



When a ngarara bit the taniwha's tail: Education, the arts and the third space

Janinka Greenwood
University of Canterbury

Abstract

In the mid-seventies Arnold Manaaki Wilson began a programme that ran for over two decades and challenged our education system. He described his programme, *Te Mauri Pakeaka*, as a *ngarara*, a pesky insect that bit the tail of the sleeping *taniwha* (monster) that represents Māori knowledge, values and arts within the education processes of Aotearoa. He used the arts as a catalyst for schools and communities to reevaluate the role of all things Māori within the education system, and he held his workshops on *marae* (extended family and tribal home base) throughout the country. Thousands participated: students, teachers, principals, departmental administrators, *kaumatua* (male elders), parents and artists. However, in the devolution of educational responsibilities that took place under the name of *Tomorrow's Schools* (Minister of Education, 1988) Arnold was retired and the programme stopped. The legacy lives in the altered awareness of participants, in the arts works in *whare kai* (dining rooms) around the country, and in ways of exploring dance and drama, but, while Arnold's reputation as an artist is widely acknowledged, his role as an educator and as an agent of educational change is not. Perhaps it was too challenging?

Focus of this articleⁱ

A detailed account of *Pakeaka* is provided by Arnold himself writing in collaboration with the current author (Greenwood & Wilson, 2006). This article recalls the key features of the project and explores its ongoing challenge to our understandings of who we are as people of Aotearoa, of how we approach dance and the other arts and of what we do in education. Thus the focus of this article is not so much on reporting the proceedings of the now historic project as on highlighting selected detail of the events, processes and reactions in order to explore how they may still challenge and inform how we view not only the teaching of dance and the other arts, but learning and teaching more generally.

Dance is one of the newer subjects in New Zealand schools. It is rapidly growing in popularity among students and is developing a range of theorisations of its pedagogical practices that support its stake in the national academic curriculum. Like the other arts subjects, dance has the potential to provoke students to examine and express their locatedness in their own bodies and in their

social and physical environments. On the other hand it could be taught within the bounds of defined sets of performative modes.

My intention here is not to provide further theorisations but rather to provoke questions about the purpose and nature of our teaching, and to encourage exploration of dance and the other arts as subjects that engage us in exploring who we are and how we are in the world. In addition, I propose that the rich pedagogical practice in the arts can take the role of provocateur within the wider domain of learning and teaching across the curriculum.

I am tempted also to propose dance as a metaphor. In as much as we can view dance as physically embodied and moving text in space, so might we see the *Pakeaka* project as dance: a complex sequence of embodied and inter-relational texts, moving in response to energies, both choreographed and improvisational. As we view that dance in retrospect we can read it again: against the texts of our own time.

My position as author derives in part as an active participant in the historic project and as co-author with Arnold in its documentation (including Greenwood & Wilson 2004; Greenwood & Wilson 2006). It also derives from my continuing practice as teacher and teacher educator, with extended experience in arts education but also with strong interest in the processes of teaching and learning across the curriculum. I reflect this latter stance by deliberate use of the inclusive term *we* to signify those who are committed to teaching with a vision that is gently revolutionary in its approach to cultural awareness, to the role of dance and other arts as tools of individual and group exploration and expression, and to learning as a holistic and experientially grounded process. Readers will of course choose whether they place themselves inside or outside that inclusive *we*. My intention in the usage is to acknowledge that within teaching of dance and the arts there are growing communities of awareness and practice that through a range of formal and informal networks strive to make teaching socially meaningful and to engage learners as whole people not just as students of a specified discipline. Thus for some readers the inclusive *we* will resonate; for others it will hopefully serve as a prompt to define their position differently.

A very brief account of the project

The *Pakeaka* project began in a workshop at Te Pae o Hauraki Marae in 1978. It grew out of a need to change the monoculturalism of the New Zealand education system and represented a new and alternative way of learning about Māori ways of

seeing the world from that which was the current model of courses about Māori values and culture for senior teachers and administrators.

Students and teachers from four schools came. They lived in for three days, researching local history and turning their findings into performances and murals. They were hosted by the local people who became their repositories of knowledge and their guides on how to approach Māori histories and art forms. In addition, a large number of administrators and advisors from the Department of Education arrived to observe and sometimes participate. At the end of the three days the students and teachers returned to their schools to complete their artwork. Some months later the schools came back to the marae to present their finished work: the murals to hang in the dining hall, the performances to serve as embodied but momentary testaments to what had been explored and learned.

Over time the programme evolved, taking different shapes in each region in response to local communities and to changing social and cultural environments. For example, at Wairaka Marae, Whakatane, in 1979 the Tuhoe children of rural Ruatoki found themselves leading the city high schools in finding the rhythms of dance and of the marae itself, marking a place for potential change in the postcolonial history of land confiscation and local school closure. In Porirua, in 1980, the beat of wooden drums and the swing of skirts of white pandanus fibre showed how the Pasifika communities of the district engaged with the exploration of what dance and education generally could mean. In Waahi Marae, Waikato, in 1984, there was overt political comment in performances and murals, reflecting the challenges being issued throughout New Zealand about the Treaty of Waitangi and its implications for the education of Māori. In Forum North, Whangarei, between 1982 and 1988, five weeklong workshops took place in the new built community arts centre, and the availability of a theatre with technical resources, as well as space for a community to live and sleep together, gave rise to new forms of dance and drama that drew on the performative styles of both Māori and Western traditions.

Creating a third space

The historic monoculturalism of New Zealand schools has been widely investigated and described (Bishop & Glynn, 1999 Greenwood & Wilson 2006; Walker, 1990). Not only was there an absence of things Māori within the curriculum, but also the proportion of Māori students failing was shameful. The scaling of examination marks was benchmarked against English and the styles of teaching privileged

individualism, the written word and passive receptivity by learners. Māori parents and elders, who had themselves experienced failure within the schooling system, saw no role for themselves whereby they could support the education of their children or influence the schools to change.

Arnold's initiative took education out of the school and onto the marae. The shift was in every case temporary and involved only a limited number. However, within that number were students, teachers, parents, elders, principals, departmental officers and artists: a cross-section of those who needed to be actively engaged in young people's learning. The workshops allowed each of these groups to explore their role as collaborators in teaching and learning and to explore the processes of teaching and learning within a context that was responsive to Māori values and aspirations. In a brief to schools Arnold Wilson (cited in Greenwood, 1999, p.100) describes the programme as:

a serious attempt, not to promote art alone, but to use it initially as a catalyst to spark off discussion and thought about the underlying attitudes and values which are the heart and the very guts of culture, and the source of creative effort. ... Everyone is a learner. ... This programme uses art as a catalyst to enable Māori and Pākehā to learn more of their heritage, to understand the positive values of their society such as sharing and caring, *manakitanga*, love and compassion, *aroha*, *whanaungatanga*, family feeling and obligations.

The programme thus became a dramatic enactment of what could happen in schools, an experiential study of the understandings and ways of living that could grow as the worlds of Māori and Pākehā cross and the space where they meet grows, an exploration of a third space (Greenwood & Wilson, 2006).

A challenge to concepts of learning

As well as offering a space for cross-cultural encounter, the *Pakeaka* project offered an opportunity to re-examine the nature of learning. The pedagogical methodology of the workshops may have looked haphazard to a casual observer: there was no written statement of achievements objectives, very little direct instruction and equally little regulation of who worked on what project and when. Throughout the dining hall (or the exhibition hall when the project came to Forum North in Whangarei) there were groups of people learning haka (dances), weaving tukutuku patterns into the backboards of murals, drawing out intricate templates,

or carving the figures that would be layered onto the work. In a relatively quiet space to the side early childhood teachers, writers and parents were making illustrated books. In the kitchen a group was preparing the next meal while they thrashed out the lyrics of the *waiata* (songs) they were developing for their performance. Outside and down the bank a little, a group of students sat around a *kuia* (female elder) learning how to strip flax and weave a headband. *Poi* (small ball on the end of a string) circled anywhere there was room for them, as those who knew how to make them dance were teaching novices. Behind the apparent chaos of freedom an observer who stayed longer would see a purposeful drive to complete the work, evolving collaboration among people who had never worked together before, and growing commitment from everyone. At the same time there was space for individuals to take time out: to check up on aspects of a local history, to argue about protocols, gossip, or just walk away from it all and take time out.

The experience of *Pakeaka* prompts us today to look at the nature of learning, to consider whether it is a predominantly intellectual process or also an emotional and attitudinal one, to examine the extent to which it is embodied, and communal. The following pages re-visit episodes in the history of the project to explore how they may provoke our thinking about education today.

Time: Segmentation and flow

Our secondary schools often structure learning into disconnected periods, moving students, and often also teachers, from subject to subject without allowing for overflow and without making connections between the truncated periods of learning. In their report on their experience the group from Tikipunga High School, Whangarei, (1982, cited in Greenwood & Wilson, 2006, p.147) included this poem:

5 days 100 hours
 6,000 minutes
 360,000 seconds
 of living together in a complex
 sleeping together in a hall
 eating together at long tables
 watching *Limbs* and *Downstage* and John Bolton
 exercising and doing dishes
 playing guitars in corners and singing

smokingⁱⁱ behind doors and in public
helping other schools, being helped
meeting, discussing, planning
trying out, shaping, making
losing the thread and despairing
feeling tired and edgy
discovering, fitting pieces together, triumphing, celebrating
hamburger hunting in the early morning
falling in love with our mattresses after nights
spent thinking we had better things to do than sleep.

They capture something of the flow of movement that occurred from activity to activity, from struggle to achievement, and from periods of relaxation to excited concentration. The question this raises for us as educators today is whether our schooling system, the secondary school system in particular, makes good use of time to encourage and develop learning. Our timetables are meticulously constructed, but are we able to make use of students' (and teachers') natural cycles of energy? How often do we teach to students who are physically and emotionally lethargic and are unable to access them when they are buzzing? How often do we need to stop just when we are building up steam and simply hope that we can pick up the enthusiasm again in the next lesson a day or two later? To what extent are we able to cater to the need of individuals to change roles from follower to leader, from learner to teacher and back again? Are our schools open to parents at the times *they* are free to come in, or are they restricted from access by timing? Above all, do we allow enough time for group energies to reach fruition, and do we allow individuals to move on when they feel their learning in an area has reached fruition?

Space, and occupation

Photographs of the workshops show big open spaces with groups of people working on separate tasks in close proximity to each other. When the skill saws started up, the screech would be momentarily terrible. Most of the time, however, the sounds of guitar, flute, hammer pounding chisel into wood, intense discussions in Māori and English mingled together to create comfortable background noise that each group simply ignored as they focused on their own work. Sometimes a space would be cleared and everyone would come together on the spread mattresses and watch

Limbs Dance Company dance, *Statement Theatre* enact traditional stories and Māori biographies, or James Henare, the Northland elder, play his recordings of archaic chants. Often groups would drift outside to improvise and rehearse *haka* (Māori dances) that would be woven into a performance that integrated western and Maori elements.

What made the clustered space comfortable and workable was a sense of ownership. In the context of the marae on which *Pakeaka* took place, Māori students and parents felt at home and Māori elders were easily able to shift the ease they felt in guiding their community on their own marae to guiding the schools to learn local history and the reasons for protocols. Many of the Pākehā may have felt a little sheepish at first, but as the days passed they eased into the rhythms of the marae and to a sense of belonging. In the context of Forum North, there was initially no history of belonging to the new built and architecturally designed community complex but the continuing process of eating, sleeping and working at close quarters made the raw physical space a virtual marae, and incidentally made Forum North a community centre that was claimed by the people of the Northⁱⁱⁱ. In the *poroporoaki* (closing ceremony) that closed one of the Forum North *Pakeaka* workshops, one of the Māori teachers who had watched her students immerse themselves into the work and the facilities, stood with tears in her eyes and said: “Before this I thought art and this Forum North building, were for artie-farties, but this has shown that it’s a place where we can all come” (Whangarei Community Arts Council, 1982). As the worldwide *Occupy* movements showed, settling camping quarters in a space becomes a dramatic symbol of ownership.

The enduring question that *Pakeaka* offers us in this context is: what kinds of spaces do we need to create to make it possible for our communities and our young people to learn? Are schools that separate students from their families and communities the best answer?

How do we create change? Who has to learn first?

When Arnold began to bring people into *Pakeaka* he was faced with the challenge of needing to facilitate changes in expectation in almost all of the people he worked with. The kaumatua (male elders) of the 1970s knew their tribal lore, but they had lost touch with the education of their young people and saw themselves as outside the education system. The Māori farmers, truck drivers and housewives knew how to support the work of the marae but did not feel comfortable walking through the gates of the school. The departmental administrators and

superintendents knew about curriculum development, the art advisors sometimes even knew something about Māori dance and visual art forms but they were aliens to the marae and its way of processing gatherings and exploring issues. The artists he brought in, dancers, musicians, carvers, actors, writers, knew their art forms and materials and often were at home on the marae, but unless they were themselves teachers they had seldom been inducted into processes of formal education. The teachers involved, usually an arts teacher and English teacher and the Māori language teacher were subject specialists, unsure (apart from the Māori language teacher) of what would happen on a marae and untrained in how to work across disciplines in collaboration with each other. The students, while varying in attitudes, generally brought the advantage of adventurousness and willingness to try something different. In one of his briefs to participants (Wilson, 1983), Arnold wrote:

Who are we educating?
The children
The parents
The people
The heavies (administrators)
The Department of Education
The principals
The teachers or the community?

More than once departmental officials asked Arnold why he had not held separate preparatory sessions for kaumatua so they would be ready to guide the schools and not deflect focus from the children's learning. But the scale of the change he sought to promote, and the absence of existing infrastructures meant that he could not work fractionally. He had needed to bring all the parties together to teach each other, to learn from each other, and to evolve change together.

Planning for complex change continues to present similar challenges. How can all those involved be brought together? Should we work with one group at a time? or while the others wait? The legacy of *Pakeaka* prompts us to use the breadth of expertise within our wider community and facilitate opportunities for collaborative learning.

Layers of learning

In many of the workshops, local *kuia* would bring in freshly cut flax to teach weaving. One of the girls (Paeroa College, 1978) reported her experience:

During the day an elder came down and showed me and six other girls how to make kits and I said to myself: 'all it is, is just stripping your flax and then plaiting' but it wasn't anything like I thought. All that day it took me to weave my kit. I could have left it and gone with the others for a swim but I stuck it out because I wanted to finish it and be able to show my parents what I could do. When it was completed I was quite proud of myself. Then one of the women told me I had to give it away to somebody. She said that whenever you make your first kit you must give it away otherwise you will never make another one.

Her account highlights a number of layers of learning. Firstly, there is the complex process of weaving itself: the careful preparation of the materials and the intricacy of manipulating the springing blades. Secondly, there is the development of persistence and commitment. Her friends went to swim but this girl worked at her self-appointed task all day because she wanted to prove to herself and her family that she could complete a demanding project. Thirdly, there was learning about the traditions of the craft including the expectation that the proud first product would go to someone else rather than the maker. And there was a further latent and symbolic learning about the importance not only of sharing but also of keeping motivation alive and seeking for continuous improvement: if we keep what we first make, we will never make something further.

The challenge from *Pakeaka* is to conceive the learning we plan in our classrooms in similarly complex layers. The New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007) nominates values and key competencies in rich multi-dimensional terms that promise to legitimise such planning but the pressures of reporting outcomes often lead us to reduce our planning to more simplistic and measurable elements.

What needs to be taught for a caring society?

In *Pakeaka* the given art-making tasks were intended as a catalyst for other learnings: about cultural values, about other people's ways of seeing their relationship to the land and to history, about collaboration and about exploring a

sense of identity. A student's report (Paeroa College, 1978) describes his perception of what was taking place:

It wasn't a classroom situation; here you learnt from experiences.... In our marae you felt a sense of belonging and love, a sensation that made you feel you were someone important and you counted. It made me feel proud of my Māori ancestry.

The account speaks to the importance of creating learning environments where individuals are encouraged to develop their own sense of worth and to find out what makes others feel safe, valued and supported. There were many ways this occurred during *Pakeaka*. One example is the way Joe Toki, an elder from the Far North, shared his time and attention with the young students who came from his community of Broadwood, a remote rural school, into the city setting of Forum North and to encounter an array of new arts forms and new experiences. He would sit for hours watching his children work with various artists and advisors, seldom offering anything but his quiet smiling pleasure at seeing the youngsters absorb new experiences. Once he watched them work with a dance advisor from Wellington. She worked with the group to devise a performance about Arai Te Uru and Niwa, the taniwha guardians of the Hokianga. The students were cautious about experimenting with enacting movements of the sea. They knew haka, but this was alien and, apparently, non-Māori. They refused to paint their faces with the swirling green and blue colours the advisor suggested. "It's not Māori," they maintained. Uncle Joe watched, then came forward. "Would you paint my face?" he said to the advisor. His children felt safe and followed suit.

Joe Toki's style of leadership created a space for the wary Hokianga students to feel secure in their Māori identity and in their individual dignity as well as to embrace something new and different. The legacy of incidents such as this one is a provocation that we ensure we teach the whole person and not just their intellects: that we take care to nurture the sense of self-worth and belongingness within our students at the same time as we prompt them to move beyond the stasis of their current understandings, to make sure new learning is a growth and not a substitute.

How can we support generous teaching?

The kaumatua who answered Arnold's call in the early *Pakeaka* workshops came, like Joe Toki, with a great generosity and willingness to share. Many had spent

lifetimes seeing distance between Māori and Pākehā, if not always in surface relations then in values and in ways of communal interacting and in relating to land and history. They saw the workshops as an opportunity to heal some of the gap.

A video recording (Whangarei Community Arts Council, 1982) captures a kaumatua reflecting on what had taken place during one of the workshops in Forum North and on how he felt that the interactions that had started could lead to a different kind of New Zealand society: one grounded in both Māori and Pākehā cultures.

I have always wanted to see Pākehās learning Māori culture and Māoris learning Pākehā culture. As I see it, it is the only way the two races can come together.....

I am here today because all the knowledge I've got, I want to share—I want YOU to have it: I want to bring Māori and Pākehā close together. I want to bring about fellowship—Love—Aroha as we call it.... Your love for my love. That's what Aroha means.

The record of *Pakeaka* is full of telling incidents, like the one above with Joe Toki, when kaumatua would ease groups through moments when the students' energy was stuck or when the teachers or facilitators were unsure about how to approach sensitive material. However, teachers, Māori as well as Pākehā, did not always find it easy to shift their school-based ways of approaching knowledge to align with the style of kaumatua. A Māori language teacher (W. McMath, personal communication, February 12, 1998) recalls his initial perplexity:

When we started talking to our kaumatua, first, I was expecting answers in the same way as I might go to an encyclopaedia. And secondly, when the answers didn't come like that, I felt a sense of panic that maybe the kaumatua didn't really know.

He was, at that time, young, the only Māori teacher in his school and appointed according the current practice of fast track training on the basis of his language fluency. He had felt unprepared to carry the responsibility of guiding his school into exploring Māori history and had been perturbed when all his questions were not directly answered. By the time he came to report the experience he was a kaumatua himself and could appreciate that the knowledge he had sought was not as rigid as he had thought and that the oblique answers of his kaumatua and

reciprocal questions had been intended to broaden out the field of inquiry and to make him understand how knowledge was intertwined with people. Indeed, the kaumatua would often take time to sit together and discuss the accounts they had been given in their own intergenerational learning and consider how best to share the material.

Many Pākehā teachers also initially found it hard to set aside the book learning they had acquired about Māori protocols and local legends, and to open up to hearing the local people's situated and slightly varying accounts. It was not always easy for the two knowledge systems to meet.

Our schools today draw students from communities that are multicultural, and often parents and elders do not know how to bring the values and the knowledge they hold dear through the doors of the school to share. A legacy from *Pakeaka* is to provoke us to consider how we can welcome such knowledge through the door and how we can support the generosity of those who are willing to teach us.

Non-linear processes

Looking across the two decades of *Pakeaka* workshops, one of the features that stands out is that the learning and facilitation that took place did not fit neatly into boxes. There were always a number of synchronous layers. At one level there was overt and active learning *about* things: about haka and *tukutuku* (woven decorative panels) for instance, or about histories about particular places. And, incrementally as the workshops continued around the country, there was an opening up of awareness of the continuing history of race relations within New Zealand and of the impacts of Pākehā dominance on education.

At another level there was subtler learning about knowledge itself. What is relevant knowledge? Who holds it? Who owns the dance forms, the styles of *whakairo* (carving)? Who owns the stories that were being told? And in what ways could everyone share in them, and perhaps play with them? Similarly, there were explorations of the nature of art. What kind of aesthetic expectations shape the works that we think are good art? And what are the functions of art within a society? Are there ways the processes within the particular arts can be used to highlight questions and to focus learning?

There was invitation to realise the land itself has voices and that working in the space involves becoming responsive to the whispers of the land, that biculturalism is not a pre-fabricated static product and not exclusive of multi-

cultural difference, that culture is dynamic and changing but it is dangerous when change is inscribed by those who hold power on the outside, that spirituality is part of knowledge, and that while we do not begin with an empty slate we do have the opportunity to face and heal history.

At yet another level, there was learning about oneself: about capabilities, insecurities, the contribution one could make to the group. Leadership roles changed during *Pakeaka*: teachers often looked to their students for guidance; students who had seemed to lack lustre in the classroom sometimes flowered on the marae as they took charge of the kapa haka, the kitchen, or the whole completion of a project.

In as much as *Pakeaka* might speak to the way we conceptualise our unit plans and specific lessons, it stands as an encouragement to think about the multiple layers and non-linearity of the learning we plan to facilitate. Measurable objectives have real use. However, there is opportunity for more.

Making the impractical and unthinkable possible

One of the themes of performance was the various stories of Maui. Tikipunga High School, for instance, explored the story of Maui capturing the sun, and related it to the contemporary issue of never having enough time to do the things we think are important. The devised work combined a thunderous haka with contemporary vocal chorus and a flowing dance of the sun. The artists and elders who were present encouraged the school to experiment with style and not be afraid of breaking with tradition. An elder (cited in Greenwood, 1999, p. 60) reminded the group:

Maui and the sun trapping is part of the whole collection of Maui stories—and in them he comes out as someone who is mischievous, who defied conventions, he wasn't hamstrung by tradition.

When the first workshop took place, there was no certainty how it would turn out. On the one hand the assemblage of people brought together a collection of talents that made anything possible; on the other hand the heterogeneity of that gathering could have spelt confusion, conflict and disaster. Like Maui, Arnold and those who worked with him set out to capture the sun, to make the impossible happen. The process over the years was not without tension and hitches^{iv}, but over and over again, groups devised performances and created murals despite apparent disorder and disruption. All the groups with different backgrounds, and often also different areas of focus, ate together, slept together, talked with each other and

worked alongside each other, sometimes collaboratively and sometimes separately. Many students and many teachers completely changed their perspectives and expectations. The face of New Zealand was changed—not by *Pakeaka* alone but with *Pakeaka* facilitating many aspects of the change.

The legacy suggests it is feasible to strategise to catch the sun. Many of the worthwhile projects in educational change, seem difficult to achieve and so are perhaps unthinkable. *Pakeaka* suggests those are the ones that might most need our attention.

In the third space: Making New Zealanders; learning for change

Third space is term that is becoming widely used to describe new developments that grow outside of existing norms. As a concept it is perhaps most useful when it describes something that grows out of existing but different spaces that somehow overlap and generate new possibilities. Such possibilities draw on their origins but do not replicate them or replace them. Space in this sense is both terrain and opportunity. The distinctive nature of the third space is that it is emergent, fluid and unscripted. It holds possibilities and challenges. It continuously needs to be discovered, negotiated, and shaped.

In terms of cultural identity, the third space might be the space where Māori and Pākehā cultures meet, interact and allow a New Zealand identity to emerge between them, embracing both, drawing from both but not diminishing the value of both existing in their own right. That is one way of seeing the third space that *Pakeaka* gave life to.

However, *Pakeaka* also generated another kind of third space. It brought *curriculum* into meeting with *community* and in the meeting space new learning possibilities grew. Taking this concept into our current education practice, we might see the curriculum space as where the curriculum framework stands together with the heritage of classroom practices and national achievement standards. Here also stands what we have thought we knew and how we used to teach. In the community space stand the extended families and communities whose young people we teach. In this space are the communities' cultural values and lore and the social embodiment (sometimes inspiring, sometimes problematic) of the cultural and interpersonal concepts we seek to teach. Here are possibilities for collaboration and co-learning. In this paradigm the third space becomes learning for change.

Concluding comments

Arnold Wilson was made a New Zealand *icon*^v in 2007 for his achievement as a sculptor. The award was well merited: he was the first Māori graduate from an Art School and throughout his life he personally explored ways to make a Māori ethos come to life in the materials he worked with and actively supported other Māori artists and the development of Māori art as a thriving and internationally valued enterprise. But his work as an educator is still largely unacknowledged.

Perhaps because material art is solid and lives in art galleries, museums, government buildings and the collections of the rich, it is less dangerous to applaud. Education for change, even when it seems to be successful, may be seen as interesting, perhaps provocative, but unsustainable. In as much as such teaching is also an art form, it is, like dance and drama, evocative, perhaps stirring, but transitory. Perhaps it is also seen as dangerous: it interrupts habitual, seemingly safe, patterns and who knows what might grow out of it. So as situated performance, in workshops on individual marae and in community spaces, *Pakeaka* was applauded. It has lived in various ways on the changes it created in individual participants. But has not been recognised as a serious prototype for further educational exploration or as an on-going challenge to how we go about our daily business of schooling. The taniwha Arnold talked about awaking, the role of Māori knowledge, values and arts within our national education processes, remains awake, though not always heeded. The taniwha of provocative, community engaging, experiential learning seems to have been allowed to drift back into sleep.

In the Forum North workshop described earlier, Joe Toki unassumingly led his children to feel comfortable with the art opportunities opened up by working with a dancer from another culture and with expert advisors. He also led those advisors to understand how meaningful the stories they worked with were to his community. On the final day of the weeklong workshop the schools performed to an audience that packed the theatre, with friends and families filling not only the seats but all the standing space in the aisles. As the students of the Hokianga came on to the stage in the colours of the sea and dancing the sinuous shapes of their ancestral taniwha, Uncle Joe came in with them, half a beat out of step, but dancing. *Pakeaka* was about change, but it was also about love.

If Arnold's ngarara is a dramatic symbol of refutation of a system that was monocultural and excluding of things Māori, including acceptance of and success for Māori students, it is also a symbol of belief and of love. While we, educators

who inherit the legacy of *Pakeaka*, keep alive refutation of limiting systems, belief in the possibility of doing things differently and love for those we work with, perhaps there will be enough pesky insects to bite the taniwha's tail again, and yet again, and so prompt the taniwha to dance.

References

- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Greenwood, J., & Wilson, A. (2006). *Te Mauri Pakeaka: A journey into the third space*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
- Greenwood, J., & Wilson, A. (2004). Shifting the centre. In *Perspectives in Education*, 22(1), 141-148.
- Greenwood, J. (1999). *Journeys into a third space: A study of how theatre enables us to interpret the emergent space between cultures* (Doctoral thesis, Griffith University). Retrieved from <http://www.worldcat.org/title/journeys-into-a-third-space-a-study-of-how-theatre-enables-us-to-interpret-the-emergent-space-between-cultures/oclc/155546040?referer=di&ht=edition>
- Minister of Education. (1988). *Tomorrow's schools: The reform of education administration in New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Government Printer.
- Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Paeroa College. (1978). *Report of Pae o Hauraki programme*. Paeroa, New Zealand: Author's collection.
- Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.
- Whangarei Community Arts Council. (1982). *Cross-Cultural Community Involvement Project*, Forum North, 1982. (video).
- Wilson, A. (1983). Invitation to participants for Forum North hui. Author's personal collection.

ⁱ The image above is a drawing by Arnold Wilson, reproduced from Greenwood & Wilson (2006).

ⁱⁱ This was a time when smoking was still socially endorsed. While students hid their smoking behind bike sheds, many schools still had smoking areas for their teachers.

ⁱⁱⁱ Since that time most of Forum North has been taken over as Council offices and the theatre and exhibition hall are now run as purely commercial enterprises.

^{iv} Some of these are recorded in Greenwood & Wilson (2004).

^v Award given by New Zealand Arts Foundation.