

1-1-2009

New Zealand as a Biracial Nation: How the Springbok Tour of 1981 Helped Revive Maori Culture

Elizabeth G. Boig
Lehigh University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://preserve.lehigh.edu/perspectives-v27>

Recommended Citation

Boig, Elizabeth G., "New Zealand as a Biracial Nation: How the Springbok Tour of 1981 Helped Revive Maori Culture" (2009). *New Zealand: new challenges in paradise*. Paper 10.
<http://preserve.lehigh.edu/perspectives-v27/10>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Perspectives on Business and Economics at Lehigh Preserve. It has been accepted for inclusion in *New Zealand: new challenges in paradise* by an authorized administrator of Lehigh Preserve. For more information, please contact preserve@lehigh.edu.

NEW ZEALAND AS A BIRACIAL NATION: HOW THE SPRINGBOK TOUR OF 1981 HELPED REVIVE MĀORI CULTURE

Elizabeth G. Boig



Introduction

In this article I begin with a brief history of the Māori, the indigenous people of New Zealand, and the colonization of the island by Europeans, or Pakeha. I describe the Māori way of life, which included collective ownership of land, and show how Māori culture was changed by the imposition of European values. Next I detail the injustices done to the Māori in spite of the Treaty of Waitangi, which was the settlement document written and signed by both Pakeha and Māori leaders in 1840. This document is significant because it gave Māori the right to citizenship, a gift that was not usually bestowed on indigenous peoples when their native lands were colonized by Europeans. On the other hand, the Treaty was not respected, which led to unfair land acquisition and other injustices. The document, however, remains a crucial part of the Māori story, because it provided Māori with a legal basis for reparations later on. Finally, I discuss the events before

and after the South African Rugby Team's 1981 Tour. New Zealanders were split between those who wanted the games to go on and those who wanted to cancel the games as a protest against South Africa's system of apartheid. The protests and the violence that followed caused New Zealanders to look inward at their own race relations. Many Pakeha realized that their treatment of the Māori was more like apartheid than they wanted to admit. After the protests several Māori organizations were formed along with initiatives in the areas of education, health, land, and political involvement. Though the statistics show that Māori do not yet have equal status with Pakeha, much improvement has taken place. It is evident to the visitor that Māori symbols and language are now an integral part of the New Zealand identity.

The Māori People

Traditionally the center of the Māori hierarchy was the family. The smallest unit (mother,

father and children) lived with their closest relatives within an extended family. A group of extended families, called a *hapu*, made up the *iwi*, or tribe. The chief, a first-born son, was the man who could prove his connection to the longest lineage. (Hanson, pp. 12–14) These familial groups lived on land owned collectively by the *iwi*, and the *iwi* chief made decisions for the whole. The largest *iwi* today, Ngāpuhi, has 103,000 members. (“Ngāpuhi the Iwi”)

When Captain James Cook discovered the Māori on his first voyage to New Zealand in 1769, he observed their way of life and saw that they had very few possessions and no interest in trade. Their custom was to have only just enough food, clothing, and weapons to insure the immediate survival of the *hapu*. When Cook returned only five years later, the Māori greeted him with clothing, tools, and weapons to trade for nails, hatchets and cloth. (Simpson, pp. 13–15). From the beginning, Māori life was altered by the influence of the Europeans.

The Treaty of Waitangi

Many years after Cook’s expeditions to New Zealand, British citizens began migrating to New Zealand in significant numbers. Outbreaks of violence and crime had occurred during settlement; and by gaining sovereignty of New Zealand, the Crown sought to ensure the safety of both settlers and Māori. Lieutenant-Governor William Hobson was able to obtain the signatures and approval of the treaty by 40 Māori chiefs during a single day of debate, adding 500 more chiefs months later. The treaty became law on May 21, 1840. (“Making the Treaty of Waitangi”)

The problem was that the Treaty of Waitangi had two versions, one in English and one in Māori. In the articles that detailed the terms of the settlement, the two versions were interpreted differently. The first article stated that Māori would relinquish their *kawanatanga*, or sovereignty, to the British Crown. The English interpretation was that the British Crown would have full control over New Zealand, whereas the Māori assumed, by their interpretation, that sovereignty would be shared between the Māori and the Pakeha. The second article in English guaranteed that Māori would retain control over

their lands, forests, fisheries, and other property by holding a communal title. In the Māori version, they were guaranteed possession of their *taonga*, which means treasures. Because *taonga* included language and culture in addition to lands, forests, and fisheries, the Māori anticipated that all aspects of their cultural life, language, and economy would be protected. Māori had a rich culture and maintained their history through oral tradition; therefore they wanted to protect it in this legal document along with the physical possessions that the Pakeha valued. (“Treaty of Waitangi”)

When the Māori signed the Treaty of Waitangi, they believed that their *mana* would be respected. *Mana* means authority, prestige, spiritual power, charisma, and ability to lead. *Mana* is involved in every activity in which the Māori engage, and they think about the status of their *mana* in every situation of life. (“Mana”) Over the next hundred years, in spite of the good intentions of the Treaty of Waitangi, their *mana* was not protected by the New Zealand government.

The Continued Exploitation of the Māori People

Emigration from Europe increased rapidly after the Treaty was signed. Unfortunately, the European immigrants brought diseases to which the Māori had no immunity. So many Māori died from disease that they soon became the minority population. The Europeans also brought advanced weaponry which had great appeal to the Māori warriors. Combat is a Māori ritual; *iwi* engaged in warfare with other *iwi*, but usually not to a lethal end. This changed when the *iwi* began using muskets against each other in tribal warfare. (Simpson, p. 20) The population of the Māori in 1820, before the arrival of European settlers, was 100,000. (Maddison, p. 76) That number was cut in half during the first sixty years of settlement; the Māori population was estimated at 45,000 in 1901. (Belich, p. 191)

The Māori custom, or *tikanga*, was to value the community over the individual and to work together for the common good over personal achievement. The difference between the Western ideal of land title and proprietorship and the Māori custom of tribal ownership and communal responsibility was a clash in cul-

tures. The Native Land Act of 1865 changed the stipulation for communal ownership that was in the Treaty of Waitangi. By this act Parliament hastened the purchase of Māori land. (Williams, p. 16) It undermined the strength of the Māori *iwi* system by encouraging individual tribe members to sell their part of the *iwi* land. In this way Māori lost over 64 million acres of land in 150 years. The North Island is where most of the loss occurred, with the estimate of Māori land being 4.8 million acres in 1920, compared to the 11 million acres Māori held in 1891.

Māori continued to use whatever land they kept to pursue their way of life in agriculture, hunting, and fishing. When there was not enough food to support their *hapu*, some Māori obtained seasonal or temporary jobs on Pakeha land development projects. The most significant areas of commerce for Māori were the kauri gum and logging industries. (Belich, p. 192) As time went on, Māori began to rely more on employment with Pakeha and continued to move into cities looking for work. Most were not happy being away from their families, competing with each other for work to support their families and living in an environment where they encountered Pakeha daily.

Once a large population of Māori became urban, they experienced acts of discrimination and prejudice similar to those experienced by African-Americans in the U.S. around the same time. In 1952 complaints were made by Pakeha parents about having their children “mixing” with Māori children in the public schools. A separate Māori school was established as a result. (Belich, p. 190) Also during the 1950s a survey of hotels reported that one-quarter did not allow reservations to be made by Māori. James Belich, a noted New Zealand historian and professor of New Zealand history at Victoria University in Wellington, wrote about some of the derogatory terms used against Māori: “‘Māori bugs’ were evil-smelling insects; ‘Māori time’ was being unpunctual.” (Belich, p. 190) Such terms used commonly helped to create a stereotype of the Māori that the Pakeha did not dispel.

By 1966, 62 percent of Māori had moved into an urban environment, and by 1986 that number rose to 83 percent. (Belich, p. 471) Not only did they interact with Pakeha, but they saw how they lived and Māori were affected by the comparison. Mason Durie, a Professor of

Māori Research and Development at Massey University in New Zealand, explains: “Urbanization also meant diminished access to those institutions and skills that nurtured a positive identity, so that being Māori was measured more by deficit in comparison to the Pakeha middle-class than by any notion of a secure Māori identity.” (Durie, p. 21) Māori suffered from relative deprivation; in an environment dominated by Pakeha, they needed money and material possessions. Urbanization seems to have almost destroyed the Māori way of life and the culture of the collective community.

Māori Political Activism before 1981

All during the European colonization, it was difficult for the Māori to challenge any of the rulings of the British Crown because the *iwi* were geographically separate. In 1852 Tamihana Te Rauparaha, son of a respected Māori chief, decided to organize the *iwi* in order to present a unified front when challenging the British Crown. He did this by founding Te Kingitanga, the Māori King Movement, in 1858. (“In Search of a King . . .”) The first Māori King, Patatau Te Wherowhero, was a renowned warrior and had ancestral connections to many *iwi*. He emphasized the importance of the King movement as a symbol of unity and vowed to fight for the land that had been lost by the *iwi*. (“Potatau Te Wherowhero — Māori King Movement”)

In 1909 the Young Māori Party was formed at Te Aute College,¹ with the goal of gaining recognition for Māori symbols within the Pakeha community. One successful adoption of Māori culture was the incorporation of the *haka* into the warm-up routine of the All Blacks, New Zealand’s national rugby team. The Young Māori Party sought to use the growing status of Māori culture as a bargaining point on important political matters. James Belich reported the goals of the Young Māori Party as stated by Apirana Ngata, one of the group’s founding members and a prominent Māori activist: “The explicit aim was in Ngata’s words, ‘influencing Pakeha opinion to a more kingly attitude and

¹Te Aute College is a Māori all-boys high school (grades 9–13) located in Napier, a coastal city in the North Island of New Zealand. Te Aute was established in 1854 and is famous for producing Māori leaders. (Te Aute College)

respect towards the Māori.” Belich interpreted this message in the following way: “If Pakeha wished to claim that New Zealand’s race relations and indigenous people were the best and whitest in the world, fine. Indeed, Māori will help by supplying the battalions, the sports teams, and the cultural symbols. But Māori will insist on some sort of quid pro quo, such as finance for the land-development schemes and a set of state-funded but benignly separate institutions.” (Belich, pp. 212–14) Belich said that the Young Māori Party was happy to offer Māori cultural symbols to the Pakeha, but in exchange they wanted better schools, health care, and restitution for their stolen lands.

In 1962 Paul Robeson, an American political activist, advocated militancy to a group of Māori as a tool in their fight for justice. Dr. Bill Pearson, a New Zealand academic and an observer at the event, noted that this idea did not resonate with Māori because they have an “ideal of racial harmony.” (Sharp, p. 6) Though the Māori did not use violence, some years later they did actively participate in demonstrations to raise awareness of their issues. In 1975 a march of 20,000–30,000 Māori took place from the North Island to Wellington, New Zealand’s capital, to protest the loss of Māori land. (Richards, p. 243)

Setting the Stage for the 1981 Springbok Tour

While many New Zealanders were dedicated to the resurgence of the Māori culture and restitution for past injustices, it was the game of rugby that raised awareness of the issues for everyone. If not for this national pastime and New Zealand’s powerful team called the All Blacks, Pakeha might not have witnessed first-hand the racism of the South Africans and might not have tried to come to terms with racist treatment of the Māori in their own communities.

Racial segregation had existed in South Africa since its inception, but in 1948 the South African Parliament introduced a legalized system of segregation which it called apartheid, meaning “separateness.” Better race relations were on the agenda in many nations during this time, so that South Africa’s legalization of apartheid caused international condemnation.

The United Nations publicly disapproved; and in 1968 it took the South African apartheid boycott to the sports field. The Gleneagles Agreement was a pact between all of the Commonwealth states to not engage in any matches in any sport with a nation that upheld apartheid. The leaders from all Commonwealth countries, including New Zealand, agreed to this, making a bold protest against South Africa’s policy. (Newnham, p. 5)

Commitment to racial justice was not shared by all New Zealanders, and the Gleneagles Agreement was not strictly honored. The Springboks, South Africa’s national rugby team, had traditionally been one of the All Blacks’ biggest competitors, and the rivalry between the two teams was an integral part of the New Zealand identity. Trevor Richards, one of the founders of the anti-apartheid group HART (Halt All Racist Tours), put this in context best: “But deep within the country’s [New Zealand] bones, at the heart of the place where ‘national culture’ is created, lie rugby and South Africa.” (Richards, p. 9) There had been many matches between the Springboks and New Zealand’s All Blacks in the 1900s, and the two teams were regarded internationally as the two rugby giants. Richards went on to say that from the beginning of their competition the South Africans abhorred playing Māori as equals and “the spectacle of thousands of Europeans frantically cheering on a band of coloured men to defeat members of their own race was too much for the Springboks, who were frankly disgusted.” (Richards, p. 11)

In 1973 New Zealand was faced with the option of engaging in an athletic contest with South Africa. New Zealand’s Prime Minister Norman Kirk turned them down, not only due to the moral issue, but also because he feared potential violence. However, during the next New Zealand election campaign, Prime Minister Candidate Robert Muldoon ran using a pro-Springbok Tour strategy. Muldoon said that “I want to see the All Black team go to South Africa and lick the pants off the Springboks. If I can personally be there to cheer them on, so much the better.” (Newnham, p. 6) Muldoon won the election, appealing to the rural New Zealanders who were obsessed with rugby and thought it absurd for government to stop a match with their long-time rival.

Many New Zealanders agreed with the Glengales Agreement and saw refusal of the All Blacks to compete with the Springboks as a perfect way to rebuke South Africa for apartheid. Many anti-apartheid groups were also formed as a result of the uprising in Soweto, an urban area in Johannesburg. In 1976 the South African government introduced the compulsory use in schools of the Afrikaans language, a derivative of Dutch used by a small minority of white South Africans. Student leaders organized a protest numbering thousands of students which resulted in the murder of hundreds of black students by the police. (“16 June 1976: ‘This Is Our Day’”)

In response to the Soweto uprising, HART and the Citizens Association for Racial Equality (CARE) organized a protest to stop the impending tour of South Africa by the All Blacks. The protests, however, were to no avail; the New Zealand Rugby Football Union (NZRFU) and Prime Minister Muldoon allowed the tour to take place. Furthermore, both the NZRFU and the Prime Minister endorsed the tour despite the fact that the South African government prohibited the Māori members of the All Blacks to participate.

The international community was outraged by New Zealand’s agreement to engage with South Africa. Many Commonwealth countries showed their disapproval by trying to exclude New Zealand from the 1976 Olympics in Montreal, stating: “We have no other peaceful remedy against the barefaced support of New Zealand for acts of inhumanity against Africans in South Africa.” (Newnham, p. 7)

This reaction reaffirmed the goals and direction of CARE and HART, now joined by MOST (Mobilization to Stop the Tour) and COST (Campaign to Oppose the Springbok Tour). Each group saw the importance of non-violence in their efforts and was inspired by the traditions of Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr., and Te Whiti.²

²Te Whiti was a relative of the prophet Te Ua Haumene, who founded Pai Marire, a Māori religion whose central message was peace. During the New Zealand Land Wars, a series of battles over land between Māori and Pakeha that took place from 1843 to 1872, Te Whiti encouraged Māori not to use violence against Pakeha who were unlawfully taking Māori land. (“Parihaka”)

Graham Mourie, the captain of the All Blacks, also decided to show his support for the anti-apartheid movement and chose to protest the tour by not competing. He knew that this decision could have made him forfeit his spot on the team but he said that “leadership in my mind is making the right decisions.” (Winder, p. 1) Chris Peterson, an active protestor of the tour, was interviewed in 2001 by the *Wairapa Times-Age*, a New Zealand newspaper, about his involvement in the anti-apartheid movement. As Peterson said:

In 1981 we were an anomaly on the edge of the world, waving the flag for social justice at home but saying segregation was okay in South Africa. We weren’t as bicultural as we thought we were. We were a bit smug. I think we grew up a bit through that turmoil. . . . It was also the start of a change in this country in relations between Māori and Pakeha. (“Dark Days of Thunder . . .”)

The Tour

The tour began in Gisborne, where the last New Zealand tour of the Springboks in 1965 had been held. This time, however, the mood was not as friendly. In 1965 there had been an official welcome at the *Poho O Rawiri marae*. A *marae* is the welcoming place for guests in a Māori village. This time there were protesters standing outside the *marae* watching as the guests entered. Hone Ngata, the great-great-grandson of Apirana Ngata, founder of the Young Māori Party, delivered a powerful speech in response to not being allowed into the *marae* for the welcoming ceremony. Tom Newnham, another founding member of HART, recorded Hone Ngata’s words: “Last week,” he said, “I was Master of Ceremonies at a function here and today because you are fooled by racists, you do not let me in. You talk of hospitality. Perhaps we are too hospitable. We always put out a hand and say *kia ora* [the traditional Māori greeting]. Now I think if Hitler were alive we would welcome him.” (Ngata as quoted in Newnham, p. 21) Hone Ngata incited both sides. Words exchanged by both protesters and supporters became more harsh and eventually lead to violence.

The first match of the tour occurred on Wednesday, July 22. Protestors called it the Day

of Shame. This was the first day of the official demonstrations led by CARE, HART, and COST. Throughout the tour the groups met to organize their strategies and to maximize their impact. In his book, Tom Newnham included an article from the *New Zealand Herald* that remarked on the increasing organizational skill of these protest groups as the tour went on. As the article stated, "For more than seven hours between 8,000 and 10,000 protesters divided into seven squads played an intriguing game of cat and mouse which had the police — by their own admission — as stretched as they have been on this Tour." (Newnham, p. 53) COST organized itself into teams: Pink, Yellow, Orange, White, Blue, Green, and Brown. Each team took on different tasks such as creating blockades on the road or forming an impenetrable line around the stadium. Geoff Chapple, an author and political activist during the tour, commented that "the prevailing goodwill or tolerance, citizen to citizen, gradually disappeared. The mere act of wearing the distinctive red, white, and black HART Stop the Tour badge became bravery." (Chapple, p. 186)

Wherever the Springboks went, protestors followed. For the remainder of the tour there were protests at every match, and then afterward in the streets, and even at the hotels where the Springboks stayed. There were banners that read: "*KA WHAWHAI TONU MATOU AKE AKE AKE!* (We will fight on forever and ever and ever)." (Newnham, p. 22) New Zealanders were passionate about this issue, and they showed it through their protests. In the introduction to Athol McCredie's book of photographs from the tour, D.L. Kelly comments: "In fact, everywhere we look in these photographs, we see a supposedly phlegmatic people raised to the heights of passion." (McCredie, p. 4) Over 150,000 people gathered in 28 different locations throughout the tour to act in a total of 200 demonstrations. (D.L. Kelly in "A Country Divided")

There were many individual accounts of brutalization and retaliation by pro-tour men and women against the anti-tour protestors. Tom Newnham recounts one protestor's gruesome encounter with three hundred rugby fans in which he was battered by everything imaginable: beer crates, mud, bottles, and fruit:

"His eyes were bruised and filled with mud; tears were streaming down his swollen cheeks." (Newnham, p. 22) New Zealanders who supported the tour were just as outraged that their favorite pastime was being ruined by political motives.

Since nothing like these protests had ever occurred before in New Zealand, the police force was not trained to handle mobs the size that the tour drew. The police officers were assigned to either the Red Squad or the Blue Squad, and their job entailed keeping order outside and inside the matches as well as escorting the Springboks to their various destinations. Some police officers were assigned to dress in plain clothes in order to overhear plans being made by the protestors. Their goal was crowd control and safety. As the tour proceeded, however, police officers began using extreme physical force against the protestors. Chapple wrote of the police reaction: "There was no statutory power giving police any such right, but it was now open season on protestors." (Chapple, p. 131)

As Trevor Richards commented on the success of CARE, HART, and COST: "We built a movement which crossed generational and class boundaries, divided families, and shifted New Zealand into a different national and international consciousness." (Richards, p. 242) Barry Gustafson, a New Zealand historian, summarized the controversy over the tour as a conflict of geographically different opinions, saying that it was "a generational and attitudinal clash" between the traditional, older generation from the country and small towns and, on the other hand, the more liberal younger generation living in urban Auckland and Wellington. (Gustafson, p. 310) Gustafson's opinion was supported by a five-day poll conducted by the *New Zealand Herald* a month after the Springboks left. The question asked in the poll was whether or not a Springbok Rugby team should have come to New Zealand. The poll indeed showed geographical differences, the majority of "no" responses coming from the major cities and the majority of "yes" responses coming from rural towns. ("Opinion around New Zealand . . .") The final overall vote was 54 percent of New Zealanders against the tour and 42 percent in favor. (Richards, p. 229)

Outcomes of the Tour

Five years after the Springbok Tour, researchers from Victoria University conducted interviews with many Māori who participated in the protests. This was a typical response to questions about the future:

I think the first thing is some sort of programme; I haven't got the answer to it specifically, but educating our people, about racism. Educating just not our people, Māoris and Pakehas both, equally about the situation in New Zealand, now and as it has been. . . . I think we've got to build towards creating, you know, a society in this country that is built on the solid understanding of the cultural things we can get from each other and following from that, a total abolition of the institutionalised racism that is running rampant in this country. (Quaddel, pp. 23–24)

Initiatives have been undertaken to address many of these issues. Three organizations that have done the most in the area of improving Māori life and reviving Māori culture are the Waitangi Tribunals, Te Puni Kōkiri, and the Māori Party.

The Waitangi Tribunals were established by the Treaty of Waitangi Act of 1975 to achieve restitution for the land wrongfully taken from Māori in the early years of settlement. The purpose of these tribunals was to find out the truth from the past, to listen to the claims from communities, to affirm proven claims, and to explain how some claims did not meet the criteria for restitution by the Crown. (Waitangi Tribunal) All matters investigated were between the British Crown and Māori; no other private parties were allowed to bring claims to the Waitangi Tribunal. As of February 11, 2008, 1,430 claims have been heard. All claims are given a number and then grouped with related claims to be heard at the same time. The Tribunal's job is to give recommendations to the government on how to resolve the situation at hand. Hearings are public, and anyone may attend. It is expected that all claims will be heard and resolved by 2012. The Waitangi Tribunal states that its goal is to play a critical role in “resolving the grievances, restor-

ing the wellbeing of Māori communities and reconciling Māori communities with the state and other parts of society.” (Waitangi Tribunal)

Te Puni Kōkiri (TPK), the Ministry for Māori Affairs, launched a re-vamped program to engage Māori in new projects and aid them in their business, health, and education endeavors. TPK developed the Māori Potential Approach, which outlines three key areas that will enhance Māori lives: *matauranga*, the building of knowledge and skills; *whakamana*, strengthening leadership and decision-making; and *rawa*, development and use of resources. TPK acts as an advisory board to the New Zealand government on behalf of Māori, working closely with the Ministry of Education, which has dedicated resources to funding Māori immersion schools. This is TPK's mission statement:

The success of New Zealand depends on Māori success and the success of Māori depends on their success as Māori. It means that Māori culture is recognised and validated and incorporated into the learning process. It means that personalising learning is happening and that the curriculum is relevant to Māori identity. We also must have an assessment system that helps foster success — so that success breeds success and mana builds mana. We must all step up to achieve Māori success and realise the potential of Māori youth. (Te Puni Kōkiri)

The Māori Party, a political party focused on Māori working for Māori issues, was formed in 2004 and has ever since been an important player in Parliamentary elections, public discussion, and policy making. In the New Zealand General Election of 2008, the Māori Party helped swing the election in favor of the National Party. Interestingly, the respective candidates were asked about their involvement in the 1981 Springbok Tour. Helen Clark, leader of the Labor Party and Prime Minister from 1999–2008, was involved in protests against the Springbok Tour in her youth. John Key, leader of the National Party, however, responded that the Springbok Tour was not a part of his life. (“Leaders Debate . . .”) John Key won the election with the help of Māori votes despite his lack of involvement.

Māori Status Today

New Zealand's Ministry of Social Development publishes the Social Report each year, which provides information about different aspects of New Zealand life. Its goal is to make the New Zealand government aware of the issues affecting the lives of New Zealanders so that programs for improvement can be developed. The Social Report has ten outcome domains and indicators: health, knowledge and skills, paid work, economic standard of living, civil and political rights, cultural identity, leisure and recreation, physical environment, safety, and social connectedness. Some areas have shown progress — for example, health, employment, and education. Still, the statistics show that Māori are not economically and socially on a par with Pakeha.

Statistics on life expectancy show that Pakeha live longer than Māori, but the trend for Māori has been improving, though not impressively. Māori life expectancy increased by 13 years for males and by 16 years for females from the 1950s to the 1980s; but as of 2002 the life expectancy for males was still only 67 years and 72 years for females. On the other hand, non-Māori life expectancy in 2002 was 75 years for males and 81 for females. (“The Social Report 2007”)

Employment statistics from the past few decades also show the Māori lagging behind. Māori employment rates increased from 61 percent in 1986 to 66 percent in 2007 while Pakeha rates went from 74 percent in 1986 to 80 percent in 2007. (“The Social Report 2007”)

Māori participation in early childhood education (for 3-year-olds) was 85 percent in 2000 and up to 91 percent in 2007, while Pakeha participation was 95 percent in 2000 and 98 percent in 2007. The statistics on higher education

are not as good. The percentage of Māori with a secondary (high school) degree was 39 percent in 1991 and 63 percent in 2007, compared to the Pakeha 66 percent in 1991 and 80 percent in 2007. The percentage of Māori with bachelor's degrees went from 1 percent in 1991 to 9 percent in 2007, and for Pakeha the percentage went from 8 percent in 1991 to 22 percent in 2007.

Conclusion

Although statistics reflect the fact that programs and initiatives for Māori are working, the trend is sluggish. In general, Māori are still not as well off as Pakeha. Toni Marraccini's paper in this issue of *Perspectives* focuses on the disparities between Māori children and Pakeha children with respect to quality of life. She also provides more information on the government programs targeted to aid Māori children and families.

On the other hand, the impact of movements dedicated to Māori equality and revival of Māori culture can be seen clearly in New Zealand today. When we visited New Zealand, we saw Māori art and cultural symbols everywhere, a clear sign to the world that New Zealand is both Pakeha and Māori. At every business or government meeting we were greeted first in English and then in Māori. Many Pakeha are learning the Māori language in order to be successful in business ventures with Māori and because they are beginning to value the Māori culture as part of their own national identity. As New Zealand becomes even more diverse with the influx in recent years of other Pacific Islanders and Asians, this small country will surely be a testing ground for the success of multiculturalism.

REFERENCES

- "16 June 1976: 'This Is Our Day.'" SouthAfrica.info Online. June 15, 2006. Online. www.southafrica.info/about/history/soweto-150606.htm. Accessed August 20, 2009.
- "A Country Divided." Online. www.nzhistory.net.nz/culture/1981-springbok-tour. Accessed August 20, 2009.
- Belich, James. *Paradise Reforged: A History of the New Zealanders from the 1880s to the Year 2000*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001.
- Chapple, Geoff. *1981: The Tour*. Wellington, New Zealand: A.H. & A.W. Reed LTD, 1984.
- "Cook Island Māori-Population." Online. www.stats.govt.nz/analytical-reports/pacific-profiles-2001/cook-island-Māori/population.htm. Accessed July 25, 2009.
- "Dark Days of Thunder — When a Free Nation Confronted Apartheid in Sport." *Wairapa Times-Age Online*. August 25, 2001. Online. www.wairapa.co.nz/times-age/weekly/2001/springboks_tour.html. Accessed December 8, 2008.
- Durie, Mason. *Nga Tai Matatu: Tides of Māori Endurance*. New York, U.S.: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Gustafson, Barry. *His Way: A Biography of Robert Muldoon*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press, 2000.
- Hanson, F. Allan and Louise Hanson. *Counterpoint in Māori Culture*. London and Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983.
- "In Search of a King — Māori King Movement." New Zealand History Online. July 3, 2008. Online. www.nzhistory.net.nz/politics/the-Māori-king-movement/in-search-of-a-king-3-Jul-2008. Accessed August 22, 2009.
- "Leaders Debate Latest Updates: Clark v Key." *The New Zealand Herald*. Online. October 14, 2008. Online. www.nzherald.co.nz/nz-election-2008/news/article.cfm?c_id=1501799&objectid=10537451. Accessed January 23, 2009.
- Maddison, Angus. *The World Economy: Historical Statistics*. OECD Publishing, 2003. Online. Accessed August 19, 2009.
- "Making the Treaty of Waitangi." New Zealand History Online. February 11, 2009. Online. www.nzhistory.net.nz/politics/treaty/read-the-treaty/drafting-the-treaty. Accessed November 21, 2008.
- "Mana." Māori Dictionary Online. www.maoridictionary.co.nz/index.cfm?dictionaryKeywords=mana&n=1&idiom=&phrase=&proverb=&loan=. Online. Accessed August 24, 2009.
- McCredie, Athol. *The Tour Photographs*. Wellington, New Zealand: Thames Publications Ltd., 1981.
- Newnham, Tom. *By Batons and Barbed Wire: A Response to the 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Real Pictures Ltd., 1981.
- "Ngāpuhi the Iwi." Online. www.ngapuhi.iwi.nz/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=91&Itemid=86. Accessed July 10, 2009.
- "Opinion around New Zealand on the 1981 Springbok Tour." New Zealand History Online. July 22, 2007. Online. www.nzhistory.net.nz/media/photo/opinion-on-the-springbok-tour-around-new-zealand. Accessed August 24, 2009.
- "Parihaka." New Zealand in History Online. 2000–2008. Online. history-nz.org/parihaka.html. Accessed August 22, 2009.
- "Potatau Te Wherowhero — Māori King Movement." New Zealand History Online. June 25, 2008. Online. www.nzhistory.net.nz/politics/the-Māori-king-movement/potatau-te-herowhero. Accessed August 21, 2009.
- Quaddel, Diane. "Maoris, Polynesians and the Tour," in *Counting the Cost: The 1981 Springbok Tour in Wellington*. David Mackay, Malcolm McKinnon, Peter McPhee, and Jack Phillips, eds. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University, History Department, 1982.
- Richards, Trevor. *Dancing on Our Bones: New Zealand, South Africa, Rugby and Racism*. Wellington, New Zealand: Bridget Williams Books, 1999.
- Sharp, Andrew. *Justice and the Māori: Māori Claims in New Zealand Political Argument in the 1980s*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Simpson, Tony. *Te Riri Pakeha: The White Man's Anger*. Waiura, Martinborough, New Zealand: Alister Taylor, 1979.
- "The Social Report 2007." Ministry of Social Development. Online. www.socialreport.msd.govt.nz. Accessed July 25, 2009.
- Te Aute College. Online. www.teaute.school.nz/welcome/index.html. Accessed August 26, 2009.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. Online. www.tpk.govt.nz. Accessed February 10, 2009.
- "The Treaty in Brief." New Zealand History Online. January 24, 2008. Online. www.nzhistory.net.nz/politics/treaty/the-treaty-in-brief. Accessed February 10, 2009.
- "Treaty of Waitangi." Tourism New Zealand Online. 1999–2009. Online. www.newzealand.com/travel/about-nz/history/history-treaty-of-waitangi.cfm. Accessed August 22, 2009.
- Waitangi Tribunal. Online. www.waitangi-tribunal.govt.nz. Accessed January 23, 2009.
- Williams, John A. *Politics of the New Zealand Māori: Protest and Cooperation, 1891–1909*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Winder, Virginia. "Springbok Tour Forces Brave Decision." *Puke Ariki Online*. www.pukeariki.com/en/stories/sport/Mourieon81tour.htm. Accessed November 20, 2008.
- "Young Māori Party." Online. www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/654075/Young-Māori-Party. Accessed June 28, 2009.