

---

## Adler self-evident, Freud improbable and Jung imprecise !

Forty years ago a Maori tutor in adult education asked if I would run a full day, marae based seminar on Freud, Adler and Jung for a group of tribal elders. This somewhat bizarre request was irresistible and the day, indeed, was full of great fun, ribaldry, intellectual challenge, rhetorical display and adventure, and, well, just learning.

My greatest surprise was that the older men and women rather regarded those prevailing "insights" as immature intellectual scramblings. They rather implied that they knew all that, that it was sometimes true and sometimes not, but that their own understandings of human motivation and explanation just went way beyond. And instead of the three divisions of Freudian consciousness theory surely we knew that human awareness was differentiated into levels as laid down when the primal night differentiated, te po uriuri, te po tangotango, te po whawha and so on; the same sequence as the stages of labour in birth or the passage from life to death; or after death of the fading of the material soul into something else. Well I wasn't. "Huh. And you call yourself a psychologist?"

Just incidentally they found Adler entirely self-evident, Freud improbable and Jung just altogether too imprecise!

Well, maybe I was just a young fellow being put in his place. Certainly they were right in denying the adequacy of the standard psychologies of those days and indicating that there was more to know. No one mentioned the Treaty of Waitangi but they were asserting a cultural sovereignty over their own knowledge and their right to bring it forward as an alternative view.

# BEYOND THE TREATY

Professor James Ritchie

Centre for Maori Studies & Research,  
University of Waikato

---

Forty years have passed and with them almost everyone of those wise old people that I spoke with that day. During that time, especially over recent years the Treaty of Waitangi has become the pivot in bringing about a quiet revolution in bicultural relations here. Recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi is now built into over fourteen Acts of Parliament, the separate charters of most Departments of State, major institutions such as Universities and thousands of service agencies such as school Boards of Trustees.

The literature on modern Treaty interpretation and background is now very extensive and is developing continuously through the hearings of the Waitangi Tribunal, negotiations conducted by the Treaty Policy Unit of the Justice Department and otherwise by government, through Planning Tribunal decisions and those of the Courts, through local body recognitions as well as by a regular stream of books and other commentary publicly available.

All this both reflects and contributes to public awareness. So rapidly has this changed over the last decade that those who have not had opportunity and assistance in keeping up with changes may well feel bewildered by the task of integrating Treaty perspectives into their

---

ordinary operations. Most of us are migrants from the past into a new world where the bicultural parameters have been changed around us.

Our first responsibility is to service the training needs which this situation requires. New entrants to the profession can acquire Treaty awareness through their regular training. This, of course requires that those who are directing such training recognise this need and take steps to meet it. therefore anyone who is heading such a project, and those who are their heads, such as Deans, H.O.D's (potentially these days that's everyone) should put attendance at a workshop high on their personal re-training list. The organisations themselves need to be promoting (and paying for) skill up-grading in this matter. None of this is optional any more.

But the Treaty alone, and even the considerable body of modern interpretation, will not specify in what ways a scholarly and service organisation like the Psychological Society, as a body or as requiring standards of its membership or in practice, must do. In essence the Treaty simply says that this is a bicultural society. In Becoming Bicultural (Huia Press 1992) I have tried to spell out the ethical and value-based requirements as I see them in general. But as I have said there the Treaty is simply a signpost that points the way towards the broad territory of bicultural responsibility.

The wider object is cultural understanding and respect. The focus on the Treaty is a operational device just as the Treaty itself was a political device to ensure that cultural coherence could replace legal and jurisdictional confusion. The history of the Treaty exemplifies the danger because when it became con-

venient to do so government administration and indeed the Courts declared it a nullity. Even when this was done the pre-constitutional obligation to recognise cultural custom and practice remained. It is that which modern Treaty interpretation places in the real focus; it is that which cannot be escaped or denied.

So just doing a workshop, making statements about Treaty recognition in charters or codes of practice or ethics will not be enough. Carefully extending our understanding of other

---

**Maori psychology is emerging from the chrysalis of its intellectual tradition**

---

ethnicities here, working with their scholars and practitioners,

understanding their wisdom must become part of the ongoing life- long learning of us all.

Just over a hundred years ago psychology itself emerged as a definable discipline. So too Maaori psychology is emerging from the chrysalis of its intellectual tradition. The analogy is imprecise because it implies that the process is nature-made and inevitable. Intellectual understanding is just not like that. Maaori understanding of things psychological has to be constructed, as has any body of knowledge and the prime task is to make explicit the assumptions and methods upon and by which this will be done. We will not see this achieved if all that we can offer to Maaori students is the chance to become brown copies of the orthodoxy which the University-based tradition has created (in what is after all a mere blink in the time-line of the history of ideas).

Somewhere, sitting in our ranks or classrooms there is the Lita Hollingworth, the William James or Morton Prince of Maaori psychology. What we can now recognise is that there is this possibility and that to deny it is ethnocentricity, whatever face it wears or argument is used.