MĀORI AND INDIGENOUS VIEWS ON R & R

Resistance and resilience

*Mera Penehira**

Alison Green†

Linda Tuhiwai Smith‡

Clive Aspin§

Abstract

This article explores the development of Māori and Indigenous frameworks of resilience, considering the impact of engaging with largely State-led notions of resilience on Māori development. We highlight the closely linked notion of resistance, asserting the necessity of a firm political analysis from Indigenous researchers engaged in this discourse. One of the Indigenous criticisms of resilience theories is that by definition they assume an acceptance of responsibility for our position as disadvantaged individuals. That is, by examining and developing theories and models of resilience we buy into the idea that this is the way it is and we need simply to get better at bouncing back and being resilient. Resistance, however, represents an approach of collective fight-back, exposing the inequitable distribution of power, and actively opposing negative social, political and economic influences. This article represents a Māori Indigenous political response to the resilience discourse.

* Lecturer and Director Postgraduate, Te Puna Wānanga, Faculty of Education, University of Auckland, New Zealand. Email: m.penehira@auckland.ac.nz

† Doctoral Candidate, School of Māori and Pacific Development, University of Waikato, New Zealand.

‡ Pro-Vice Chancellor Māori, Te Kotahi Research Institute for Innovation, Wellbeing and Inspiration, University of Waikato, New Zealand.

§ Consultant, ATRIO Consulting, Sydney, Australia.

Keywords

resilience, resistance, Māori, Indigenous, wellbeing, kaupapa Māori

Introduction

This article centres on doctoral and community research undertaken within the International Collaborative Indigenous Health Research Partnership (ICIHRP) programme "The Role of Resilience in Responding to Blood Borne Viral and Sexually Transmitted Infections in Indigenous Communities", otherwise known as the Mauri Tū Mauri Ora project.

The ICIHRP programme was established in 2002 when the Health Research Council of New Zealand, the Canadian Institute of Health Research and the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia—the national health funding agencies for each country—formed a partnership to support collaborative research in the area of Indigenous peoples' health. The first grants were centred on resilience as the broad theme, on the basis that this covers all spheres of the life cycle and can be applied to identify intervention points at various stages of life and specific health issues. The Mauri Tū Mauri Ora project therefore has provided a unique platform whereby the concept of resilience could be investigated from the perspectives of Indigenous peoples across three countries. This article represents Māori investigations of the resilience discourse.

One of the Indigenous criticisms of resilience theories is that by definition they assume an acceptance of responsibility for our position as disadvantaged, dispossessed individuals (Battiste, 2008a; McGuire, 2010; Scarpino, 2007; Sodeke, 2005). That is, by examining and developing theories and models of resilience we in fact buy into the idea that this is the way it is and we need simply to get better at coping, at bouncing back and being resilient. Resistance, on the other hand, indicates an approach of collective fight-back, exposing the inequitable distribution of power, and actively opposing those forces which have a negative impact on our lives, socially, politically and economically.

This article traces the development of Māori and Indigenous frameworks of resilience, and considers the impact of engaging with largely State-led notions of resilience on Māori development, and in particular on the closely linked notion of resistance. Specifically we discuss the necessity of a firm political analysis from Māori and Indigenous researchers engaging in this discourse. We pose questions that are of significance to the much-needed political analysis of current resilience theories:

1. Is resilience the State's current mechanism to encourage Māori to re-frame our experiences of colonialism as successful adaption despite risk and adversity?
2. Why would we re-name and re-frame Māori acts of resistance as acts of resilience?
3. Who benefits from this re-naming, re-framing and re-positioning?

Exploring Māori identity provides a clear platform from which to deal with these questions. It cannot be denied that as Māori, we are very fluid and flexible in the way that we live as Māori and our acceptance of the huge diversity of people who identify as Māori. The terms with which Māori have identified traditionally and which still apply in contemporary society are iwi, hapū and whānau. Although these terms have previously been through periods of both acceptance and denial by the Crown, they are currently widely used for both legislative and public policy purposes (Durie, 2003). Different iwi and hapū have, over a number of generations, drawn from their values and traditions when developing strategies for resisting colonial policies. As more and more Māori now live

away from their traditional homelands and communities, and with many families having now been city-dwellers for several generations, there are additional formations of Māori communities. Māori living in cities and in other parts of the world continue to draw upon Māori values and traditions, albeit re-fashioning and employing them so as to foster and maintain their wellbeing outside of their homelands. Unfortunately, however, the government tends to take a very rigid view in respect of Māori identity. On the surface it appears to afford iwi or tribal structures greater legitimacy than the more recent formations of other types of Māori communities, but in reality iwi and hapū, like non-traditional Māori formations, are also forced to conform, to their detriment, to State-determined models for Māori development (Dodd, 2002). This is not unlike the rigidity that some anthropologists apply in their efforts to determine what counts as Indigenous. As Linda Smith (2007) argues, however,

> It would be naīve to assume that the "past" either in its pre-colonial or 19th and 20th century colonial formations is not also always present in the way identities, subjectivities, discourses, and social formations are deployed and contested in contemporary relations of indigeneity, of settler societies and native communities. (p. 336)

In essence, we are who we always were, pre-colonial; we are who we are as both colonised and de-colonised resisters; and we are who we will be in terms of future responsive and pro-active formations. No peoples or communities are devoid of change, particularly those who have been colonised and settled. Our responses, our resistance to colonisation and ongoing dominant population systems do not detract from our indigeneity or our status as tangata whenua. Our pro-active strategies and ways of living aimed at iwi, hapū and Māori community wellbeing, language retention, and cultural and socio-economic survival suggests that the notion of resilience may be as much a part of our identity as our traditional knowledge and ways of being.

Defining resilience

Resilience may be defined as "the means by which indigenous people make use of individual and community strengths to protect themselves against adverse health outcomes" (ICIHRP, 2004, p. 1). Under this definition, resilience is recognised as a significant contributing factor to the health and wellbeing of Indigenous people in the 21st century. This section of the article explores the meanings that underpin resilience amongst Indigenous peoples as it is presented in current Indigenous discourse.

The approach undertaken in the Mauri Tū Mauri Ora project recognised that resilience is a multi-faceted notion; that a multitude of factors influence and determine both the need for resilience and the resilient strategies and behaviours we employ within our own communities. These include our colonial history, negotiating and meeting challenges in the face of adversity, and the multiple relationships of which Indigenous people are a part. Indigenous peoples throughout the world have solid histories of meeting and overcoming challenges. However, it is important to acknowledge that some challenges facing Indigenous peoples have been insurmountable and the result has been their destruction or the destruction of their ways of life (Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, 2009).

In Aotearoa New Zealand, two centuries of colonialist oppression resulted in a severe decline of the Māori population, language dispossession, increased health problems and educational failure (Walker, 2004). In recent times there has been resurgence in the Māori population along with Māori demands for greater socio-economic self-determination, and language and cultural renaissance. From the 1980s there has been some recognition by the State of the effects

of historical and contemporary colonial policies on Māori culture and society. However, Māori demands for self-determination have largely been re-interpreted by the State as a vehicle for devolving the management of government-led education, health and social services to the Māori non-government sector. Similarly, iwi, hapū and contemporary Māori groups seeking settlements over breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi have observed the resultant commodification of Māori assets and resources, forcing Māori trusts and incorporations into the economic marketplace (Durie, 2005). Thus Māori and the State are involved in a complicated and ongoing relationship that involves Māori resistance, Māori resilience, State concessions, Māori reclamative actions and State responses. Similarly to Indigenous people in other parts of the world, Māori have shown and continue to show incredible resilience through our resistance to colonisation. This is one example of Māori resilience, demonstrating why resilience should not be considered as a single approach to wellbeing. Rather, resilience is one of a number of inter-related Māori and Indigenous approaches which, all together, constitute a system for responding to colonial oppression.

So, in understanding resilience it is important to firstly recognise our past and the contribution that this has made to our contemporary understandings of the world. "The historical encounters between indigenous peoples and colonisers have led to the development of a range of protective mechanisms that indigenous peoples have deployed in their efforts to assert their sovereignty and self-determination" (ICIHRP, 2004, p. 1). In the main, theories and models of social resilience have emerged from non-Indigenous perspectives; indeed, social resilience has its origins in Western psychological discourse. In recent years, however, the notion of resilience has drawn greater attention from government agencies, research funders, and Māori and Indigenous academics and researchers, and as a result there is now a growing body of work in this regard. There remains, however, a lack of rigorous critique of the resilience literature and it would appear, ironically, that much of our work as Māori and Indigenous researchers has focused on how we can adapt the notion of resilience to better fit our own Indigenous ways of knowing and being. The resilience literature focuses largely on the resilience of the individual as opposed to that of the collective. This individualistic focus posed three specific challenges to the Mauri Tū Mauri Ora project:

1. How do current notions, theories and models of resilience fit with kaupapa Māori and other Indigenous theories and models?
2. Given the significance of the "collective" to the Māori and Indigenous lens, what do individually focused resilience theories and models contribute to our work?
3. What might a Māori framework of resilience look like?

The approach to these questions was to consider the existing Indigenous literature in relation to resilience and consider terms that describe an Indigenous history and view of resilience.

Indigenous peoples and resilience

This section of the article highlights some of the current significant Indigenous thinking with regards to resilience and how it might be applied with our own people and work. It is not intended that this section provide an exhaustive overview of all the literature in this field, as this can be accessed already across a number of different sources (Battiste, 2008a; McGuire, 2010; Scarpino, 2007; Tousignant & Sioui, 2009). Rather, this section focuses on specifically Indigenous adaptation and discussion of the notion of resilience.

> What seemed both odd to me, yet normalized among my people at the time, was what

> I witnessed in my early years of growing up among my extended family, my cousins and relatives, all of them leaving school early, having to move with the seasons to survive. Few of my relatives went beyond elementary education. They were resilient nonetheless, creative, imaginative, and always having a good sense of humor, strong family relations, and also strong coping skills with overt and systemic racism evident in the towns, among schools, workplaces, and services in the towns. The townspeople held deeply engrained prejudices against Indians. By my parents' encouragement and their own coping strategies for dealing with racism, they modeled, as was modeled to them, character, honesty, creativity, perseverance, and resilience. These, then, became my tools as I continued through school. (Battiste, 2008b)

Professor Marie Battiste and other Indigenous academics (McGuire, 2010; Scarpino, 2007) have highlighted the importance of contextualising Indigenous people's resilience, and our engagement with this notion, in our shared histories of colonisation. This includes an understanding of the racism and oppression that has created the sites in which we have been required to be resilient. Although not explicitly stated, this kind of Indigenous analysis tells us that there have indeed been circumstances in which we have had little option but to bounce back or resile from things which may have been out of our control. However, what is significant about Battiste's work is that she recognises the importance of moving beyond resilience when she engages with the term "renaissance".

> The story of my parents and ancestors has been one about resilience, while my own generation's story in the last 25 years has emerged as one of regeneration, a renaissance, built by a first generation of Indigenous people who struggled with the many facets of the education system to achieve "higher" education degrees. (Battiste, 2008b)

Battiste seems to distinguish her parents' resilient responses to the negative effects of colonisation from her own generation's responses, which she describes as more renaissance-orientated or reclamative; responses which have as their goal the purposeful restoration of Indigenous peoples and communities. Thus, a point is found at which we can recognise the ongoing nature of Indigenous struggle and self-determination, and importantly, the place in which we are better focused in terms of moving beyond survival. The political contextualisation is furthered by Battiste, who states:

> The self-determination movement inherent in the Indigenous Renaissance has displayed the depth and power of a small portion of our humanity, its noble commitment to empower the powerless and dispossessed to lead better lives and overthrow the chains of racism, assimilation, and Eurocentricism. (Battiste, 2008b)

The notion of racism, assimilation and Eurocentricism being overthrown is again important recognition of the forward thinking we can engage in, as opposed to continuing to explore ways to be resilient, as if we cannot surpass the chains of ongoing colonial oppression.

McGuire (2010) cautions us to engage with resilience in a critical manner because, at its core, resilience may be based upon ideas of survival of the fittest. McGuire, not unlike Battiste, is involved in reclamative strategies; in particular, learning her Anishinaabe language, which she affirms as a strategy understood by her communities as decolonising, and therefore central to their continued wellbeing.

What McGuire's work highlights is that although the Indigenous approach and engagement with resilience is to focus on collective or community strength, the term does have its origins in individuality and survival of the fittest. So, Indigenous academics have adapted resilience in order to make it work for us. The irony is that resilience itself, by definition, is

about adaptation in order to survive or overcome circumstances of adversity.

Tousignant and Sioui (2009), Canadian Aboriginal academics, discuss further characteristics of how Indigenous people view or have adapted the notion of resilience in order to describe and theorise the survival of Indigeneity amidst colonial racism and oppression. "Resilience in Aboriginal communities is a long process of healing that allows (one) to supersede the multiple trauma and the loss of culture experienced during the colonization and after" (p. 43).

As alluded to earlier with regard to Professor Marie Battiste's (2008b) work, contextualising the resilience discourse in our shared histories of colonisation is critical to understanding both our present positioning, and the way forward. It is worth considering, however, how other terms such as "resistance", "sovereignty" and "self-determination" might be better placed in the discussion; for example, substituting the term resilience with the term resistance in the statement by Tousignant and Sioui: "[Resistance] in Aboriginal communities is a long process of healing …" (p. 43). Certainly, resistance activities are familiar and they exist in common everyday conversations within the communities that we live and work in, and do not require adaptation to fit us, hence their worthiness for consideration. This is discussed more fully in the next section of this article.

It is also of note that the notion of resistance as a part of the resilience discussion is incorporated and not avoided by Tousignant and Sioui; in fact the term "resistance" sits alongside other familiar aspects of our Indigenous being.

> Characteristics specific to the notion of resilience in Aboriginal cultures are spirituality, holism, resistance and forgiveness. The main obstacle to overcome in the process of resilience is the phenomenon of co-dependency which leads to superficial attachment, lack of trust, and refusal of authority. The concept of cultural identity is central to resilience in this context … community resilience has to rely on the capacity of families to be resilient themselves, which involves breaking the law of silence, naming problems and coping with them with the support of networks and institutions. (Tousignant & Sioui, 2009, p. 43)

Honor the Earth is an organisation founded and working in the area of Indigenous resilience in relation to the environment and natural resources. The discourse shared by this group includes terms such as sovereignty, and refers to adaptation that is best mitigated from our own sources of Indigenous solutions and traditional knowledge. The organisation describes Indigenous resilience as culturally based Indigenous solutions which foster the reclamation of traditional knowledge, an adaptive strategy that ensures the health of Indigenous children, now and into the future (Honor the Earth, n.d.).

It appears from this section of Indigenous analysis and theorising of resilience that marked adaptation has been required in order for this notion to have relevance for Indigenous peoples. Scarpino (2007), self-described as an urban Aboriginal woman based at the University of British Columbia, makes explicit the inherent differences between Western and Indigenous theorising about resilience.

> From a Western perspective, risk and protective factors are linear forms used to explore resilience. From an Indigenous perspective, however, the exploration is a continual web of relationships, process and flow that encompasses life from childhood to adulthood and through to Elder status … the process of resilience is dependent on Indigenous ways of knowing. (p. 33)

Traditional and Indigenous ways of knowing and being have been central to our theorising and application of the term resilience to the work that we do in our communities (Blackstock & Trocme, 2005; Durie, 2005; Heavyrunner &

Morris, 1997). Our histories and contemporary experiences of colonisation, coupled with the ongoing racism and oppression intrinsic to this, have at times demanded a resilient response in order to maintain survival. A number of writers (Durie, 2005; Sodeke, 2005) have expressed the desire to move beyond survival, and indeed this is a common desire amongst our people, which to varying degrees has been achieved in some sectors of Indigenous communities. In Aotearoa New Zealand the Māori language education movement was initiated by Māori communities—iwi and hapū who were unwilling to accept State-led Māori education or the possibility that Māori language may not flourish, let alone survive, if its future were left to the State (Walker, 2004). The movement and the successes generated demonstrate the desire of Māori to reject survival and State-determination for Māori self-determination and wellbeing.

The next section explores further notions that might be engaged, or re-engaged, in order to theorise beyond survival.

Exploring the terms: From resistance to resilience and back again

As stated earlier, the two-fold approach to answering our questions regarding resilience includes an exploration of terminology that assists us in understanding Indigenous history and views of resilience. The terms are purposely coupled as opposing notions which describe the continuum of strategies, behaviours and outcomes that could make up a Māori and Indigenous peoples resilience framework: acceptance and resistance; reactive and proactive; survive and flourish; individual and collective; State control and self-determination. These terms are all employed rigorously in Indigenous discourse across a range of disciplines; in particular, health, education and development.

The continuum framework is multi-layered in that each pair of strategies sits on its own line or continuum. As should be expected, the Indigenous holistic view that all things are inter-connected is a feature of the multi-layered framework we propose, not dissimilar to frameworks proposed by Indigenous researchers such as Blackstock (Blackstock & Trocme, 2005), Wuttenee (2004) and Durie (2005). Their frameworks, like ours, present resilience as only one of a number of inter-connected and inter-dependant factors or strategies associated with achieving Indigenous wellbeing. Blackstock and Wuttenee offer frameworks which, although their forms are circular rather than linear, nevertheless, anticipate movement within and changing relationships between circles, depending upon the challenges facing communities at a particular time. Durie's (2005) framework for wellbeing, or more particularly, endurance, takes the form of a continuum but the point is well made that the domains on the continuum are all interconnected.

The continuum framework we offer gives space and value to the different strategies Māori have employed, since colonisation, to try to achieve positive outcomes. Those strategies draw from traditional iwi and hapū values and traditions, as well as from more contemporary Māori community contexts. The framework also recognises that although strategies such as resistance, being proactive, flourishing, collectivity and self-determination are clearly those which are most likely to lead to positive outcomes for Indigenous peoples, there are times when the strategies at the opposite end of the continuum have been required. These are the times when Indigenous peoples have, through necessity to survive, had to react to, or resile against, the negative impacts of racism and colonisation.

A strength of this framework is that it encourages us to consider how much of our energy and focus remains at the resilient or reactive end of the continuum, as compared to that which we expend at the resistant or proactive end of the continuum. We contend that, historically,

pre-colonisation energy was well spent at the proactive end, but that as a result of the need to survive colonisation, much more energy has been focused at the reactive end, and indeed that we are in danger of continuing this trend unless we intervene to change. We intend that this framework with its attendant discussion contributes to that change.

Acceptance and resistance

As stated in the introduction to this article, one of the major Indigenous criticisms of resilience theories is that by definition they assume an acceptance of responsibility for our position as disadvantaged dispossessed peoples. That is, by examining and developing theories and models of resilience we in fact buy into the idea that this is the way it is and we need simply to get better at coping, at bouncing back and being resilient.

Resistance, on the other hand, tends towards an approach of fighting back, actively opposing those things which negatively influence us, whether socially, politically, economically or in any other human way. As prominent Māori lawyer and activist Annette Sykes (2007) states, "We don't simply want to just look at what is happening *because of* [emphasis added] the forces of colonisation but also to look at ways to change that" (p. 122).

Acceptance could be perceived as being at the beginning of the continuum, where acceptance is the space that Indigenous peoples occupy for the time it takes them to formulate a response to colonisation. Resistance is at the other end of the continuum, signalling the paramount importance of stopping further colonising forces such as the neoliberal agenda, resisting the continuation of things which will require further acceptance and further resilience.

Resistance offers a much stronger set of political tools and is aimed more at dealing with the causal factors that would otherwise require us to employ resilience. In defining resistance, Annette Sykes (2007) draws broadly on practical, political, family and sovereignty contexts:

> Māori resistance to that [neoliberalism] is not to go to McDonald's and KFC, and lately with the threat of things like the Bird Flu pandemic, to reinstitute traditional tribal gardens … for me it must come back to personal commitment to change right through to a political commitment to challenge the inculcation of those neoliberal values into our modern Māori institutions, including direct challenges on corporate elites, which are really the living icons of this philosophy, and challenges too to the government agencies and bureaucrats that corporate elites bribe or co-opt to promote the liberal notions that the monster of globalisation promotes. (p. 116)

As stated earlier, both strategies are important for different reasons and will necessarily be employed at different times. For example, racism and colonisation more generally cause different impacts on Indigenous peoples, from which we need to resile in order to survive.

Reactive and proactive

Those working in the field of educational psychology engage with the terms "reactive" and "proactive" on a regular basis, often being tasked with developing dual behaviour management strategies, the first being those that might be employed as a response to a child's difficult behaviour (reactive strategies), the second being those that were put in place to elicit desired behaviours and deflect unwanted behaviours (proactive).

In terms of a continuum, and to engage the analogy of behaviour management, reactive strategies sit at the beginning. When faced, for example, with a 12-year-old boy throwing desks and chairs around the classroom, you need to react fast. Reactive strategies are linked closely with survival; in this example, survival of the classmates or teacher who may be in the path of the chairs and desks. It is also about the 12-year-old boy—his survival in terms of his continued presence in the community of the

classroom. If this behaviour continues he will be removed and possibly suspended or expelled.

Considering reactive and proactive strategies, there is a long history of Māori demands for proactive and collective control of social policy as it affects Māori. By definition, Māori and Indigenous peoples engage in heated debates with States over greater involvement in State-determined policy making. Unfortunately, the basis for Māori inclusion in policy making is underpinned by State principles of participatory democracy, citizenship and social inclusion, rather than recognition of Māori self-determination (Humpage, 2006).

The "reactive" strategy available to Māori is to take part in State-led consultation processes when social policies are being planned or fine-tuned for implementation. The results have been disappointing, despite Māori repeatedly seeking opportunities to engage in proactive policy making strategies. In the reforms of the health sector in the 1990s, the prospect that Māori may have an opportunity to exert a more proactive influence was raised. Three national Māori authorities formed a taskforce and for a time they argued with success that Māori were more than stakeholders or interest groups in policy making. Eight months after the formation of the taskforce the newly formed Ministry of Health contracted the taskforce to provide national policy advice on Māori health. Unfortunately the taskforce was short-lived and in the face of opposition from Māori, the Ministry of Health terminated the contract and sought policy advice through the reactive public consultation process (Durie, 2005).

Proactive strategies are about long-term sustained change. They are not an emergency-type response; they are well-planned and thought-out strategies that are aimed at change over time. More importantly, they remove the focus from undesired behaviour, or in the case of policy making, from individual policies. Instead, proactive behaviour management strategies give space for parents and teachers to consider the desired behaviours and to focus on ways of increasing that said behaviour. Proactive policy making strategies focus on the distribution of power and control between Māori and the State, seeking to alter the distribution so as to reflect the right of Māori for greater self-determination.

So the continuum is not something in our view that we look at, quickly work out which end is the winning end, and immediately dismiss the opposite end. Indeed, we would suggest that our greatest examples of Indigenous resilience occur when we give ourselves the space to traverse the continuum in order to effect change. Being reactive satisfies our need to respond to immediate risk, threat or actual harm. Being proactive enables us to reduce risk and, more importantly, consider longer-term strategies that will assist us to achieve our desired position.

Survive and flourish

Survival is unquestionably uppermost to Indigenous peoples, as it is to any member of the human race. For Indigenous peoples, knowing how much we have lost in the colonial struggle, the fear that we might not survive is real. It is recognised that resilience has been critical in assisting Indigenous people to survive colonialist regimes (Battiste, 2008a; Blackstock & Trocme, 2005; Durie, 2001; Greenwood, 2005). Moreover, it was argued that resilience is fundamental in helping Indigenous people to capitalise on the past with a view to enhancing health and wellbeing in the future. We would consider this to be the case only when it is coupled with the proactive approaches of resistance.

Stephen Sodeke (2005), in his address to the Traditional Knowledges Conference in Aotearoa New Zealand in 2004, described the ability to apply past lessons to the future as integral to the concept he calls "human flourishing" (p. 254), a concept that is fundamental to the self-determination of Indigenous people. As he describes it, human flourishing is critical to the

development of Indigenous communities and allows Indigenous people and other vulnerable communities to realise their full potential and to succeed at all levels—human, social, economic, political and spiritual. The fish hook for Māori with regard to strategies that allow us to reach our potential is not the concept of flourishing; rather, it is the State's co-option of the language of flourishing. Current State policy for Māori development is focused around the notion of "Māori succeeding as Māori" (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2008); however, the parameters of what Māori development means is again determined by the State, not by iwi, hapū and Māori communities.

We argue that flourishing or reaching potential is essential to an Indigenous framework of resilience. That is, resilience has to be understood and indeed our only engagement with it must be as something far transcending survival and approximating greater Māori and Indigenous autonomy and control. Notwithstanding, survival remains an essential beginning point on the continuum. Obviously, if we do not survive, we cannot dream of what could be nor ever hope to achieve it.

Individual and collective

Ehara taku toa i te toa takitahi engari he toa takatini—My strength is not mine alone, but belongs to the many. This well-known Māori proverb is testament to the importance of collectivism implicit in the Māori worldview. It is echoed further in songs and other narratives, not only of Māori, but of most, if not all, Indigenous peoples throughout the world.

As stated earlier, however, much of the resilience literature focuses on the resilience of the individual, and at best, the attempts to acknowledge collectivity simply look at the cumulative resilience of individuals within a given setting or community (Kulig, 2000). This individualist focus is grounded in liberalism and more recently, in neoliberalism. A Māori view, however, would suggest that a more appropriate framework would be one that addresses the resilience of iwi, hapū and whānau, as well as other contemporary community groupings of Māori.

The continuum that we suggest, however, would not necessarily dismiss the notion of individual resilience. The reality for many of our people is that through colonial oppression and assimilation we have become very adept at living as individuals. Indeed, this could be viewed as one of the strategies of resilience employed by some Māori and Indigenous peoples in order to survive and progress in the context of neoliberalism. Moreover, many of us have all but lost the ability to function in the collective. So, for reasons of inclusivity, the continuum of individuality to collectivism is an essential element of this resilience framework.

State control and self-determining

In reviewing literature regarding State control and self-determining peoples, Indigenous writers and activists (Bargh, 2007; Battiste, 2008b; Dodd, 2002; Pihama, 2001; Smith, 2007; Te Awekotuku, 1991) point towards State control being synonymous with neoliberalism. That is, a neoliberal context is one in which the State acts as "mediator of the marketplace keeping it open as a place in which individuals can compete" (Smith, 2007, p. 343). So whilst the initial reading of this might be that the State removes itself from the position of control, it is in fact the opposite that takes place. As Smith notes, the State simply distances itself from the individual and allows marketplace negotiations to occur seemingly out of its control. This would assume a level playing field exists between Māori and other New Zealanders in the marketplace. However, this is clearly not the case as Māori are statistically much more likely than the majority population to have greater health problems, achieve lower education levels, and be economically and socially disadvantaged. These inequities, then, result in a reliance on the State, which in turn gives the State a certain level of control; for example,

the State determines Māori health and education provisions, social services, and levels of funding.

Māori activist Teanau Tuiono (2007) describes the way in which neoliberalism threatens our life, culture, and language, saying "it's trying to McDonald's-ify everything" (p. 126). In other words, we will see similar things occurring throughout the world, similar provisions and values in terms of economics, social development and politics. A positive neoliberal view would have us believe that the choices made available through these types of global enterprise are of benefit to all and are a natural and inevitable consequence of development. That is, that everyone has the same choices and indeed, more choices in this context. However, the reality is that those choices are determined by majority peoples, in that, what survives and thrives in a neoliberal world are things that are popular and therefore economically viable. If you belong to the majority population, or the majority population reflects what you desire in the world, then this works. If you are part of a minority population, whether Indigenous or not, and if your desires differ from those of the majority population, then your situation in a neoliberal world remains the same. That is, the choices you might desire are out of your control—in a neoliberal world the control is with the majority population spending dollar, and in an explicitly State-controlled world, the control sits with the State and governments, which, despite greater Māori participation, also happen to be largely representative of the majority population.

Many Māori and Indigenous leaders argue that self-determination is the ultimate goal. So what does it look like at the self-determination end of the continuum? As Leonie Pihama (2005) explains:

> The struggle for tino rangatiratanga as noted within Te Tiriti o Waitangi, is a struggle for Māori sovereignty, and as is the case for many Indigenous Peoples around the world, that struggle has been a part of the experience of this country since colonization. Tino rangatiratanga is an expression of Māori aspirations for self-determination, Māori autonomy, Māori sovereignty. As such it is expressed as a key objective in many Māori movements. (p. 361)

Terms such as Māori sovereignty, iwi autonomy, self-governance and mana motuhake have become synonymous with being self-determining, and they are very much a part of the events and actions that encompass both resistance and resilience. As Pihama states, self-determination is one of the ways that we express and indeed conduct ourselves both in response to colonisation and as proactive Indigenous peoples. As a response to colonisation, the quest for self-determination is concerned with our ability to make decisions that are independent of the State that is responsible for the ongoing colonisation. In other words, self-determination provides an alternative strategy to the acceptance of State systems, laws and policies that are part of colonisation.

The Indigenous struggle for self-determination is an enduring struggle to recapture something of the self-governance and leadership that Māori and other Indigenous peoples had before colonisation, knowing that we can never fully regain what was taken (Durie, 2005). In the spaces where we can assert our self-determining rights, we make our own decisions about how we want to live, and as Māori and Indigenous peoples, we are guided by the traditions, values and structures that are our own. In this sense, self-determination is a future-focused strategy, and it is also reclamative. In the few spaces where Māori can exert a level of self-determination, Māori processes and protocols provide the framework within which self-determination occurs.

In summary, the understanding of resilience that informed the Mauri Tū Mauri Ora project draws on our past and applies these lessons to the present, so that the strategies we develop and implement will allow us to reclaim what

we need to flourish now and in the future. However, in doing so, critical understandings of the notions of resilience and the surrounding present discourse have given rise to concern about a number of issues raised in the introduction of this article.

The first concern is that resilience may be the State's current mechanism to encourage Māori to re-frame our experiences of colonialism as successful adaption despite risk and adversity. This should not come as a surprise. Colonising nations have long histories of subjugating Indigenous discourses about oppression and asserting damaging discourses that speak to others' realities. Using terms like resilience potentially exposes Māori and Indigenous discourses to subjugation and a kind of psychic disorientation from our own traditions, values, structures and processes. One example is the insidiousness with which the State has attempted to legitimate iwi polities, invisibilise hapū and co-opt Māori notions of whānau (Cheyne, O'Brien, & Belgrave, 2000). Another example is the State's policy of Māori development, which includes policies for building capacity and closing inequitable socio-economic gaps between Māori and Pākehā.

From 2000 onwards the State set about persuading iwi, hapū and Māori communities to see themselves as under-developed and in need of State-determined Māori development. There is nothing about the term development that celebrates the traditions, the values and the contemporary approaches that Māori have reclaimed or built anew since the onset of colonisation. Instead, development is something that is done to and for Māori; certainly Māori self-determination is presented as almost incidental to State-determined Māori development. This subtle repositioning of the State as benefactor, thereby re-framing Māori colonial oppression, directs attention away from the role the State has played in the plundering of land and resources which has, almost 200 years later, resulted in the very same socio-economic gaps that the State now wants to work with Māori to close.

The second concern of this article is to query why we would re-name or re-frame Māori acts of resistance, collectivity and self-determination as acts of resilience. In short, we wouldn't! Our acts of resistance need to occupy space as acts of resistance in the discourses we construct about ourselves and our complex and turbulent relationship with the State. What we resist and the methods we use to resist are shaped by the interplay between our self-determining rights to live in particular ways, and our quest to come up with effective responses to State oppression (Russell, 2005). When Indigenous peoples engage in contemporary acts of resistance, they are struggling against an already-present body of knowledge about themselves and their relationships with States. Recent Māori resistance to the Foreshore and Seabed Act 2004, for example, draws upon historical and contemporary Māori knowledge about iwi and hapū customary rights, the Treaty of Waitangi, and successful traditional and contemporary self-determined resistance strategies, as well as knowledge about national and international economic policies and globalisation.

The third and final consideration of this article is to explore who benefits from the re-naming, re-framing and re-positioning that occurs with the introduction of the term resilience into Māori and Indigenous discourse. Indigenous peoples stand to benefit when we engage with our own understandings of resilience, on our own terms, and when we can, using our own languages. The benefits for Indigenous peoples come from using concepts that emerge from our own realities, including our own struggles, and which fit our own already-present bodies of knowledge. One of the problems that Indigenous peoples face in colonial contexts is that States attempt to subjugate Indigenous discourses and if we fail to critique such processes we expose ourselves to damaging colonial discourses. We seek a concept of resilience that emerges from our own realities, that speaks to our individual and collective selves, that recognises colonisation as a constant adversity,

and that supports acts of resistance in order to dismantle colonialism and re-establish Māori and Indigenous self-determination.

This article has explored the development of Māori and Indigenous frameworks of resilience, with consideration to the impact of engaging with largely State-led notions of resilience on Māori development, and in particular on the closely linked notion of resistance. We have presented a political analysis from Māori and Indigenous researchers engaging in this discourse, and gone some way towards answering critical questions for those working in the resilience field. In summary, it could be stated that the term resilience does not necessarily fit well with Māori and Indigenous peoples. The term resistance appears to have a greater resonance and offers a more solid history in terms of the strategies we utilise to foster and maintain Māori and Indigenous wellbeing. It is also important to note that in our own Indigenous languages there are many other terms that could be applied more appropriately. Whilst it could be argued that we are in danger of expending energy and space unnecessarily in analysing terminology such as resistance in a paper such as this, it is our position that when terminology begins to re-frame, re-shape or re-position discussion that has historical and present day significance, Indigenous researchers must take a lead role in discussing and determining how these impact on Indigenous health and wellbeing.

Glossary

hapū	sub-tribe
iwi	tribe
kaupapa Māori	Māori ideology
mana motuhake	absolute/independent authority
Pākehā	non-Māori and non-Indigenous
tangata whenua	people of the land
Te Tiriti o Waitangi	Treaty of Waitangi
tino rangatiratanga	sovereignty
whānau	family, extended family in Māori terms

References

Bargh, M. (Ed.). (2007). *Resistance: An indigenous response to neoliberalism*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.

Battiste, M. (2008a). Research ethics for protecting indigenous knowledge and heritage: Institutional and researcher responsibilities. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 497–510). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Battiste, M. (2008b). *Indigenous renaissance in education* [DVD]. Keynote address to World Indigenous Peoples Conference in Education (WIPCE), Melbourne, Australia.

Blackstock, C., & Trocme, N. (2005). Community-based child welfare for Aboriginal children: Supporting resilience through structural change. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, *24*, 12–33. Retrieved from https://www.mcgill.ca/files/crcf/2005-Communiy-Based_Welfare_Aboriginals.pdf

Cheyne, C., O'Brien, M., & Belgrave, M. (2000). *Social policy in Aotearoa New Zealand: A critical introduction* (3rd ed.). South Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.

Dodd, M. (2002, December). *Nation building and Māori development: The importance of governance*. Paper presented at the Contesting Development: Pathways to Better Practice: Third Biennial Conference of the International Development Studies Network of Aotearoa New Zealand, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Durie, M. H. (2001). *Mauri ora: The dynamics of Māori health*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (2003). *Ngā kāhui pou: Launching Māori futures*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.

Durie, M. (2005). *Ngā tai matatū: Tides of Māori endurance*. Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.

Greenwood, M. (2005). Children as citizens of First Nations: Linking indigenous health to early childhood development. *Paediatric Child Health*, *10*(9), 553–555.

HeavyRunner, I., & Morris, J. B. (1997). Traditional native culture and resilience. *Research and Practice*, *5*(1).

Honor the Earth. (n.d.). *Resilient food and energy economies*. Retrieved from http://www.honorearth.org/resilient_food_and_energy_economies

Humpage, L. (2006). An "inclusive" society: A "leap forward" for Māori in New Zealand? *Critical Social Policy*, *26*(1), 220–242.

International Collaborative Indigenous Health Research Partnership (ICIHRP). (2004). *Application to HRC for the International Collaborative Indigenous Health Research Partnership* [Unpublished].

Kulig, J. C. (2000). Community resilience: The potential for community health nursing theory development. *Public Health Nursing*, *17*(5), 374–385.

McGuire, P. (2010). Exploring resilience and indigenous ways of knowing. *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health*, *8*(2), 117–131.

Pihama, L. (2001). *Tihei mauri ora: Honouring our voices. Mana wahine as kaupapa Māori theoretical framework* (Unpublished PhD thesis). The University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Pihama, L. (2005). Mana wahine theory: Creating space for Māori women's theories. In P. Leistyna (Ed.), *Cultural studies: From theory to action*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Russell, P. H. (2005). *Recognising Aboriginal title: The Mabo case and indigenous resistance to English settler colonialism*. Sydney, Australia: University of New South Wales Press.

Scarpino, G. (2007). Resilience and urban Aboriginal women. *Native Social Work Journal*, *6*(1), 33–55.

Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. (2009). *State of the world's indigenous peoples*. New York, NY: United Nations.

Smith, L. T. (2007). The native and the neoliberal downunder: Neoliberalism and "endangered authenticities". In M. de la Cadena & O. Starn (Eds.), *Indigenous experience today* (pp. 333–352). Oxford, England: Berg.

Sodeke, S. O. (2005). Enhancing human flourishing in Indigenous communities: Challenges to community members, researchers and research. In Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga (Ed.), *Tikanga rangahau mātauranga tuku iho—Traditional knowledge and research ethics—Conference proceedings 2004* (pp. 251–258). Auckland, New Zealand: Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga.

Sykes, A. (2007). Blunting the system: The personal is the political (M. Bargh, Interviewer). In M. Bargh (Ed.), *Resistance: An Indigenous response to neoliberalism* (pp. 115–124). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.

Te Awekotuku, N. (1991). *Mana wahine Māori: Selected writings on Māori women's art, culture*

and politics. Auckland, New Zealand: New Women's Press.

Te Puni Kōkiri. (2008). *About us—Māori potential approach*. Retrieved from http://www.tpk.govt.nz/en/about/mpa/

Tousignant, M., & Sioui, N. (2009). Resilience and Aboriginal communities in crisis: Theory and interventions. *Journal of Aboriginal Health, 5*(1), 43–61.

Tuiono, T. (2007). We are everywhere (M. Bargh, Interviewer). In M. Bargh (Ed.), *Resistance: An Indigenous response to neoliberalism* (pp. 125–132). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.

Walker, R. (2004). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.

Wuttenee, W. (2004). *Living rhythms: Lessons in Aboriginal economic resilience and vision*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.