He Wero – Towards a bicultural and multicultural discipline

Ian Stuart

E ngā mana, e ngā reo, e ngā kārangaranga maha,
Tihei Mauriora.

Taku mihi tuatahi ki te rangi, te timatanga, te mutunga o te ao katoa. Tēnā rā koutou.

Taku mihi tuarua ki ngā motu o Aotearoa, ngā maunga, ngā awa, ngā wāhi tapu. Tēnei te mihi nui a tēnei, te uri o Te Ati Haunui a Paparangi. Tēnā rā koutou katoa.

Taku mihi nui ki te marae o Te Whare Takiura o Kahungunu raua ko te whare Te Ara o Tāwhaki. He turangawaewae ki au. Tēnā kōrua.

He mihi aroha anō hoki tēnei ki ngā tipuna whare maha e tū nei i ngā whare kura o Aotearoa. Ko koutou ngā pātaka o te mātauranga Māori, he taonga mō ngā iwi, he whakaruruhau anō hoki mō ngā kaiwhakaako me ngā tauira huri noa i te motu. E ngā tīpuna whare, tu mai rā koutou mō ake tonu atu. Ka mihi anō hoki ki a marae ātea, arā, ki a Papatuanuku. Tēnā koutou.

Ka huri ahau ki te hunga mate. Ka mihi ki nga tīpuna, rātou rā i hīkoi nei i te ara o tēnei mātaurangi, arā, te mātauranga o te hunga pāpaho. E hika mā e, he taonga tuku iho rā ā koutou mahi, ā, koinei rā te pupū ake a roimata ki a koutou te matangarongaro. Engari, haere, haere, haere. Moe mai i roto i te rangimarie o tō koutou Atua.

Ki a tātou te hunga ora, tēnā tātou, tēnā tātou, tēnā koutou katoa.
Ki ōku hoa o Te Ara o Tawhaki, ōku pouwhirinaki, ōku poutautoko i ngā mahi o te mātauranga Māori, kei te mihi, kei te mihi. Kei ngā kōrero rā ka whai iho, ko ētahi tonu o ngā whakaaro i hua mai i a au e mahi ana i ō koutou taha.

He mihi ki ōku kaiwhakaako. Koutou rā i kaha nei ki te āmai i ō koutou mōhiotanga ki a au. Ka mau kē tō koutou wehi! Tēnā koutou.

Ka mihi ki a koutou e aro mai nei ki ēnei maramara korero. Ko te tūmanako o te kaituhi ka tahuri

mai koutou ki te whakawaewae, ki te whakaringaringa i tēnei kaupapa. Nā reira, koutou rā e te hunga mātauranga, anei rā te wero. Tīkina mai te taki! Tēnā koutou.

Anei rā te kōrero a Ihenga o Te Arawa, arā, ko Ihenga te mokopuna a Tama Te Kapua. 'Kei muri i te awe kapara he tangata kē, mōna te ao, he mā.' He whakatauāki tēnei, ā, ki a au nei, he kupu poropiti anō hoki tēnei nā Ihenga. Kua mārama nei tātou ki te wero a tērā kōrero rongonui a Ihenga, ko tā tātou i te rā tonu nei, he whakarerekē i te ao!

Nā, kua takoto nei te taki, ka huri ahau ki te reo o Te Ao Mārama, arā, ki te reo o te tangata kei muri i te awe kapara.

The whakatauāki I have used as a challenge to New Zealand's Media Studies community says; *Shadowed behind the tattooed face a stranger stands, he who owns the earth, and is white.* It was said by Ihenga, the grandson of Tama Te Kapua of Te Arawa. In New Zealand in this time, it appears that the prophecy is true. The white races, (i.e. non-Māori or Pākehā) have control of the world. This is also largely true of academia, and of the discipline of Media Studies. It is a product of western cultures, in its forms of communication, its theories, its explanations and interpretations. As such, Media Studies is mono-cultural. My challenge to this discipline is simple: become bicultural and then multicultural. In this way I believe we will develop a New Zealand approach to Media Studies, and make a significant contribution to our understandings of the world in which we find ourselves, not only New Zealand, but globally.

Currently we have a bicultural and multicultural media-scape in Aotearoa. There is a healthy Māori media operating in print, radio and television. There is Pacific Island radio and Chinese-language newspapers, as well as Pacific, Asian and Māori programming pepper-potted throughout what is generally regarded as the Mainstream Media. What we have in New Zealand is no longer a single cultural monolithic set of "consciousness industries" (Enzenberger 1962), it has become a bicultural and multicultural media-scape.

But the academic discipline studying this diverse media-scape is mono-cultural. It is to this issue that I address this challenge. This challenge is to examine and change the academic forms – the western methodologies we all operate under - to become bicultural, and from that platform to institute a major New Zealand research programme, using epistemologies and methodologies drawn from all cultures in Aotearoa/New Zealand, which examine the cultural interactions of our developing multicultural mass communication system.

Fundamentally, I am problematizing New Zealand's Media Studies by suggesting that every question has more than one possible answer; every situation has more than one possible explanation, drawing on explanations from more than one culture; every question, every critique, every criticism, rather than challenging validity, is a site for research, a departure point for new theorising. I am suggesting that instead of relying on our western-derived conventions for speaking and presenting information, the way forward is to listen to the different ways of discussing these issues, of answering questions and of doing research. It is in the exploration of the issues I raise that Media Studies in New Zealand will become bi- and multicultural. Therefore, this paper asks many questions, to raise issues which need discussion, debate and research, rather than supplying answers. It is a challenge – a wero - rather than a set of answers. I would argue that the answers can only be found by opening the discourse to other cultures; finding the answers in a bi- and multicultural discourse.

Some approaches to the topic of biculturalism and multiculturalism have begun by defining these two terms. I will give a brief account shortly. However, I would argue that the nature and operation of biculturalism in any given context is to be discussed and negotiated amongst those people involved in each context. For one culture to define biculturalism, as has happened in several fora in Aotearoa/New Zealand, is the exercise of power over the other culture, and inherently mono-cultural. If biculturalism is to be discussed and negotiated within each context, then setting the conventions for such a discussion must be an exercise in biculturalism in itself. To only allow the conventions for speaking and presentation from one culture is to act mono-culturally. Therefore, the first step along the bicultural path is to decide the conventions of the debate – my first challenge to the western-derived academic culture we work under.

Consequently, this piece has been deliberately constructed using a whaikōrero form and format. As I began to write this, I realised that my challenge to academia for being mono-cultural was framed as a discursive essay - an institutional form which is drawn from the mono-cultural western academic models. Because it draws on presentation forms from both Māori and New Zealand's European-derived cultures, the English language section of this piece can be read as an essay. But it is predominantly written as a whaikōrero, and should be read as such. In that it does incorporate some western-derived forms, it is a (perhaps hesitant) attempt at a bicultural written form.

As a whaikōrero, I have chosen the kawa known as tau utuutu, which means the first speaker in any situation comes from the Tangata whenua, the second from the manuhiri

side of the paepae, back to the tangata whenua, and so on, backwards and forwards across the domain of conflict, in controlled debate and discussion. This is a form close to a western-derived debating style, and therefore more accessible to everyone. And because it is close to a western debating style, it allows for people to enter the debate using their own culturally-based discussion forms.

I want to begin by defining biculturalism as a concept of shared power. The statement "New Zealand is a bicultural country" is a political statement, about who has power in this country. The statement "New Zealand is a multicultural country", is a sociological/anthropological descriptive statement. Both of these statements are valid, and, because they are from different contexts, they are not oppositional statements. Both demand responses, and becoming bicultural is the first step on the path to multiculturalism. Accepting biculturalism demands sharing power between Māori and Pākehā. Once biculturalism is achieved, it is a smaller step to multiculturalism, as it is an extension of biculturalism.

Arguments for biculturalism are reasonably easy to formulate. Firstly, the free practice of one's own culture, without undue influence or pressure, is a basic human right. That right has never been overruled by the influx of other peoples and other cultures into New Zealand. Immigrants were welcomed here by the tipuna, as long as they respected Māori culture. Māori hold this position today.

Secondly, Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi guarantees Māori total control over their taonga. Culture is considered a taonga, in fact it is taonga tuku iho, and therefore Māori have a guaranteed right to practice their own culture in New Zealand. If that right accrues to Māori then it also accrues to Pākehā, as Treaty partners, who consequently have the right to practice their culture in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The important point I want to stress is that the rights to the free practice of culture accrues to both Māori and Pākehā. This means we have two legitimate cultures in this country and, as biculturalism is a political statement, this means we have two legitimate forms of power, Māori forms and the currently dominant western-derived forms.

Academia is an institution in which people exercise power. This is largely a social power, not economic or political power, though in many ways, in terms of acting and influencing people's behaviour and exercising power, academia attempts the exercise of political and economic power. (Of course. dividing power into the forms political, economic and social is an analytical approach only, as the reality is that all three forms are interlocked and indivisible.)

Our academic system traces its roots to the European university systems which have been adopted in our former British colony. Within this system we have learnt the conventions of our discipline. We can all cite the whakapapa of our ideas, and each of our individual whakapapa of ideas will be different. The basic outline of my own might look like; Marx, Gramsci, Adorno, Lazarsfeld, Habermas, Hall, Bourdieu, Said and Spivak. But in learning the concepts of Media Studies, we have adopted the epistemologies, the research methodologies, as well as the oral and written forms of presentation, of the western-derived academic systems. In such an adoption exists an exercise of power. This is the power to research, the power to critique, the power to write and publish, the power to comment and the power to teach. This power is granted only to those who know and use the acceptable forms and can cite an acceptable whakapapa of their ideas, in the acceptable form. Within our whare wananga we teach those institutional forms that we have learnt, giving top marks only to those who learn them best. Only those who have learnt to use the correct forms can publish in our journals. This is the editorial/peer review process, and the base values of these judgements lie in our European-derived academic culture. I would argue that this means those who have accumulated the appropriate symbolic capital, who know the codes of academia, (Bourdieu 1984, 1993) are allowed to participate, those who don't know are excluded – an exercise of power. But that exercise of power privileges a few and disadvantages the many. It especially privileges those with the Pākehā cultural capital to enter our teaching institutions where academic capital can be easily added to existing cultural capital. Those who have only Māori or Pacific cultural capital have small chance of success in academia.

For the Media Studies academy to become truly bi- and multicultural, the power to speak must be shared amongst other cultures. Here, the concept of a discussion about biculturalism in the New Zealand Media Studies context is important, because it is through the discussion that we not only learn what biculturalism means, but we also begin to practice biculturalism. This means the discipline must be open to culturally different ways of presenting information (hence the construction of this piece as a whaikōrero), as well as culturally different ways of conceiving and theorising social interactions and of explaining social systems, especially those around the mass media. Once we have changed the conventions of debate, and can allow for different ways of working within Media Studies, we need topics to approach from bicultural and multicultural perspectives, to which I now turn.

Just as our academic system is the product of one particular culture, our mass communication technology and forms are also products of the same European-derived cultures. The mass media system has grown up with our mass society and *The Structural Transformation of the*

Public Sphere (Habermas 1962) presents one way of looking at the evolution of the mass news media intertwined with the evolution of our political processes. Now, other cultures are taking the mass media and using it to produce their own. However, the mass media is not culturally neutral; we are, in fact, studying a product which interacts with and changes the culture within which it is placed, and, by doing so, changes itself. This adoption of technology and forms into different cultures offers new and interesting cultural interactions, new sites for study, research and potentially new ways of theorizing social interactions around the mass media. It especially offers new opportunities for expanding theories outside the western-based ways of conceptualizing used by our academic discipline; opportunities to seek theories drawn from, and based within, the different cultures in Aotearoa/New Zealand who are using the mass media.

But, to frame this discussion, I want to call into question the objectivity of the academy grounded in one culture, studying the cultural products of another group, critiquing and theorizing about them as if they are the products of the academy's own culture. During the 80s and 90s Friere's concept of conscientization (Friere 1996 (1970)) was used extensively amongst groups working with indigenous people. However, to expect indigenous people to assume a Marxist perspective, which is what Friere's conscientization implies, is in itself a coloniser's expectation. To expect Maori to adopt a Marxist position is simply to colonise them with more Eurocentric ideas and analysis. I want to apply the same concept to the mass media technologies and systems, and argue that expecting indigenous people to use the mass media systems in the same way as the European-derived cultures is to make assumptions of assimilation at best, or colonizing at worst. As indigenous people adopt the mass media into their own culture, they should be allowed to do so on their own terms, according to their own needs and desires and in ways compatible with their own cultures. And to be free to explain that use, to theorize mass media, according to their own culturally-based understandings of social functions.

Here I am arguing for an implementation of the implications of Said's concept expressed in *Culture and Imperialism*. He states:

> *Westerners have assumed the integrity and the inviolability of their cultural masterpieces, their scholarship, their worlds of discourse; the rest of the world stands petitioning for attention at our windowsill. (Said 1994: 259)*

Said argues that the radical position of stripping culture of its time, place and affiliations is incorrect, and that the correct study is of the interactions of the whole community and

the recognition of "interdependent histories". It is this recognition of New Zealand's social interdependences and interactions that presents the opportunity to create a bicultural and multicultural Media Studies in which different voices are free to speak in their own culturally appropriate ways, and from which will arise a truly New Zealand discipline of Media Studies, with a major contribution to make on the world stage. This will not be a Media Studies split into a Māori section, a Pacific section, a Pākehā section; rather it will draw on several different cultural strands to create a unified approach – a New Zealand Media Studies.

Taking the academic discipline as exercising social power through its institutions, the academy attempts to force indigenous people into its own culturally-based ways of seeing and interacting with the world. Every time people view a cultural product from the mass media, whether it is print, film, radio, television and now digital information, it is read from a particular cultural perspective. For Media Studies academics this perspective is not necessarily as part of an intended audience with a preferred reading, but also as part of a Media Studies discourse, with its own academic reading. However, within that discourse we still bring our cultural biases, cultural judgements, value judgements and expectations. This means the academy does not stand apart from culture to criticise culture. It has no objectivity based on an extra-cultural position. It is an inherent part of any culture and is threaded with those cultural perspectives.

Some of what I am challenging the Media Studies academy to do is already happening, as Media Studies examines the differing media products within a multicultural media-scape. However, that examination is still based within European-derived theories and methodologies, which, I acknowledge, produce useful information, analysis and perspectives. I have used such analysis and approaches myself to investigate the Māori media in particular. However, a truly bicultural and multicultural discipline will only arise when other culturally-based approaches are used.

I would like to start part of my discussion by looking at the concept of humour. Humour is generally recognised as culturally based, and not all humour transfers from culture to culture. In the New Zealand mediascape, both *The Kumars at No 42* (Evans and Brigstocke 2001). and its predecessor *Goodness Gracious Me* (Wood 1998) use humour which is very much appreciated by a New Zealand audience. However these programmes are products of a particular cultural context. They have been created by one small British group (largely British-born people of Indian descent) for a wider British audience. As with any humour of this nature, they contain social comment. Questions can be asked such as: What are these

cultural producers saying about themselves to the wider audience they are broadcasting to? What are they saying about themselves to their cultural and social contemporaries? What are they saying about British people amongst whom they live?

In New Zealand this programme is also regarded as very funny - I appreciate it, as do many other people I know. But there are many other questions we can ask about the reception of this programme in Aotearoa/New Zealand, both in terms of the viewing audience and our own reception as academics. What is the reading that we give to the text in this programme in New Zealand? We are not part of the audience this programme was made for, so are we reading the text in the way the producers intended? We may well share an overall reading with the producers, but what of the subtleties? What of the connotations? What about the narratives on which these cultural products are based? Do we completely understand the narratives of Indian descendents born in Britain? Or are we reading this programme from our own narratives about Indian-descent people born in Britain? Do we have the cultural capital to even comment?

All this means we bring a particular cultural reading to television programmes, whether it is as part of an appreciative audience or part of academia. If we then move that concept to the products of a different culture within New Zealand - Māori television, Māori radio – and apply this idea, there are many questions we can ask. I ask these questions as both a challenge to the western-derived knowledge system but also as potential research questions: What is the cultural knowledge we bring with us? Do we judge the products of Pacific Island radio based on our narratives about Pacific Islanders in New Zealand? Or do we judge them based on Pacific Island narratives of life in New Zealand? Can we view these programmes, critique and discuss them in their own cultural context? Do we have the necessary cultural understanding to appreciate the full context? Do we have the cultural capital to be a functioning part of groups other than our own? And if not, how do we critique and comment on them? What are these programme makers saying to the rest of us? What are they saying to themselves? What are they trying to say about the interactions between the different cultures that live in New Zealand? What kind of readings have they given these cultural products? We can watch programmes like *bro-Town*, laugh and think that we have got the preferred reading, but have we? Just because the apparent message that we read into these programmes is sympathetic rather than oppositional, is that the reading that the producers of these programmes actually want us to get? Or is there a different kind of reading of the text that these producers are trying to impart?

Moving to a wider view, Māori have established a network of radio stations across the country, and what appears to be a viable television channel. Both radio and television were established to promote te reo and tikanga Māori. The drivers behind these moves to establish a modern Māori media recognise that the mass media systems are cultural reproduction systems and Māori wished for their own, rather than relying on the western-derived and western-centres cultural reproduction systems. But will a Māori mass media system achieve Māori aspirations? Is it possible to do this? How does the mass media really interact with Maori culture? How do we take cultural products from one culture and interact with them in a different culture? What meanings do these products have in a different culture?

We can begin to explore this issue by using a physical example - an artefact such as a pounamu pendant. Within Māori culture, pounamu is very highly regarded; it is the blood of the taniwha Poutini and all objects made from pounamu are considered taonga. Wearing these products made from pounamu holds significance for Māori and Pākehā. For Māori a pendant shaped like a mere may be a symbol of spiritual and temporal power. Tiki is an atua with an assigned role in the Māori pantheon and is worn as a symbol with specific meaning. These can also be family heirlooms. However, when a Pākehā wears a mere-shaped pendant it can have no similar significance. A Pākehā has no spiritual or temporal power within te Ao Māori. Therefore the symbol in that sense is meaningless. However, the symbol has a different meaning for the Pākehā wearing it: pounamu jewellery has become a New Zealand icon, and a symbol of identity. Pounamu pieces worn by Pākehā have significance because it is pounamu - the shape may be purely aesthetic. This means that the products of one culture change meaning when taken into another culture.

Now we can look at the media and say it creates cultural products. I would suggest that these cultural products also change meanings as they change culture, and this opens a site for research, with many questions surrounding the interaction between the mass media systems and the culture.

Here is a site for new work and new theories of media/audience interactions. The products and interactions of other cultures' adaptation of the mass media technologies and forms may well be open to critique and theory based in western approaches, as such analysis may tell us something valid and useful. However it might be more useful to look to different cultural explanations of media interactions, and therefore to new theories of the media and its interactions with societies. Can we develop a New Zealand Media Studies which draws together different threads and cultures to present new theories and concepts of media-

influenced social interactions? Now that we have a developing multicultural media-scape, with a multicultural audience, can we theorize the multiple possible cross-cultural interactions and inseminations amongst the audience? What is the effect on our New Zealand social imaginaries of such a variety of images, languages, interactions, music, story-telling and information? Our western-derived culture has theories and analysis to answer many of these questions, but what answers to these questions would Māori, New Zealand Samoan, New Zealand Chinese, New Zealand Tongans, New Zealand Fijians or New Zealand Thai give if they were asked to answer from within their own culture?

In his concept of system and lifeworld Habermas (1987) offers a further site for bicultural and multicultural research. In broad-brush terms, Habermas argues that the "system" colonizes the "lifeworld" and the mass media is part of the "system". Habermas' concept is also related to the notion that the mass media functions as a cultural reproduction system, which is why Māori wanted their own media. However, this approach is firmly grounded in western approaches and theorizing, in which the mass media is part of the hegemonic processes of society. What needs to be addressed is the extent to which we can apply this characterisation to the developing multicultural media-scape in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Research can centre on questions such as: How does the Māori media interact with Māori lifeworlds? How does Pacific Island radio interact with New Zealand-living Pacific Island lifeworlds? (As Māori and Pacific Island radio offer sites of resistance to the dominant New Zealand culture it is unlikely they are sites of colonization by the system.) Or, if they are sites of colonization, in whose interests are they acting? Can we divide these groups (cultures/ethnic groups) into civil and civic society? How do the concepts of private and public apply in these cultures? Are the interest groups exercising power directly involved in the media arenas, or do they exercise power from a distance? And how are all our different culturally-contexted mass media systems interacting with each other? How are they interacting with the various cultural groupings in New Zealand?

What I am proposing is a research project in which every question, every critique and every criticism, rather than challenging validity or theory, becomes a departure point for research. For instance, one possible critique of this kōrero is that it takes an essentialist approach to culture. That is a valid criticism within western paradigms. I would want to defend my position a little and say that the theoretical base on which that critique is made is mono-cultural, but I do not wish to rely too heavily on that response. Rather, many Māori, especially those operating in cultural areas, have adopted an essentialist approach to their own culture in the face of the overwhelming in-coming dominant culture, and by their own

efforts to hold onto Māori culture. Pākehā too, are good at telling Māori what their culture is, – it is this, but it is not that - and in doing so form an essentialist position. This raises the question: What does this mean for the portrayal of Māori culture through radio and on television? One criticism I heard during the 1990s was that MaiFM was "not a real Māori radio station". If that is the case, what does a "real Māori radio station" sound like apart from the compulsory percentage of te reo Māori? What culture must a "real Māori station" draw on or portray? Does Maori radio need to come from what has been called the marae-based culture? Can Māori radio reflect the realties of modern urban Māori culture? Is that acceptable to the marae-based Māori? The critique that an urban Māori-run radio station is not "real Māori" comes from an essentialist view of Māori culture and denies legitimacy to the urban cultures, an untenable position. The same people who previously criticised MaiFM as "not real Māori" also supported the foundation of our Māori television channel, which is not operating from an essentialist position, but offering a wide range of 21st century Māori broadcast products, and appealing to a Pākehā audience as well. Can this apparent contradiction be answered through western-derived approaches, or must it only be answered through Māori approaches?

For several years now I have been considering this question in a number of different forums and arenas. Stripped to its basics, when someone is sitting on a couch watching television, whose culture is that person participating in? Does it matter what television programme they are watching? I have no predetermined answer to this question, rather I am still exploring the implications of the question.

The actions of sitting on the couch watching television would seem to be participating in Pākehā culture. This is because the cultural context, rather than the action, appears to be Pākehā, especially as there is no historically-derived kawa covering that set of actions. The actions of sitting on the couch watching television are common to people of many cultures. The action is forced by the television itself, which demands attention. As television comes from Pākehā culture, so, perhaps, does the action of watching it? But if this is true, then attempts to promote Māori culture through television are immediately undermined. However this is not an answer that Māori want to give, even though it is the most obvious answer. If the answer is that people are participating in Māori culture, then the cultural context is dependent on the programme being watched, and therefore Māori culture itself is changing - it is becoming a mediated culture.

As Māori have adapted many practices, manufactured objects, materials, food and

artefacts from European-derived cultures into their own, this is not an especially new situation. Each adoption has produced new kawa, such as the adoption of tables, with the accompanying kawa most New Zealanders are familiar with: do not sit on tables or change babies on food tables in a Māori environment. But adopting mass media technology and approaches into Māori culture is a new situation. (Māori operated newspapers in the 19th Century, but I would argue that the contemporary Māori media is a wholesale adoption into the culture which has never before been seen in Aotearoa/New Zealand.) This will force culture change because the mass media is not culturally neutral. Very few objects, institutions and practices are culturally neutral, but the mass media has a high degree of process/culture change attached to it. So here we have an excellent site of possible research, in (at least) two areas.

Firstly, Māori television will force cultural change through interaction with the mass communication systems, a prime site for New Zealand Media Studies work. Using European-derived theories and approaches of academia for the research will produce valid and interesting results. But using other epistemologies and methodologies will produce different, and in many ways, new and more interesting results. But this will happen only if academia allows the natural expression of those epistemologies through different cultural ways of speaking.

Secondly, Māori are starting to use mass media technologies in different ways. Many of my Pākehā friends and colleagues watch Māori television even when they do not fully understand what is being broadcast - "because I like the visuals" or "because it is more interesting". Here we have another site for research: Do Māori mass media styles differ from other mass media styles? If so, in what ways? But rather than use exclusively European-derived critiques and approaches, what are Māori critiques and explanations of their styles? And further, what impact will the interaction with Māori media have on Pākehā who watch this television station? Listen to Maori radio? How will Māori television and radio impact on Pākehā lifeworlds? How will Māori television impact on Pacific Island lifeworlds? If it offers a site of resistance and cultural recognition/pride it must have some impact on our Pacific Island communities. What are the Māori and Pacific Island answers to these questions?

In another area, I have been considering the impact of the news media on Māori decision making processes. Our European-derived news media has grown as part of our European-derived democracy (see, for instance, Habermas 1962) Our decision-making processes are intertwined with the news media, with reports of decisions made, with discussion about

possible decisions and issues involved in each decision. It is a group process opened to all by the news media. Some decisions may even be overturned by public pressure, such as by the use of petitions, further debate and public argument.

Māori decisions, on the other hand, are made in hui, on marae, where those present participate in the decision-making process. What is given to people outside the hui is only the final decision. The arguments, discussion, and who was on which side of the argument are left within the hui. Opening such hui to the news media opens up the decision making process to public scrutiny, and to further public comment. This is not kawa, and is the reason why many Māori are uncomfortable with news reporters attending hui. The right to attend public meetings and for news gatherers to report fully on meetings is integral to the European-derived cultures, but is foreign to Māori and other cultures. This came to a head at Te Tii Marae, Waitangi, in February, 2005, when the mainstream news media was excluded from the proceedings, with attendant public comment and debate. My point is that here we have other sites for research – the interaction between Māori decision-making processes and western-derived news techniques, and the potential change in Māori decision-making processes because of interaction with the Māori news media. There is also the question: what kind of reporting processes are Māori developing within a culture which has different group decision-making processes?

In answering the questions I pose, we have the work of people like Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) and Evelyn Stokes (1985) with the beginnings of Māori epistemologies and methodologies which we can apply to our discipline. These approaches are linked to Māori ways of speaking and presenting information, So we must allow these different ways of speaking to enter our forums, our journals, our discourses. In doing so we will become truly bicultural. Once we have become bicultural, and have allowed different voices to speak in different ways, with different theorizing, it is a small step to open the discipline to other cultural approaches – other Pacific voices and the range of Asian voices.

When we come to the idea of the multicultural approaches, we have in New Zealand a real multicultural mediascape. We now need to create real multicultural academic landscape to match. It will be in the reconception of New Zealand's social interdependences and interactions which are mediated by our mass media systems that the opportunity to create a bicultural and multicultural Media Studies exists. We must allow new voices and approaches to enter the whakapapa of Media Studies in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Then we will have a bicultural and multicultural discipline with important offerings internationally. This would

make a significant contribution, I believe, to Media Studies in general, with our changing multicultural world and communication systems, without cultural boundaries.

I want to end with Spivak's words of hope for the future:

> *What I would look for rather is a confrontational teaching of the Humanities that would question the students' received disciplinary ideology (model of legitimate cultural explanations) even as it pushed into indefiniteness the most powerful ideology of the teaching of the Humanities; the unquestioned explicating power of the theorizing mind and class, the need for intelligibility and the rule of law. (Spivak 1988)*

It is usual to end a whaikōrero with a waiata, impossible in a written format. So I will conclude with this whakatauki.

Nau te rourou, naku te rourou, ka ora te iwi.
Nō reira tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou katoa!

References

Bourdieu P (1984) *Distinction; a social critique of the judgement of taste* Harvard University Press Cambridge, Mass

Bourdieu P (1993) *The Field of Cultural Production* Polity Press

Enzensberger H M (1962) *The Industrialization of the Mind The Consciousness Industry: On Literature, Politics and the Media* New York Seabury 3-15

Evans, L. and D. Brigstocke (2001) *The Kumars At No 42* BBC Hat Trick Productions

Friere P (1996 [1970]) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* Penguin London

Habermas J (1962) *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An enquiry into a category of bourgeois society* MIT Press Cambridge, Mass

Habermas J (1987) *Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason* Beacon Boston

Said E (1994) *Culture and Imperialism* Random House New York

Smith L T (1999) *Decolonizing Methodologies* University of Otago Press Dunedin

Spivak G C (1988) *In Other Worlds: Essays in cultural politics* Routledge New York

Stokes E (1985) *Maori Research and Development* University of Waikato Prepared for the Social Sciences Committee of the National Research Advisory Council

Wood N (1998) *Goodness Gracious Me* BBC