity of injustices that were committed. “We took your lands; we stole your children. Sorry about that”.’¹⁷ However, Thompson, still sees value in an apology and argues that it ‘is best understood as an attempt to make up for the past – an act that cannot succeed but which is necessary to perform’. How best to perform it and what might a well-performed apology achieve?

The Apology (singular) is supposed to make everyone feel better, not just the Crown. It is supposed to be an exchange between two groups, a ‘reconciliatory gesture’, a sign of mutual intent, namely ‘rebuilding the relationship’ that had been shattered by colonial violence and the less obvious, but no less lethal, bureaucratic violence that followed. The Apology is symbolic. Such a Crown-Maori apology does not shut down discussion. It should open it up. For example, The Apology should not preclude other, more difficult apologies that may need to be exchanged between members of different iwi. Maori men were members of the force that invaded Parihaka and Maori fought with the Crown in Taranaki between 1860 and 1869 too.¹⁸

Despite Te Miringa’s skepticism, it would be possible to argue that, at Parihaka, a better kind of apology – ‘The Apology’ – could still work to help restore mana (for Maori) and honor (for the Crown) and so rebuild relationships between the two. To do this, I could suggest that it would need to meet the four criteria that Janna Thompson has outlined as necessary for a ‘genuine political apology’.¹⁹ Namely, the content of the apology and the ceremony surrounding it should be endorsed by the victims and their representatives and by the people who live in the nation responsible for the wrong; the government should make sure that the victim’s suffering is ‘embedded in the official history of the nation’; and the government will demonstrate that it will not harm the victims or their descendants anymore.²⁰

I endorse these ambitious criteria. However, none of the Parihaka apologies have managed to achieve these aims. Leaving aside the apology implicit in the findings of the 1927 Sim Commission and possibly even in the findings of the 1880s West Coast Commission too, the first Crown apology for the invasion of Parihaka was given, without warning, at the first Waitangi Tribunal hearing at Parihaka in 1991. Solicitor Tom Winitana, a Tuhoe man, spoke on behalf of the Minister of Justice, Pakeha Doug Graham. Winitana said the Crown did not dispute Taranaki claimants’ testimony about the sacking of the village at the 1927 Sim Commission and it did not dispute claimants’ version of events now. The Crown would listen respectfully if people chose to talk about the invasion but it did not expect ‘any one of you to come before this Tribunal and suffer the distress of re-telling those events.’ Rather, Winitana concluded, the Crown was ready to enter into direct negotiations with Taranaki iwi to ‘discuss any proposal whereby the mana of Parihaka might be restored.

We are the descendents, the inheritors of that unhappy past. It is our duty to give it a proper burial. It is my duty, as one of Her Majesty’s Ministers, to apologise to the ancestors of

Parihaka and I now do so. In doing so I look now to the future. It beckons us all. Let us stand together as we face what is to come.²¹

Parihaka leaders rejected the apology. It had come without warning, they explained, almost as an afterthought. It was addressed to the dead rather than the living, the descendants of those who had ‘lived through the sacking and looting and destruction of Parihaka’. If an apology was to be offered to the living, it would have to be an event of national significance because Parihaka itself had been a gathering place for iwi from beyond Taranaki. It would have to be offered to a large audience that included Maori from around New Zealand rather than the smaller group of Taranaki people assembled for a tribunal hearing. The Parihaka Pa Trustees wrote: ‘The hurt of Parihaka is therefore felt far beyond Taranaki. What happened there was something of an affront to nations. To the nations which embraced each other as Treaty partners in 1840.’²² The timing and form of the apology, therefore, would need to be negotiated between the Crown and the people of Parihaka.

The bearer of the apology should have a status that matched the status accorded to the invasion of the village, an invasion that ‘took place at the direction of the highest authorities’. As events unfolded information was even being telegraphed directly to both Houses of the General Assembly’, Trustees wrote.²³ Ideally, an apology should be offered by the Minister of Justice in the presence of the Minister of Maori Affairs and the Prime Minister. Te Miringa Hohaia and others offered to help the Crown ‘along the path’ to an apology. In response, Minister Graham wrote that he was ‘deeply disturbed’ his apology had been rejected. He had been acting in good faith and believed that his ‘personal apology to your ancestors’ would demonstrate to Parihaka people that ‘as Her Majesty’s Minister responsible for Treaty claims I was listening to their grievances with sympathy and understanding’.²⁴

Mutual incomprehension and affront characterizes this exchange. For both sides, this apology damaged rather than enhanced relationships and eroded the honor of the Crown and the mana of Parihaka. It is interesting to observe that the concerns of the Parihaka Pa Trustees anticipate Thompson’s more recent arguments about the criteria necessary for a ‘genuine political apology’. In their letters, the Trustees offer to help the government negotiate an apology that would be appropriately dignified and ceremonial and, therefore, demonstrate the Crown’s recognition of Parihaka’s mana and the Crown’s desire to do no further harm to people who are living there. But the Trustees were also letting the Government know how any actions taken to make up for the wrong of te pahua would need to match the actions of the original event. The Trustees were referring to the fact that utu (payment, satisfaction, a balancing up of accounts) would need to be part of an apology too.²⁵

The four other official apologies have been negotiated between individual Taranaki iwi and the Crown. In 2001, two of the Taranaki tribes, Ngaati Ruanui and Ngati Tama, signed Deeds of Settlement with the Crown. In the Ngati Ruanui Deed, the Crown acknowledged ‘the serious damage it inflicted on the prosperous village of Parihaka and the people of Ngaati Ruanui residing there’ and said its ‘treatment of the people of Ngaati Ruanui residing at Parihaka was unconscionable and unjust’.²⁶ In the Ngati Tama Deed, the Crown made a direct apology ‘for its actions at Parihaka’.²⁷ The 2003 settlement with Ngaa Rauru Kiitahi explained how intimately the south Taranaki iwi were connected with Parihaka and the suffering that resulted from the Crown’s actions there. ‘The Crown profoundly regrets, and unreservedly apologises to Ngaa Rauru Kiitahi for its actions during the Taranaki wars,’ the Apology said.²⁸ In the 2005 Ngati Mutunga deed, the Crown again acknowledged the ‘serious damage it inflicted on the prosperous village of Parihaka’ and its ‘unconscionable and unjust’ treatment of Ngati Mutunga people living there. The Apology included the statement: ‘The Crown profoundly regrets, and unreservedly apologies for, its unconscionable actions at Parihaka’.²⁹

Each of the documents acknowledged that the suffering of Maori in Taranaki had been compounded by earlier, botched attempts at making amends. The Deeds acknowledged that ‘despite previous efforts made in the twentieth century, including those of the Sim Commission, it has failed to deal in an appropriate way with the grievances of [insert iwi name here]’.³⁰

Peter Adds makes explicit the meanings behind this rather general statement.³¹ In a recent essay on the long aftermath of confiscation, Adds demonstrates how successive mechanisms that were supposed to fix Taranaki grievances over confiscated land – such as the Sim Commission, the Taranaki Maori Trust Board (1931), the formation of Parininihi ki Waitotara (1976) and the Waitangi Tribunal hearings (1990-1995) – have often multiplied and intensified the problems within and between hapu and iwi, not to mention between Maori and Pakeha. As for Treaty settlements, in Taranaki and elsewhere, Adds argues: ‘Bitter public feuds have almost become the norm in this process’.³²

The Crown has admitted to a poor record in dealing with Taranaki grievances and Taranaki Maori agree with this assessment. At the Tribunal hearings, many claimants were angry about the ‘charade’ and expense of participating in yet another inquiry when previous ones had failed.³³ In 2000, Taranaki poet Jacqui Sturm despaired at delays in redressing the wrongs of the past, asking: ‘How much longer/must we reap/their bitter harvest?’³⁴ Given this, it would probably have been wiser for the

Government to refrain from offering any apology at all for Parihaka until it had negotiated with representatives of every Taranaki iwi. There was a model for this approach. No apology has been offered, yet, for the Crown's taking of Taranaki's greatest taonga, the beautiful mountain Taranaki (Mt Egmont). Instead, each of three Taranaki settlements already negotiated specifically states that apology and cultural redress in relation to the mountain will be developed in consultation with all iwi.³⁵

Still, there's no point lamenting what might have been. 'The Apologies' are out there and they invert the usual narrative of the victim group who pushes for decades for justice and recognition until, finally, the perpetrator group caves in and utters The Apology. More than this, though, the Parihaka apologies challenge researchers to think about what kind of history-making, if any, might be able to achieve either reconciliation or even a fair hearing for the many past and present injustices that exist in a settler nation such as Aotearoa New Zealand.

Beating shame

Historian and ethnographer of the Pacific, Greg Denning liked to say that all history-making was a dialogue between past and present and this is a more positive way of describing what other scholars might deride as 'presentism'.³⁶ Maori actions and performances demonstrate a different and perhaps more powerful example of 'presentism'. Namely, many Maori seek to point out that the past is often present, here and now, shaping what we do and say and how we think. The past is not an event that can be boxed up, labeled and put away. Rather, it is still unfolding. This sense of open-endedness is especially potent for Parihaka, which was a prophetic community. Followers of Te Whiti and Tohu expected the utterances of the two men to shape the future. In 1927, for example, many Maori saw the establishment of the Sim Commission as a fulfillment of Te Whiti's prophecy that peaceful protests would, eventually, force the government to inquire into confiscated lands.³⁷ In his opening evidence at the first Tribunal hearings at Parihaka in 1991, Lindsay Rihari McLeod, recited a whakatauki (saying) that made a similar point: 'A proverb of Te Whiti is translated as: "The bird startled has flown, only the quiver of the bough remains". We are the quiver – their descendants whom despite all their pain and hurt and feelings of injustice, never taught us to be bitter, vindictive or take revenge'.³⁸

Likewise, two events in Taranaki in early 2010, demonstrated how the past 'quivers' or reverberates in the present. On 18 March, the front page of the *Taranaki Daily News* featured a photograph of a dignified old woman swinging back a mallet to bang on an enormous red drum. Relatives surrounded the kuia (elderly woman) and everyone was dressed in black. Some had albatross feathers in their hair

– a symbol of allegiance to the passivist principals of Te Whiti and Parihaka – and others wore wreaths made from kawakawa leaves. The ‘mournful rhythm’ of this drum accompanied the opening of the ‘Te Ahi Ka Roa, Te Ahi Katoro Taranaki War 1860-2010: Our Legacy – Our Challenge’ exhibition at Puke Ariki museum and library in New Plymouth. Later that day at Owae Marae in Waitara, the drum beat again as Te Ati Awa leaders, Prime Minister John Key and Minister of Treaty Negotiations Chris Finlayson signed documents to mark the commencement of settlement negotiations regarding Treaty of Waitangi claims.

Taranaki kaumatua and Archdeacon, Tiki Raumati, told a reporter that the drum had been given to his grandmother, who was a leader of poi at Parihaka. ‘They used that drum in the military and I will say we turned it around on them and drummed them out with peace and love, Raumati was reported as saying.³⁹

Raumati was reminding readers that troops played bugles, drums and tin whistles when they marched into Parihaka on 5 November 1881 to invade an unarmed community. While we Taranaki people feel terrific pride at the non-violent resistance of Parihaka people, the plunder has also generated a great deal of shame, remorse, sorrow, anger and suffering for Maori and, to a lesser extent, for Pakeha. The war drum is a fitting metaphor for this shame, which has beaten down through the generations, influencing how we think about ourselves, our histories and our future.

For people who have been colonised, there are many possible shades of whakama (shame and embarrassment), from big shames to little ones, from collective ‘Maori’ shame to specific iwi shame; all the way through to hapu, whanau and individual, private and personal shame. The varieties of ‘big shames’ might include shame about the loss of language and land and about the loss of resources, traditions and leaders. These losses are also serious assaults on mana. Hapu or whanau shames are less obvious, perhaps, but no less damaging to a group’s status. They can be about the actions or inactions of your ancestors (including the sale of land, failure to fight or even fighting on the side of the Crown); about the colour of your skin, about your blood quantum; about the place where you live (which has been one of my personal shames – Australia!); about the lack of seafood on the table at a feast or even about your own poor pronunciation of the few Maori words you know and your lack of knowledge of waiata.⁴⁰

Joan Metge has described whakama as both a state of mind and a behaviour associated with this feeling. ‘Analysis of the situations in which whakama occurs reveals a variety of causes: shyness, shame not only for wrongdoing but also for being suspected of it, embarrassment over falling short in some respect, feelings of injustice, powerlessness and frustration. The common denominator seems to be “feeling at a disadvantage, being in a lower position morally or socially”, whether as a result of your own actions or another’s,’ Metge wrote.⁴¹

People respond to shame and embarrassment in a number of ways. One common strategy is to forget. Novelist Alexis Wright, a member of the Waanyi nation of the Gulf of Carpentaria in Australia, says many families have ‘stories that are impossible to resolve. The stories in these families have created a sense of shame or humiliation, and are hidden or destroyed’.⁴² Shameful stories are lost through ‘deliberate acts of forgetting’, through concealment, through not saying anything at all ‘because it is not worth the trouble’.⁴³ This response, this ‘deliberate forgetting’, is perfectly articulated in *The Historian who lost his Memory*, a short story written by Taranaki leader Te Rangihiroa (Peter Buck) in the early twentieth century and discovered, much later, by literary scholar Alice Te Punga Somerville in the archives of the Bishop Museum in Honolulu.⁴⁴ In this story, the historian narrates ancient tribal events, but when a visitor asks about a ‘relatively recent event (a battle at Kaiwhakauka) the historian claims not to know about it’.⁴⁵ The rangatira steps in and tells the story, revealing that the historian is the great-grandson of the man who is humiliated in the battle. Then, Te Punga Somerville writes, the visitors ‘realise that the historian “lost his memory” because of his own relationship to events’.⁴⁶ The historian, in fact, lost his memory because he was ashamed.

Forgetting is rarely innocent. People have to work hard to not to know, not to recall, not to see, to be truly ignorant.⁴⁷ Laura Ann Stoler describes ignorance as ‘an ongoing operation, a cumulative ... and laboured effect’ that is achieved and sustained inside ‘the social space of family and friendship’.⁴⁸ When a family forgets, it is at risk of losing not only the troubling stories but many other family legacies too.⁴⁹ On reflection, I can see that one of the things I was doing in my book, *The Parihaka Album: lest we forget*, was exploring how shame – about insufficiency, as in a partial or damaged or ‘worthless’ fraction of Maori-ness or maybe about excess, a shame about being Maori at all – worked in my family and how this feeling of shame prevented my grandmother and great-grandmother from passing on valuable information to my father and his cousins and also to us, the grandchildren. Damage to whakapapa is one bitter legacy of colonisation. Perhaps it was just easier to forget about all

that and stay in what I called ‘the dementia wing of history’. As Peter Addis has noted, there was a generation of Taranaki people who were taught there was no future in being Maori.⁵⁰

Janna Thompson reminds us that: ‘People are caused to suffer not merely by the events themselves but by the ideas they get into their head about these events.’⁵¹ Forgetting is one way of avoiding this suffering but it comes at a great cost. When possible, a less destructive response to humiliating events is to remember them in a different way, to actively seek to change your relationship to the shameful-painful events and in so doing to rewrite and repair your history, to try and make something good out of something bad. I owe this insight to tikanga expert, Professor Pou Temara who shared a Ngati Awa whakatauki on this theme at a symposium on apology at Waikato University in February 2010. The saying is: ‘Utua te kino ki te pai – Repay the bad with the good/Whaiho ma te whakama e patu – let shame be your punishment.’

In Australia, an example of such radical, creative remembrance is Myall Creek, where, in 1838, between ten and twelve white stockmen murdered 28 Wirrayaraay children, women and men in an unprovoked but well-planned attack. It is hard to imagine anything good coming from such an event; yet descendants of both the victims and the perpetrators have tried to turn the event around by working together to erect a monument to the victims of the massacre. The monument was unveiled in 2000 and an annual memorial service is held on the site each year.⁵²

The war drum is another example of coping with shame through active, creative, provocative remembering. As Tiki Raumatī has observed, Maori have claimed a weapon of war, the drum, and ‘turned it around on them’ re-presenting it as a weapon for peace.⁵³ The instruments of the invaders quickly became the instruments of the residents of Parihaka in their own drum and fife bands.⁵⁴ A similar ‘turning around’ is at work in a well-known nineteenth-century waiata ‘Te Piukara’ (the bugle), which links the sound of the bugle with the trouble and violence that surrounded Parihaka. The song is chanted like a dirge yet there is also a triumphant and subtle flick at the end.

The final verse of ‘Te Piukara’ is: ‘Piko mai e kaawana ko ahau to ariki/Ko koe taku pononga e te kuini/kei maunawa’, which Te Miringa Hohaia has translated as meaning, ‘Come forth bow down before us Governor I am your lord./you are my servant/O Queen, source of our oppression./Such trouble.’⁵⁵ Here, the victims’ are claiming a moral victory at the same time as they express terrible suffering. Similarly, the newsletter for the Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust, the group

representing Taranaki Maori living in Wellington, is ‘Te Ngonga o te Piukara’ (The Sounds of the Bugle), a pointed reference to this waiata to the benefits of non-violent resistance and to the new future that may beckon now that we have settled our Treaty claim, an event that included an Apology (from the Crown) and a Statement of Forgiveness (from us).⁵⁶

Whakapapa and history

Linda Tuhiwai Smith has written that revisiting history, or ‘coming to know the past’, is a crucial part of decolonization, while Dipesh Chakrabarty has urged subaltern scholars and others on the margins to think about ‘provincializing Europe’, that is acknowledging how embedded European understandings are in the ideas that underlie academic history-making.⁵⁷ In a similar vein, cultural theorist Stephen Turner has argued that: ‘For the settler the Western notion of history is perhaps the deepest form of forgetting a self-constructing form of repression’, one that denies ‘the experience of contact’.⁵⁸ This ‘forgetting’ starts close to home, in the family. For instance, one of my Pakeha forbears was John Howard Wallace, a historian and long-time secretary of the Early Colonists Association, whose voluminous papers are held at the Alexander Turnbull Library in Wellington. Wallace spent decades trying to compile a list of early Pioneers (those who arrived before 1850) but his feverish work ‘forgot’ the fact that some of these people, such as his brother William, had married even earlier Pioneers – Maori women already living in the places where ‘first ships’ landed.⁵⁹

The Treaty claims process creates a community of memory – Port Nicholson Block in Wellington for example – that is based on whakapapa. Every hui, every newsletter, every email reinscribes the past we share and reminds us that we are all the product, at some stage, of intimate ‘contact’ between Maori and Pakeha in either Wellington or Taranaki. The history we are working to turn around is deeply personal as a result. It might be the story of a drum given to a grandmother, or a frightened child singing beneath the haunches of a soldier’s horse or a great-grandfather who drank too much and sold too much land or a grandmother who refused to use her Maori name.

In the Maori world, I have little standing without whakapapa. It is a taonga. In the introduction to a new edition of *Whakapapa*, members of the Maori interest group of the New Zealand Society of Genealogists, site comments made by Dr Pita Sharples during the third reading of the Births, Deaths, Marriages and Relationships Amendment Bill in July 2008. He said:

The Maori Party comes to this Bill driven by the principal of whakapapa. We come to this Bill with a deeply personal understanding of what it means to any discussion of births, deaths marriages and relationships. We, as tangata whenua, hold in the highest regard the value of whakapapa as a means of defining who Maori are as a people. Whakapapa is the bridge that links us to our ancestors, which defines our heritage, gives us the stories which define our place in the world.⁶⁰

Whakapapa works to shape personal identity but for a person like me, who is also an academic, whakapapa shapes and strengthens research methodologies too. Building on the groundbreaking work of Linda Smith, among others, younger Maori scholars have rearticulated the importance of whakapapa and whanau to their research agendas but also sought to extend their work beyond this frame. Arini Loader describes Maori history ‘as personal and Maori history is relationships – or put simply, Maori history is whakapapa’ but it is also about ‘casting the net wider’.⁶¹ Melissa Williams has considered what stories might be silenced in a Maori-focused research agenda in which the researcher wanted to uphold the mana of their communities and the people they were writing about. Nephia Mahuika has also challenged Maori researchers to embrace new theoretical approaches, especially theory and methodologies of oral-history making and asked whether Maori might look beyond whanau and iwi to ‘yet consider producing more of our own bigger and broader histories’.⁶²

Whakapapa is a web that connects my relatives to a range of local, national and international stories, affirming and destabilising them. History, then, is not just a dialogue between present and past but between the intersections of very little stories (what my great-grandmother did and what her father did and so on) with very big stories (what the New Zealand Company did, what the British Empire did).

In her reflections on doing Aboriginal family history, Maria Nugent explains that ‘Aboriginal family history is always more than family history ... it is always implicitly, sometimes explicitly, engaged with other historical narratives, both the local and national level and possibly even the global level’.⁶³ For an Aboriginal Australian, then, doing family history entailed coming to terms with two related wrongs, the wrongs in the past (history-as-the-past) and with the wrongs of how the past has been represented (history-as-the-past-represented’).⁶⁴

Perhaps all family historians – indigenous or not – confront these related wrongs, in some way, as they burrow away in the past and learn how often individual stories contradict national ones. Yet the

supposed smallness or narrowness of the pasts pursued by genealogists is limiting. Australian historian Graeme Davison writes that the domain of the genealogist is essentially private and it connects only tenuously with the concerns of national or international history. Doing family history, Davison argues, ‘speaks not to our sense of historical significance but to our need for personal identity’.⁶⁵ Indeed, it is sometimes argued that the personal connection with the past provided by family history blinds people to the bigger picture. Many Australians and New Zealanders feel an intense attachment to relatives who fought in World War I and academic historians such as Joy Damousi have analysed how the ‘merging of military and family history’ has led to a strong investment in a nationalist, militarized past that resists necessary ‘historical analysis’.⁶⁶

Genealogists may be searching for identity, for glory or infamy or for a place in a militarized story of the nation, they may be writing small, private, emotional and anti-analytical history, but the stories people unearth about their ancestors are powerful markers of identity in the present. As Alexis Wright suggested in her essay on family secrets, these ‘little stories’ resist, very powerfully, any attempt at intervention from ‘big stories’, such as official apologies for historical injustice, that might be imposed from outside the frame of the family. This is precisely why we academics should pay attention to them. What is a nation, really, aside from a collection of families? As Tania Evans has put it, in an article that urges academic historians to engage, seriously, with what genealogists are doing: ‘Big pictures are constructed using lots of little people’.⁶⁷ The flawed Parihaka apologies suggest that there is a disconnect between what the Crown says about the past, supposedly on behalf of the nation, and what ordinary people say about it inside their homes.

Domestic history versus national history

While Maori in Taranaki have repeatedly demonstrated the connections between past and present, some Pakeha resent any reminders of contact or conflict that might unsettle cherished, simplistic stories of faith, ‘heritage’ and pioneering decency. One recent example demonstrates this well. A few weeks before the opening of the Taranaki War exhibition, local and international Anglican dignitaries were in New Plymouth for the consecration of St Mary’s Cathedral – the first new Anglican cathedral anywhere in the world in the past 80 years.⁶⁸ White settlers built the church in 1840 and Te Ati Awa leader Sir Paul Reeves, a former Archbishop of New Zealand, reminded readers that some Maori saw St Mary’s as a garrison church with all its attachments and flags.⁶⁹ Armaments were stored there. A parishioner took issue with Sir Paul’s comments. In a letter to the editor, Connie Jones wrote:

St Mary's was never associated with Parihaka but now we have been taken over by Maori hierarchy like Tiki Raumati poking his nose in ... The 1860s wars (in which my grandfather George Henry Herbert fought as a Redcoat) has nothing to do with Parihaka. Also our new Dean, Jamie Allen, has been hoodwinked by Maori activists within Taranaki that we now have to apologise for some obscure wrongs perpetrated by the colonials.⁷⁰

The correspondent ended her letter by saying she was 'appalled' that Tiki Raumati had been appointed Archdeacon and that Raumati and others associated with Parihaka were 'infiltrating our beautiful new cathedral' and 'trying to rewrite our heritage'.⁷¹ Connie Jones was outraged yet all she had to do is look at the walls of the church she obviously loves to find connections between the wars of the 1860s and the establishment of Parihaka pa in 1866, as a refuge for Maori whose land had been confiscated after the wars.⁷² The church is decorated with paintings of the coats of arms of various regiments who fought against Taranaki people in the wars.

The complaint about having to 'apologise for some obscure wrongs' was slotted into the letter after the author has explained her understanding of the history of the church ('built long before the 1860s Land Wars') and, by extension, of Taranaki itself. Jones is angry about Anglican leader's plans to apologise, an act that she sees as an affront to her heritage.

The letter-writer suggests that Maori history and Maori remembrances burden Pakeha. This view is quite commonplace. In her survey of apologies in Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States, Melissa Nobles notes that opinion polls show 'polarization on Maori issues', a finding that suggests 'the Waitangi Tribunal has not produced a reconciled political community'.⁷³ To support this contention, Nobles cites a review of a book about the Treaty of Waitangi in which the reviewer, Philip Temple, complains that Pakeha 'are required to carry the moral burden' for historical injustice and they are 'exhausted' by this and resentful about the 'successes' of the Waitangi Tribunal process. Temple writes 'the Treaty has come to be seen ... as a one-way street, a document that enables Maori to claim and receive apologies and compensation from a largely Pakeha government without reciprocation, let alone thanks'.⁷⁴

But Connie Jones does not appear to be carrying a 'moral burden' about the actions of her Red Coat grandfather or about the war insignia that decorates her church. The burden, shame and exhaustion wrought by Taranaki's past is carried, overwhelmingly, by Maori, not Pakeha.

Te Whakama (The Shame or Embarrassment)

The Deed of Settlement between Ngati Mutunga and the Crown includes two waiata that were performed before and presented to the 1926-27 government-appointed Sim Commission on confiscated lands. The document explains that the waiata record the experience of Ngati Mutunga and other northern Taranaki iwi in relation to both the original confiscation legislation (the 1863 New Zealand Settlements Act) and to the commission's findings on the Taranaki Wars, including the invasion of Parihaka.⁷⁵

The first waiata, 'Ko Waitara', is about the town where the Taranaki War started in 1860. The second one, 'Te Whakama', is about embarrassment and shame. The waiata is reproduced in Maori accompanied by an English translation. The first few lines in English read: 'Such is the shame its conclusion will not be achieved./We the people will continue/This world inflicts a realm of pain extending far into the past/Display it all for the occasion before us ...'.⁷⁶ The song talks specifically about the leaders at Parihaka and reminds the audience that the raukura (albatross feather) worn by the singers is a sign of allegiance to the peaceful teachings of Te Whiti and Tohu. The song ends by reminding listeners of the great wrongs committed in the name of a Christian God and that Parihaka's leaders offered an alternative. 'The clothes of the people are torn asunder,let/calm be spread through the world/As an ultimate peace upon the land/So that the actions of the prophets, Jesus and his apostles may ease off/Te Whiti and his children strove so they may/stand strong in the midst of conflict.'

Even in translation, this waiata indicates what might be wrong with an apology as a way of coming to terms with the past. Thompson argues that there are two kinds of discourses around wrongdoing or reparation. The first is legalistic and is concerned with 'rights and obligations, restoration and compensation'. The second is theological, 'concerned with apology, forgiveness, contrition, atonement and reconciliation'.⁷⁷ An apology invokes Christian ideas of good and evil, salvation and damnation, the heavenly and the earthly; yet in 'Te Whakama', Ngati Mutunga condemn Christianity and the things done in the name of 'Jesus and his apostles' and offer Te Whiti as an alternative to conflict. For people at Parihaka, Christianity was the source of problems. Can an apology, with its strong Christian overtones, work there?

Moving away from questions of faith, the English version of the song indicated that the war crimes committed by the Crown in the nineteenth century were so great that non-Maori could never make up

for them. In this frame, an apology was pointless, mainly because the shame was so great that it could never be ‘concluded’. But the translation of the song also suggested that the confiscation of land, the imprisonment of people, the ransacking of Parihaka had all been intended to destroy Taranaki Maori. Yet even this extreme action had self-evidently failed because here, in front of the Commission, were Ngati Mutunga people singing ‘E mahi tatou ake e te iwi/ we the people will continue’.

However, as so often happens, quite a bit was lost in translation. I asked Pou Temara to have a look at the waiata and to see whether my analysis of it was on the right track. What did he think about my idea that the song was saying non-Maori would never be able to make amends for ‘the things they did to the Maori people in the olden days’?

Temara started to read the Maori words. ‘This song is about Maori shame and Taranaki shame at being landless,’ he said. He continued to read: ‘E whaiwhaia nei e tea o he ao koha ra e/kpu tautoro mua’ which is translated, in the Deed, as ‘This world inflicts a realm of pain extending far into the past.’ Temara said the translation was incomplete. ‘This word, whaiwhaia, is connected with makutu,’ he said. In his opinion, the line compared confiscation with a curse and it explained that Taranaki people ‘cursed the world’ because they had lost their land but it also expressed the feeling that ‘we are cursed because we are landless’.⁷⁸

I was stunned. His interpretation was so different from the English preamble that explained what the song was ‘about’ and from the translation itself and yet it made sense. The English language preamble (‘this song is about the embarrassment and shame ‘tauwi’ should have for the terrible things they did to the Maori people in the old days’) directs the reader to see a meaning in the song about ongoing Pakeha culpability but in a typically oblique Taranaki Maori way, the waiata also has a deeper, hidden meaning. By looking for these other meanings, historians can turn around their understandings of past events and gain new insights into the process of reconciliation from an indigenous as well as a Crown perspective.

From the moment of invasion, Taranaki people had started to tell stories that turned events around. ‘Te Piukara’, the song sung by the victims of war points out that the invading force ‘lost’ because the non-violence of the people at Parihaka prevented the soldiers from firing even a single shot. This work of turning events around continued in the early twentieth century in Taranaki testimonies before the Sim Commission and it accelerated in the 1970s, when the ‘Parihaka aunties’ along with people like Ruka

Broughton and Te Miringa Hohaia began to revive the songs and traditions of Parihaka, to build up the mana. This work was part of a bigger revival and renewal, the period when, as Peter Moeahu has put it, ‘the gardens of success were planted. The seeds of Kohunga Reo, Maori radio, Maori television, Maori incorporations, Treaty settlements, improved Maori health, improved Maori education, and reduced Maori offending were sown’.⁷⁹ In 2000, after seven years of planning and work, Maori and Pakeha joined together to create ‘Parihaka: The Art of Passive Resistance’, the successful millennium exhibition at Wellington’s City Gallery and accompanying award-winning book. In 2005, Te Miringa Hohaia presided over the first peace festival was held at Parihaka, an annual event that welcomed performers and guests from around the world. In 2010, the drum that was used by the military was the drum that welcomed the Prime Minister and his entourage to a sign documents to initiate settlement talks. Through festivals, books, art, song and political activism and more, Parihaka people are repaying ‘the bad with the good’ and so lifting the burden of shame.

Conclusion

This article has demonstrated that there are multiple approaches to thinking about historical injustice and the suffering that flows from criminal events such as the invasion of Parihaka. I have acknowledged the importance of the work performed by the Waitangi Tribunal and the sincerity of the five official apologies already offered for te pahua. I further acknowledge the taonga (such as tribal waiata) contained in Tribunal archives and in the Deed of Settlement documents published by the Office of Treaty Settlements. Yet, I have also demonstrated that these gestures of remorse and reconciliation have had a limited impact on either restoring the mana of Parihaka or rebuilding relationships between the Crown and Parihaka. Instead, I have considered how Taranaki Maori have worked to ‘beat shame’, victimhood and disadvantage by turning around understandings of historical events and so ease ‘the realm of pain’ inflicted by confiscation and marginalisation. The intimate, whanau-centred nature of this work provides a model that all New Zealanders – but especially established and emerging historians – might follow. Historiographer Berber Bevernage has recently asserted that the way we think of historical time strongly influences the way we deal with historical injustice and the ethics of history. Berber writes, with such brilliance, ‘that the concepts of time traditionally used by historians are structurally more compatible with the perpetrators’ than the victims’ point of view, and that breaking with this structural bias demands a fundamental rethinking of the dominant modern notions of history and historical time’.⁸⁰ The examples given in this essay are an invitation to break with dominant notions of history and historical time and the apologies that flow

from them. Instead, lets share the deep, ongoing ‘moral burden’ of colonisation and lets also celebrate the connections and insights that this troubled past has made possible.

¹ I dedicate this work to the memory of Te Miringa Hohaia who asked me to pursue this challenging topic. The arguments I make have been developed in collaboration with many people, including Te Miringa Hohaia, Giselle Byrnes, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Pou Temara, Miriama Evans, Mahara Okeroa and Neville Gilmour as well as the participants in the Apology and Remorse Symposium at Waikato University in February 2010 and the audiences at research seminars at the Stout Research Centre, Victoria University, Wellington and in historical studies at La Trobe University, Melbourne, where I presented earlier drafts of this essay. This final version of the essay has benefited from an expert, anonymous readers report at Te Pouhere Korero. I am grateful for all the help I have received as well as the support of the extended Wallace whanau.

² With thanks to Professor Richard Hill for this information. He was at Parihaka in 1981 and heard the apology. 'Arohamaï remember Parihaka 5th November 1881' reads the front of the T-shirt, on sale in Taranaki in 2010. With thanks to Honiana Love for this reference and the T-shirt!

³ *The Taranaki Report: Kaupapa Tuatahi*, Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal, 1996 and *Report on Inquiry into Confiscated Native Lands and Other Grievances*, Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives (AJHR), Vol II, G-6, 1928. The 1927 commission found that looting had indisputably taken place at Parihaka and that the government was responsible 'morally if not legally' for the theft of stock and personal belongings. The commission decided that, 'according to good conscience and equity' a one-off payment of 300 pounds should be made to Maori at Parihaka in acknowledgment of the wrong that was done, p. 32.

⁴ See Rachel Buchanan, *The Parihaka Album: Lest We Forget*, Wellington, 2009; Hazel Riseborough, *Days of Darkness: The Government and Parihaka Taranaki 1878-1884*, Auckland, 2002, second edition; Dick Scott, *Ask That Mountain: The Story of Parihaka*, Auckland, 1975. Also, Peter Walker, *The Fox Boy*, London, 2001.

⁵ For an interesting analysis of the precursors to the first Taranaki war see Danny Keenan, 'Origins of War in North Taranaki', in Kelvin Day, ed. *Contested Ground Te Whenua I Tohea The Taranaki Wars 1860-1881*. Wellington, 2010, pp.18-33.

⁶ Richard Hill, 'War and Police: The Armed Constabulary in the Taranaki Wars' in *Contested Ground*, 205.

⁷ Roberto Rabel, 'New Zealand's Wars' in Byrnes ed. *New Oxford History of New Zealand*, Melbourne, 2009, p.245.

⁸ Dion Tuuta, 'Perpetual Leasing in Taranaki, 1880-2008', in R. Boast and R. Hill eds., *Raupatu: The Confiscation of Maori Land*, Wellington, 2009, pp.235-242.

⁹ Peter Moeahu, 'The Promise of Parihaka', *Taranaki Daily News*, 16 January 2010, 16.

¹⁰ *Taranaki Report*, p. 312.

¹¹ Buchanan, *Parihaka Album*, pp.219-220, 255

¹² Judith Binney, 'History and Memory: The Wood of the Whau Tree, 1766-2005' in *New Oxford History of New Zealand*, p.74.

¹³ See Meredith Gibbs, 'Apology and Reconciliation in New Zealand's Treaty of Waitangi Settlement Process', in Mark Gibney et al eds, *The Age of Apology: facing up to the past*, Philadelphia, 2008, pp.154-167 and Maureen Hickey, 'Negotiating History: Crown Apologies in New Zealand's Historical Treaty of Waitangi Settlements', *Public History Review*, vol. 13, 2006, pp.108-124.

¹⁴ *Guide for Claimants Negotiating Treaty Settlements*, Crown Forestry Rental Trust, Summary Edition, Wellington, 2008, p 31.

¹⁵ *Healing the Past, Building a Future: A guide to Treaty of Waitangi Claims and Direct Negotiations with the Crown*, Wellington, 1999, p.83. The capital letters for The Apology are in the original.

¹⁶ Te Miringa Hohaia, personal communication, 7 December 2009.

¹⁷ Janna Thompson, 'Is Apology a Sorry Affair? Derrida and the Moral Force of the Impossible', *The Philosophical Forum*, Vol XLI/3 (Fall 2010), pp. 259-274.

¹⁸ *Taranaki Report*, 104.

¹⁹ Janna Thompson, 'Apology, Justice and Respect: A Critical Defence of Political Apology', in *Age of Apology*, p.40.

²⁰ Thomspson, 'Apology, Justice and Respect', pp.41-42.

²¹ Doug Graham, 'Iwi o Taranaki', statement from Office of the Minister of Justice, delivered by Tom Winitana on 17 October 1991 at Parihaka, see Record of Inquiry, Taranaki report, F17 (a) 3, Waitangi Tribunal Archive (hereafter WTA).

²² Te Miringa Hohaia (Milton Hohaia), letter to the Minister of Justice, re: Apology for Parihaka, 27 February 1992, Taranaki report, Record of Inquiry, F17 (b), WTA.

²³ Hohaia to Minister of Justice, F17 (b), p. 2, WTA.

²⁴ Graham to Hohaia, 9 April 1992, F17c, WTA.

²⁵ I am grateful to Mahara Okeroa for reminding me how significant utu is for Taranaki iwi in the forthcoming settlement negotiations, personal communication, 24 August 2010. For a discussion of the complex meanings of this word see Williams, *Dictionary of Maori Language*, 471. Also Oxford Dictionary of New Zealand English, 877-878. In 1894, for instance, Tua-o-Rangi noted: 'Most born New Zealanders, whether fair or dark, have some conception of the meaning of the word utu ... the ancient Maori did nothing for nothing...No man could accept service or gifts without requital and retain the esteem of his fellows; still less could he allow injuries to pass unavenged. Utu (value) he expected for the presents he made; utu (payment) he required for goods or purchase; utu (satisfaction) he exacted from hereditary foes and all whom he conceived [had] injured him'.

- ²⁶ Ngaati Ruanui and Her Majesty the Queen in right of New Zealand, Deed of Settlement Of The Historical Claims Of Ngaati Ruanui, p.44.
- ²⁷ Ngati Tama and Her Majesty the Queen in right of New Zealand, Deed Of Settlement Of The Historical Claims Of Ngati Tama, p.35.
- ²⁸ Ngaa Rauru and Her Majesty the Queen in right of New Zealand, Deed of Settlement of the Historical Claims of Ngaa Rauru Kiitahi, 27 November 2003, pp.37-40 and 55-58. Ngaa Rauru translate apology as whakapaaha which means to sigh or express regret.
- ²⁹ Ngati Mutunga Deed of Settlement, pp.67-68.
- ³⁰ Ngaati Ruanui Deed of Settlement p.44.
- ³¹ Peter Adds, 'Te Muru me te Raupatu: The Aftermath', in *Contested Ground* pp.255-277.
- ³² Adds, 'Te Muru', p.271.
- ³³ See, especially, Hana Te Hemara, 'Statement by Te Atiawa women in support of Taranaki Raupatu claims', 9 April 1991, Documents to the end of the fourth hearing, D10,WTA.
- ³⁴ Jacqui Sturm 'He Waiata Tenei Mo Parihaka' in Hoahaia ed *Art of Passive Resistance*, 205. Roma Potiki expressed similar disillusionment in 'Rain Over Taranaki', 206.
- ³⁵ Ngaati Ruanui, 15; Ngati Tama, 11; Ngati Mutunga 35.
- ³⁶ Greg Dening, 'A Poetics for History' in *Performances*, Melbourne, 1996, p.44.
- ³⁷ Buchanan, *Parihaka Album*, 152-156.
- ³⁸ Lindsay Rihari McLeod, record of inquiry from first Parihaka hearing, WTA, F12, 3.
- ³⁹ Matt Rilko, 'Turning a page in history', *Taranaki Daily News*, 18 March 2010, 1.
- ⁴⁰ Skin colour has become a feature in Australia, recently. See Deborah Snow, 'Indigenous applicant not black enough for job', *The Age*, 4 November 2010. See, also, 'Andrew Bolt Sued Over Aboriginal Identity Comments', *The Age*, 30 September 2010. Nine prominent Aboriginal people are taking legal action against conservative News Limited columnist Andrew Bolt for a series of columns, including one called 'White is the new black'.
- ⁴¹ Joan Metge and Patricia J. Kinloch, *Talking past each other: problems of cross-cultural communication*, Wellington, 1978, pp.22-23. With thanks to Neville Gilmour for suggesting this excellent source.
- ⁴² Alexis Wright, 'Secrets and Ties', A2, *The Age*, 6 February 2010, 12-13.
- ⁴³ Wright, 'Secrets and ties'.
- ⁴⁴ Cited by Alice Te Punga Somerville as undated 'Manuscript Notes of Peter H Buck' MS SC BUCK Box 2.29. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- ⁴⁵ Alice Te Punga Somerville, 'The Historian who lost his memory': a Story about Stories, *Te Pouhere Korero* 3, Wellington, 2009, p.64.
- ⁴⁶ Somerville, 'Historian', *Te Pouhere Korero*, p.64.
- ⁴⁷ For an analysis of how this process has worked in Australia see Chris Healy, *Forgetting Aborigines*, Sydney, 2008.
- ⁴⁸ Laura Ann Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*, New Jersey, 2009 pp. 248-49.
- ⁴⁹ Alexis Wright, 'Secrets and Ties', p.13.
- ⁵⁰ Peter Adds. 'Te Muru', p.276.
- ⁵¹ Janna Thompson, *Taking Responsibility for the Past: reparation and historical injustice*, Cambridge, 2002, p.82.
- ⁵² Bronwyn Batten, 'The Myall Creek Memorial: History, identity and reconciliation', in William Logan and Keir Reeves, eds *Places of Pain and Shame: Dealing with 'Difficult Heritage'*, London, 2009, pp.82-96.
- ⁵³ The drum is integral to poi and waiata at Parihaka. For example, see two photographs taken in 1984 (John Miller) and in 1994 (Gil Hanly) at Parihaka. In the second one, Tahuaroa plays the drum. See *Parihaka: the Art of Passive Resistance*, 2000, 85.
- ⁵⁴ See, for instance, William Collis' photograph of the magnificent 'Parihaka fife and drum band 1880-1890s' outside Te Raukura, Alexander Turnbull Library 1/1-012052-G.
- ⁵⁵ 'Te Piukara', transcribed and translated by Te Miringa Hohaia, in *Parihaka: the Art of Passive Resistance*, 2000, 46-47. A similar point was made by Tamati Whanagui and others in their petition to the New Zealand Government in 1925, a petition that was part of the huge push to get an inquiry into confiscated land. Of the invasion day, Whanganui wrote: 'When Te Whiti and Tohu did not surrender to the Government, the Parihaka Pa was besieged by Mr Bryce and his soliders. Whereat Te Whiti said, 'If you shoot me I will surrender, but if your gun does not fire, you will surrender yourself to me.' Tamati Whanagui and others, 'To the Honourable speaker and Members in Parliament assembled at Wellington', petition 93/1925, MA 85, 4, Archives New Zealand.
- ⁵⁶ See 'Statement of Forgiveness', in *Taranaki Whanui Ki Te Upoko O Te Ika and Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust and The Sovereign in Right of New Zealand*, Deed of Settlement of Historical Claims, 19 August 2008, p. 19.
- ⁵⁷ Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, Dunedin, 1999, 34. Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, Princeton, 2001.

- ⁵⁸ Stephen Turner, 'Settlement as forgetting' in K. Neumann et al eds., *Quicksands: foundational histories in Australia & Aotearoa New Zealand*, Sydney, 1999, p.35.
- ⁵⁹ See *Parihaka Album*, 'Pioneers', 235-268.
- ⁶⁰ Dr Pita Sharples, cited in *Whakapapa: an introduction to researching Maori and Pakeha-Maori Families, their history, heritage and culture*, Wellington, 2008, p.4.
- ⁶¹ Arini Loader, 'Casting The Net Wider: Native American Literary Nationalism in Aotearoa', *Te Pouhere Korero* 4, Maori History Maori People p. 53.
- ⁶² Melissa Williams, 'When It Comes To Your Own': Telling Stories of Post-War Maori Migration' and Nepia Mahuika, 'Korero Tuku Iho: Our Gift and Our Responsibility', both in *Te Pouhere Korero* 4, pp.14-23 and pp.24-40. See, also, Neipia Mahuika's "This Horrid Practice": The Cannibalizing of Maori and iwi History', paper delivered at New Zealand History Association conference, December 2009, for a frank discussion of place of whakapapa in ethical history-making.
- ⁶³ Maria Nugent, 'Aboriginal family history: some reflections', *Australian Cultural History*, no.22, 2003, p.144.
- ⁶⁴ Nugent, 'Aboriginal Family History', p.147.
- ⁶⁵ Graeme Davison, 'Ancestors', in *The Use and Abuse of Australian History*, Sydney, 2000, pp.80-109. See, also, Gary Tippet, 'One Big Family', *The Sunday Age*, 31 October 2010.
- ⁶⁶ Joy Damousi, 'Why do we get so emotional about Anzac?' in Marilyn Lake and Henry Reynolds, eds. *What's Wrong With Anzac? The Militarisation of Australian History*, Sydney, 2010, pp.95-97.
- ⁶⁷ Tanya Evans, 'Secrets and Lies: The Radical Potential of Family History', *History Workshop Journal*, Summer 2011, p.36.
- ⁶⁸ Helen Harvey, 'Hongi great levelling experience for archbishop', *Taranaki Herald*, 4 March 2010.
- ⁶⁹ 'Hongi great levelling experience'.
- ⁷⁰ 'Reader not happy with Sir Paul', Connie Jones, letter to the editor, *Taranaki Herald*, 15 March 2010.
- ⁷¹ Connie Jones, 'not happy'.
- ⁷² Tim Ryan, 'The British Army in Taranaki' in Day ed, *Contested Ground*, 126. Ryan describes how British Army soldier Philip Walsh, a member of Hatchment – 65th (Yorkshire North Riding), came up with the idea of decorating St Mary's with 'painted memorial hatchments commemorating various regiments'. The first painting was put up in 1878, the last in 1908.
- ⁷³ Melissa Nobles, *The Politics of Official Apologies*, New York, 2008, p.121.
- ⁷⁴ Philip Temple, 'New Book in Treaty Takes Political Line', *New Zealand Herald*, 15 July, 2004, cited in Nobles, *Official Apologies*, 122.
- ⁷⁵ 'Historical Account: Sim Commission', Ngati Mutunga Deed of Settlement, p.43.
- ⁷⁶ Ngati Mutunga Deed of Settlement, p.44.
- ⁷⁷ Thomspson, *Taking Responsibility for the Past*, p.47.
- ⁷⁸ I also wish to acknowledge the help of Miriama Evans of Ngati Mutunga, with the translation and interpretation of Te Whakama.
- ⁷⁹ Moeahu, 'Promise of Parihaka'.
- ⁸⁰ Berber Bevernage, *History, Memory, and State-Sponsored Violence*, London, 2012, ix.